



## Christchurch City Council

# HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

13 DECEMBER 2006

3.00 PM

IN THE BOARDROOM, LINWOOD SERVICE CENTRE  
180 SMITH STREET

**Community Board:** Bob Todd (Chairperson), David Cox, Anna Crighton, John Freeman, Yani Johanson, Brenda Lowe-Johnson and Brendan Smith

**Community Board Principal Adviser**

Clare Sullivan

Telephone: 941-6601

Fax: 941-6604

Email: [clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz)

**Community Secretary**

Kevin Roche

Telephone: 941-6615

Fax: 941-6604

Email: [kevin.roche@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:kevin.roche@ccc.govt.nz)

**PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**

**PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

### INDEX

- |               |            |   |
|---------------|------------|---|
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>1.</b>  | <b>APOLOGIES</b>  |
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>2.</b>  | <b>CONFIRMATION OF REPORT</b>                                   |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>3.</b>  | <b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>   |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>4.</b>  | <b>COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE</b>               |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>5.</b>  | <b>QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS</b>                                   |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>6.</b>  | <b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>                               |
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>7.</b>  | <b>EASEMENT OVER RESERVE – MORGANS VALLEY</b>                   |
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>8.</b>  | <b>APPLICATION YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND - CATALIN ONC</b>         |
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>9.</b>  | <b>RANDOLPH STREET AND BASS STREET - STREET RENEWAL PROJECT</b> |
| <b>PART A</b> | <b>10.</b> | <b>ALLEN STREET – PROPOSED MOTORCYCLE PARK</b>                  |
| <b>PART A</b> | <b>11.</b> | <b>ARMAGH STREET KERB EXTENSION</b>                             |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>12.</b> | <b>CHARLESTON CLUSTER UNDERGROUNDING</b>                        |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>13.</b> | <b>TRUSCOTTS ROAD ALTERATIONS</b>                               |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>14.</b> | <b>INSTALLATION OF POSTER BOLLARDS ON ROADS</b>                 |
| <b>PART A</b> | <b>15.</b> | <b>CITY MALL REDEVELOPMENT</b>                                  |

**We're on the Web!**

[www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/](http://www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/)

**1. APOLOGIES**

**2. CONFIRMATION OF REPORTS**

The report of the ordinary meeting held on Wednesday 22 November 2006 has been circulated to Board members.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the report of the ordinary meeting held on Wednesday 22 November 2006 be confirmed.

**3. CORRESPONDENCE**

**Attached** is a copy of correspondence received from Yani Johanson on behalf of the Phillipstown Heritage Trust. A copy of the draft Trust Deed has been separately circulated to members.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the correspondence be received and staff provide a report to the Board in respect to this request.

**4. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE**

**5. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

Members may at any ordinary meeting put a question to the Chairperson concerning any matter relevant to the role or function of the Community Board concerning any matter that does not appear on the order paper. All questions are subject to Standing Orders 4.1.1 to 4.1.5.

**6. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**6.1 INSTALLATION OF POSTER BOLLARDS**

Mr Terry Ryder and Jamie Holloway of Phantom Bill Stickers, will address the Board in respect to the report on the installation of poster bollards.

**6.2 ARMAGH STREET KERB EXTENSION**

Mr Mark McGuinness, "Belgian Beer Café Torenhof", has been granted speaking rights in respect to the proposed kerb extension in Armagh Street to create an outdoor dining area.

**7. EASEMENT OVER RESERVE – MORGANS VALLEY**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager Transport and Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Bill Morgan, Property Consultant

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of the report is to seek the Board's approval to the granting of stormwater discharge easements over Morgans Valley Reserve.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. An application has been received from Neil Construction Ltd to discharge stormwater from its proposed subdivision on Major Hornbrook Road into the existing stormwater gullies running through Morgans Valley Reserve.
3. Under Section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977, provision exists to grant such easement where the reserve will not be materially altered or permanently damaged. The application by the company falls into this category and as such approval is being recommended subject to appropriate conditions.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

4. As indicated above, the application complies with the provisions of Section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977 which permits local authorities to approve applications for easements over reserves under such circumstances and as this application complies there are no legal impediments why it should not be approved.
5. All costs associated with the easement are to be borne by the applicant who will also be liable for compensation which will be paid prior to the issue of the 224 Certificate on completion of the subdivision.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Board approve the application on the terms and conditions recommended within the report.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

## BACKGROUND

6. Neil Construction Ltd have recently acquired the property at 300 Major Hornbrook Road and have submitted a plan of subdivision creating 24 residential allotments over the property. The subdivision is depicted on the attached plans (**see Attachments 1 and 2**).
7. Following consideration of the application, the company was advised that their proposed scheme incorporating the provision of tanks to mitigate for the increased stormwater run-off from the site was suitable. It was accepted that the discharge of roof water and road water to the natural gullies was acceptable subject to the following conditions.
  - (a) All house sites are to connect their stormwater run-off from pavement and roofs to a 9,000 litre tank. The tank arrangement being required to comply with the Council's Stormwater Tank Installation Guidelines.
  - (b) A boulder pit is to be excavated down to bedrock and an overflow dissipation weir to be constructed in order to control the discharge of the water down the gullies running through the reserve.
  - (c) Native plants are required to be used for stabilisation around the discharge channel with the planting to be protected by fencing to prevent the area being grazed by stock.
  - (d) The application is subject to the Department of Conservation's approval under the Reserves Act 1977 which will be sought following consideration by the Board.
  - (e) The company is required to pay the Council compensation for the easements and this has been assessed by Ford Baker at a rate of \$50m<sup>2</sup> for the headworks and easement line. These areas will be defined accurately on completion of the work and the sum assessed accordingly.

## OPTIONS

8. This land naturally falls towards the reserve with the existing stormwater discharge running down the gullies identified where each of the headworks occurs. As the stormwater will initially be captured and held in 9,000 litre tanks, and then released through the system, it is believed that adequate protection will be provided to ensure that no damage to the reserve will occur. Given these measures, it is believed that the application will not materially alter or permanently damage the reserve, and as such its approval is recommended subject of course to the Department of Conservation's consent.
9. There are no other practical solutions to the stormwater discharge.

**8. APPLICATION YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND - CATALIN ONC**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8534
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager Recreation and Sport
<b>Author:</b>	Diana Saxton, Community Recreation Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to an application for funding from the 2006/07 Youth Development Scheme.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The applicant, Alin Catalin Onc, is a 12 year old Phillipstown School student of Bordesley Street, Linwood. Catalin is seeking funds to represent Mainland Soccer at the National Federation Tournament for 13<sup>th</sup> Grade Boys to be held in Napier from 17–21 December 2006.
3. This is the first time the applicant has approached the Board for funding support.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

4. There are no legal issues to be considered. The following table details trip expenses and funding requested.

<b>EXPENSES</b>	<b>Cost (\$)</b>
Return airfare	
Accommodation and food for five nights	
Training, playing and tournament costs	
<b>Total Cost inclusive of above</b>	<b>\$800.00</b>
Amount for each player to contribute	\$ 400.00
Amount being contributed by applicant	\$100.00
<b>Amount Requested from Community Board</b>	<b>\$300.00</b>

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board allocate \$300 to Catalin Onc from the 2006/07 Youth Development Scheme to assist with costs associated with participation in the National Federation Tournament for 13<sup>th</sup> Grade Boys to be held in Napier from 17–21 December 2006.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

**BACKGROUND**

5. Catalin Onc has a passion for his chosen sport - soccer. He is highly regarded by his school principal and classroom teacher as a talented, hard working, determined character who is an excellent ambassador for his school and a very successful example of a new migrant from Romania to New Zealand. Catalin is also being nominated by Phillipstown School at the annual Linwood Woolston Rotary Clubs honour student role award as an outstanding young person and leader.
6. Catalin comes from a highly supportive family who are doing everything to enable their son to participate and excel in his chosen sport. However, costs involved with settling in New Zealand does make raising the required funds difficult and they would be very appreciative of any financial assistance available to enable Catalin to pursue his passion.

## 9. RANDOLPH STREET AND BASS STREET - STREET RENEWAL PROJECT

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager Transport and Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Andrew Hensley, Consultation Leader

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to proceed to final design, tender and construction of the Randolph Street (Bass Street-Linwood Park) and Bass Street (Aldwins Road-Randolph Street) Street Renewal Project, as shown in the plan for Board approval at **Attachment 1**.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Due to the construction of Wastewater Pump Station 11 and associated pipe work, sections of Randolph Street and Bass Street require renewal. In addition, the Council's Asset Management Plan has identified and recommended the replacement of the existing kerb and dish channel with kerb and flat channel.
3. As a result, a street renewal project has been initiated to renew the kerb and channel and upgrade the carriageway. There are also opportunities to improve road safety and the environment for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists.
4. Initial issues consultation was undertaken in September/October 2006, from which the Council received 46 written responses. The key issues raised included:
  - Landscaping.
  - Traffic speed.
  - Personal security while walking along the street after dark.
5. Other comments included the wish to improve grass berms, footpaths, lighting, more trees, the intersection priority of Randolph Street and Bass Street, upgrading of the Linwood Park entrance, and a number of other issues which fall outside the project scope.
6. The community was divided as to whether speed humps and other traffic calming measures should be implemented.
7. As a result of internal and external feedback, the objectives of the project were confirmed as to:
  - Replace the kerb and dish channel with kerb and flat channel.
  - Improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles where practicable.
  - Ensure the design meets the demand for on-street parking.
  - Provide landscape enhancement where possible.
  - Upgrade lighting if appropriate.
  - Ensure adequate drainage design.
  - Reflect the local road nature of the street.
8. Following further investigations and with the assistance of the September/October 2006 responses, a preferred concept plan option was developed. This was presented to the Board on 25 October 2006 at a seminar meeting.
9. Consultation was undertaken with owners, occupiers and interest groups within the affected area, and also citywide via the external stakeholders mailing list.
10. Approximately 500 consultation newsletters were distributed, resulting in 28 written responses received on the concept plan, of which 23 (82%) generally supported, 4 (14%) did not support, and 1 (4%) stated no preference.
11. A summary of the consultation can be found in Section One - Background. Many respondents made comments on aspects within the proposal resulting in minor changes to the concept plan.
12. The concept plan for Board approval is shown in **Attachment 1**. The key features of the plan include:

- A nine metre wide carriageway on Randolph Street.
- Six metre wide narrowings at the intersections of Randolph Street/Bass Street, and Randolph Street/Marcroft Street.
- Raised and paved platform at the Randolph Street/Marcroft Street intersection.
- Mid-block raised and paved platform on Randolph Street between Bass Street and Marcroft Street.
- A hammerhead turning area 15 metres before the end of Randolph Street.
- An 8.5 metre wide carriageway on Bass Street.

#### **FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

13. The budget for Randolph Street is \$880,000 with Bass Street to be done as reinstatement work under the contract for the pump station.
14. There are aspects of the scheme design that cannot be undertaken within a reinstatement. These are the Bass Street landscaping and the lighting upgrade and they have been included in the scheme estimate for Randolph Street.
15. The total scheme estimate for Randolph Street is \$890,453 which is within 5% of the budget.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Approve the proposal shown in **Attachment 1** to proceed to final design, tender and construction.
- (b) Approve the following parking restrictions.

#### **NO NEW STOPPING**

##### **BASS STREET**

- (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Bass Street commencing at its intersection with Aldwins Road and extending 15 metres in a easterly direction.
- (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Bass Street commencing at its intersection with Aldwins Road and extending 13 metres in a easterly direction.
- (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Bass Street commencing at its intersection with Randolph Street and extending 15 metres in a westerly direction.
- (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Bass Street commencing at its intersection with Randolph Street and extending 17 metres in a westerly direction.
- (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Bass Street commencing at its intersection with Randolph Street and extending 11 metres in a easterly direction.
- (vi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Bass Street commencing at its intersection with Randolph Street and extending 11 metres in a easterly direction.

##### **RANDOLPH STREET**

- (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Randolph Street commencing at its intersection with Bass Street and extending 15 metres in a southerly direction.



- (viii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Randolph Street commencing at its intersection with Bass Street and extending 17 metres in a southerly direction.
- (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Randolph Street commencing at its intersection with Bass Street and extending 34 metres in a northerly direction.
- (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Randolph Street commencing at its intersection with Bass Street and extending 23 metres in a northerly direction.
- (xi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Randolph Street commencing at its intersection with Marcroft Street and extending 15 metres in a southerly direction.
- (xii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Randolph Street commencing at its intersection with Marcroft Street and extending 15 metres in a northerly direction.
- (xiii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Randolph Street commencing at a point 12 metres south of its intersection with Marcroft Street and extending 29 metres in a northerly direction.
- (xiv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Randolph Street commencing at a point 193 metres north of its intersection with Marcroft Street and extending 13 metres in a northerly direction (to end of carriageway).
- (xv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Randolph Street commencing at a point 189 metres north of its intersection with Marcroft Street and extending 16 metres in a northerly direction (to end of carriageway).

#### **MARCROFT STREET**

- (xvi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Marcroft Street commencing at its intersection with Randolph Road and extending 16 metres in a westerly direction.
- (xvii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Marcroft Street commencing at its intersection with Randolph Road and extending 16 metres in a westerly direction.

#### **CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted and staff be thanked for the consultation process undertaken for this project.

#### **SECTION ONE: BACKGROUND**

- 16. Due to the construction of Wastewater Pump Station 11 and associated pipe work, sections of Randolph Street and Bass Street require renewal. In addition, the Council's Asset Management Plan has identified and recommended the replacement of the existing kerb and dish channel with kerb and flat channel in Randolph Street between Linwood Park and Bass Street.
- 17. As a result, a street renewal project has been initiated to renew the kerb and channel and upgrade the carriageway in Randolph Street between Linwood Park and Bass Street. The Bass Street component will be carried out as reinstatement work as part of the pump station contract. There are also opportunities to improve road safety and the environment for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists.
- 18. Randolph Street and Bass Street are both located in the Ferrymead Ward of the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board and are classified as local roads in the Council's roading hierarchy.
- 19. Randolph Street has a 20 metre wide road reserve and a 10.2 metre wide carriageway. Bass Street has a 12 metre wide road reserve and an 8.5 metre wide carriageway.

20. The Land Transport New Zealand Crash Analysis System shows there have been no crashes recorded for the five year period between 2001 and 2005 and one crash at the Randolph Street/Bass Street intersection in the 10-year period from 1996 to 2005.
21. An initial issues consultation survey was undertaken in September/October 2006, from which the Council received 46 written responses. The key issues raised by residents included:
  - Landscaping.
  - Traffic speed.
  - Personal security while walking along the street after dark.
22. Other comments included the wish to improve grass berms, footpaths, lighting, more trees, the intersection priority of Randolph Street and Bass Street, upgrading of the Linwood Park entrance and a number of other issues which fall outside the project scope.
23. Internal Council consultation was undertaken in September 2006, which did not result in any significant issues being raised. However, Randolph Street was identified as a cycle/pedestrian link between Linwood Park and Linwood College.
24. As a result of internal and external feedback, the objectives of the project were confirmed as:
  - To replace the kerb and dish channel with kerb and flat channel.
  - To improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles where practicable.
  - To ensure the design meets the demand for on-street parking.
  - To provide landscape enhancement where possible.
  - To upgrade lighting if appropriate.
  - To ensure adequate drainage design.
  - To reflect the local road nature of the street.
25. A preferred concept plan option was developed and then presented to the Board on 25 October 2006 at a seminar meeting.
26. Consultation on the concept plan was undertaken with owners, occupiers and interest groups within the affected area, and also citywide via the external stakeholders mailing list in October/November 2006.
27. Primarily consultation was conducted via a consultation newsletter but also included a Randolph Street Residents' Committee meeting on 26 October 2006, a public meeting on 7 November 2006, on-site meetings, phone calls, emails and the Council's 'Have Your Say' website.
28. Approximately 500 consultation newsletters were distributed, resulting in 28 written responses received on the concept plan, of which 23 (82%) generally supported, 4 (14%) did not support, and 1 (4%) stated no preference.

**The key issues raised by respondents during the Concept Plan consultation phase included:**

29. Footpaths – concern raised in regard to the width of the footpath.

*Footpaths will be 1.5 metres wide between grass berms, 1.65 metres wide against boundary fences and 1.8 metres between landscaping areas as is Standard Council Practice.*
30. Landscaping – Improvements and fencing upgraded at Linwood Park.

*Greenspace has agreed to a new fence.*
31. Could there be more trees and landscaping.

*Due to the location of services there is no possibility for more trees, however, the landscaping at the corner of Marcroft Street will be increased.*

32. Access – Request for a left turn into Bass Street from Aldwins Road.
- There is insufficient room in Aldwins Road for traffic to pull out of the traffic lane to make the left turn.*
33. Could the left turn out of Marcroft Street be retained.
- There is a safety issue with the merging traffic from the Harrow Street traffic signals so this cannot be retained.*
34. Traffic calming – Could a traffic calming device be placed between Marcroft Street and Linwood Park.
- The distance from Marcroft Street to the end of the street is too short to allow for the appropriate spacing of traffic calming devices.*
35. Could the priority controls at Randolph Street be changed.
- The “Give Way” against Randolph Street eliminates the straight through passage for Randolph Street traffic and acts as a traffic calming device.*
36. The feedback from the community has resulted in minor alterations to the landscape area at the corner of Marcroft Street and Randolph Street.
37. A number of other issues that fell outside the scope of the project were also raised and where applicable these issues have been forwarded to the relevant Council Officers.
38. The feedback has been considered by the project team and alterations considered. The concept plan required very little change other than additional landscaping at the Marcroft Street intersection. It was felt this minor change did not require wider notification, and given the nature of the entire feedback, it is considered there is sufficient support for the concept plan to proceed to formal approval.

## SECTION TWO: OPTIONS

### 39. Option 1 - Status Quo

Randolph Street and Bass Street to be reinstated following the Pump Station construction as it currently is.

### 40. Option 2

- A nine metre wide carriageway for the full length of Randolph Street.
- Narrowing to seven metres at the intersections of Randolph Street/Bass Street and Randolph Street/Marcroft Street.
- Two centre carriageway planted islands on Randolph Street between Bass Street and Marcroft Street.
- One six metre wide narrow point on Randolph Street between Marcroft Street and Linwood Park.
- A 16 metre diameter cul-de-sac at the end of Randolph Street.
- An 8.5 metre wide carriageway the full length of Bass Street.

### 41. Option 3

- A nine metre wide carriageway the full length of Randolph Street.
- Narrowing to seven metres at the intersections of Randolph Street/Bass Street and Randolph Street/Marcroft Street.
- A change in priority at the intersection of Randolph Street and Marcroft Street, with south bound traffic on Randolph Street north, now priority controlled.
- One mid-block narrowing to six metres on Randolph Street between Marcroft Street and Linwood Park.
- A 16 metre diameter cul-de-sac 15 metres before the end of Randolph Street.
- An 8.5 metre wide carriageway the full length of Bass Street.

42. **Option 4**

- A nine metre wide carriageway the full length of Randolph Street.
- Narrowing to seven metres at the intersections of Randolph Street/Bass Street and Randolph Street/Marcroft Street.
- Road humps on Randolph Street each side of the Bass Street intersection.
- A change in priority at the intersection of Randolph Street and Marcroft Street, with south bound traffic on Randolph Street north, now priority controlled.
- Mid-block one lane chicane on Randolph Street between Bass Street and Marcroft Street.
- Mid-block one lane chicane on Randolph Street between Marcroft Street and Linwood Park.
- A 16 metre diameter cul-de-sac 15 metres before the end of Randolph Street.
- An 8.5 metre wide carriageway the full length of Bass Street.

43. **Option 5**

- A nine metre wide carriageway the full length of Randolph Street.
- Narrowing to six metres at the intersections of Randolph Street/Bass Street and Randolph Street/Marcroft Street.
- A raised and paved platform at Randolph Street/Marcroft Street intersection.
- Mid-block raised and paved platform on Randolph Street between Bass Street and Marcroft Street.
- Hammerhead turning area 15 metres before the end of Randolph Street.
- An 8.5 metre wide carriageway the full length of Bass Street.

44. The preferred option is Option 5, and is shown in **Attachment 1**.

45. For all options, following the completion of the Wastewater Pump Station 11 project, Marcroft Street will return to 'left hand turn in only' and Bass Street will remain as 'left hand turn out only'.

**SECTION THREE: ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**

46. **Option 1 - Status Quo**

This is not a viable option due to the poor condition of the asset as a result of the Wastewater Pump Station 11 and associated pipe work construction. The Asset Management Plan had identified that the existing kerb and dish channel is in need of replacement.

47. **Option 2**

This option meets all the project aims and objectives but is not supported by the Project Team for the following reasons:

- Centre carriageway planted islands being located over services.
- Cul-de-sac head will require the resumption of Council land from properties at 108, 110 and 112 Randolph Street, affecting residents.
- Due to low traffic volumes, narrowing of intersections to seven metres may be considered not narrow enough to slow vehicles.

48. **Option 3**

This option meets all the project aims and objectives, but is not supported by the Project Team for the following reasons:

- The priority change at Marcroft Street could create a speed issue around the corner and may attract more traffic from Aldwins Road. While the priority change does slow traffic using Randolph Street, this is outweighed by the potential traffic and speed increase on Marcroft Street.
- Due to low traffic volumes, narrowing of intersections to seven metres may be considered not narrow enough to slow vehicles.

49. **Option 4**

This option meets all the project aims and objectives, but is not supported by the Project Team for the following reasons:

- The one-lane chicanes will result in a loss of on-street parking. Residents will see this as a shortfall.
- Road humps at the intersection of Randolph Street and Bass Street are not required.
- The priority change could create a speed problem and attract more traffic to Marcroft Street. Residents could see this as a shortfall.
- Due to low traffic volumes, narrowing of intersections to seven metres may be considered not narrow enough to slow vehicles.

**PREFERRED OPTION**

50. Option 5 is the preferred option and meets all the project aims and objectives. It takes into consideration all identified asset management issues, best practice guidelines, safety issues, safety audit recommendations, community feedback and legal considerations associated with the project.
51. The local road nature of Randolph Street is reflected in the kerb to kerb width of nine metres, with narrowing of the intersection to six metres and the raised paved platforms will create a low speed, local street environment. This is consistent with the nature of the street.
52. Bass Street remains at its existing carriageway width of 8.5 metres.
53. The proposal improves safety for pedestrians and cyclists as it will reduce speed in Randolph Street. The footpath has been relocated so the conflicts with power poles are removed. The hammerhead turning area is located 15 metres from Linwood Park providing a safer entry and exit for pedestrians.
54. Pedestrians will find the wider relocated footpaths in Randolph Street more accommodating than the existing one metre path (the footpath will vary between 1.5 metres, 1.65 metres and 1.8 metres depending on the location).
55. This project has several crossing locations for pedestrians. The proposal ensures a continuous path of travel across intersections with standard kerb cut-down treatments. The carriageway crossing distances have been reduced to six metres at the intersections. Tactile pavers have not been included in the proposal as this is a local road.
56. The path from the hammerhead turning area to Linwood Park provides a greater separation to the carriageway, which improves cycle and pedestrian safety.
57. The design meets demand for on-street parking as the proposed nine metre wide carriage provides for on-street parking on both sides of the street. There is a small loss of parking at the intersections and at the turning area; however, the overall parking demand is low.
58. The proposed grass berms, landscape planting and street trees where services allow, will enhance the street.
59. The existing street lighting will be upgraded.
60. There has been one crash recorded in the last 10 years. The crash was at the Randolph Street intersection with Bass Street where the driver failed to give way. The narrowing of the intersection will make drivers more aware of the intersection and slow vehicle speeds through the intersection. The priority at the intersection will remain unchanged as an additional traffic calming measure on Randolph Street.
61. Many properties in Randolph Street occupy Road Reserve. However, the design for this project does not require the occupied land.

**10. ALLEN STREET – PROPOSED MOTORCYCLE PARK**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager Transport and Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Patricia Su, Traffic Engineer

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the support of the Board to the installation of a short length of parking designated for motorcycles in Allen Street **(see Attachment 1)**.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The proprietor of “City Scooters” situated at 32 Allen Street has expressed concern that there is a lack of motorcycle parks for their business.
3. The surrounding land use in the area is predominantly commercial and being located in an area of the central city close to the Christchurch Polytechnic, creates a demand for on-street parking. The kerbside spaces are therefore mostly occupied by customers from surrounding businesses or students from Christchurch Polytechnic.
4. There is no available parking provided off street by the business, however, the Council has provided other motorcycle shops around Christchurch with designated motorcycle parks to service their customers. This formalises the area in which motorcycles park instead of having them squeezed between vehicles. This proposal is consistent with other requests.
5. Consultation was undertaken with Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology as they own the car park area and they have no objection to the proposal. City Scooters is the other person directly affected by the proposal and they have requested the motorcycle park.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

**Cost**

6. Installation of signs, markings and posts is within existing budgets.

**Legal**

7. Land Transport Rule Traffic Control Devices 2004 “Part 12.4 Types and means of indicating parking restrictions”. The area is within the central city area which is outside the Board’s delegation for roading.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Board recommends to the Council that it approves the following parking restriction:

That parking be restricted for motorcycles only, on the south side of Allen Street from a point 69 metres west of the Madras Street intersection and extending 10 metres in a westerly direction.

**CHAIRPERSON’S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

**11. ARMAGH STREET KERB EXTENSION**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager Transport and Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Patricia Su, Traffic Engineer

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek support from the Board to the removal of two parking spaces and construction of a kerb extension for the purposes of an outdoor dining area on Armagh Street, between Oxford Terrace and Durham Street North.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. An application has been made by "Belgian Beer Café Torenhof" to extend the kerb line and enlarge the footpath adjacent to their premise on the south side of Armagh Street between Oxford Terrace and Durham Street North to create an outdoor dining area similar to places like Café Valentinos on Colombo Street. Their proposal involves the removal of two parking spaces (**see Attachment 1**).
3. There are three "Pay and Display" parking spaces adjacent to a loading zone area. A survey of the parking spaces usage was undertaken and usually, only two of the three parking spaces would be occupied at any one time. The works are to be done in accordance with the Council's standard specifications. It is therefore proposed that the two parking spaces are removed to achieve the desired kerb line.
4. The applicant has obtained the written support of all the residing tenants within the Canterbury Provincial Council Buildings for the removal of two of the "Pay and Display" parks. The Courts Department who are located on the opposite side of Armagh Street from the applicant have been informed of the application. No resident groups cover this area.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

5. All costs associated with the works to extend the kerb line will be met by the applicant. The lease of the footpath space is expected to generate an income stream that will offset the loss of parking revenue from the two "Pay and Display" spaces.
6. A recommendation from the Board to the Council is required for the removal of the two "Pay and Display" spaces adjacent to the site and to the granting of the application.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Board supports and recommends to the Council that it approve the removal of the two "Pay and Display" spaces and the application, subject to:

- (a) The present no stopping of vehicles on the south side of Armagh Street commencing from Oxford Terrace and extending 35 metres in a westerly direction being revoked.
- (b) The stopping of vehicles being prohibited at any time on the south side of Armagh Street commencing from Oxford Terrace and extending 49 metres in a westerly direction.
- (c) All costs associated with the kerb extension being met by the applicant, any furniture placed on the street to be in accordance with Council Policy and appropriate measures being taken to preserve the heritage kerb stone in this locality.
- (d) That should the applicant wish to terminate the lease of the outdoor dining, then the applicant shall be responsible and bear all financial cost relating to the reinstating of the two "Pay and Display" spaces.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**12. CHARLESTON CLUSTER UNDERGROUNDING**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager Transport and Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Jeanette Ward, Team Leader Capital Programme (Transport)

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Board on the options being presented to the Council for the continuation of undergrounding in the Charleston Cluster, in accordance with an earlier undertaking given by the Council.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Charleston area is bound by Wilsons Road, Ferry Road, Ensors Road and the railway corridor. There are several City Plan zonings across the cluster area. The Charleston Neighbourhood Plan (NIP)(**Attachment 1**) was published in September 2001 and since that time the focus has been putting it into action.
3. The Charleston NIP signalled an intention to underground overhead services in the Charleston streets the year before kerb and channel work commenced. It was always intended that the funding for the undergrounding would be sourced from the Urban Renewal Budget. This budget has been used for the undergrounding that has occurred to date.
4. Since 2002, Charles Street, the southern end of Barbour Street (Charles Street to the end), and Short Street have had the kerb and dish channel renewed and the overhead services undergrounded. The kerb and channel renewal project on Osborne Street is almost complete, this project did not include undergrounding as the budget was not available.
5. The Council took over the responsibility for funding undergrounding and determining which streets are undergrounded from Orion (then Southpower) in 1996/97. In accepting the transferred responsibility for street selection, Council officers developed a framework for prioritising projects which has been in use since that time, undergoing refinements. The "policy" for determining how available Transport and Greenspace funding is allocated is:
  - To be done in conjunction with major road works where road widening requires the existing poles to be relocated.
  - On major arterial routes, particularly entrances to the city.
  - On major tourist routes.

As the Charleston Cluster comprises local roads, undergrounding would not qualify under this policy.

6. Since 2001 the Council has undergrounded all arterial roads that have been identified through the kerb and channel renewal programme. A number of collector roads have not been undergrounded under this policy. These roads have not been undergrounded primarily because the pole positions were not affected by replacement of the road kerb and channel and there were higher priorities at the time. Some arterials have also been undergrounded in conjunction with footpath resurfacing.
7. As well as the undergrounding budget for these essentially main roads there was an 'Urban Renewal Policy' (and associated budget) adopted in August 1995. Under the latest LTCCP decisions this Urban Renewal operational funding has been reduced to \$100,000 per year. As this is inadequate to underground all but the shortest of streets, any decision to use this budget for undergrounding of local roads would need to be made on its merit and as a top up to another operational budget.
8. The recent LTCCP outcomes take effect from the 2006/2007 financial year. The 2006-2016 LTCCP has made no provision for local road undergrounding and so this is not included as an outcome in the planning of local roads. As a result there was no further provision for undergrounding in the Charleston Cluster except for the remaining stretch of Barbour Street (from Charles Street to Ferry Road). This stretch of Barbour Street is being undergrounded from 2005/2006 Urban Renewal funding.



9. The most recent Charleston Cluster project included street designs for Barbour Street (between Charles Street and Ferry Road), Grafton Street, Frederick Street, Grenville Street, Laurence Street and Henry Street. Completion of this cluster would mean that all the streets in the Charleston area would have kerb and flat channel. Barbour Street will be undertaken in the 2006/07 year and Grafton Street and Henry Street will follow in the 2007/08 year. Unfortunately the timing of the other three streets in the cluster is unknown at this point in time.
10. Options are presented in this report to allow the continued undergrounding of the Charleston Area. They include using existing undergrounding budgets, bringing forward budgets, budget increases and LTCCP substitutions.

#### **FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

11. The annual budgets for undergrounding are as follows:
  - **\$1,104,833** Transport and Greenspace Operational Budget (for main roads).
  - **\$100,000** Urban Renewal Operational (potential to use for undergrounding local roads).
  - **\$216,901** Transport and Greenspace Capital (Street Light Conversion – the cost of converting street lighting in conjunction with undergrounding programme).
  - **\$10,000** Urban Renewal Capital (street light conversion).
12. The total estimated cost of undergrounding the remaining streets is \$2,321,505 which is comprised of the following estimates for each of the streets.
  - Grafton Street \$588,280
  - Osborne Street \$635,100
  - Frederick Street \$223,520
  - Grenville Street \$327,910
  - Laurence Street \$341,380
  - Isabella Place \$205,310
13. There are no legal implications for this project.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the information be received by the Board. The options will be considered by the Council at its meeting on 14 December 2006.

#### **CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

- (a) That the information be received.
- (b) That the Board request that the Council receive a joint deputation of representatives of the Charleston Neighbourhood Association and the Chair of the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board.

## SECTION 1 - BACKGROUND ON CHARLESTON CLUSTER UNDERGROUNDING

### The Charleston Cluster

14. The Charleston area is bounded by Wilsons Road, Ferry Road, Ensors Road and the railway. There are several City Plan zonings across the cluster area. At the southern end of Grafton Street, Osborne Street and Barbour Street the zoning is Business 3 (Inner City Industrial) and Business B3 (Inner City Industrial Buffer). At the Ferry Road end of Barbour Street and Grafton Street the zoning is Business 1 (Local Centre). The remainder of the Charleston Cluster is primarily residential and zoned Living 3 (Medium Density).
15. The Charleston Neighbourhood Plan (NIP) was published in September 2001 and since that time the focus has been on putting it into action. A public meeting in September 2002 agreed to a co-ordinated solution for roading improvements in the area. This was the start of the clustering concept in Charleston.
16. The Charleston NIP signalled an intention to underground overhead services in the Charleston streets the year before the kerb and channel work were commenced. This intention was expressed to the residents of Charleston but never committed to by way of a Council Resolution. There is however text on the matter which can be found on the Charleston NIP document. The document states *"In conjunction with the kerb and channel renewal programme, funds have been allocated to underground the overhead services the year prior to the kerb and channel works being done. As with the kerb and channel renewal programme, the first two years of the underground programme are definite with the following three years open to change."*
17. It appears that this intention to underground the Charleston NIP is a unique situation ie. no other NIP's in the City have the same undergrounding intention.
18. It was always intended that the funding for the undergrounding would be sourced from the Urban Renewal Budget. This budget has been used for the undergrounding that has occurred to date.
19. Since 2002, Charles Street, the southern end of Barbour Street (Charles Street to the end), and Short Street have had the kerb and dish channel renewed and the overhead services undergrounded. The kerb and channel renewal project on Osborne Street is almost complete, this project did not include undergrounding as the budget was not available. **Attachment 2** illustrates the streets which have kerb and flat channel and **Attachment 3** illustrates those that have underground services.
20. Additional development of Jade Stadium, by way of another spectator stand, is due to commence so that the development is complete by the time of the 2011 Rugby World Cup. Council has indicated that the completion of the Charleston Cluster by that time would be preferable.

### Background on the Councils Undergrounding Involvement

21. The Council took over the responsibility for funding undergrounding and determining which streets are undergrounded from Orion in 1996/97. In accepting the transferred responsibility for street selection, Council officers developed a framework that was based primarily on the selection process for streets that Orion had been using up to that point. The street selection framework has been in use since that time, undergoing refinements. The selection policy itself was not determined, nor resolved by Council, but has received implicit approval by the general Council approvals given to the on-going capital programme which has outlined and identified future arterials/collectors for undergrounding.
22. The "policy" for determining how the available funding is allocated is:
  - It be done in conjunction with major road works where road widening requires the existing poles to be relocated.
  - On major arterial routes, particularly entrances to the City.
  - On major tourist routes.

As the Charleston Cluster comprises local roads, undergrounding would not qualify under this policy.

23. To satisfy the above, projects along designated traffic routes (ie. arterials and collectors) are selected from capital works programme (mainly kerb and channel projects) as possible candidates for undergrounding. In the past the budget allocation has not allowed all designated traffic routes in the capital works programme to be undergrounded, therefore candidates have been prioritised based on road hierarchy, traffic volumes and the need to relocate poles.
24. Since 2001 the Council has undergrounded all arterial roads that have been identified through the kerb and channel renewal programme. A number of collector roads have not been undergrounded under this policy. These roads have not been undergrounded primarily because the pole positions were not affected by replacement of the road kerb and channel and there were higher priorities. Some arterials have also been undergrounded in conjunction with footpath resurfacing.
25. There are approximately 40 km of 'major arterials', 124 km of 'minor arterial' and 145 km of 'Collector roads' that still have overhead wires. It is estimated that it would take 250 years to complete undergrounding of these remaining roads under the current expenditure level.
26. As well as the undergrounding budget for these essentially main roads there was an 'Urban Renewal Policy' (and associated budgets) adopted in August 1995. This Urban Renewal policy seeks the progressive renewal of the older residential parts of the city to standards appropriate in the modern environment. Undergrounding of overhead services was included as one of the activities which can help to upgrade residential areas.
27. The budget for carrying out the Urban Renewal Programme, from 2001 to 2006 was \$250,000 per annum Operational budget and \$250,000 Capital budget. The operational budget was spent almost entirely on undergrounding overhead wires with approximately 10% of the operational cost being spent from the capital budget on associated replacement street lighting. The Capital budget was not available for funding undergrounding. Undergrounding is very popular with communities and is an essential component of achieving environmental enhancement in older residential areas. It is most effective when a group of streets is done however the \$250,000 was only sufficient to underground one or two streets a year. The streets were selected according to the following criteria:
  - In Neighbourhood Improvement Plan Areas.
  - In the upcoming Kerb and Channel Renewal Programme, (it is preferable to underground the wiring just prior to the kerb and channel renewal).
  - Where the undergrounding will have the most effect e.g. where there are no large street trees or where adjoining streets have already been undergrounded.
  - Where the cost of doing a street, part of a street or combinations of streets adds up to under \$250,000.
28. Urban Renewal undergrounding has focussed on the following streets in recent years:
  - Charleston area over the recent years, Charles, Barbour, Short Streets in the Charleston area.
  - Special Amenity Areas in the Fendalton/Merivale Area – eg. Winchester, Stirling Streets.
  - Rees Street, which is in a special amenity area and was sufficiently short in length to be accommodated with the unallocated 2005/06 budget.
  - Angus Street, which is a narrow street that underwent major reconstruction and integration with reserve and waterway work – undergrounding was seen to add particular value here.
29. Under the latest LTCCP decisions the Urban Renewal operational funding has been reduced to \$100,000 per year. As this is inadequate to underground all but the shortest of streets, any decision to use this budget for undergrounding of streets in Neighbourhood Improvement Plan areas would need to be made on its merit and as a top up to another operational budget.
30. One other policy for undergrounding used to exist, this was the Narrow Streets Policy. In 2004 the MOA Residents Association sought funding for undergrounding of narrow streets in older areas. The argument being that in narrow streets there is no opportunity to plant trees or have berms or other roadside greenery to disguise or diminish the appearance of the poles and overhead wires. This initiative was supported by Council and allocated funding from 2006/07 (onwards). At the 2006 LTCCP budget discussions, Council made the decision to remove all funding allocated to the Narrow Street category, hence this policy is no longer operative.

Preliminary reports only into suitable selection criteria had been developed for this policy, and no streets have been undergrounded under its mantle.

31. The recent LTCCP outcomes take effect from the 2006/2007 financial year. The 2006-2016 LTCCP has made no provision for local road undergrounding and so this is not included as an outcome in the planning of local roads. As a result there was no further provision for undergrounding in the Charleston Cluster except for the remaining stretch of Barbour Street (from Charles Street to Ferry Road). This stretch of Barbour Street is being undergrounded from 2005/2006 funding.
32. The remaining annual budgets in the LTCCP for undergrounding are as follows:
  - **\$1,104,833** Transport and Greenspace Operational Budget (for main roads).
  - **\$100,000** Urban Renewal Operational (potential to use for undergrounding local roads).
  - **\$216,901** Transport and Greenspace Capital (Street Light Conversion – the cost of converting street lighting in conjunction with undergrounding programme).
  - **\$10,000** Urban Renewal Capital (street light conversion).

#### **Future kerb and channel renewal projects in the Charleston Cluster**

33. The most recent Charleston Cluster project included Barbour Street (between Charles Street and Ferry Road), Grafton Street, Frederick Street, Grenville Street, Laurence Street and Henry Street. Completion of this cluster would mean that all the streets in the Charleston area would have kerb and flat channel. All of these projects were to occur over the next three years.
34. However, the kerb and channel renewal works within the Transport and Greenspace Capital Programme are currently being reviewed to maximise Land Transport New Zealand subsidy levels. This means some changes to the programme will occur. The effect of this process on the Charleston Cluster is that Barbour Street will be undertaken in the 2006/07 year and Grafton Street, Henry Street, Laurence Street, Fredrick Street and Grenville Street are planned to follow in the 2007/08–2008/09 years.

#### **The estimated costs to underground the Charleston Cluster**

35. 'Rough order of cost' estimates for the remaining streets to be undergrounded have been prepared using costs provided by Orion and include an allowance for increasing cable prices. To gain a more accurate estimate an undergrounding design would need to be prepared for each of the streets.
36. The operational costs include \$810/m (includes both sides of street) for the power plus \$1,000 per property for Telecom. The capital costs are the street lighting component which based on 10% of the operational costs. These estimates assume the current agreements with Telecom and Telstra remain in place, ie. Telecom share the cost 50/50 with Council and Telstra fully fund their part of the work.

**Table 1- Cost Estimates for Undergrounding the Charleston Cluster**

<b>Street Name</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>Operational Costs</b>	<b>Capital Costs</b>
Grafton Street (Includes Henry)	<b>\$588,280</b>	\$534,800	\$53,480
Laurence Street	<b>\$341,380</b>	\$310,350	\$31,035
Frederick Street	<b>\$223,520</b>	\$203,200	\$20,320
Grenville Street	<b>\$327,910</b>	\$298,100	\$29,810
Isabella Place (Includes entire re-sealing of footpaths and driveways)	<b>\$205,310</b>	\$182,100	\$23,210
Osborne Street (Includes entire re-sealing of footpaths and driveways)	<b>\$635,100</b>	\$541,000	\$94,100
<b>Total Estimate</b>	<b>\$2,321,505</b>		

### The Main Roads included in the three year kerb and channel renewal programme

37. The kerb and channel renewal programme has been recently reviewed due to the Land Transport NZ issues that arose around which projects qualify for funding. The following collector and arterial streets are on the programme for kerb and channel renewal for the next few years. The years beyond that are still being developed.

**Table 2 – Main Roads on the three year programme**

Street Name	Hierarchy	Total Cost	Operational Costs	Capital Costs
<b>2007/08</b>				
<b>Blighs Road</b> Wairakei to Idris	Collector	<b>\$365,750</b>	\$332,500	\$33,250
<b>St Martins Road</b> Wilsons to Ensors	Minor arterial	<b>\$339,380</b>	\$308,530	\$30,850
<b>2008/09</b>				
<b>Bridge Street</b>	Minor Arterial	<b>\$440,000</b>	\$400,000	\$40,000
<b>2009/10</b>				
<b>Bower Avenue</b>	Minor Arterial	<b>\$1,023,000</b>	\$930,000	\$93,000

### SECTION 2 – OPTIONS

38. If the Council wishes to underground the remaining streets in Charleston the following funding options are available.

**Option One – Make a one-off exception to the Main Roads Undergrounding Policy and use existing Undergrounding Budgets to implement the Undergrounding of Charleston over the next four years**

39. This option would involve using both the main roads undergrounding budget and remaining Urban Renewal Budget to implement undergrounding in Charleston over the next five years to meet the 2011 preferred deadline. The degree of funding recommended is around \$300-500,000 a year to achieve the completion of the cluster. This leaves funds for some of the main roads that require renewal over this time. The remaining amounts match those above in Table 2 required for main road on the kerb and channel programme. A suggested timeframe and funding commitment (operational) is shown in the table below.

**Table 3 – Option One – Operational funding**  
(\*indicates the use of the \$100,000 Urban Renewal budget)

Street	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Grafton Street	\$541,000			
Grenville Street		\$298,100		
Laurence Street		\$310,350		
Fredrick Street		\$203,200		
Isabella Street			\$182,100	
Osborne Street				\$541,000
Main Roads	\$670,033	\$393,183	\$1,022,733	\$663,833
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>\$1,204,833*</b>	<b>\$1,204,833*</b>	<b>\$1,204,833*</b>	<b>\$1,204,833*</b>

**Option Two - Make a one-off exception to the Main Roads Undergrounding Policy and use existing Undergrounding Budgets to implement the Undergrounding of Charleston over the next two years**

40. This option would involve using both the main roads undergrounding budget and remaining Urban Renewal Budget to implement undergrounding in Charleston over the next two years to finish well before the 2011 preferred deadline. The degree of funding to achieve this is the entire use of existing budgets in the first year. This leaves no funds for the main roads in the first year and only \$300,000 in the second year. A suggested timeframe and funding commitment (operational) is shown in the table below.

**Table 3 – Option Two – Operational funding**  
(\*indicates the use of the \$100,000 Urban Renewal budget)

Street	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Grafton Street	\$534,800			
Grenville Street	\$298,100			
Laurence Street	\$310,350			
Fredrick Street		\$203,200		
Isabella Street		\$182,100		
Osborne Street		\$541,000		
Main Roads		\$278,533	<b>\$1,104,833</b>	<b>\$1,104,833</b>
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>\$1,143,250*</b>	<b>\$1,204,833*</b>	<b>\$1,104,833</b>	<b>\$1,104,833</b>

**Option Three – LTCCP Level of Service Substitutions**

41. Review all 2006/16 LTCCP Level of Service substitutions and savings options as presented to council during LTCCP deliberations with a view to specifically identifying a \$2.5m substitution.

**Option Four – Undergrounding Budget Increase**

42. Formally authorise a one off undergrounding budget increase of \$2.5m to be included in the 2007/08 financial year. This allows for the expenditure to be directly rated for.

**Option Five – Do Nothing**

43. The Council does not underground Charleston despite the intention made to the community as part of the NIP Plan.

**ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**

**Option One - Make a one-off exception to the Main Roads Undergrounding Policy and use existing Undergrounding Budgets to implement the Undergrounding of Charleston over next four years**

44. This option would involve using what has been traditionally budgeted for the arterial and collector routes that are upgraded as part of the kerb and channel renewal programme. An assumption is made that the budget amount remains constant over the next five years. There are a number of implications associated with this option:
- The programme to underground main roads that are undergoing kerb and channel renewal matches the suggested spending framework. The undergrounding would need to occur in the same year of construction.
  - Any other main roads not undergoing construction could not be undergrounded. It may be desirable to have these main roads also undergrounded for the rugby world cup.
  - The safety benefits of removing poles on main roads may not be realised.
  - Undergrounding on local roads is often requested by the residents, dedicating the majority of funds to one area of the city may be considered unreasonable and unfair.

**Option Two - Make a one-off exception to the Main Roads Undergrounding Policy and use existing Undergrounding Budgets to implement the Undergrounding of Charleston over next two years**

45. This option would involve dedicating all of what has been traditionally budgeted for the arterials and collector routes in the first year and two thirds in the second year. An assumption is made that the budget amount remains constant over the next five years. here are a number of implications associated with this option:
- The programme to underground main roads falls behind schedule and there may be the need to delay some projects until the undergrounding funding becomes available. It may be desirable to have these main roads also undergrounded for the rugby world cup.
  - Blighs Road (Innes to Wairakei), St Martins Road and Bridge Street would be undergrounded as part of the kerb and channel renewal or delayed until the budget to underground is available as there is little opportunity to return in the future to underground and would incur higher costs due to re-instatement.
  - The safety benefits of removing poles on main roads may not be realised.
  - Undergrounding on local roads is often requested by the residents, dedicating the majority of funds to one area of the city may be considered unreasonable.

**Option Three - LTCCP Level of Service Substitutions**

46. Review all 2006/16 LTCCP Level of Service substitutions and savings options as presented to council during LTCCP deliberations with a view to specifically identifying a \$2.5m substitution. Note that other Transport and Greenspace operational maintenance budgets are already forecasted to be over expended in 2006/07 therefore no opportunities exist within Transport and Greenspace for expenditure substitution. These budgetary pressures will be realised in 2007/08 Streets maintenance budgets. Therefore this option is not recommended.

**Option Four - Undergrounding Budget Increase**

47. Formally authorise a one off undergrounding budget increase of \$2.5m to be included in the 2007/08 financial year. This allows for the expenditure to be directly rated for. However this option in isolation would increase rates in 2007/08 by approximately 1.25%.

**Option Five - Do Nothing**

48. The Council does not underground Charleston despite the intention made to the community as part of the NIP Plan. This option would mean that the undergrounding of main roads could continue without an exception being made for local roads.

**13. TRUSCOTTS ROAD ALTERATIONS**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager Transport and Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Barry Cook, Network Operations and Traffic Systems Team Leader

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to update the Board on investigations into improving the traffic behaviour in Truscotts Road.

**BACKGROUND**

2. Board members will recall a deputation by appointment from Bryan Lintott to its 8 March 2006 meeting requesting "a traffic bylaw" at Ferrymead.

**DISCUSSIONS**

3. The Christchurch City Traffic and Parking Bylaw 1991 allows the Council by way of resolution to add roads to the ninth schedule (Street Racing Prohibition), which provides a ban on vehicles under 3,500 kg from using that road on Friday, Saturday and Sunday nights. This was a mechanism which was very effective at eliminating "hoons" from industrial cul-de-sacs in the Wigram Area.
4. More recently the law has been changed which gives the Police more powers to deal with these issues.
5. Truscotts Road is not an industrial area and there are functions held at Ferrymead Heritage Park at night where vehicles under 3,500 kg are expected to be used. Although bonafide vehicles are exempt, this would make enforcement in this situation very difficult.
6. With the new laws, it is not appropriate or necessary to continue the proliferation at night time vehicle bans across the city.
7. Additionally, Truscott Road is in the process of being legally closed. (Road Stopping).
8. As an interim measure, staff looked at measures that could be installed now, in anticipation of the 'road stopping', that would discourage 'hoon' behaviour in Truscotts Road. A plan (**Attachment 1**) of a proposal for the intersection of Truscotts Road and Deavoll Place was prepared and circulated for comment.
9. The concept was well received, however, the Heathcote Valley Neighbourhood Association will not support the construction of the proposal until after the 'road stopping' has taken place. The proposal is seen as creating other issues like headlights shining into houses and tyres skidding when 'hoons' negotiate the new intersection layout.
10. The 'road stopping' process is a long and drawn out legal process that is still requiring a number of legal issues to be resolved. Currently it is expected to be complete by mid 2007.

**CONCLUSION**

11. It is not appropriate to include Truscotts Road in the ninth schedule of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw, particularly when Truscotts Road is going through 'road stopping' procedures.
12. It is not appropriate to carry out the proposed works at the intersection of Truscotts Road and Deavoll Place until after the 'road stopping' has been completed.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL****Costs**

13. The costs of any works will be within existing budgets.



**Legal**

14. The "road stopping" will be carried out in terms of the requirements of the Local Government Act 1974.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

- (a) That the information be received.
- (b) That the Board support the installation of the proposed alterations at Truscotts Road and Deavoll Place on completion of the Truscotts Road 'road stopping'.
- (c) That Bryan Lintott be kept informed.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

**14. INSTALLATION OF POSTER BOLLARDS ON ROADS**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager Transport and Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Weng Kei Chen, Asset and Policy Engineer

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of the report is to seek Board comment on the poster bollard sites proposed by Phantom Bill Stickers Ltd. The Board comments will form a part of the report to Council when it considers the locations of poster bollards on roads.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Council has an agreement to licence poster bollards with Phantom Bill Stickers Ltd. This agreement is for the installation of 100 poster bollards in the City by December 2006 and thereafter an additional ten per year until 2011.
3. There are already 44 bollards installed and these are mainly in the Central City.
4. Since June 2005, representatives of Phantom Bill stickers have been in discussions with staff to seek approval for the remaining 56 poster bollards prior to December 2006.
5. To date there are 17 bollard sites that Council staff consider appropriate and are recommending to the Council for consideration **(see photographs attached)**.
6. There are 16 bollards proposed to be sited in the suburban areas of Lincoln, Riccarton, Hornby, Papanui, Shirley, Sumner, Linwood, Ferrymead and one in the Central City.
7. The following proposed poster bollard locations requiring Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board input and comments are:
  - (a) CH0602 Madras/Moorhouse Avenue outside Countdown by bus stop.
  - (b) CH0601 Nayland/Wakefield Avenue opposite Sumner Community Centre.
  - (c) CH0502.1 Wakefield/Mariner Street paved area.
  - (d) CH0503 Ferry Road outside Woolworths bus stop.
  - (e) CH0504 Buckleys Road outside Eastgate.
  - (f) CH0505 Buckleys Road outside Eastgate.
8. Phantom Bill stickers Ltd requires the consent of the Council as owner of the roads, prior to it lodging resource consents for the structures.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

9. The Council will not encounter any expenditure
10. The Company will also require resource consent for their locations.
11. There is an agreement in place between the Council and Phantom Bill Stickers Ltd.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Board recommends to the Council it approve installation of poster bollards at the following sites:

- (a) CH0602 Madras/Moorhouse Avenue outside Countdown by bus stop.
- (b) CH0601 Nayland/Wakefield Avenue opposite Sumner Community Centre.

**13. 12. 2006**

- 27 -

- (c) CH0502.1 Wakefield/Mariner Street paved area.
- (c) CH0503 Ferry Road outside Woolworths bus stop.
- (e) CH0504 Buckleys Road outside Eastgate.
- (f) CH0505 Buckleys Road outside Eastgate.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**BACKGROUND**

11. The poster bollards are solely for promoting Christchurch and Christchurch events.
12. In June 2003, the Council adopted an installation approval process for poster bollards. Decision of their locations was delegated to the Central City Streets Subcommittee with input from Community Boards. With the current Council's structure, the Council itself will now have to approve their installation.
13. The approval process adopted also outlined the assessment criteria for the location suitability and these are:
  - Vehicle traffic safety.
  - Pedestrian movements.
  - Access issues with relation to property.
  - Utility services.
  - Affect on businesses for example door entrances.
  - Consultation with building and business owners.
  - Sensitive environments eg river banks and heritage buildings etc.
14. Staff are satisfied that the above criteria have been met when assessing these bollard location sites.
15. The agreement with the Company is working well and a good working relationship has been developed between the two parties.
  - The bollards have been kept in good working order with few negative comments received.
  - The Company has been actively clearing posters appearing on street furniture and on utility cabinets.
  - The Company has made space available for community group's posters. We were advised that 90 community groups used the space and the Company has posted 14,000 posters in the last 12 months. This is excess of 10% allocation agreed.
16. There is also information available in the customer services, advising groups of the free space available for community poster.

**13. 12. 2006**

- 29 -

**15. CITY MALL REDEVELOPMENT**

To be separately circulated.