

## The Strand / Cass Street Hui 8 - Group Minutes

Location: Haratu Kororāreka Marae and Online via Teams

Date: 9.30-11am, 6 May 2026

### Attendees

#### CHAIR

Jaye Michalick FNDC Team Leader, Growth Planning and Placemaking

#### FNDC

James Witham FNDC Manager, Integrated Planning  
Jane Hindle FNDC Member Bay of Islands Whangaroa Community Board  
Janine Worrall FNDC Support Officer, Integrated Planning  
Tammy Wooster FNDC Group Manager, Policy and Planning

#### SME

Denise Bijoux Catalyse  
James Blackburn Director/Civil Engineer – Hawthorn Geddes

#### Roading Working Group Members (voting rights)

Adam Davey Community  
Bruce Mitchinson Russell Wharf Trust  
David McKenzie Russell Protection Society  
Debra Rewiri Chairperson of Kororāreka Marae (Tangata Whenua)  
Emily Rust Disability  
Jacqui Madelin Community  
Katarina Lavender Disability  
Shane Maddren Business

#### Apologies

Adam Cooper Business  
Marsha Davis Tangata Whenua

## 1. Draft Proposal for Public Engagement on Cass Street Design

- Denise from Catalyse, discussed the high-level outline from the document she sent out - Kororāreka Russell Final Community Engagement: Cass Street and The Strand roading changes.
- Agreement that engagement should be inclusive, transparent, and accessible.
- Importance of involving a broad range of stakeholders, including residents, businesses, visitors, and all road users and it was highlighted that the RRWG's involvement is key.
- Bylaw changes are to be made as well on engagement and consultation. (Parking Bylaw needs engagement and Road user Bylaw – introduce vehicle restrictions which is a new requirement that requires consultation). Timeline on how long the formal consultation process will take and depends on Council's adoption of the change to the Bylaw. Design and cost estimate handover to the FNDC's Transportation team.
- Need to clearly communicate project goals, constraints, and decision-making processes.
- Community Engagement - Three clear spaces for locals to drop in to:
  - Russell RSA on a Thursday and Saturday (walking tour) and Kororāreka Marae (walking tour).
  - View and comment on plans, artists impressions and explanatory notes.
  - Ask questions and hear from the RRWG and FNDC.
  - Engage with Bylaw consultation.
- Community should understand which elements of the design are fixed and which can be influenced. Value seen in presenting clear design options and visual materials to support informed feedback.
- Recognition that multiple channels will improve reach and accessibility across different groups i.e. phone, email and door knocking.
- Posters to invite the general public and the use of social media.

|   | April | May | June             | July   |
|---|-------|-----|------------------|--|
| Develop & agree plan                                |       |     |                  |  |
| Develop collateral                                  |       |     |                  |  |
| Promotion & events                                  |       |     | Deliver mid June |  |
| Draft report, circulate to Working Group & finalise |       |     |                  | By early July, Deadline 17/07 for 07/08 CB hui |

- Significant feedback will be reported back to Council and RRWG and then up to the Board.
- When can physical work be done without affecting trade over summer? November the latest and finish up by 8 December.
- The group understood that after consultation/feedback and bylaws we are not coming back to the RRWG, it is going up to Council. The RRWG will receive a feedback summary. It will be put in the Poster explanatory notes to the Community that the RRWG will not be able to make changes after consultation. Put it in a Thank you package to the RRWG from Council.
- Key topics identified for public input included:
  - Safety and accessibility.
  - Traffic movement and parking.
  - Streetscape amenity and placemaking opportunities.
- Prioritise work and spend.

## 2. Review HG Plan/Cost Estimates for Cass Street

Hawthorn Geddes explains Plan:

- The planter at the right-hand end is only two metres wide, so it cannot be used as a parking space.
- It's not feasible to reduce the planter enough to create additional usable parking.
- The space cannot practically be converted into three functional parking spaces.
- There is limited benefit in narrowing the space – doing so would result in a very narrow, impractical parking bay. Even with adjustments, the area would realistically only support two parking spaces.
- Decision is needed to make the space properly usable, potentially relocating the sign into the planter.
- While one space may be gained formally (currently used informally), there is a risk of effectively losing two spaces overall.

- Maximising parking in this area will not realistically allow three vehicles to park safely at the same time.
- Attempting to fit three cars would be too tight and creates a risk of car damage, particularly from opening doors.
- There is agreement that Adam's assessment is technically correct, but practical usability is the concern.
- It may be possible to remove the high-rise element of the planter.
- If the formal planter is made narrower, there may still be pavement underneath that could help slightly improve the space
- The space could legitimately be designated as motorcycle parking and to mark the surface MC.
- The proposal reduces the total number of marked car parks, but results in fewer, wider, and more usable spaces.
- Two dedicated motorcycle parks are added, helping free up car parks.
- One additional car park is formalised elsewhere, partly offsetting the loss.
- Very narrow car parks are considered functionally unusable for modern, wider vehicles.
- Slight widening (around 200 mm) improves usability and reduces cars parking over the lines.
- A vote is proposed on whether to:
  - Remove two car parks on the northern side,
    - Add two motorcycle parks on the northern side,
    - Add one car park on the southern side.
    - This approach allows James to finalise the line markings.
    - The plan retains the Pōhutukawa tree and central planter.
- Everyone was in agreement.
- Entry into Cass Street:
  - The plan is to use two low bollards as a visual signal to indicate transition into a different space. Visually difficult, not physically difficult.
  - This signal could work with or without reconstructing the crossing.
  - The two bollards are not additional—they are included within the previously discussed total of 18 bollards.
  - The proposed placement of the bollard is off the vehicle sweep and traffic design lines on both sides.
  - Positioning the bollard this way could result in awkward or unclear placement.
  - While it may send the intended signal, it conflicts with standard traffic design. Pros and cons to each option.
  - There is a shared agreement to retain the bollards.
  - Correct positioning of the bollards is considered critical.
  - The bollards are intended to prevent illegal parking at two locations.
  - They also provide a strong visual signal of a change in road-use space.
  - The group is clarifying whether a formal vote is needed or if prior agreement is sufficient.
  - The suggestion is to proceed by confirming retention and moving to the next step.
- Loading bay for fuel tanker:
  - The corner is chamfered, reducing conflict for vehicles turning right and heading north on the Strand.
  - Traffic conflict at this location is considered minimal.
  - It was confirmed early on that the Coca-Cola truck cannot and does not use this route.
  - As a result, large vehicle movements are not a major concern here.
  - The primary remaining vehicle consideration is Russell Tours', but they turn left first.
- Accessible Park
  - The space is dimensioned like a standard parking space, allowing swing room on the seaward side.
  - The space will not be formally marked due to the presence of an existing bench.
  - Clear indication is needed that it is:
    - An accessible parking space

- Intended for parking
  - Vehicles should park parallel, not perpendicular.
- There is no need to hatch an additional 1.2 m unloading zone, as the area lies within a shared space.
- Vehicle conflict is low because traffic will be prevented from entering Cass Street and turning south onto the Strand.
- Cost Estimates
  - Costs nearly \$112,000.
  - Around \$50,000 remains from the existing placemaking fund.
  - A decision is needed on how to allocate or spend this remaining money.
  - A report will be presented next month to the Bay of Islands–Whangaroa Community Board.
  - The report will request approval to carry the remaining funds into the next financial year.
  - Purpose of carryover is to implement the project later this year.
  - A further request will be made to see if the Community Board can allocate additional funds.
  - Any additional approved funding would also be carried forward into the next financial year.
  - use existing funds wisely now, based on agreed priorities, to maximise what can be delivered.
  - Car parking and road line marking are considered essential and prioritised first.
  - Prioritisation framework is being used (Priority 1 and 2, with option to add Priority 3 if needed).
- Bollards
  - Estimated cost is about \$1,000 per bollard on average including installation.
  - Bollard cost assumption: The ~\$1,000 per bollard estimate depends on sourcing local, well-priced materials and installation; costs would rise if commercially supplied bollards are required.
  - Prioritisation: Confirm whether bollards are deemed Priority 1 for delivery given current funding constraints
  - Bollards designed TBC, drilled planted bases and suspended fixing, 1200-millimetre nominal height, 300 diameters, including installation. Propriety stainless steel available.
- Pohutukawa – remedial works to existing Pohutukawa tree(s) and planters' north side of Cass Street. Private landowner will do this work at his cost, just awaiting consent from Council.
- Shared Zone delineation:
  - 3 options – Group agreed to spend nothing on delineation and let everything else speak to it.
- Signage, including bracketry and/or special mounts to over height bollards as Priority 1 at \$5,000.
  - Signage at shared zone entry: Two signposts are proposed at the transition into the shared zone—one on each side—as you enter.
  - Design and placement: One sign will be relocated into the planter to remove it from parking space, with the adjacent sign retained; both would use standard NZ signposts (possibly black) for a simple, cohesive aesthetic rather than decorative poles.
  - Existing sign issues: Current signage is too low (about 1.4 m to the bottom of the sign) and poorly mounted, with a mix of old timber bollards and a temporary steel post, creating both safety and presentation issues.
  - Proposed solution: Retain the old northern bollard as it helps define parking but install a new modern post in the planter (black painted aluminium or timber to suit heritage) and raise the signs to modern standard height for visibility and compliance.
  - Once the final sign types and layout are confirmed, James can quickly obtain pricing from suppliers such as Fulton Hogan's sign department.
- Saw cut pavement and construct in-situ concrete dished channel, including realignment of existing drain grate to suit - \$50,400 – Priority 1.
  - The proposal involves a full reconstruction of the entry, including road pavement and associated works.
  - This level of work explains why the cost estimate is high.
  - The option was included so decision-makers understand the scope, complexity, and cost implications.
  - This work will be the most disruptive – two phases. Most disruptive in terms of duration and accessibility.

- The group had moved quickly toward New London pavers as the preferred option for the raised York Street entrance.
  - Traffic Management/Environmental Management – Priority 1. Environmental management costs will be borne from concrete work.
  - P&G.
    - The estimate discussed represents about 20% of total physical works for preliminaries and general (P&G) costs.
    - For a \$90,000 works value, this equates to around \$18,000 in P&G.
    - P&G costs include:
      - Contractor insurance
      - Set-out and surveying
      - RAM data collection required by roading authorities
      - Other ancillary and compliance costs
      - These costs are unavoidable when engaging a contractor.
      - 20% is a typical and reasonable allowance in engineering estimates.
- Ended at 108,000 plus or minus 30%.

### **3. Discuss Cost Estimates for Items Uncosted by HG**

- Carving Costs - Priority 2 – Deb waiting on bollard carving costs. Marae may be able to provide additional funding. Estimated at 4,000.
- Poutama Patterning – Priority 2.
- Smart Bins – no smart bins. 2 stainless steel bins. Relocate 1 bin – cost to be confirmed.

### **4. What to do with items left from the Trial**

Interest in planter boxes has been received from multiple groups:

- Russell Organisation / Resilient Russell: 1
- Boating Club: 2
- School: some requested
- Sports Club: likely 1
- Whangaroa: 3
- Jaye to follow up with groups (including Jacqui).
- Community groups are responsible for collecting their allocated planter boxes.
- Coordination is encouraged to avoid multiple hires (e.g. shared transport), but this is not council's responsibility.
- No barrels are expected to be included.

### **5. Other**

- The agenda item going to council decision-makers must clearly outline pros and cons of the proposed options.
- Ongoing or future costs (e.g. maintenance, renewals) must be explicitly identified.
- Decision-makers need full information on implications and risks to make informed choices.
- This is a standard part of the Council decision-making process and something to be mindful of when preparing the report.