

7. SOLWAY AVENUE – NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPROVEMENTS

Officer responsible Asset Management Team Leader	Author Hamish Peacock – Consultation Leader, DDI 941-8662
--	---

The questions raised by Mr Cumming in his letter of 26 September 2004 are, in my opinion, for the Board to address, so this report concentrates on the issues raised by Mr Harland.

The purpose of this report is to address the matters raised by Ross Harland and those residents he represents between 54 to 68 Solway Avenue.

It is assumed that the residents from numbers 54 to 68 agree with the views expressed by Ross Harland as the letter written on their behalf (dated 18 October 2004) is only signed by Ross Harland.

HISTORY

This project has involved changing the parallel parking to 90 degree angled parking on the eastern side of Solway Ave adjoining the College of Education site. Intersection improvements associated with the parking improvements are also proposed as illustrated in the attached scheme plan. The primary objective is to relieve parking congestion in nearby localised streets by increasing the number of car parks in Solway Avenue between Dalrye Place and Parkstone Avenue.

The Community Board gave approval to consult with the community on 31 March 2004, then subsequently approval to design, tender and build on 4 August 2004. As part of the approval I wrote to inform all residents on 31 August 2004 of the approval and justification for it. A copy of that letter is attached.

On 31 September 2004 the Community Board first considered the various responses I had received from residents, namely 54, 60, 62 and 62 Parkstone Ave and 17 Dalrye Place. Whilst they were sympathetic to the issues raised the Community Board confirmed their (approval) decision, but asked that I investigate P120 parking outside the residents properties between 54 to 68 Solway Avenue to enable greater control of parking outside their properties.

I met with the residents on 11 October, whom outlined their opposition to P120 parking and the entire angled parking proposed.

MR HARLAND LETTER (18/10/04)

In regard to Mr Harland's letter in opposition and request for consideration I would like the following points known. These correspond to the numbered points raised in Mr Harland's letter.

- 1 This project came about through residents complaining about their local residential streets being parked out by College of Education students before 1997. As a result a parking survey was carried out in 1997, which recommended angled parking in Dovedale Avenue, followed by angled parking in (the entire length between Parkstone Avenue and Dovedale Avenue) Solway Avenue. In 1998 Dovedale Avenue project was completed.

The current project is relevant because the initial consultation carried out in October 2003 asked residents if Dovedale Avenue parking had relieved parking congestion in local streets. The answer to those questions was:

Yes = 23 (Solway Ave=16 and Parkstone=7)

No = 19 (Solway Ave=13 and Parkstone Ave=6)

Also, as part of the October 2003 consultation residents were asked if there were parking issues in Solway Avenue. The answers to that question was:

Yes= 29 (Solway Ave=20 and Parkstone Ave=9)

No = 28 (Solway Ave=24 and Parkstone Ave=4)

While these results were fairly balanced it should be noted that Brian Williams (62 Solway) and Tony Hamilton (58 Solway) responded that Dovedale Ave parking had not been successful, yet Ross Harland (54 Solway) thought it had been successful. All three agreed in their responses that there were parking issues in Solway Avenue.

- 2 The evaluation of the responses only provided the numbers of responses who had clearly supported or opposed the proposal. There were 31 other responses that did not clearly indicate if they support or oppose the proposal. Those 31 responses raised issues that could not be interpreted to be in support or opposition, which included the following matters:
- Design issues - e.g. Parkstone/Solway intersection, Dalrye/Solway intersection, entrance to the College of Education, street safety.
 - Amenity issues - trees, noise and pollution.
 - Parking demand question -
 - Design suggestions - centre line marking, parking restrictions, layout of the 90 degree angled parking.
 - College of Education should provide car parks.

The Board gave approval of this project for the reasons outlined in the letter to residents (dated 31 August 2004). This was on balance that the proposal would consolidate the parking from nearby residential streets to immediately adjoining the College of Education.

- 3 The basis of the Community Board's decision was on balanced consideration of both opposition and support. It should be understood that many residents chose to not respond because they do not oppose (or even care) about the proposal and on that basis in my opinion the Community Board's decision was considering the greater public benefit of consolidating College parking demands nearest the College. Their decision was not solely based on numbers of support or opposition.
- 4 The justification for more car parks adjoining the College of Education has been through using the 1997 parking survey and the October 2003 consultation. The point that Ross Harland has made in point 5, raises issues in terms of the thoroughness of investigations. Given the scale and nature of this project there has been appropriate funds allocated and work carried out to justify this project, however greater justification could be investigated if another (up to date) parking survey was carried out. In my opinion if this level of investigation was invested in each project rate increases would be inevitable.
- 5 I understand that the Dovedale Avenue angled parking project also had opposition from residents when proposed, but since being built the Christchurch City Council Transport and City Streets Unit has not received complaints, nor reporting of crashes. The road width of Solway Avenue is the same as Dovedale Avenue and should not result in "far greater" accident potential as suggested by Ross Harland.
- 6 Ross Harland has a valid point about the effect of the raised bund, however the current plan will also calm traffic speeds and therefore potentially reduce traffic noise. This should be particularly relevant on the intersections.
- 7 The Community Board had requested that I report back on the P120 parking offered to the residents. This was a measure to try and provide greater use of parks for residents. Clearly residents from 54 to 68 oppose P120 parking restrictions on the residents side.

Recommendation: That the report be received and that it be considered in conjunction with the residents deputation on the Solway Avenue angle parking.

Deputy Chairperson's

Recommendation: For discussion.