

10. RESURFACING OF VEHICLE ENTRANCES

Officer responsible Transport and City Streets Manager	Author Weng-Kei Chen, Asset Policy Engineer, DDI 941-8655
--	---

The purpose of this report is to present information on the issues, options and additional costs of maintaining vehicle entrances as requested by the Committee at its March 2004 meeting.

BACKGROUND

In March 2004 the Committee considered a report advising of the request from the Fendalton/Waimairi and Riccarton/Wigram Community Boards that the Committee review the current policy/practice on the maintenance of vehicle entrances.

The report advised the Committee of the recommendations passed at recent meetings of the two Community Boards and the receipt of a petition from residents in Harkness Place to the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board in November 2003.

The report noted that this policy had been considered by the Council in May 2001 and attached a copy of the report considered by the Committee at that time. In addition it updated the costs that had been included in that report in respect to the additional budget provision required for implementing the change in the policy to reseal all vehicle entranceways and noted that these were now estimated at \$285,000 per annum for resurfacing and \$55,000 for maintenance, total \$340,000.

The Committee decided to review the current policy on the maintenance of vehicle entrances and requested that a report on the issues, options and additional costs be presented to the Committee by July 2004.

ISSUES

There are many different situations where vehicle crossings are not maintained by the Council. The common reason is that the benefit of the crossing is directly attributable to the property owner rather than to the general public. A footpath provides a public benefit so where a footpath exists the Council maintains the footpath, which in most cases includes the vehicle crossing. Situations where the Council does not maintain the crossing are as follows:

1. Private ROW's and driveways in hill suburbs, where no footpath exists or from the back of the footpath if one does exist. Note than in the hill situation the actual road boundary can be many metres back from the edge of the road and if a footpath exists then it is normally immediately behind the kerb.
2. Hill side driveways supported by retaining walls.
3. Properties along waterways where the vehicle crossing includes a bridge or structure.
4. Industrial properties, where no footpath exists.
5. Rural properties.
6. Residential areas, excluding hill areas (Living H), where there is no footpath, eg Harkness Place.

In the above situations the property owners have the advantage of being able to decide on the type of material used in the construction, that is, they can choose to use the same material as they have on their own property.

In looking at the policy the following issues come to mind:

- The maintenance of property owner installed materials. The maintenance is clearly the responsibility of the property owner, but with changes in owners, and trenching by others, this responsibility does get questioned.
- There is an inconsistency in that in situations where there is a footpath and it is not adjacent to the boundary then the section of driveway from the back of the path to the boundary is maintained by the Council when it could be considered a private benefit.

There are approximately 200 streets in residential areas with footpaths on one side, ie number 6 above where crossings are not maintained by the Council.

OPTIONS AND COSTS

A number of options exist:

1. Council to maintain all vehicle crossings from the kerb to the boundary including structures.
Estimated additional cost - \$340,000 pa plus structures maintenance.
2. Council to maintain only those crossings covered by 6 above and excluding owner installed materials.
Estimated additional cost - \$13,000 pa (\$5,000 maintenance, \$8,000 renewal).
3. Retain existing policy.
Additional cost – nil.

CONCLUSION

There are a number of situations where the Council does not maintain vehicle crossings because the benefit is solely to the property owner and it would seem unfair for ratepayers in general to fund this private benefit. For the majority of these situations, especially hill driveways with supporting structures, it is clearly accepted that the property owner is responsible for the maintenance. There are a number, though, such as the Harkness Place situation, where it is not so well understood by property owners.

In reviewing, the policy officers are of the view that in general it operates satisfactorily, is fair and equitable and consistent with private/public good balance.

Staff

Recommendation: That current policy be reconfirmed.

Chairman's

Recommendation: That the above recommendation be adopted.