

#### 4. SULLIVAN AVENUE STREET RENEWAL

<b>Officer responsible</b> Asset Management Team Leader	<b>Authors</b> Brian Neill, Network Operations, DDI 941-8616; Ken Stevenson, Asset Management, DDI 941-8555
--	--

##### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to respond to the Board's request for information on the street renewal and living streets process and the reasons behind Sullivan Avenue being reprogrammed for construction during 2008/09.

##### **BACKGROUND**

At its meeting on 31 March 2004, the Board received a deputation from residents of Sullivan Avenue who were concerned that the Council has reprogrammed scheduled street renewal work in their street and that the opportunity for the Council to enter into a 'living streets process' may not occur for some time. The residents also presented a petition signed by 80 people supporting the deputation.

The Board decided: *"to seek a report to the Environment and Traffic Committee addressing the issues raised in the deputation and outlining the process for creating a living street."* This report outlines how the decision was made to defer this project during the street renewal prioritisation process and comments on the opportunities available to the Board to readdress the timing of the project.

The deputation presented the Board with a number of concerns, most of which can be addressed during the street renewal process. Typically, this process commences 18 months to two years prior to the tendering process for such a project. Once the timing issues have been resolved it would then be appropriate for the City Transport Unit to report on specific issues and how living streets principles could be applied to this particular project.

##### **STREET PRIORITISATION PROCESS**

The Committee will be aware that a new process for prioritising street renewals was approved by the Council in April last year. A copy of the approved process is attached. As part of this process streets are rated based on their condition, traffic volume and proximity to schools etc, and then ranked taking into account clustering and other factors. The streets to be rated come from the road assessment and maintenance management database to ensure those streets in the worst condition are done first. This new process was used in developing the five year programme that has been approved in the draft long term council community plan.

It is noted that when approving the new process the Council also resolved that the new process be applied to all streets that were already on the programme from 2005/06 onwards.

It is also noted that the new process was put in place to avoid debate about individual streets at Council level during the annual plan process.

##### **SULLIVAN AVENUE COMMENTS**

Sullivan Avenue scored reasonably highly in the rating, which is not surprising considering the issues raised by the petitioners. The other streets in the area, that is McKenzie Avenue and Keswick Street, scored lower. It is noted that the issues raised by the petitioners are typical of many streets of similar age in the city. They are not unusual or extreme issues.

The ranking process (Step 3) placed Sullivan Avenue in the 2007/08 year. It had previously been in the 2005/06 and 2006/07 years. Mackenzie Avenue and Keswick Street were new to the programme and were placed in 2008/09.

The ranking process places an emphasis on 'clustering' streets so areas of common interest can be completed concurrently. This has tended to result in some streets with lower ratings rising in the programme so they can be done at the same time as the higher rated streets in the same area. Because Mackenzie Avenue and Keswick Street scored lower and the link between them and Sullivan Avenue was not as strong as some other areas, for example Charleston, there were no 'special' reasons for Sullivan Avenue being higher than 2007/08. It is noted, though, that this initial ranking (Step 3) placed Sullivan Avenue ahead of some Charleston projects, that is Grenville Street, Grafton Street, Henry Street and Frederick Street.

## **PREVIOUS HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD DECISIONS**

The Committee will recall that as part of Step 4 of the process the attached table was presented to the November 2003 meeting of the Environment and Traffic Committee to enable it to consider reprioritisation. At this meeting the Committee considered that the Charleston projects mentioned above should be brought forward from 2008/09 into 2007/08. The Committee, under delegated authority, agreed to swap these with Madras Street, Ryan Street and Sullivan Avenue. This resulted in Sullivan Avenue being placed in 2008/09.

## **LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLAN (LTCCP)**

The Draft LTCCP for 2004/05 has been approved by the Council and is ready to go out for public consultation.

It is noted that the prioritisation process will take place during the preparation of each LTCCP. This will be once every three years, except the first LTCCP is for two years. The Board will have the opportunity to consider Sullivan Avenue again during the preparation of the next LTCCP.

## **LIVING STREETS PROCESS**

Living Streets is about achieving a better balance in our streets between activities (pedestrian, bicycles, general traffic) and neighbouring development (residential and business).

The living streets philosophy is applied to all street improvement projects. As part of the implementation of the living streets philosophy some pilot projects were constructed to enable an evaluation of the process and philosophy.

The kerb and channel prioritisation process has a principle of *'Recognition of street renewal as a means of improving the social fabric of the city by providing a more pleasant streetscape to encourage community involvement and activity'*. This means that all street renewal projects are developed with this as a key guiding principle, and the street renewal budget allows for this.

## **DISCUSSION**

The approved process has been used in developing the new five year street renewal programme, and the LTCCP is about to go out for public submissions. The Council will then consider the submissions before finalising the plan in June. The submission process is then the process for the Board to suggest making changes to the draft programme. Alternatively the Board could wait until the next LTCCP process and look at reprioritising Sullivan Avenue then.

If the Committee wishes to support the Sullivan Avenue project being brought forward in the programme now then it could recommend a substitution and make a submission on that basis.

## **CONCLUSION**

The deputation by Sullivan Avenue residents highlighted a number of issues that are endemic to wide roadways in older suburban areas of the city. The Council's street renewal and living streets process will address most of these issues.

Residents are concerned about the deferral of this work until 2008/09. The Board can either support the Sullivan Avenue project being brought forward in the Capital Works Programme by offering a substitution and making an appropriate submission to the Council or wait until the next LTCCP process and look at reprioritising Sullivan Avenue then.

### **Staff**

- Recommendation:**
1. That the information be received.
  2. That the Committee recommend a course of action to the Board.