

## 11. RUTLAND STREET - PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN ISLAND

<b>Officer responsible</b> City Streets Manager	<b>Author</b> Brian Boddy, DDI 941-8013.
--	---

The purpose of this report is to request the Shirley/Papanui Community Board recommend that the proposed pedestrian island in Rutland Street be deleted from the Capital Works Programme.

The Board resolved at its March meeting that the appended publicity plan for the construction of a pedestrian island in Rutland Street be approved for consultation and that staff advise the Board of any objections raised during the consultation process. One hundred and thirty five publicity pamphlets were distributed in the area surrounding the Rutland Street/Mays Road intersection. Nineteen responses have been received from the property owners and residents in this area, including a petition from the kindergarten advising that they "... are opposed to the proposed crossing island...". The feedback relevant to the concept plan is summarised below.

### Parking

- We are concerned about the loss of on street parking.
- Proposed parking restrictions/losses cannot be recommended.
- I am against the removal of parking on the east side of the road, which will cause more children to cross the road.
- Some yellow no parking lines would be appreciated outside my place.
- The proposed facility is ok except for the loss on street parking.
- The proposed facilities are insufficient reason to reduce the number of parking spaces available.
- Proposed parking restrictions will just make parents have to park further away, thereby increasing walking distances when dropping their children off or picking them up.
- Any parking restrictions should be on the west side not the east side to reduce the need for pedestrians to cross the road.
- Parking should be banned on the west side of Rutland Street from Mays Road to No. 197.
- I am totally opposed to this design with its proposed parking restrictions and road narrowing.

### Proposed Design

- This is an excellent idea.
- This work not required, there is no problem. It is only busy at kindy time and even then it is not that bad.
- The pedestrian island should be installed in McFaddens Road at its intersection with Rutland Street.
- The island is too close to the corner.
- The island should be placed closer to the kindergarten.
- The pedestrian island is in the wrong place to meet the demand. Pedestrians cross mainly at the kindergarten entrance and a few cross between there and the bend.
- It would be better to place the island closer to the kindergarten with its associated no parking restrictions. This would make it easier for people waiting to cross the road to and from the kindergarten entrance.
- We are opposed to the proposed crossing island.
- How about speed humps in Rutland Street and Tomes Road at the corner.
- The proposed island, flush median and no-stopping will all help the problem.

### General Comments

- The only times when it is difficult to cross Rutland Street is at 9.00 am and 3.00 pm.
- There are more disadvantages than advantages.
- Footpath needs to be widened on both sides of the road where pedestrians wait to cross the road at the intersection.

After considering the above feedback and options suggested in the 2002 Rutland Street Pedestrian Crossing Facility Report (the report recommended kerb extensions just to the north of the kindergarten entrance) the project team advise that the work be deleted from the Capital Works Programme for the following reasons: -

- Due to budget restrictions the proposed kerb extensions (estimated cost \$30,000) are unable to be considered as a "Plan B".
- The lack of support from the majority of the respondents in the Community for the proposal as shown on the appended plan.

**Staff**

**Recommendation:** That the proposal as shown on the attached plan be deleted from the Capital Works Programme.

**Chairperson's**

**Recommendation:**

1. That the staff recommendation be adopted.
2. That the situation be reviewed in 12 months.