



Christchurch City Council

FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

TUESDAY 8 AUGUST 2006

AT 4.00 PM

**IN THE BOARD ROOM
FENDALTON SERVICE CENTRE
CORNER JEFFREYS AND CLYDE ROADS**

PLEASE NOTE:

- 1. Members are requested to visit 85 Crofton Street (item 6 on the agenda) prior to the Board meeting.**
- 2. There will be a briefing (for members only) by Maryanne Lomax immediately after the Board meeting regarding the application for funding by Aurora Trust**

Community Board: Mike Wall (Chairman), Val Carter (Deputy Chairperson), Sally Buck, Faimeh Burke, Cheryl Colley, Pat Harrow and Andrew Yoon

Community Board Principal Adviser
Elsie Ellison
Phone 941 6701 DD1
Email: elsie.ellison@ccc.govt.nz

Community Board Secretary
Prebashni Naidoo
Phone 941 6728 DD1
Email: prebashni.naidoo@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION
PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION
PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX	PG	NO	
PART B	3	1.	APOLOGIES
PART C	3	2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – BOARD MEETING OF 11 JULY 2006
PART B	3	3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
		3.1	Vincent Jagers
		3.2	Mr Aubrey Fitzpatrick
		3.3	New Zealand Police, Inspector Andy McGregor
PART B	3	4.	PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS
PART B	3	5.	CORRESPONDENCE
PART C	3	6.	85 CROFTON STREET - BIRCH TREE REMOVAL
PART C	5	7.	MERIVALE LANE MANAGEMENT OF ON-STREET CAR PARKING
PART C	8	8.	MCDUGALL AVENUE KERB & CHANNEL RENEWAL
PART C	13	9.	NEW ROAD NAMES
PART C	14	10.	WORKS, TRAFFIC AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE – REPORT OF 24 JULY 2006
PART C	15	11.	CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANTS PANEL - REPRESENTATIVE
PART B	15	12.	UPDATE FROM THE COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER
PART B	15	13.	GOOD NEWS STORIES
PART B	15	14.	UPDATE ON BOARD FUNDING
PART B	15	15.	BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
PART B	15	16.	NOTICES OF MOTION
PART B	15	17.	MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

1. APOLOGIES**2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – BOARD MEETING OF 11 JULY 2006**

The report of the ordinary meeting of the Board held on 11 July 2006 has been circulated to Board members (attached).

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**3.1 VINCENT JAGERS**

Vincent Jagers will be in attendance to report on his participation at the Southern Skies soccer tournament in Australia. The Board helped to fund his trip through the Youth Development Fund in April 2006.

3.2 AUBREY FITZPATRICK, 89 CROFTON STREET

Mr Fitzpatrick has been granted speaking rights to address the Board regarding an application to remove a Silver Birch tree outside his property.

Clause 6 of this agenda refers. Mr Fitzpatrick has been provided a copy of the staff report.

3.3 NEW ZEALAND POLICE, INSPECTOR ANDY MCGREGOR

Inspector McGregor will be in attendance to update the Board on recent police activities in the northern police area.

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

Nil.

5. CORRESPONDENCE

- Thank you letter from Westburn School (attached).

6. 85 CROFTON STREET - BIRCH TREE REMOVAL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Graham Clark, Arborist and Rod Whearty, Parks and Waterways Advocate

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to consider an application from the owner of 85 Crofton Road to remove the street tree outside their property in order to remove the existing house.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In May 2006 Mr Fitzpatrick contacted the Council (RFS No CSR90421669) requesting the removal of the street tree (Silver Birch, *Betula pendula*.) on the berm outside 85 Crofton Road.
3. The reasons for the request is to allow the removal of the existing dwelling in its entirety prior to the construction of a new residential dwelling on the site. If the removal operation was undertaken entirely within the applicants property without encroaching onto the neighbouring property, then the existing Birch tree would need to be removed.

6. Cont'd

4. The tree which the applicant would like removed is a maturing silver birch (*Betula pendula*) which shows signs of being in good health and vigour. It is a medium sized tree, approx 14m in height with a canopy spread of 10m. While there are a number of pockets of included bark at the larger branch unions approximately 3 metres up the main trunk, the trees form is good and it is very healthy. The arborist is not unduly concerned by the presence of these bark inclusions as they do not significantly affect the current structural integrity of the tree.
5. The tree is situated mid way across the grass berm in front of the property, hence it contributes to the amenity of the street landscape (photos of tree form and position in street will be tabled at the meeting). It is one of a group of approximately eight trees of this species type (*Betula pendula*) which have been planted in the immediate area to create an avenue affect for this section of the street.
6. The tree on the berm has been identified by the applicant prior to his application for demolition consents etc. The applicant has verbally indicated a willingness to pay for removal costs and also to pay for a replacement tree post completion of the development. He has had a quote to remove the tree in conjunction with other arboreal operations planned for the property and was quoted \$250 for the removal by the contractor engaged to undertake work within his own property.
8. However, the applicants removal replacement proposal is not "like for like", as it does not take into account the size and condition of the existing tree, the trees amenity value, or the time and resources the Council has invested in this tree.
9. Removal of this tree will have a significant effect on the aesthetic character in this part of the street. The tree is located within a group and removal will adversely impact on the existing "avenue" effect created this group.
10. The Transport and Greenspace Arborist has completed a compensation assessment on this tree (see **attachment**) which identifies the real cost of removing this tree when all other factors are taken into account. Staff would recommend that the applicant be charged the costs identified in the compensation assessment if the Board resolves to approve the applicants request. This would be consistent with other recent situations where applications to remove street trees for property development have been approved.
11. Tree removal is often seen as the "easy" option and there is a general lack of appreciation around the amount of time, cost and resources required to produce a mature healthy tree. This approach will also encourage people to become more environmentally conscious and increase their awareness around the true cost of removing mature healthy trees for development purposes.
12. Transport and Greenspace staff believe it is possible to remove the existing building with out affecting the birch tree if it is removed on an angle across the front of the neighbouring driveway and property. This would require the applicant to get consent from the adjoining neighbour to cross their land.
13. If the neighbouring property is not utilised to facilitate the house removal, there is no way the house can be removed from the property without the street tree being removed. It must be noted that the birch trees in this area are far from reaching there optimum age. Failing any catastrophic environmental or physiological events, it would not be unreasonable to expect these trees to remain healthy and sound until at least 2035.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

14. The tree is not listed as protected under the City Plan.
15. The Council has the right to retain this tree and is under no obligation to remove the tree to facilitate the removal of the dwelling at 85 Crofton Road.
16. If the Board approves the applicants request, then all cost associated with removal of the tree would be the responsibility of the applicant. All work would be carried out by a Council approved contractor.

6. Cont'd**OPTIONS**

- 17 There are two possible options in relation to this application.
1. Decline the residents application to remove the tree because an alternative route is available that would allow the house to be removed off the site while still retaining the tree, albeit this option requires the applicant to obtain the neighbours approval to cross their land.
 2. Approve the residents application to remove the Birch tree outside 85 Crofton Road subject to the applicant paying \$6500 identified in the compensation assessment which includes the cost of replacement planting. All costs to be paid prior to any work commencing to remove the tree. The Transport and Greenspace Unit would notify the immediate neighbours as a matter of courtesy prior to undertaking the work.

PREFERRED OPTION

18. The preferred option is option 1.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board approve Option 1 as outlined under the "Options" heading, thereby declining the residents application to remove the street tree outside 85 Crofton Road.

7. MERIVALE LANE - MANAGEMENT OF ON-STREET CAR PARKING

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Environment
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Jeff Owen, DDI 941-8971

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to both inform the Board of the outcome of the consultation process regarding the management of on-street car parking in Merivale Lane between Winchester Street and Papanui Road and seek approval for the installation of parking restrictions (refer attachment).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council has received numerous complaints from local residents regarding the levels of traffic congestion and on-street parking in Merivale Lane between Winchester Street and Papanui Road. The congestion is predominantly attributed to the presence of the Selwyn House School and Pre-School and the Ferndale School and Resource Centre on the south side of the Lane all of which are high traffic generating activities particularly at peak "drop-off" and "pick-up" times namely 8am to 9.30am and 2.30pm to 4pm. The Lane is also experiencing a large amount of all day (on-street) parking which is predominantly attributed to staff from these schools. The high levels of on-street parking contributes to the congestion and raises safety and visibility issues for both residents and road users of the Lane.
3. Merivale Lane between Winchester Street and Papanui Road has a carriageway width of 7.4m which widens to 11.5m for a distance of 60m between numbers 87 and 75 Merivale Lane at the western end of the Lane. Currently there is a "no stopping" restriction on the north side of the Lane which applies between the hours of 7am to 9am and 3pm to 4.30pm. There is no footpath on the north side of the Lane.

7. Cont'd

4. Two rounds of consultation have been carried out involving all affected stakeholders. The first sought to identify the issues and problems currently being experienced in the Lane. A total of 49 consultation documents were delivered and 28 were returned. The consultation documents suggested the problems currently being experienced could be alleviated with the installation of a parking restriction on the south side and a broken yellow "no stopping" line on the north side of the Lane.
5. The majority of submissions received expressed dissatisfaction with the current situation. The main concerns that emerged from the consultation process were:
 - (a) Traffic congestion in the Lane at peak school times;
 - (b) The narrowness of the carriageway;
 - (c) Lack of enforcement of the current "no stopping" restriction;
 - (d) Concerns over whether or not emergency vehicles would be able to travel down the Lane during peak times;
 - (e) The large amount of all-day (on-street) parking on the south side of the Lane;
 - (f) The lack of available on-street parking for residents and their visitors;
 - (g) Frustration with the schools for not providing adequate off-street parking for staff and parents;
 - (h) Inconsiderate parking on both sides of the Lane (encroaching over driveways);
 - (i) Poor visibility when exiting driveways due parked vehicles, especially on the north side;
 - (j) Excessive speed;
 - (k) Concerns for the safety of the school children especially when they are dashing across the road to parked vehicles on the north side;
 - (l) The lack of a footpath on the north side of the Lane;
6. The feedback from the first round of consultation showed that:
 - (a) 14 were in favour of the installation of a parking restriction on the south side of the Lane and 11 were opposed;
 - (b) 18 were in favour of the installation of a broken yellow "no stopping" line on the north side of the Lane and 7 were opposed;
 - (c) 4 suggested extending the hours of the current "no stopping" restrictions on the north side;
 - (d) 2 suggested installing P120 parking restrictions on both the north and south sides of the Lane;
 - (e) 4 suggested installing parking ticks at driveways;
 - (f) 1 suggested installing speed humps in the Lane;
 - (g) 1 suggested making the Lane one-way;
 - (h) 1 suggested widening the carriageway outside the Selwyn House School.
7. Feedback from those opposed to the suggested parking restriction on the south side showed most were concerned that they would be inconvenienced by the installation of a restriction as would their visitors. Most felt that the current problems were only an issue during school days and that the suggestions were too restrictive outside these times i.e. weekends and school holidays. Most had no confidence that the restrictions would be policed by parking wardens regularly and therefore felt they would be ineffective.
8. The second round of consultation offered the following two options for comment:

Option 1:

 - (a) That the status quo remain (unrestricted parking) on the south side;
 - (b) That a broken yellow "no stopping" line be installed on the north side of the Lane from Winchester Street to number 75 Merivale Lane and from number 87 Merivale Lane to Papanui Road leaving some unrestricted parking between numbers 75 and 87 Merivale Lane where it can be accommodated it due to the road being wider (note that this would replace the existing ("no stopping 7am - 9am, 3pm - 4.30pm") restriction).

7. Cont'd

Option 2:

- (a) That a "P120, 8am–4pm, School Days" parking restriction be installed on the south side of Merivale Lane between Papanui Road and Winchester Street and that parking ticks be installed at driveway entrances on the south side to help alleviate problems associated with parked vehicles encroaching over driveways;
 - (b) That a broken yellow "no stopping" line be installed on the north side of the Lane from Winchester Street to number 75 Merivale Lane and from number 87 Merivale Lane to Papanui Road leaving some unrestricted parking between numbers 75 and 87 Merivale Lane where it can be accommodated due the road being wider (note that this would replace the existing ("no stopping 7am - 9am, 3pm - 4.30pm") restriction).
9. A total of 49 consultation documents were delivered and 26 submissions were received with the following results:
- Nine supported Option 1;
Eighteen supported Option 2.
10. The proposed broken yellow "no stopping" line will help alleviate the issues of congestion in the Lane by limiting parking to the south side only. It will also significantly improve visibility for residents exiting their properties and increase the general safety of the Lane by reducing pedestrian activity on the north side where there is no footpath. Some residents were concerned that the installation of a time limited parking restriction on the south side of the Lane would be too restrictive for residents and their visitors outside of school hours particularly in conjunction with the proposed broken yellow line on the north side. By limiting the restriction to "8am – 4pm School Days" (as in Option 2) residents will benefit both from the increased turn over of car parking spaces when the restriction is operative and from unrestricted parking outside school hours. The results of the second round of consultation show the majority of residents are in favour of Option 2 and therefore it is recommended that the Community Board supports this. Option 2 is considered the most cost effective and practical solution to the problems currently being experience in Merivale Lane.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. The installation of road signs and markings is within operational budgets.
12. The Land Transport Rules provide for the installation of parking restrictions including broken yellow (no stopping) lines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board agree that:

- (a) The stopping of vehicles between 7am – 9am and 3pm – 4.30pm be revoked on the north side of Merivale Lane commencing at the Winchester Street intersection and extending in an easterly direction to the Papanui Road intersection.
- (b) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Merivale Lane commencing at the Winchester Street intersection and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 20 metres.
- (c) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Merivale Lane commencing at a point 76 metres east of the Winchester Street intersection and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 298 metres.
- (d) The parking of vehicles be limited to 2 hours between 8am – 4pm, School Days on the south side of Merivale Lane commencing at a point 20 metres east of the Winchester Street intersection and extending in an easterly direction of a distance of 354 metres.

8. MCDOUGALL AVENUE KERB & CHANNEL RENEWAL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	Transport & Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Melissa Renganathan, DDI 941-8662

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board's approval for the McDougall Avenue kerb and channel renewal project to proceed to final design, tender and construction.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. McDougall Avenue was initially part of a cluster of two projects which included Mansfield Avenue. Due to the change in the Christchurch City Council kerb and channel renewal programme for 2006/07, Mansfield Avenue has been delayed to later in the programme. McDougall Avenue is likely to proceed in 2007/2008 as a separate project.
3. McDougall Avenue is a local road in the Merivale/St Albans area. McDougall Avenue is 13.7 m wide between Papanui Road to Murray Place. Murray Place has a threshold treatment in place that reduces the width of McDougall Avenue to 9.5m from here to Browns Road. Due to the age and condition of the existing kerbs, dish channels and footpaths, McDougall Avenue has been scheduled for renewal in the 2007/2008 financial year.
4. McDougall Avenue is residential in nature, however the Nurse Maude District Nursing Association fronts onto the street between Papanui Road and Murray Place.
5. An initial issues consultation survey was sent to the residents of McDougall Avenue in October 2004. On-street parking and landscaping were identified as key issues. McDougall Avenue residents also highlighted safety at intersections and traffic volume as issues. (A summary of consultation feedback can be found in **Attachment 4**.) The Community Board was advised through seminars in September 2005 of the background to the project and the proposed consultation to be undertaken in relation to the concept Plans.
6. A Concept Plan (refer to **Attachment 1**) for McDougall Ave along with Mansfield Avenue was distributed for consultation in September 2005.
7. It was proposed to fully reconstruct McDougall Avenue from Papanui Road to Murray Place. The roadway would be reconstructed at 9.4m wide with a 7m wide threshold installed at the McDougall Avenue/Papanui Road intersection. The roadway at the McDougall Avenue/Murray Place intersection would be narrowed to 8m. Approximately 14 restricted parks were proposed at the western end of McDougall Avenue.
8. Flowering Cherry and Magnolia trees were proposed within the grass berms. Additional landscaping is proposed at the McDougall Avenue/Murray Place intersection. It was proposed to plant a Camellia hedge along the length of the boundary fence of the Nurse Maude Hospital.
9. The main issues raised related to the proposed restricted parking and road narrowings. In light of the feedback, a public meeting was held to allow residents and Council officers to meet and discuss the way forward for the re-construction of both McDougall and Mansfield Avenue.
10. The meeting was held in December 2005 and four key issues for the streets were identified; street width, parking, general design and landscaping. Following the feedback received from the consultation brochure and the December public meeting, different options were developed and presented at a second meeting.

8. Cont'd

11. This second meeting was held in March 2006 and two options for McDougall Avenue were presented (**Attachment 2**). The number of the restricted parks had been greatly reduced. The main differences between the two options for both streets were the road width, with options having a 9m or 10.5m wide carriageway. The majority of those in attendance chose the option with the wider carriageway.
12. An update on the project progress and copies of the preferred option were sent to those who responded to the concept plan consultation and attended the meetings.
13. The plans included as **Attachment 3** have been identified as the preferred option for the renewal of McDougall Avenue as they satisfy the aims and objectives of the project, and have reasonable support from the community. It is therefore recommended that the plan included in **Attachment 3** proceed to final design, tender and construction.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

14. The estimated total cost for this project is \$ 322,100 inclusive of all consultation, design, and project management.
15. McDougall Avenue is part of the Street Renewal Programme and is programmed for construction in the 2007/2008 year.
16. Aside from the resolutions relating to new traffic restrictions set out below, there are no legal implications from this project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Community Board:

- (a) Approve the McDougall Avenue kerb and channel renewal project, as detailed in Attachment 3, to proceed to final design, tender and construction.
- (b) Approve the following new traffic restrictions:

New no stopping

- i. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Papanui Road commencing at its intersection with McDougall Avenue and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 13 metres.
- ii. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Papanui Road commencing at its intersection with McDougall Avenue and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 13 metres.
- iii. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of McDougall Avenue commencing at its intersection with Papanui Road and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 13 metres.
- iv. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of McDougall Avenue commencing at a point 166 metres from its intersection with Papanui Road and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 27 metres.
- v. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of McDougall Avenue commencing at its intersection with Papanui Road and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
- vi. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of McDougall Avenue commencing at its intersection with Murray Place and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
- vii. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of McDougall Avenue commencing at its intersection with Murray Place and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.

8. Cont'd

- viii. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Murray Place commencing at its intersection with McDougall Avenue and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
 - ix. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Murray Place commencing at its intersection with McDougall Avenue and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 18 metres.
- (c) The new traffic restrictions described in (b) above to take effect upon completion of the works described in (a) above.

8. Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON MCDUGALL AVENUE KERB AND CHANNEL RENEWAL

17. McDougall Avenue is a local road, 13.7 m wide between Papanui Road and Murray Place. Murray Place has an existing threshold treatment in place that reduces the width of McDougall Avenue to 9.5m from approximately 15m before Murray Place to the Browns Road end. While the road is residential in nature the majority of the south side of the Avenue, from Papanui Road to adjacent Murray Place is fronted by the Nurse Maude District Nursing Association.
18. Due to the age and condition of the existing kerbs, dish channels and footpaths, the street has been scheduled for renewal in the 2007/2008 financial year.
19. The principal aim of the project is to renew the dish kerb and channel in McDougall Avenue and replace it with kerb and flat channel. The objectives include:
 - To develop a scheme that is consistent with work already completed in Murray Place
 - To provide additional parking for Nurse Maude and Merivale Mall, but not allow parking to be the defining character of the street.
 - To ensure the speed environment is appropriate for a local road.
 - To improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.
 - To develop appropriate landscaping, i.e. berms, planting and street trees.
 - To highlight the change in hierarchy from minor arterial to local road at the Papanui Road intersection in a manner that is consistent with the area.
 - To enhance the amenity aspect of the street.
 - To ensure access to residential properties is improved.

CONSULTATION

20. Eighteen responses were received from McDougall Avenue during the initial issues consultation. On-street parking and landscaping were identified as key issues. McDougall Avenue residents also highlighted safety at intersections and traffic volume as issues. The key positives highlighted were the streets' proximity to shops and amenities. The key negatives highlighted were the lack of parking and lack of landscaping.
21. Concept Plans for McDougall Avenue was presented at a seminar to the Community Board in September 2005. The background to the project was explained and the proposed consultation to be undertaken in relation to the concept plans was presented.
22. Consultation newsletters presenting the concept plans (as shown in **Attachment 1**) were distributed to stakeholders for consultation in September 2005. Approximately 500 newsletters were distributed and feedback was received from 11 people. Most respondents were supportive of the proposed renewal in general, however, many also had concerns over various aspects of the proposal. The majority of respondents raised concerns over the narrowness of the street and the proposed amount of time restricted parking. An overview of the key issues raised throughout the consultation process is included in **Attachment 4**.
23. A public meeting was held in December 2005 to address issues raised by respondents. Twenty-eight residents and business owners (as well as members of the Community Board) attended. The Project Team took into consideration the feedback received and prepared an additional two options. These new options were presented at a second public meeting in March 2006.
24. Twenty-one people (as well as members of the Community Board) attended the second meeting. At the meeting the participants voted on the options presented for both streets and preferred Option 4 for McDougall Avenue as this option had a 10.5m carriageway. The Project Team advised at the meeting that they would consider this feedback before identifying a recommended option.
25. Feedback (summarised in **Attachment 4**) received on the concept plans (**Attachment 2**) presented at the meeting was considered by the project team, and as a result some changes were made to the concept plans (as shown in **Attachment 3**) to produce the preferred options. The Project Team recommends a 10m wide carriageway for McDougall Avenue as it provides sufficient road space for parking on both sides and some traffic calming benefits.

8. Cont'd

26. **Attachment 4** includes a summary of the feedback and its consideration by the Project Team. Letters summarising the consultation process and informing residents of the preferred options were mailed to those who responded in July 2006.
27. The plans included as **Attachment 3** have been identified as the preferred option for McDougall Avenue, as they satisfy the aims and objectives of the project and have reasonable support of the community. It is therefore recommended that the Plans detailed in **Attachment 3** proceed to final design, tender and construction.

OPTIONS

McDougall Avenue

28. Three options were assessed as part of the Mansfield Avenue kerb and channel renewal. Other than Option 1 (the status quo), all other options intend to replace the kerb and channel.
 - (a) Option 1: Maintenance of the status quo.
Retention of the existing kerb and dish channel.
 - (b) Option 2: 9.4m carriageway (Refer to **Attachment 1**. This option was chosen to go out to consultation in September 2005.)
29. This option proposed a 9.4m wide carriageway with a 7m wide cobbled threshold at the Papanui Road/McDougall Avenue intersection. The carriageway at the McDougall Avenue/Murray Place intersection will be narrowed to 8m.
30. New footpaths, grass berms and trees were proposed on both sides of the street. Additional landscaping was proposed on the north side of McDougall Avenue at the intersection with Murray Place, and on the south side adjacent to 32 McDougall Avenue. It was also proposed to plant a Camellia hedge along the length of the boundary fence to the Nurse Maude Hospital.
31. Twelve P120 parks were proposed on the north side of the street from the intersection of Papanui Road to adjacent to 15 McDougall Avenue and on the south side from Papanui Road to the eastern boundary of 4 McDougall Avenue. Two P10 parks were proposed immediately west of the P120 parks on the south side of the street.
32. Options developed based on feedback from consultation and the December 2005 public meeting.
 - (a) **Option 3: 9m carriageway**
33. This option proposed a 9m wide carriageway and a 7.5m wide intersection at the McDougall Avenue/Murray Place intersection. The landscaping proposed was the same as described in Option 2 above. (Refer Attachment 2a).
No time restricted parking is proposed.
 - (b) **Option 4: 10.5m carriageway**
34. The carriageway is maintained at 10.5m with an 8m wide cobbled threshold at the Papanui Road/McDougall Avenue intersection. The carriageway at the McDougall Avenue/Murray Place intersection will be 8.5m wide. (Refer Attachment 2b).

PREFERRED OPTION

McDougall Avenue

35. The preferred option for the renewal of McDougall Avenue is Option 4 with minor changes as described below and illustrated in **Attachment 3**.

8. Cont'd

36. The preferred option consists of a 10m wide carriageway (as it provides sufficient road space for parking on both sides and some traffic calming benefits) with an 8m wide cobbled threshold at the Papanui Road/McDougall Avenue intersection. The carriageway at the McDougall Avenue/Murray Place intersection will be narrowed to 8.5m. New footpaths and berms are proposed on both sides on the street. Flowering Cherry and Magnolia trees are proposed within the grass berms on both sides of the street. Landscaping is proposed on the north side of McDougall Avenue at its intersection with Murray Place and on the south side adjacent to 32 McDougall Avenue. It is proposed to plant a Camellia hedge along the length of the boundary fence to the Nurse Maude Hospital.

No time restricted parking is proposed.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**McDougall Avenue**

37. Option 1 is not recommended, as it does not achieve the principal aim of the project of renewing the old kerb and dish channel, and does not address the other objectives of the project. Maintaining the status quo is also not consistent with the Road Safety Strategy or the CCC Financial Plan and Programme 2004, and conflicts with the objectives of the asset management plan.

Option 2 – 9.4m carriageway and time restricted parking on the western side of the street.

38. Option 2 will enhance the streetscape through implementation of landscaping and improve the utility and level of service provided through the renewal of kerb and channel, and road and footpath surface. It is also consistent with the Road Safety Strategy particularly in respect to designing and managing roads with appropriate speed environments and providing safe facilities for pedestrians.

Option 2 satisfies the aims and objectives of the project but was not supported by the residents.

Option 3 – 9m carriageway, no time restricted parking

39. This option will satisfy most of the aims and objective of the proposal (except that it will not provide any parking for Nurse Maude). It was presented to the community at the second public meeting along with Option 4. This option was rejected as the community preferred a wider carriageway.

Option 4 - 10.5m carriageway

40. Option 4 (with the variation discussed in the preferred option detailed in paragraph 36 above) was therefore chosen as the preferred option. Option 4 satisfies the aims and objectives of the project and has the support of some of the community.

9. NEW ROAD NAME

General Manager responsible:	Regulation and Democracy Services, Peter Mitchell
Officer responsible:	Environmental Policy and Approvals Manager, Steve McCarthy
Author:	Bob Pritchard, Subdivisions Officer, DDI 941-8644

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to obtain the Board's approval to three new roads (refer attached).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The approval of the proposed road and right of way names is delegated to the Community Boards.
3. The Subdivision Officer has checked all the proposed names against the Council's road name database to ensure they will not be confused with names currently in use. The names have also been discussed with staff at Land Information NZ who act on behalf of the emergency services in respect to road naming.

9. Cont'd

RUSSLEY BUSINESS PARK

4. A new business park subdivision is under construction on Johns Road. A new road will run parallel to Johns Road and will link McLeans Island Road and Sawyers Arms Road. The applicant company originally requested that the main road be named Russley Park Drive. This proposal was declined, as it was thought that having Russley Road and Russley Park Drive in close proximity but not adjacent to each other, could create some confusion. The three names proposed reflect firstly the business park theme with the name for the main road proposed as "Logistics Drive" and secondly, the names for the two small cul de sacs recognising the proximity to the airport with "Koru Place" and "Jet Place" proposed.
5. (Permission was obtained from Air New Zealand to use the name "Koru". The name Logistics Drive is in keeping with the small cul de sac over the northern boundary of the subdivision, approved some years ago as Export Avenue.)

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. The administration fee for road naming is included as part of the subdivision consent application fee, and the cost of name plates is charged to the developer. There is no financial cost to the Council. Local Authorities have a statutory responsibility to approve road names.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board approve the names 'Logistics Drive', 'Koru Place' and 'Jet Place'.

10. WORKS, TRAFFIC AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE – REPORT OF 24 JULY 2006

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services
Officer responsible:	Elsie Ellison, Community Board Principal Adviser
Author:	Prebashni Naidoo, Community Board Secretary

The purpose of this report is to submit the following outcomes of the Committee's 24 July 2006 meeting.

**Report of a meeting of the Works, Traffic and Environment Committee
held on Monday 24 July 2006 at 8.00 am
in Meeting Room 1, CCC Fendalton.**

PRESENT: Cheryl Colley (Chairperson), Sally Buck, Val Carter and Andrew Yoon.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Faimeh Burke and Mike Wall.

1. DEPUTATIONS

Nil.

2. GAMING VENUES POLICY

The Committee reviewed the contents of the Gaming Venues Policy with the result that the **attached** submission has been prepared.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- (a) That the Board's submission on the Gaming Venues Policy, be adopted.

The meeting concluded at 8.45 am.

11. CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANTS PANEL - REPRESENTATIVE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager: Regulation and Democracy Services
Officer responsible:	Elsie Ellison, Community Board Principal Advisor
Author:	Prebashni Naidoo, Community Board Secretary

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to the appointment of a representative on the Character Housing Maintenance Grants panel.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. If you own a Character Home within Christchurch City, including Banks Peninsula, grant funding is available to help towards the external upgrading and maintenance of individual family homes which have a distinctive visual character and make a key contribution to the quality and identity of local streets.
3. Grants are available to individual house owners of character residences who are intending to undertake maintenance or repair work to upgrade the external appearance of the existing property (**see attached pamphlet**).
4. All applications received by the Council shall be reported to the appropriate Community Boards who will make recommendations to the Character Housing Grants Panel.
The Panel will consist of one member from each of the Community Boards and a representative from the Strategy and Planning Group.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

5. Nil

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board appoint an elected representative to the Character Housing Maintenance Grants panel.

12. UPDATE FROM THE COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER

The Community Board Principal Adviser will provide a verbal update to the Board on current issues.

13. GOOD NEWS STORIES**14. UPDATE ON BOARD FUNDING**

Attached are schedules with up-to-date information regarding the Board's 2005/06 Discretionary, SCAP and Youth Development Funds.

15. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Board members will be provided with an opportunity to get an update on community activities/Council issues.

16. NOTICES OF MOTION**17. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS** (If any have been submitted in accordance with Standing Orders 4.1.1 to 4.1.5)