

## **DRAFT MINUTES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MEETING: | Transport Forum |
| CHAIRED BY: | Hon Mark Mitchell, MP for Rodney  Chris Murphy, Chair of One Warkworth Business Association |
| DATE: | Friday 28 June, 2019 |
| TIME: | 8am – 9.45am |
| LOCATION: | The Boardroom, The Oaks Retirement Village,  Queen Street (behind the old Warkworth Tavern) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Attendees: | Hon Mark Mitchell; Chris Murphy, Dave Stott, Murray Chapman, Rachel Callendar, Ida Dowling; Kelli Sullivan; Hueline Massey; Roger Williams: Robert Jones; Karsten Stevenson; Greg Sayers; Bill Endean; Kimdon Nguyen; Melanie Alexander; Glyn Williams; Beth Houlbooke; Burnette O’Connor; Mark Macky, |
| Apologies: | Seb , Ryan Bradley |

**Welcome, Introductions and Apologies**

Hon Mark Mitchell

There is huge value of having an organized business association in place. Being organized presents an opportunity to advance our issues and keep pushing them through.

Things are moving in a positive direction. The process to get Hill Street started was done through a meeting in Wellington with NZTA, Auckland Transport and Mark Mitchell. There is nothing stopping us getting this process under way, but we now need funding to get going. Not a lot of response at Government level. They are applying pressure re the Warkworth-Wellsford road. The money needs to be appropriated.

Confirmation of minutes of meeting dated 1 March 2019

* Moved - Dave Stott
* Seconded – Roger Williams

**Matakana Link Road update** (Kimdon Nguyen - Project Manager MLR- Auckland Transport) Puhoi to Warkworth State Highway Extension (RONS)

Last meeting Kimdon wasn’t in attendance. Update on progress since last meeting.

Discussions with One Warkworth and Local Board. Held an engineering workshop to find areas where savings can be made. Objective was to identify potential savings which could be reinvested into additional infrastructure.

This has resulted in an updated design for Stage 1 where there will be approximately 800metres of 4 lane capacity within the MLR carriageway from SH1 to just prior to the bridge, then this will reduce to a 2 lane capacity carriageway. NZTA have confirmed approval for this revised approach.

In addition to the current Stage 1 design, we have been given approval to proceed with a second design which proposes a 4-lane capacity road along the full length of the new MLR road. This is called Stage 1b and is proposed to be tendered at the same time as Stage 1. additional -

NZTA funding is still required for this approach.

In terms of the consents and designation works, the hearings were in end March/early April. Decisions were received 3 weeks ago. The appeals period for consent has closed. There is 1 appeal and the designation appeal period is expected to close end of July/early August.

We must now progress through the appeals process which includes formal mediation to try to resolve the appeals. The mediation date has not been set yet, but is expected to occur in September/October 2019.

If the appeals cannot be resolved through mediation, we would then progress to the environment court. This could occur in early 2020.

AT are not expecting construction to start this calendar year as construction cannot be started without the designation and associated consents being confirmed.

**Queries/Comments**

Dave Stott – as part of OneWarkworth talking with AT – we have been delighted with the response we have had from AT. It has been a very positive relationship and we now have got what we were pushing for at the beginning of the year. What impact is the programme going to have in terms of completion of construction and the opening of RONS?

Kimdon: The MLR project is subject to a separate designation to the RONS. The opening of the RONS is not subject to the completion of MLR. However, it is recognized that there are obvious benefits to opening MLR at the same time as the RONS.

Robert Jones – NX2: We have now been asked by the Transport Agency to work with them to look at options available in terms of being able to open the motorway on time even if the Matakana Link Road isn’t finished and the land acquisition still required for widening of SH1 from the junction of Matakana Link road to the roundabout of the motorway. Still some preliminary work being done on a Plan B so that we can have the motorway open and traffic free-flowing, even though it won’t be full works on SH1 as originally envisaged.

Question: Is the opening of SH1 with RONS dependent on delivery of Matakana in terms of timing?

RJ: In terms of the existing contract it is – the requirements for the opening include the widening of SH1 through to Matakana Link Rd intersection. Time is running out now and they are looking at other options available to them. Transport Agency didn’t have land available for the widening between Link Rd connection on SH1 up to the roundabout.

Roger Williams: There would be a very strong right turn coming in from Matakana Road and Sandspit Rd. The right turn traffic backs right up over Matakana Rd and Sandspit road stopping people coming into Warkworth.

RJ: The solution they are looking at present is a temporary one. Land is still required on both sides of SH1 to complete widening to the connection but is not currently available. This is linked to the connection through to MLR itself. Now looking at options to provide some relief for traffic to MLR and into Warkworth itself. Have only just been asked to look at that now so no solutions are available just yet.

This land may be subject to going through the Public Works Act which will take some time. Currently negotiating with landowners in the area but the landowner has appealed the MLR which is providing some difficulty in completing the land acquisition.

Burnette: In terms of delivering outcomes for the community it would seem better to put effort into communicating with the landowners and resolving the issue. My opinion is that it needs a round table discussion.

Mark Mitchell suggested that we have a dashboard at the next meeting to highlight green/orange/red in terms of the MLR so if it’s not going to be delivered on time, we can clearly understand the issues and delays.

Kimdon: The (appeals) process is putting us behind.

Chris Murphy: Can you progress the design and tender process to contractors on the basis that the contractors accept there may be a delay with the commencement date. That way we are not in a situation where negotiations get to a point where issues are resolved, and you have to go back and start design and tender process, losing several months. Can you advance both discussions concurrently?

Kimdon: The risk is that there is only limited time the tender is valid for and we go past that period, then the prices are not valid.

Robert Jones: There are other procurement processes AT could follow that allow some flexibility on how the final design is arrived at and how its paid for.

Kimdon: The risk is AT enters the contract with no guarantees that we have got the land and/or consents. We would be entering an agreement where they are not able to honour that contract.

Chris M: In a commercial sense, if you can establish a preferred contactor and reserve your position should price vary due to timing issues. Could you look at this as an option and report back to us.

Dave Stott: Our discussion with the board suggested we could go ahead with these projects concurrently and a preferred contractor could be chosen from a tender process and any changes negotiated at that point.

K: This was assuming if it were to go ahead without any appeals, we would go down the traditional procurement process.

Burnette: How certain are you that areas at the Matakana Rd end are not going to change?

K: That all depends on the appeals. Still waiting for appeals to come in.

Chris to RJ: As a potential contractor do you see scope for a tender process that would result in the appointment of a preferred contractor on terms that would protect AT.

RJ: There is, there is risk but it could be a shared risk between all parties. The important thing in terms of timing is to get the earthworks in play. The bulky earthworks can be adapted to any additional scope that might be required in terms of connections for landowners and appeals. The key to getting this finished on time is getting the earthworks done.

Mark Mitchell: When are we going to go past the point of non-delivery of the earthworks.

RJ: We are signaling to the Transport Agency now that we cannot complete our scheduled works because there is no certainty of completion date of the widening of SH1 through to the MLR connection. They are working on a Plan B because the MLR won’t be finished in time for the motorway finishing.

Earthworks to start on 1 October on Matakana Link Rd to coincide with the RONS.

Mark M: If the board themselves indicated in a meeting the work can be done concurrently to get this underway. Is this not the message you got?

Kimdon: We have been working on the traditional procurement approach which means the design for Stage 1 and Stage 1B tendered at the same time once the consent process has been gone through.

Mark M: Where has this decision been made?

Kimdon: This was the information I’ve been given and that I’ve provided the board on our procurement approach and that was provided to our executives. Their feedback was that this is the direction we are going.

Chris: What needs to happen for you to adopt a concurrent approach?

Kimdon: Tendering in line with appeals? Now that we have appeals, we have to go through the process. We need to look at the programme to understand options available.

Burnette: Subject to analysis of the appeals, if there is a limited scope, could you proceed with bulk earthworks? You could go to the Courts saying the scope of the appeals are limited to XYZ, there’s not a question about bulk earthworks, no-ones appealing that there’s going to be a road and get an exemption to start those works.

Kimdon: Yes, now that we have got appeals on those consents, we know the content of those appeals, we are still waiting on the contents of the designations but depending on the nature of those appeals, we could look at those options.

Burnette: That is useful for community to flag that that is an option.

Greg Sayers: Clarity question to Burnette – around appeals – There is nervousness round the risk – did I hear that you suggested a round table conversation with certain parties for the appeals to be dealt with?

Burnette: From my understanding there are Warkworth Land Co, Stallen, Goatley, Warkworth Showgrounds people. Everyone wants the same outcome – they want a MLR. So, if we can work out the details collectively, there is a high likelihood that there could be a pretty fast mediated settlement.

Greg: Is that appropriate and do Mark and I need to facilitate such a roundtable meeting, and do you have an idea of the names of the parties – can they be provided.

Mark M: That would be an option as long as the will exists within AT / NZTA to engage with stakeholders.

Kimdon: We have been engaging the whole way through and from my understanding all those appeals that relate to MLR we have been spoken to and addressed. There are certain things that are subject to appeals the landholders don’t necessarily agree with but there are processes in place they need to go through to address those points.

MM: to Kimdon - If the stakeholders are willing – could/would AT or NZTA facilitate getting stakeholders around the table to get things moving. Robert has a clause in his contract that says they can’t open RONS until the MLR is ready. It is becoming critical when the 1 October date for earthworks is going to compress very quickly. Is that possible – because if not, then we will call that meeting ourselves.

Kimdon: It can happen. We are happy to come to stakeholder’s meetings, it’s just whether they’re willing to change their position on the same points we’ve discussed. It’s the points round future intersection access for development which we can’t provide because they’re not in a position to show what the effects are of the development. There is a separate process through AC where future development proposals are assessed.

Chris M: My impression is that the parties are positioning as they traditionally would in the context of an appeal process and that the cost of this is delay in commencement of the MLR.

This is unacceptable given delay in commencement of the MLR is very likely to cripple Warkworth traffic flow with Hill Street not coping with Northern traffic flows (to and from). There is also risk of the northern interchange being compromised.

Kimdon: There needs to be some look at that because the Puhoi/Warkworth project was approved without the MLR.

Chris M: Hill St struggles with existing Warkworth traffic flows. It will not cope with increased northern orientated traffic flows or the pending population growth. We think it is absolutely crucial that MLR is open and operative at the time that RONS is completed, and the only way that can be achieved is for a concurrent development of design and tendering process. So, Kimdon, are you able to go back to AT and share with them our concerns and get some feedback about the possibility of a concurrent process. One Warkworth is unable to influence the outcome of the discussion between AT and Appellants. But if AT delays the design and tender process, work will not start until next year’s earthworks season, and we’re going to have at least 12 months, if not more, of disruption, which the Warkworth community shouldn’t have to tolerate.

Kimdon: Yes, we have to go through and reassess what our programme is.

Chris M: The community is asking that you advocate for a concurrent approach.

Is there opportunity to get one contractor who can build MLR to engage with a suggestion on how a market tender could take place, with flexibility to give you assurances.

KN: Yes, there’s processes that are available.

MarkM: Going back to what Greg was saying, why don’t we try to get another meeting here in the next few weeks to find out because with what Robert is saying, the Plan B is going to be hugely costly, big blowouts then you’ll have to go back anyway, once the MLR is sorted out. Is that how you see it Robert?

Robert Jones: The Plan B issue really is the traffic clogging up the roundabout at the northern end and not creating the free flow for traffic to head north. Because if the traffic is throttled coming back into Warkworth and we’ve got cueing at the end of the motorway, that’s not going to be practical for either people coming to Warkworth or those using SH1. That wasn’t the intention. Plan B is how can we complete the northern connection in a way that allows traffic to move round it in a free flow way as was originally intended and you may get cueing back into Warkworth from the end of the roundabout.

ChrisM: Is there a possibility that that meeting could be called within the next fortnight.

Mark M: I’m really concerned – the timeframes – the worst-case scenario is having a world class state highway built and not being able to open it to use because we are being held up by the MLR. RONS was an essential project and MLR started to come on board when it became apparent that Puhoi-Warkworth was going ahead. Originally it wasn’t going to start till 2020 and was brought forward. This is the background as to why there wasn’t immediate alignment with MLR and Puhoi-Warkworth.

Chris M: OneWarkworth has been pushing for the full 4 lane MLR since AT first raised the 2-lane option mid last year. One Warkworth has also being telling AT that it is essential that the MLR opened at the time the RONS opens.

Despite progress with one part of the discussion AT is failing miserably on the other. If there is an ability to approach the design and tender process in a concurrent manner, AT has to.

Murray C: If someone wants to give Claire or me the names of the affected parties, we can invite them and set up a meeting and get some progress on this.

Mark M: That, plus we must have a really clear idea of different options that are on the table, with you taking feedback from this meeting today in terms of how we can get the process sped up and get things moving.

Roger Williams: Ian Hutchinson tabled a proposal to move the intersection 25m north – is that still on the table? It was an excellent suggestion.

Burnette: My understanding is that Warkworth Properties has lodged an appeal to the NZTA Notice of Requirement. They are the main proponent seeking that change because at the moment where the MLR is proposed to intersect with SHI makes the obvious intersection with the western link road cut through the end one of the proposed retail outlets that’s associated with the Pack N Save development that’s had resource consent issued. Their interest is in getting the MLR moved so the western link road correspondingly moved north and avoids the Warkworth Properties land which is Foodstuffs. So that is still on the table Roger.

**Warkworth to Wellsford State Highway Extension**

Kelly Sullivan NZTA – Are weeks away from lodging designation for consents for Warkworth-Wellsford - the second section. Will be lodging designations consents with Auckland Council. Construction still remains at least 10 years away, subject to funding – date in application 2030.

Because of the size of the application for a 26km offline future transport corridor, the full application will be made available from the moment that Council accepts it. It is likely that it will be notified about a month after being lodged. It will be available online on their website, in libraries and will open up NZTA Warkworth hub office for reading days. Currently doing completeness checks on these documents now.

**Puhoi to Warkworth State Highway Extension (RONS)**

Robert Jones:

Quick summary – We are pleased to say that the summer that we’ve just had has been great for progress. We are where we need to be for the overall completion of the project. We have set ourselves a very ambitions target of 4million cubic metres of earth to shift and we just about did that. Progress is taking place now where the bridge is. It’s all on plan for the next season. New projects will start ie landscaping, pavement going down next season. 2 important things for us are the tie ins at the northern section – putting aside the MLR - how we tie into the SH and staging around that is pretty important. The roundabout is starting to form but will look at how we can tie in to the main alignment of SH1 and similarly at the southern end – this tie in will be complex due to the height of the new motorway where it joins into the tunnel means they will sever the SH1 connection. That is going through review at the moment. Will keep you informed on that. Traffic may need be diverted at the Puhoi turning up onto the new ramps and onto the motorway to go through the tunnel before the rest of the motorway is complete. This will be quite disruptive – we are very cognizant of keeping traffic moving on SH1 but ultimately there will be some disruption and we will need to keep people informed as far in advance as possible. Anticipate this could be over a 3-4 month timeframe but more work still to be done on this. Will try to avoid the peak summer season.

Mark M: The work you are doing is impressive and with the scale of the project, staying on track – well done.

**Hill Street Intersection**

* New design and build
* Melanie Alexander AT
* Kelli Sullivan NZTA

Still unsure of the timing but for different reasons this time.

Interim solution has moved away from pedestrian signalised crossing on the southbound slip to a raised zebra crossing with a cross walk on Sandspit Rd. Because it intersects with the state highway NZTA have a key role in agreeing changes. Also, through the investigations found we couldn’t provide a crossing table on the northern bound slip – there isn’t enough room on the intersection footprint so that will be deferred until the bigger intersection works are completed.

Re the new design for the pedestrian crossing, AT have received the independent road safety audit – report came in last week. Auckland Transport have done their review. NZTA need to do theirs. There are a few minor changes which can be accommodated within the design. Committing to adding it to the budget for next year. Trying to work closely and quickly with NZTA colleagues to get the final push and get this underway.

Draft design was tabled and explained – not to be made public yet please.

Sandspit Rd into Matakana Rd – one of the interim measures - cameras currently observing it. The idea is to make it more of a slip lane down into a left hand turn out of Sandspit into Matakana. Will look at the outcome of the monitoring and start a period of testing and then can look at it for that intersection. One of the concerns there is safety and we want to make sure the changes made can be observed and make sure there are not untoward driver behavior changes because of the flow of traffic through there, especially right turns, need to make sure it’s not narrowed up too much. Melanie will get a timeline for this.

Beth Houlbrouke – Is one of the reasons for the cameras to find out where the traffic from Sandspit Rd is going, is it turning right, or for example. The camera at Hill Street intersection is programmed for operations and signals guys but can also help operators detect queues developing. Further detectors were put in last year as well. Which can create a warning signal for operators to pay attention to that intersection. It is not around peak period – it’s about everyday use of the intersection.

Beth: The other interim improvement was to have hatching painted across the intersection. Why can that not be done now? New financial year starts Monday so it depends on when they can get processed. Melanie to review, this was anticipated to be part of the interim works on the intersection.

Hill Street Improvements

The business case has been drafted and is currently being reviewed internally by NZTA and AT prior to final approval – It is anticipated it will be finalized by the end of August, at which point preferred option will be able to be shared with the community.

There will be no consultation on the preferred option. Once released, that is the business case. When it goes to the next phase, and once funding is secured, there is consultation over detailed design elements. Timing of that future phase is subject to final approvals and construction of the preferred long-term solution would not occur till after the Puhoi to Warkworth motorway is completed.

Mark M: Incremental changes in Hill St – ie painting – how much money and what can we do to help you get the money appropriated.

Money is set aside for this. It depends on any changes that may come through this process. AT have money allocated to undertake this work in the new FY.

Indicate to the community some kind of budget for the painting of the hatches. This is important.

Dave Stott: re the preferred option. A little disappointed that CAG was established and really had no input into the preferred option. There were 2 very schematic options provided and nothing subsequently. 2nd point – more importantly – how can we be involved to ensure you get funding for the next stages for detailed design and construction?

Firstly, we acknowledge we have been working with Supporting Growth around some of those things around walking and cycling which will explain the level of schematic design that we were looking at about – principle based – whether it would be signalizing or roundabout. The detail is in the detailed design. Re helping with funding – not something Melanie can give advice on personally.

Chris M: Are you saying is that there is nothing currently allocated? That the delivery of preferred design in August (which should have been delivered in January) will get us to a stage where nothing further happens due to lack of funding?

Kelli – No not at this stage.

Chris: The advice from NZTA and AT has for some years now has been that the the physical work to put the Hill St solution in place couldn’t commence prior to the RONS opening, but it would commence as soon as RONS opens.

Kelli – that’s right. I think we have been very clear from the outset that every phase is subject to funding

ChrisM: In a roundabout way you have been anything but clear. You take a positive step in setting up the CAG, but then the process that should have taken 12 months has taken 18 months or more. It is as if you’re giving us just enough to keep us quiet and hopeful but there is still no commitment to a solution.

Kelli – I think that’s a little unfair. I appreciate where you are coming from. And from the outside it may look like that.

Chris: We need some urgency around Hill Street.

Kelli – I’m totally aware of that. We have been working really closely with Supporting Growth we cannot treat Hill St in isolation to the future transport network for Warkworth, so both programmes have been doing work behind the scenes to remain aligned. Other programmes have come into the mix that have got to interface and so we have had to hold onto things like walking and cycling. This work behind the scenes has affected the programme. But it is for the betterment and it is a long-term improvement for this intersection, and it can’t be improved in isolation to the broader Warkworth network. I appreciate it is a real focal point so we hear the frustration and finishing the detailed business case is a fundamental part of the process and beyond that through funding, we will have completed that and will be ready to move on to the next step.

The CAG will be able to view the final business case before its announced publicly.

Chris M: Our message is where is the funding? – funding so we know money is set aside. It is a matter of prioritizing. Unless the people attending this meeting take this message back to the people who make the decisions, we will be having this same conversation in 12 month’s time.

Mark M: Chris highlights the point that although these comments are not directed at you guys, I will say this. The problem always with the approach that’s been taken by the Transport Agency and AT is that and the default position has been that the RONS will be delivered with the MLR, wait for the rest of the network to get up then we will do Hill St. I accept why you look at it like that, but all we’d say is if you can switch the way you look at it and say let’s forget about the rest of the network – but instead take the approach of how can we deliver this and get it delivered in the shortest time period possible because there is massive fatigue within the community. I agree the CAG process is good and has got us closer to the RONS coming online. Can you have a fresh look at it in terms of just delivering Hill Street rather than waiting for the rest of the network?

Chris M: Our concern is that Warkworth is going to go from 4000 to 25000 people over the next 15-20 years. At the moment every single roading initiative we have discussed today is failing and being pushed out by a year or two.

Mark M: In all fairness to these guys, I stress my earlier comments about dysfunction – these guys are operating in a very difficult environment at the moment. It’s all about priorities and where the money is flowing. We need to continue to fight but I believe we will achieve.

Dave Stott: In terms of determining priorities in funding it becomes a political issue and we need to determine as a group how we’re going to approach that and who the key people are we need to put pressure on.

Mark M is applying pressure at a central Government level through the Minister through meetings and letters. Though the priorities have been laid out and are very clear.

The community can also decide what it might be prepared to wear in terms of different funding arrangements. If the community wants it, we can have a conversation about that and with support from people like Mark and Greg, go to council and central govt agencies and say the community is prepared to wear an extra couple of hundred dollars a year or whatever.

Greg Sayers: Kelli– a key point is - you mentioned about the future growth plan and the requirement of getting the funding from Auckland Council is it critical that Beth and I make contact with someone in the Supporting Growth team for us to understand and to advocate with them about where they see the priority.

**Western Corridor / Southern Interchange**

**Ida Dowling - Supporting Grown**

NZTA and AT boards have supported and approved the indicative networks for Warkworth that we talked about at the end of last year. Now preparing for a public launch so coming out within 2 weeks to tell the communities about the recommended corridors here in Warkworth also in the North-West and North Auckland and South Auckland. We have sent out letters to affected landowners within a study area at a high level. At the early stages of identifying corridors but people who may be affected have received a letter and they’ll be putting information out publicly in the next week.

Council structure plan process has been happening also. Feedback has been received in terms of the integrated transport assessment. Amassing comments and will produce an update in the next while.

Burnette: How does that roll with the fact the structure plan has now been adopted?

Ida: We’ve been working with Council on that and will be releasing an addendum to support that plan.

Roger Williams: It is very apparent that the structure plan was lacking a lot of the information that was put forward at the draft consultation meetings and that was disappointing. The structure plan didn’t have obvious things that you should be considering so it looks like the structure plan needs revision.

Ida: the structure plan was a council process and we haven’t been working with council to prepare that so it may not have appeared to be there.

The next phase of the supporting growth we will be studying some detailed business cases in more detail over the next few months, including the western link road and southern interchange. Just reiterating that the Southern interchange will be timed for when growth occurs in the south, but we haven’t done any further detailed work on that since the engagement meeting last year.

Dave Stott: Re western link road – disappointed about - Western Link Road – Mansell Road is an inappropriate place to put a major link road because of the retirement village, other major developments happening in that area, at the same time there is a development north of that where a road will go through that they’re going to put a road through that will probably form part of the western link road and they are trying to commit to that but we feel it is an inappropriate route. The other problem is the intersection at Woodcocks Rd – there are accidents on a regular basis there. Site distances are inappropriate for a major link road. We as a community have major concerns around that.

Ida: We are recommending that Mansell Dr form a central part of that link road, but we are looking at other options further west along Falls Rd – there are environmental constraints with Mahurangi river running through there. Our recommendation is that Mansell Rd becomes that central part of the western link. We have had discussions with landowners looking at a private plan change to the north of that along the western link road alignment so will be talking with them about what that will look like. It’s going through Council.

R Williams: We have a whole lot of storms happening at the same time – one being private land change but also the stock yards development outside Mitre 10, the Presbyterian Church. All will happen at the same time. The private land change looks like it will happen from south to north which means that all that traffic is forcing itself through Hudson Road. So, it’s a perfect storm.

Ida: We are keen to finalise the location of MLR and the western link road intersection on SH1 which is one of the main reasons there are likely to be delays if there are appeals on that location. Until that’s resolved Kimdon’s team won’t be able to make much progress on the design as that has a fundamental impact on the alignment and therefore the corridor and western link road.

Funding – NZTA would not commit funding before the fund phase is complete – so business case looking at Hill St is part of the completion for that. They will lodge funding application for the next phase – that’s standard process. Indications are that funding will be made available but in terms of priorities they are focused on staging – multi modular. Looking forward to the next few years, there’s a big chunk of money going towards debt repayment for the Puhoi-Warkworth motorway. We need to count $200m per year over quite a few years – there’s not much money left over to build new stuff. There’s not as much money available as there used to be. One of the only ways we’re going to secure funding is to look for alternative mechanisms for funding quickly to build roads in this community. It’s not for lack of will on our part.

Burnette: this is being realistic. If agencies are willing to work with our clients/community collectively that is important.

Murray C: It seems counter-productive to be encouraging residential and commercial buildup and on the other hand saying we’ve got no money to build roads and infrastructure. As the town grows, we will have more and more gridlock which affects everyone who lives here. We’re building for today, not 20 years hence.

Burnette: the structure plan needs to be forward thinking and setting the framework for Warkworth for the next 20 years and in my opinion, it has totally failed our community.

Murray C: They’ve disregarded most of the stuff the community has asked them to do. We need infrastructure built here to keep up with the growth that’s coming or we’re in dire straits.

Ida: Not isolated to Warkworth – the same challenges in a lot of places.

ChrisM: Ida, at what level is AT or NZTA invested in funding? With the MLR for example, NX2 has some months ago put an offer to AT to build MLR on PPP arrangement which would defer the capital cost of construction. NX2 would get a long-term return on their investment which would enable work to be done without AT/NZTA having to front foot the capital cost. Yet this proposal was declined.

Ida: I don’t think it’s a funding issue that’s causing the delays. There is a large chunk of money that needs to be paid back but they have those priority discussions in terms of next step. This is something that Supporting Growth alliance has been working with in some detail, but the mechanics of those processes is at its very early stages.

Dave S: It’s unlikely that formula will work for Hill St. Hill St is our main priority. Where are the pressure points we can apply to look at getting funding through our RTLP? That seems to be the critical issue. Is it at Council level, AT level, NZTA level, board level, senior management level? We want to find that pressure point. We need to mobilise our community.

Ida: I think now’s the time to do that – the funding period is in 3-year chunks. There’s one 2018-2021 – all that money is largely allocated but starting from now over the next year is a planning process for the next 3 years and looking forward the next 10. This is a public process so there are opportunities for communities to comment and provide input.

Bill Endeans: Is there timing around the southern link or western link – that is intended to be timed for when that land is released.

Ida: They’re working through the details of that as part of the detailed business case.

Bill: Is that timed for the funding regime just mentioned?

Ida: yes – once the detailed business case is finished, they will be able to make recommendations about exact timing. Within the next week or two, they will be releasing publicly, the indicative network.

Rachel C: Does that mean that what you consult on can change what has been adopted in the structure plan?

Ida: Yes, the structure plan has no regulatory weight, it is a guidance document. More detailed work will be done as part of the detailed business case and there’s another opportunity then.

**Traffic Modelling:**

Roger Williams:

There are 3 glaring areas of differences between AT model and our model. One is on the number of people per household – currently using 2.14 whereas the structure plan uses 2.7. Then at Hill St, there’s a glaring error in the implement of Saturn regarding Elizabeth St and how that leg of the intersection works which may affect the business case. I’m hopeful that the business case for Hill St isn’t money dependent, because I’d hate to get a poor BC out of that because the model is wrong, and it’s very wrong. Then there’s the growth of the changing demographics of Omaha and Snells Beach, where we’re seeing not only growth but change from holiday homes to permanent. We’ve asked for a specific meeting on that but not date yet.

We would like the modelling work to be based on 2.7 people per household. Would like AT to have a meeting with us to show what the outcome of that looks like.

Hill St: existing situation to future situation. In comparison, if you haven’t got the existing situation model correct, and there is a glaring error in that – then you’ll get the wrong BCR.

Ida: from a construction cost estimate the 2 models are similar – maybe $1-2million max between the 2 options.

Roger: I was worried about getting it past the funding barrier.

Ida: The funding barrier for a project like Hill St will have to be round GPS priorities – safety is the top priority which has always been a challenge for Hill St because of the lack of serious accidents.

**General Business**

Mark M: Thank you to all parties who attend these meetings regularly, having NZTA, AT, Supporting Growth here

Kimdon: Let’s try and get that meeting together.

Mark M? The one thing that Chris raised is that we have multiple roading projects, all very dependent on each other in terms of delivering that whole network but no one has an overarching oversight on how those projects are progressing and how to head towards being delivered so the whole network comes on live as seamlessly as possible. Not sure what the solution is but it’s something I’ll be turning my mind to.

Chris M: We are heading toward the worst-case outcome – that gridlock we’ve been worried about. It’s coming to a stop. There’s no funding and the next stage hasn’t been planned.

Mark M: Acknowledging the very difficult environment you are working under, this community, OneWarkworth, Beth, Greg, myself, have to apply pressure in the right places to get some movement.

It is helpful to have a community that is engaged and active. It makes a difference. It shows the importance of having a business association that has a loud voice and has the ability to lobby and apply pressure. We’re competing with the rest of the country.

Chris: OneWarkworth wants the right solution.

Greg: In closing I would like to acknowledge the positiveness and willingness of the agencies to be here. Thank you.