



Christchurch City Council

SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 15 FEBRUARY 2006

AT 4.00PM

IN THE BOARD ROOM, PAPANUI SERVICE CENTRE,
CNR LANGDONS ROAD AND RESTELL STREET

Community Board: Yvonne Palmer (Chairperson), Myra Barry (Deputy Chairperson), Ngaire Button, Bill Bush, Graham Condon, Megan Evans, Norm Withers.

Community Board Principal Adviser

Elsie Ellison

Phone 941 6701

Email: elsie.ellison@ccc.govt.nz

Community Secretary

Elaine Greaves

Phone 941 5105

Email: elaine.greaves@ccc.govt.nz

PLEASE NOTE:

Seminar Meeting to follow at 6.00 pm

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

- PART C 1. APOLOGIES
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 1 FEBRUARY 2006
- PART B 3. PRESENTATION OF HOST RESPONSIBILITY AWARDS
- PART B 4. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
 - 4.1 Ross Paterson
 - 4.2 Ken and/or Sylvia Walker
 - 4.3 Geoff Olds and Howard Booth
- PART C 5. PRESTONS ROAD – SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS
- PART C 6. BELFAST COMMUNITY NETWORK YOUTH WORKER
- PART C 7. SUBURBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORT INTERCHANGES CRITERIA
- PART B 8. CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT
- PART B 9. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S - UPDATE
- PART B 10. QUESTIONS

We're on the Web!

www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/

1. APOLOGIES

Myra Barry (for absence).

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 1 FEBRUARY 2006

The report of the meeting of 1 February 2006 has been circulated under separate cover.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the report to Council of 1 February 2006 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

3. PRESENTATION OF HOST RESPONSIBILITY AWARDS

Representatives from the following businesses will be in attendance:

Supreme Award to Robbies, Main North Road, Belfast.
2nd place (Silver) to O'Carrols
3rd place (Bronze) to Speights Bar, Bealey Avenue

4. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

4.1 Ross Paterson

Ross Paterson, Community Gardens Development Worker, will update the Board on recent developments and plans for the future.

4.2 Ken and/or Sylvia Walker

Ken and/or Sylvia Walker will outline their (and other resident's) concerns regarding the quality of the road at Corokia Close, Brooklands (petition attached).

4.3 Geoff Olds and Howard Booth

Geoff Olds and Howard Booth (representing the Redwood Residents' Association) will address the Board with concerns relating to Prestons Road.

5. PRESTONS ROAD - SAFETY IMPROVEMENT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	Rob Munro, Transport & City Streets Unit Manager
Author:	Melissa Renganathan, Consultation Leader, DDI 941-8662

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to provide an update to the Shirley/Papanui Board on the safety improvement works for Prestons Road (east of Grimseys Road), clarify the Council's recommended safety improvement option, and seek the Board's approval to proceed to informative consultation, final design and installation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Location

2. Prestons Road is a minor arterial road, which connects a residential zone to a rural area. east of Grimseys Road, only the northern side of Prestons Road is developed for a distance of several hundred metres. East of the residences, the road is rural on both sides. There is a speed limit in the fully rural section of 80km/h. The limit changes to 50km/h in the rural/residential section, and remains 50km/h in the fully residential section.

5. Cont'd

Project Initiation

3. Motorists travelling on Prestons Road between the Grimseys Road intersection and the 80 km/h zone are exceeding the speed limit in both directions. This has been recognised as a safety issue and in 2002, the Board passed a specific resolution seeking the investigation of a rural threshold. This project was initiated in response to the Board's resolution.

Consultation

4. An initial issues consultation survey was sent out to residents in an extended zone around Prestons Road in September 2004. One hundred and seventy four surveys were sent out and seventy three responses were received. The residents identified that speed is an issue along the length of Prestons Road between Redwood School and the 80km speed zone. Additionally, the majority of residents identified the section between Grimseys Road and the 80km/h speed zone as having a major problem.
5. As a result of the consultation, the project study area has been focused on the semi-rural section between Grimseys Road and the 80km/h speed zone. The project's aim was seen as being consistent with the purpose behind the Board's resolution.

Option Development

6. Three options were developed for the section between Grimseys Road to 80km/h zone including a consultant's recommendation, a simple rural threshold and a full rural threshold. Analysis of these options included investigation into the existing vehicle speeds in the study area and also a review of the effects of other rural thresholds in Christchurch. It should be noted that the surrounding environment within the 50km/hr zone (which is rural on the south side and residential on the north) has been a major factor in determining the potential effectiveness of the developed options.
7. **Preferred Option:** The proposed solution is a three stage process.

Stage 1

Installation of a simple rural threshold, which includes two large 50/80km/hr speed signs with no physical changes to the traffic lane widths, (see attached).

Stage 2

Analysis to determine the success of the threshold will then be undertaken (including speed surveys) one year after installation of the simple rural threshold.

Stage 3

Based on the results of this analysis, further improvements may be required and installed.

8. This three stage process is the preferred solution since the simple threshold is a cheaper option than a full rural threshold and it may be just as effective, given the surrounding environment. Additionally once Board approval is obtained, this option can be installed within one month compared to the full rural threshold, which would require several months. It is therefore recommended that the option as detailed in the attachment proceed to final design and installation.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. The estimated total cost for the simple rural threshold is \$12,000 inclusive of all consultation, design, and project management.
10. The Prestons Road rural threshold is part of the Safety Improvement Programme and is programmed for construction in the 2005/2006 financial year.
11. There are no legal implications.

5. Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board approve the safety works for Prestons Road, a simple rural threshold (as detailed in the attachment) to proceed to informative consultation and final design and installation, on the basis that post construction speed surveys will be undertaken and analysed one year after installation.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

1. That staff monitor the situation for a period of six months, with a view to reporting back to the Board with the outcome of such monitoring in September 2006.
2. That the Board request a review of the speed and safety issues pertaining to Prestons Road (between Marshlands and Main North Roads) in light of comments detailed in paragraph 30 of this report.
3. That the Board request the speed check trailer be placed in Prestons Road.
4. That staff liaise with the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee to arrange for a speed camera to be located in the area.

5. Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON PRESTONS ROAD SAFETY WORK

Study Area

12. Prestons Road is a minor arterial road, which connects a residential zone to a rural area. west of Grimseys Road it is fully residential. East of Grimseys Road, only the northern side of Prestons Road is developed for a distance of 490m. The remainder of the road is rural.
13. Prestons Road's width varies from 13.2 metres in the urban section, to 7.6 metres in the rural section. There is no kerb and channel in the rural and rural/residential sections, however, there is a large timber-lined drain on the northern road boundary and a swale drain on the opposite side. The speed limit in the fully residential section is 50km/h, and this extends into the rural/residential section, ending where the residences cease. The limit east of that is 80km/h.
14. Redwood Primary School is located on Prestons Road between Main North Road and Grimseys Road.

Project Initiation and Development

15. Council was aware that vehicles were travelling faster than the posted 50km/h limit in the rural/residential section, and started investigations to address the problem. The Traffic and City Streets Unit commissioned a traffic study of Prestons Road in May 2002 which was undertaken by an external consultant. The conclusion of the report was that the very nature of the rural/residential section favoured a driving speed of 70km/h, and that little in the way of threshold treatments would induce a speed change below that level.
16. The consultant's report advised that a full rural threshold would be best placed 80m west of the Grimseys/Prestons Roads intersection. As this would place the threshold into the fully residential section, officers subsequently believed that it meant 80m east of the intersection – in the rural/residential area. The report also proposed to increase the speed limit, between the proposed threshold and the existing 50 km/h signs east of Grimseys Road, to 70 km/h. Hence, the report did not support the rural threshold at the eastern end of the rural/residential area (the 50/80 speed zone change). Further, it recommended against a speed reduction device in the area further east of Grimseys Road – unfortunately, this is precisely the area that the speed reduction is required.
17. As a result of concerns raised by the community regarding speed on Prestons Road in the rural/residential section, the Board sought a report on rural threshold in November 2002.

“Redwood Residents’ Association, Prestons Road Rural Threshold

18. *As a representative of the Redwood Residents’ Association, Mr Geoff Olds made a deputation in regard to high traffic volumes and speed on Prestons Road. The group anticipated that during the work to widen the Styx railway overbridge, motorists would choose to use Prestons Road and potentially endanger children attending Redwood School. As they understood there were no funds to provide a roundabout at the Grimseys/Prestons Roads intersection, the group requested the installation of a rural threshold on the eastern junction where the speed is reduced from 80kph to 50kph. The important aspects of the threshold would be large twin 50 kph signs, concrete kerb defining the road edge, a flush median strip and planting to give the visual perception of a narrow way.*

The Board received the deputation and requested a staff report for a future meeting on options and costs of providing a rural threshold at the Grimseys/Prestons Roads intersection.”

19. This Prestons Road rural threshold capital project was commenced following the Board's request, and placed on the programme for work in 2005/06.
20. An investigation into the Council's intranet of Council meetings, has confirmed that since the Board's request in November 2002, no further presentations or deputations have been formally made or recorded with respect to this project.

5. Cont'd

Initial Consultation

21. An initial issues consultation survey was sent out to Prestons Road and other local residents in September 2004, which extended beyond the rural/residential section. One hundred and seventy four surveys were sent out and seventy three responses were received.
22. The residents identified that speed was an issue along the length of Prestons Road between Redwood School and the 80km/hr speed zone. Additionally, the majority of residents also identified the section between Grimseys Road and the 80km/h speed zone as having the major speed problem. Comments received included complaints of excessive speed throughout the day and night, including heavy vehicles, with vehicles not slowing down on entrance to the 50km/h speed zone.
23. As a result of the feedback the principal aim of the project was focused on the reduction of speed at which motorists travel along Prestons Road between Grimseys Road and the 50/80km/h speed limit boundary, to an acceptable level. The main objectives of the project are:
 - To manage the speed of vehicles on Prestons Road within the 50 km/h speed zone.
 - Improve the safety of motorists residing in the living zone defined by the boundaries of Grimseys Road and the speed limit boundary.
 - Clearly identify the transition from the urban to semi rural zones.
 - Ensure that adequate provision is made to enhance or maintain safety for different modes of transport.
24. To meet the project objectives, it was considered that further options over and above the consultant's report (produced in 2002) were considered necessary, as the report did not specifically address the speed control requirements in the area in question.

Speed Surveys

25. The latest speed surveys were undertaken in September 2005. The results show that there is a speeding problem in both directions within the 50km/hr speed zone. The surveyed 85 percentile directional speeds are based on 24 hour, seven day count averages and are summarised below (and also illustrated in the attachment).

Location	Eastbound	Westbound
300m inside proposed threshold (west of 50/80km/h zone)	74	64
At proposed threshold	77	81
200m outside proposed threshold (east of 50/80km/h zone)	80	83

Rural Threshold Research

26. One of the options assessed to address the speeding problem east of Grimseys Road is the installation a full rural threshold at the 50/80km/h transition location. To establish the appropriateness of this solution and its potential success, research into studies on three existing thresholds within Christchurch (50/100km/h thresholds) and a number of independent consultant analysis reports was undertaken.
27. The review revealed the following:

“One of most important factors in the sustained effectiveness of the threshold downstream of the device was selecting a site as close to the rural/urban boundary as practical¹.” In the case of Prestons Road, the rural/urban boundary is not clearly defined, as there is a length of rural/residential road between the fully rural and fully residential.

¹ Roberts Road Traffic Management Review, CCC July 2005

5. Cont'd

"Motorists' speed will be determined by the environment rather than regulatory signs. 2" For Prestons Road, the rural/residential zone is an environment that does not strongly encourage speed reduction from the 80km/h area.

Analysis of speed data at the location of the thresholds in the studies, three months prior to threshold installation and one year after installation, has shown a range in speed reduction from 6% to 18%. It should be noted that the sites analysed have different road environments to that of Prestons Road. Therefore, it cannot be automatically assumed that the introduction of a full threshold on Prestons Road will have the same percentage of effectiveness.

28. Based on this research, in particular the nature of the surrounding environment, the ability for a full rural threshold to result in significant speed reduction changes along Prestons Road is questionable. The impression gained from research thus far, is that even if a full threshold is installed, vehicles are most likely to drive at a speed conducive to the road environment – in this case assessed at 70km/h.

OPTIONS

29. Five options were assessed to improve safety along Prestons Road. Two options west of Grimseys Road and three east of Grimseys Road, as described in the following paragraphs.
30. Two options were developed to investigate safety issues at the Prestons/Grimseys Roads intersection and at the Redwood Primary School, as identified during the initial consultation. The proposed solutions included a roundabout at the intersection and a school speed zone outside the primary school. These options have not been progressed further for this project as they are outside the scope of the immediate speed control requirements. They will, however, be prioritised alongside other speed/safety projects.
31. Three options were assessed as part of the Prestons Road safety improvement works, to specifically address the speeding problem in the rural/residential section, as follows:

(a) **Consultant's Report Recommendation** (see attachment)

The consultants who undertook a review of Prestons Road speed in May 2002 proposed that an urban–rural threshold be installed on Prestons Road approximately 80m east of Grimseys Road. (Note the report actually states 80m west of Grimseys Road, however, this would place the threshold into the fully residential section. Hence officers subsequently believe that the report means 80m east of the intersection; in the rural/residential area.) This option also proposed to increase the speed limit, between the proposed threshold and the existing 50 km/h signs east of Grimseys Road, to 70 km/h.

32. It is considered that the information presented in this report is substantially correct, in that:
- The speed environment in the rural/residential section is conducive to 70kmh, and that threshold treatments at the current 50/80kmh boundary are not likely to significantly reduce speeds below this.
 - The most appropriate place for a speed control threshold on Prestons Road is a few metres east of the Grimseys/Prestons Roads intersection, where the transition from rural to residential is clear.
33. However, as this project was specifically established to seek speed reduction in the rural/residential section, the option presented here is not supported. It will not decrease the speed within the semi rural 50 km/h area and, in fact, it recommends increasing the speed limit in this area. The traffic study assessed the speed environment as 70km/h. This option would legalise current driver behaviour and reflect the appropriate speed limit for the environment. It would not, however, meet the expectations of the residents in the semi rural area and will not enhance the safety for traffic, cyclists and pedestrians.

² Rural Speed Thresholds, CCC April 2003

5. Cont'd

(b) **Full Rural Threshold**

34. This option proposed a "full rural threshold" placed at the western limit of the northern residences (at the 50/80km/h boundary). It would have the standard rural threshold layout with narrow 2.5m lanes, a short flush median 1.5m wide, a 1.25m wide shoulder with a kerbed threshold, creating the constriction along Prestons Road. Standard rural threshold signs and cycle lanes will be installed behind the kerb line in the landscaped area.
35. This proposal has a low confidence of success to manage speed within the 50km/h rural/residential area (as indicated, the traffic study confirms the speed environment here is 70km/h). The full rural threshold may have *some* effect on traffic speed, but the transition between high speed and low speed environments is not striking enough to reinforce the speed reduction message of the full threshold. The primary effect on speed is expected to come from the speed limit posted on large signage, rather than the threshold structure itself. This option costs approximately \$35,000. This is therefore considered to be a high cost for an option with a low confidence of success.

(c) **Simple Rural Threshold** (see attachments 2 and 3, figure 1)

36. The "simple rural threshold" proposes two large signs, including "Welcome to Redwood" text and no physical changes to the traffic lane widths at the current 50/80km/h boundary. The standard rural threshold signs are installed in the berm area.
37. This is the recommended option. It is considered that it has the same potential to reduce vehicle speeds as the full threshold (i.e. low confidence) includes the large speed limit signage - drivers should have a clear understanding of the speed limit in this semi rural area. It is a lower cost option with the same level of success as the higher cost option above.

PREFERRED OPTION (see attachment 2)

38. It is proposed that option (c) is installed. Speeds will subsequently be monitored to confirm the success (or not) of this option. This project is within budget at \$12,000 (including all consultation, design and project management). It is a much cheaper option than that of the full rural threshold and may be just as effective. Additionally, once Board approval is obtained, this option can be installed within one month, compared to the full rural threshold, which would require several months. The proposed solution is a three stage process detailed as follows:

Stage 1

Installation of a simple rural threshold, which includes two large 50/80km/hr speed signs with no physical changes to the traffic lane widths, as shown in attachment 2.

Stage 2

Analysis to determine the success of the threshold will then be undertaken (including speed surveys) one year after installation of the simple rural threshold.

Stage 3

Based on the results of this analysis, and considering any local environmental changes, further improvements may be required and installed.

39. The stage 1 recommended option is a simple rural threshold to be placed at the eastern end of the residential properties (see attachment 3 figure 1). It is based on achieving a balance between the known effectiveness (and ineffectiveness) of other rural thresholds in Christchurch, a consultant's study about the speed environment along this section of the road, the desire of the community for speed control actions at this location, and cost.

5. Cont'd

Project Process

40. Other than the instalment of the rural threshold signs there are no changes to the road environment. The positioning and installation of a rural threshold for optimum effectiveness is primarily a matter based on technical assessments. It is therefore considered that a community engagement process considering inputs and options will not add value to the recommended option. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to seek community feedback on the recommended option. It is proposed that once approval is obtained from the Board, letters informing the community of the option for the simple rural threshold be mailed out. It is anticipated that the signs could be installed within one month, depending on the delivery capabilities of sign contractors.
41. Stages 2 and 3 will provide an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of the simple rural threshold on vehicle speed. It is proposed that additional speed surveys are conducted 12 months after installation and then analysed to determine the effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of the simple rural thresholds and determine if further improvements are required.
42. It is acknowledged that the proposed simple rural threshold does not fulfil the community's expectation of a full rural threshold, as proposed in the November 2002 delegation. However, it does partially fulfil the request, with large speed signs, and is expected to have the same level of effectiveness. This project is within budget at \$12,000 (including all consultation, design and project management). It is a much cheaper option than that of the full rural threshold and it may be just as effective. Additionally, once Board approval is obtained, this option can be installed within one month, compared to the full rural threshold which would require several months. The specific Board resolution requires staff to report on *"the options and costs of providing a rural threshold at the Grimseys/Prestons Roads intersection"*. This investigation and report has taken the liberty of interpreting the resolution's intent to investigate a threshold for speed control in front of the rural/residential properties, and has proceeded with accordingly.

6. BELFAST COMMUNITY NETWORK YOUTH WORKER

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Stephen McArthur
Officer responsible:	Lesley Symington, Unit Manager
Author:	Ollie Clifton, DDI 941-5409

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to a request for funding of \$5,000 from the Belfast Community Network for wages relating to the employment of a Youth Worker.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Belfast Community Network has been operating as an incorporated society since 2001, and is currently involved in the following activities in the Belfast community: Friday night youth café, youth holiday programmes.
 - OSCAR (after-school and holiday programmes)
 - elderly shopping service
 - craft group
 - community newsletter
 - numerous community events (Xmas Caper, Waitangi Day, Belfast Pool events).
3. The Network provides term reports on the youth holiday programmes and also annual reports on the youth café to the Community Recreation Advisor – both projects are running well.

6. Cont'd

4. Belfast Community Network has previously employed a Youth Worker for 20 hours per week, from March to November 2004, at which point in time the incumbent Youth Worker resigned. Over the last 12 months the Network has reassessed its role in meeting youth needs in Belfast, and has continued to run the Friday night youth café and youth holiday programmes. This has given the Network the opportunity to train one of their own volunteers (Kiri Stevens) in the role of Youth Worker. Kiri has now completed her Youth Worker training at CPIT, and the Network has taken the opportunity to employ Kiri for 15 hours per week as the Belfast Community Network Youth Worker (see attached Youth Worker job description).
5. A number of additional projects and tasks will be able to be undertaken in Belfast with the reinstatement of a Belfast Youth Worker, including the following:
 - (i) Advocacy and support for young people and their whanau.
 - (ii) Planning and implementation of youth events in the Belfast community.
6. In addition to these two areas of work, there have been a number of small but significant steps taken recently by Belfast Community Network staff to encourage a sense of community ownership and pride amongst local young people. Examples of this include a clean up of the Belfast pool, and assistance with the running of the Belfast Xmas Caper event. This initiative will be further strengthened by the work of the Belfast Youth Worker.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. Belfast Community Network currently has funds on hand of \$4,200 for this project (see attached budget). This funding was originally allocated by the Board to Belfast Community Network for the employment of a Youth Worker as part of 2003/2004 Project Fund allocations. The Network has requested a further \$5,000 from the Board towards this project, which would equate to 3–4 months wages.
8. The recommendation of this report is that the Board allocate \$5,000 towards this project from its 2005/2006 Discretionary Fund. The current balance of Board's Discretionary Fund is approximately \$45,000.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board allocate \$5,000 from its 2005/2006 Discretionary Fund to Belfast Community Network for Youth Worker wages.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

7. SUBURBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORT INTERCHANGES CRITERIA

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Environment
Officer responsible:	Transport and City Streets Unit Manager
Author:	Robert Woods, DDI 941-8060

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's feedback on certain proposed criteria to identify locations for the development of three suburban bus interchanges. A further report will then present an analysis of potential locations using these criteria (once approved by Council) and a request for Community Board comment on a recommendation of the three locations for scheme development, prior to seeking a resolution of such from Council.

7. Cont'd

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The development of suburban interchanges are integral to achieving the Council's vision and goals for public transport as set out in its Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy. In this Strategy, the Council has a target for the adoption of a plan identifying locations of interchanges and construction of three interchanges by June 2006.
3. In December 2005 staff conducted a seminar for Council and Community Boards on the role of interchanges and highlighted the particular functions of them in Christchurch (see attachment). The seminar outlined the aim of achieving positive community outcomes through transport improvements that encourage increased suburban transfer between services forming the metro network and also between public transport and other modes of travel. This is currently an under-utilised aspect of the system because despite the metro services being largely in place for people to move around the network, there are not the appropriate passenger interchange facilities at key points in the network to encourage transfers. By encouraging people to maximise the flexibility of the system by interchanging between services and modes, they will be able to make better use of the metro system to access a wider range of destinations, rather than be limited to just a single bus trip. This will improve the convenience of the system to present customers whilst also allowing new customers to take advantage of an improved metro system as the overall level of service becomes more aligned with their travel requirements and expectations.
4. The success of suburban interchanges depends upon improvements in a number of key areas. These improvements may be considered the key objectives for the development of the interchanges and comprise:
 - The provision of quality interchange passenger facilities at the right locations.
 - Appropriate passenger services to facilitate interchange.
 - The provision of good access and arrangements for other modes.
 - Strong ongoing marketing and promotion of the facility once it is up and running.

Success in these areas will require the Council to engage with other key stakeholders, such as Environment Canterbury, local businesses and the surrounding local communities.

5. In order to identify a fair and technically robust process for selecting the first three interchange sites, a number of different criteria options were considered. These comprised site selection by:
 - (a) Geographical spread.
 - (b) Existing passenger demand.
 - (c) Existing level of passenger services.
 - (d) Surrounding population catchment.
 - (e) Importance of the suburban centre in comparison to other centres.
 - (f) Status of the centre within the metro network.
 - (g) Land availability and complexity of procurement.
 - (h) Traffic management implications and impacts on other road users.
 - (i) Extent of changes required to the existing metro services and for existing passengers.
 - (j) Impacts on neighbouring land owners and uses.
 - (k) Project cost.
 - (l) Time to complete and time implications with other projects.

7. Cont'd

6. Having assessed these options it is recommended that criteria (d) to (l) form the criteria for selecting interchange sites as these are the most important aspects to achieving positive outcomes on the aims and objectives of the project. Criteria (d) to (f) cover matters of site significance; (g) to (j) cover matters of project feasibility; and criteria (k) and (l) cover issues of project deliverability. Whilst criteria (a) to (c) qualify as equitable in one way or another, they would not have any supporting technical rationale to indicate they would be the best opportunities for Council to take. If, however, assessments using (d) to (l) result in equal ratings of sites, (a) to (c) could be used to separate them by a second tier assessment.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. Funding for interchanges was first identified through adoption of the Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Statement stage 1 in December 2003. Budgets for suburban interchanges are currently identified in the Council's current draft LTCCP 2006/16.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board:

1. Note the aims and objectives of the project.
2. Express its support for the proposed criteria for the development of a priority list of interchange locations, these being :
 - (d) Surrounding population catchment.
 - (e) Importance of the suburban centre in comparison to other centres.
 - (f) Status of the centre within the metro network.
 - (g) Land availability and complexity of procurement.
 - (h) Traffic management implications and impacts on other road users.
 - (i) Extent of changes required to the existing metro services and for existing passengers.
 - (j) Impacts on neighbouring land owners and uses.
 - (k) Project cost.
 - (l) Time to complete and time implications with other projects.
3. Request that staff report back to the Board with the proposed interchange location priority list using these criteria (once they are adopted by Council), prior to a resolution being sought by Council for the development of the first three suburban interchange locations.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATIONS

That the staff recommendations be adopted.

7. Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON SUBURBAN INTERCHANGES

8. The development of three suburban interchanges by June 2006 is a City Council target of the Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy. It sits amongst a range of other targets for both the City Council and Environment Canterbury, emphasising the importance of ongoing and combined improvements in passenger services and infrastructure to achieve the vision set out in the Strategy.
9. Suburban interchanges aim to encourage people to transfer between different metro services and between metro public transport and other modes. With the availability of an urban network of convenient services and attractive interchanges, people will increasingly be able to move efficiently within it, making public transport a convenient alternative to most private car journeys. Interchange is a concept where customers can hop on and off different routes to reach their destination, as well as to join and leave the system via another mode. This will occur at its most optimal when the services have sufficient coverage and are of an appropriate cost, reliability and frequency to make their use realistic; supported by passenger interchange facilities that provide attractive surroundings of sufficient quality and functionality to make interchanging easy and convenient. The bus exchange is an excellent example of such a facility (albeit on a larger scale).
10. Interchanges and the supporting passenger services must therefore support the needs of people moving efficiently within a network and must also recognise where and how customers choose to join and leave the network (whether it be on foot, by bike or other mode³) and what other business they may undertake on the way, such as shopping, entertainment, leisure or personal business. Interchanges thus operate on a number of levels, with the locations that will deliver the greatest benefits being those that can most effectively deliver the interchange concept in an area with a high passenger catchment. Criteria are needed to identify the extent to which any given location is likely to perform on these fronts and therefore their priority in terms of achieving the Council's aims and objectives.

AIMS

11. The Council works towards the achievement of a number of Community Outcomes, some of which relate directly to improvements in the transport system. These include "An attractive and well designed city", "A safe city", "A city of people who value and protect the natural environment" and "A prosperous city". Contributions to these Community Outcomes through transport improvements should be recognised as an important aim of the interchanges project. To achieve these outcomes interchanges aim to encourage more trips by public transport and less by private car by encouraging transfer between metro services and also between metro and other modes of arrival and departure from the interchange. In this way better use will be made of the existing road network, improving its efficiency and safety and making higher value road trips such as freight movement faster and more reliable.

OBJECTIVES

12. From these high level aims arise certain specific project objectives. The achievement of these objectives depend largely upon addressing the differences between metro and private transport in terms of time, cost, coverage, safety, image and accessibility (being the main drivers of mode choice). The project objectives are outlined below.

³ Park 'n' ride is a form of 'interchange' not suited to the urban environment - which is the context for these bus interchanges. P&R is effective generally only on the edge of an urban area and along the line of a major high volume radial corridor such as a motorway, where car journeys can be readily intercepted. Typically, features of P&R include substantial managed free parking areas, low cost high frequency express services direct to the destination, supported by dedicated bus priority facilities. Parking controls in the urban centre, such as time limits, limited availability and price increases are also used to encourage transfer from the car at the P&R station. Park 'n' ride is a separately identified project in the Public Passenger Transport Strategy.

7. Cont'd

13. The first objective is to develop a suitable facility at the right location to encourage people to travel to a defined point in the network (via their chosen mode) where they can then transfer to another mode or service to get to their destination (or to another interchange). This infrastructure can impact upon a person's choice of travel mode by addressing common perceptions of security, image, journey time and accessibility. Feelings of security will be improved through the provision of a comfortable interchange environment, whilst its design and branding will determine its image. The way in which the facility allows the metro services to interact with the passengers (for example all services coming together at one point) also impacts upon journey time, safety and accessibility.
14. Probably as important as providing good infrastructure, is the need to provide the correct services to support the interchange concept. Attention in the areas of time, cost, coverage, image and accessibility will deliver this. Particularly essential are regular local services to get passengers to their interchange, fast and frequent links between interchanges to allow efficient movement within the network, quality buses that are clean with plenty of seats and attractive and accessible bus stops.
15. Recognising that passengers may make their way to and from the interchange using another mode, an objective should include encouragement of these types of journeys by reviewing access arrangements (for example pedestrian crossing facilities and cycle facilities on approach routes) and facilities at the interchange itself like secure cycle parking and secure storage facilities.
16. A final and often under-utilised objective for the project should be to actively inform, educate and promote interchanges before, during and after their development to ensure the maximum number of people are attracted to the facility and services. Only if people within the catchment of the interchange are aware of their options will they make use of them. Research in travel behaviour shows that changes in mode choice occur gradually and over a period of time. It is therefore important to undertake information and promotion work as part of an ongoing marketing campaign so that as people's needs and motivations change, they are regularly reminded of the alternatives available.

OPTIONS

17. A number of criteria were considered as a way to develop a priority list of sites for development. These were as follows:
 - (a) Geographical spread.
 - (b) Existing passenger demand.
 - (c) Existing level of passenger services.
 - (d) Surrounding population catchment.
 - (e) Importance of the suburban centre in comparison to other centres.
 - (f) Status of the centre within the metro network.
 - (g) Land availability and complexity of procurement.
 - (h) Traffic management implications and impacts on other road users.
 - (i) Extent of changes required to the existing metro services and for existing passengers.
 - (j) Impacts on neighbouring land owners and uses.
 - (k) Project cost.
 - (l) Time to complete and time implications with other projects.

7. Cont'd

PREFERRED OPTION

18. Having considered each criteria and the aims and objectives of the project, it is recommended that criteria (d) to (l) form the criteria to prioritise a list of interchange locations. Criteria (d) to (f) cover matters of site significance; (g) to (j) cover matters of project feasibility and criteria (k) and (l) cover issues of project deliverability. This option reflects the significance of a location in the context of achieving high level Council aims and project objectives whilst it also recognises practical matters such as the availability of appropriate land and programming with other works⁴. Using these criteria will also likely achieve the equity offered by the remaining options which could be employed if necessary to split options rated equally using the proposed criteria.
19. The following table outlines the proposed criteria recommended for use and how these criteria will be measured. Each criteria will receive equal weighting.

CRITERIA	Measured by
Significance of the location as a potential interchange	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential user catchment (surrounding population within 10 minute walk/bike/bus ride buffer zone) - Status of centre (certain major and minor suburban centres as identified in the city plan, plus others of significance in the metro network) as a destination in the city-wide context (number of employees, retail floor area). - Status of centre within the metro network (proximity, number and significance of neighbouring suburban centres and facilities, existing levels of service).
Feasibility of developing an appropriate interchange facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land availability and complexity of procurement. - Traffic management implications and impacts on other road users. - Extent of required metro changes and impacts on existing passengers and service integrity. - Likely impacts on neighbouring land owners and uses.
Deliverability of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budget implications and time to complete. - Implications of/on other planned works.

8. CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

A report detailing recent activities undertaken by the Chairperson is attached.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the information be received.

9. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S - UPDATE

The Community Board Principal Adviser report will be tabled at the meeting.

10. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (If any have been submitted in accordance with Standing Orders 4.1.1 to 4.1.5)

⁴ The development of interchanges within LTCCP 2006/16 budgets is an underlying assumption.