

GEORGE STREET RETAIL PRECINCT (GEORGE STREET UPGRADE)

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Based on the feedback from the peer review and CCAG on issues that matter to them, staff have reviewed the criteria that are being used to evaluate the options and have proposed amendments both to the list of criteria that should be used and how they should be measured to give and appropriate framework to consider the options. However, it is noted that decision-makers can choose to weight criteria and/or to have some criteria act as 'knock-out' criteria if an option scores below a certain threshold on that criterion.

| CRITERIA | | IMPORTANCE TO TRANSPORTATION AND RETAIL PLANNING CRITERIA | | HOW MEASURED |
|--|--|---|------|--|
| ORIGINAL CRITERIA | PROPOSED CRITERIA | RETAIL VIABILITY | NZTA | |
| Reduce DSI's to 0 (Road User Safety) | Safety (road users) | - | xxx | No change required |
| Improve Sense of Place and quality of experience on George Street (Amenity) | Opportunities for placemaking (space to provide for amenity features and activation) | xx | x | Was measured as "supports Council's desired plan and movement framework" meaning score based on ability to reduce vehicle access Suggest change measurement to ability to create space for amenity features (road space allocation for place-making) |
| Cycling/Micro-mobility | Cycling/Micro-mobility | x | x | No change required |
| Wider network impacts | Overall Network Function | | x | No change required |
| Ease of servicing and direct property access | Retail Accessibility (support for passing trade by car, easy access to car parking areas/buildings) | xxx | - | Change measurement from qualitative and focus on vehicle accesses with access and egress onto George to accessibility (transport) modelling access to car parking buildings (noting parking plan to look at options for other changes to maximise accessibility) |
| Legibility | ----- | | | |
| | Ability to support appropriate (electric) buses | x | x | Options that provide for 2 way traffic movement will score higher based on this criterion |
| | CPTED | xx | x | Options that provide for passive surveillance support this |
| | Flexibility of design to adapt to future needs | | | Cost and Difficulty in changing use for movement (for example 2 way to 1way etc |
| | Public Acceptability*** | | | CCAG input |

Based on the findings of the peer review staff have reviewed the assessment criteria used in the MCA for the IBC for the George Street project and recommend the following changes:

1. The original criterion 'Improve Sense of Place and quality of experience on George Street (Amenity)' should be replaced with 'Opportunities for placemaking (space to provide for amenity features and activation)'. The original criterion was measured as supporting Council's desired plan and movement framework, meaning that the score was based solely on the option's ability to reduce vehicle access. The revised criterion will allow measurement to be based on the ability of the option to create space for amenity features and activations.
2. The original criterion 'Ease of servicing and direct property access' should be replaced with 'Retail Accessibility (support for passing trade by car, easy access to car parking areas/buildings)'. The original criterion was measured as a largely qualitative focus on vehicle accesses with access and egress onto George Street; the revised criterion will allow measurement to be based on accessibility (transport) modelling of access to car parking buildings.
3. The criterion 'Legibility' is relevant to both the NZTA and Retail Viability analyses and is measured based on the consistency of design between blocks (for example, all one-way or all two-way). It is recommended to exclude this criterion if the design options do not include mixed typology options.

Four new criteria should be included in the MCA. These are:

1. the ability to support appropriate (e.g. electric) buses – options with two-way traffic movement will score higher based on this criterion;
2. crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) – options that provide for passive surveillance will score higher based on this criterion;
3. the flexibility of the design to adapt to future needs – this will be measured on the cost and difficulty in changing the movement use (for example, two-way to one-way); and
4. public acceptability – this could be measured based on the CCAG questionnaire findings.

Three remaining criteria (Road User Safety; Cycling Micro-mobility; and Wider network impacts (or Overall network function)) are fit for purpose and no change is recommended.