

2. KERB AND CHANNEL PRIORITISATION PROCESS

Ken Stevenson and Graeme Wilson were in attendance to outline the process for prioritising kerb and channel replacements, and feedback was sought from the Board on the development of a policy framework for Council approval. Specific feedback was sought on:

- Strengths of current process
- Weaknesses in current process
- What factors should be added
- What factors should be removed or changed
- Other

It was **resolved** that the following feedback be provided to the Sustainable Transport and Utilities Committee:

Strengths

- Co-ordination between kerb and channel and other roading works
- Improvements in the consultation process
- Safety benefits in relation to shoulder cross-falls

Weaknesses

- Some minor implications are not taken into account, e.g. increased volume in traffic.
- Co-ordination of works needs to go wider and involve other units, such as Parks & Waterways Unit.
- Processes should be flexible enough to accommodate changes that may occur because of works undertaken or changes to traffic flow.
- Some renewals are undertaken under the auspices of the NIP Scheme and some are not because criteria are based on urban renewal rather than the NIP Scheme (e.g. some works fall between different programmes).

What Factors Should Be Added?

- More weighting needs to be given to areas outside schools.
- Would rather see a whole section of road improved for pedestrian safety, as opposed to piecemeal work.

The Board's feedback would be presented to the Sustainable Transport and Utilities Committee to assist in developing a policy to be presented to Council in December 2002.