



Christchurch City Council

HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

12 JULY 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

Community Secretary

Kevin Roche

Telephone: 941-6615

Fax: 941-6604

Email: kevin.roche@ccc.govt.nz

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 REPORT**
- PART B 3. CORRESPONDENCE**
- PART B 4. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE**
- PART B 5. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**
- PART B 6. DEPUTATION BY APPOINTMENT
MS RAEWYN MCCOY – MCKENZIE AVENUE STREET RENEWAL**
- PART C 7. TAYLORS MISTAKE BEACH TOILETS AND CHANGING ROOMS REPLACEMENT**
- PART C 8. MACROCARPA TREE REMOVAL - 81A TAYLORS MISTAKE ROAD**
- PART A 9. TENDER – SCARBOROUGH TEAROOMS**
- PART C 10. CHESTER STREET EAST RESIDENTS ONLY PARKING**
- PART C 11. CHARLESTON CLUSTER KERB AND CHANNEL REPLACEMENT**
- PART C 12. CHRISTCHURCH STREETS AND GARDENS AWARDS COMMITTEE - REPRESENTATIVE**
- PART C 13. NOTICES OF MOTION**

We're on the Web!

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

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF REPORT

The report of the ordinary meeting held on Wednesday 28 June 2006 has been circulated to Board members.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the report of the ordinary meeting held on Wednesday 28 June 2006 be confirmed.

3. CORRESPONDENCE

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. DEPUTATION BY APPOINTMENT

MS RAEWYN MCCOY – MCKENZIE AVENUE STREET RENEWAL

Ms McCoy will attend at approximately 4.30 pm to address the Board concerning the street renewal for McKenzie Avenue which is currently scheduled for 2009/10.

7. TAYLOR'S MISTAKE BEACH TOILETS AND CHANGING ROOMS REPLACEMENT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Greenspace Manager
Author:	Joanne Walton - Parks and Waterways Area Advocate

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to the plan for the Taylor's Mistake Beach toilets and changing rooms replacement, following consultation with the local community, and occupation of legal road reserve by the replacement building.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Board members will recall that the concept plan for the replacement of the toilets and changing rooms at Taylor's Mistake Beach was presented to the Board meeting on 8 March 2006 prior to the Greenspace Unit carrying out consultation with the local community.
3. The plan was circulated to approximately 65 residential properties on the eastern side of Taylor's Mistake Road leading down into the bay, and mailed to 35 individual bach owners, in April/May 2006. It was also circulated to a number of identified key stakeholders, both individuals and organisations, and an information sign was placed on the site. There was a very good response from the local community with a total of 47 residents returning the comment form providing feedback on the proposed plan.
4. Certain key stakeholder organisations, ie the Taylor's Mistake Surf Life Saving Club, Save the Bay Ltd, and the Taylor's Mistake Association, were consulted in the early stages of this project. Prior to the distribution of the plan, representatives of these organisations were advised by telephone that a public information leaflet would be forthcoming and they would be able to make a formal comment on the proposal. The plan was subsequently mailed to individual bach owners in the Taylor's Mistake Association. The Greenspace Unit noted that none of these organisations responded formally during the consultation period.
5. Overall we received a very positive response from the community with the feedback indicating a good level of support for the building replacement.

Support for proposal	Yes	No	Not indicated	Total
Number of responses	40	5	2	47
%	85%	11%	4%	100%

6. In recognition of the residents' feedback, the Greenspace Unit proposes to make a number of minor alterations to the original proposal (**refer to attached plans**).

Proposed Changes:

- The seating will not be attached to the side of the building as originally shown. Instead the seating is likely to be situated in a more open, safe, and pleasant location on the other side of the wash-down area.
 - A drinking water fountain will be provided.
 - The facility will be provided with lighting.
 - In addition, the position of the building is now approximately 3 metres south of the previous location with the adjacent footpath realigned slightly to accommodate this. There will be no increase in the area of hard landscaped surface.
 - Funding has also been secured for an artwork to be integrated with the function of the building. It is anticipated that details of this will be presented at the meeting. It is proposed that the wooden panels on the sides of the building will be replaced with artworks of a similar theme to others in the city's coastal park environment.
7. The plan of the proposed new toilet and changing rooms building shows a range of additional facilities: male and female changing rooms each with its own toilet; additional male and female toilet cubicles opening directly to the outside of the building; an additional family changing room and an accessible changing room, each with its own toilet and hand-washing facilities, and opening directly to the outside of the building, and; a wash-down shower area and seating outside the changing rooms.

8. There was generally a high level of support for the design of the new toilets and changing rooms. Some respondents did express concerns about the adequacy of the new building in terms of its size. The Greenspace Unit is confident that the design of the new building will offer a range of options for users, with an increased number of toilets and more effective use of space. The design and materials of the building will also be more in keeping with the surrounding coastal environment, as will the removal of the existing septic tank system and the connection of the building to the reticulated sewerage system.
9. The outside seating will not be attached to the side of the building as originally shown, but will likely be positioned on the other side of the wash-down area. This is a more open, safe, and pleasant location, and provides a place for people to set down their belongings while using the showers. This also removes the possibility of people using the seating to look into the changing rooms from above.
10. Some respondents expressed concerns about the position of the new building in relation to the surrounding sand dunes, vegetation and car-parking area, and potential coastal hazards. The new toilets will be consistent with our current "safer parks" design. The new building has been moved several metres south of the existing building location so that the toilet and changing room doors are further away from the adjacent dunes and vegetation, and can be easily seen from the road carriageway and car-park. In addition, when the doors of the additional toilets and changing rooms to the outside of the building are opened, the user can immediately see into the entire toilet area. This will provide a greater level of visibility and improved safety for users of the facilities. The adjacent footpath will be realigned slightly to accommodate the change in location, but the area of hard landscaped surfacing around the building will not increase. The new building is also located well clear of the coastal hazard line identified in Environment Canterbury's Regional Coastal Environment Plan.
11. A number of issues that were raised by respondents were considered to be outside the scope of this particular project. These included the upgrading of Taylor's Mistake Road, the provision of toilets at Boulder Bay, and the provision of other amenities and improvements in the Taylor's Mistake Beach area. These issues will be considered separately by the Greenspace Unit or referred to another unit within the Council as appropriate.
12. The existing toilet and changing rooms building at Taylor's Mistake Beach is built on legal road. A large proportion of the beach, dune and car-parking area, including the existing facilities, is unformed legal road that is continuous with both Taylor's Mistake Road, and other unformed legal roads along the coastline to the north and south of the beach, and has previously been identified as road to be stopped.
13. The new toilets and changing rooms will be situated immediately south of the location of the existing building, and will still be within the legal road. The Greenspace Unit has consulted with officers from the Transport and City Streets Unit on this issue who have advised that they would be in support of this proposal. There is essentially no change to the current situation. The proposed new building is a replacement of an existing structure which currently occupies the legal road reserve. It will be located in approximately the same position but will occupy a slightly smaller footprint. The proposed new building will not interfere with vehicular traffic, or cycle and pedestrian movements.
14. All respondents have been sent a final letter of reply thanking them for their input. The letter has also informed respondents that the final amended plan would be presented to the Hagley Ferrymead Community Board for approval. Details of the meeting were provided so that any interested people could attend. Letters have also been sent to the Taylor's Mistake Surf Life Saving Club and Save the Bays Ltd advising them of this process.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

15. The current Greenspace Capital Works Programme has funding available to undertake the replacement of the toilets and changing rooms at Taylor's Mistake Beach, with \$87,275 carried forward from the 2005/06 year and \$90,000 available in the current 2006/07 year. Subject to any unavoidable delays, the works will be completed within the current financial year.
16. A resource consent will be required from the Christchurch City Council for the erection of a building in a Conservation 1A Zone and will be applied for as part of the implementation process.

OPTIONS

17. There are two options:

- (a) Do nothing/maintain the status quo.

This is not considered a viable option as the existing building is in poor condition.

- (b) Approve the plan for the replacement of the Taylor's Mistake Beach toilets and changing rooms, amended as a result of consultation feedback, and for the Greenspace Unit to commence the construction programme. To also approve the occupation of the legal road reserve at Taylor's Mistake Beach by the replacement building.

This will allow the Greenspace Unit to provide a toilet and changing room facility with an improved design and location that provides a range of options for beach users, and promotes safety. The construction of the new facility cannot proceed without the related approval to occupy the legal road.

PREFERRED OPTION

18. The preferred option is (b).

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board approve:

1. The attached plan for the replacement of the Taylor's Mistake Beach toilets and changing rooms, amended as result of consultation feedback, and that the Greenspace Unit commence the construction programme.
2. Occupation of the legal road reserve at Taylor's Mistake Beach by the replacement toilets and changing rooms building.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted and the Greenspace Unit be congratulated for the final plan and consultation process undertaken.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option**

Approve the plan for the replacement of the Taylor's Mistake Beach toilets and changing rooms, amended as a result of consultation feedback, and the Greenspace Unit commence the construction programme. Approve the occupation of the legal road reserve at Taylor's Mistake Beach by the replacement building.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Improved facilities for wider range of users; Improved safety for users.	None identified.
Cultural	No benefits identified.	None identified.
Environmental	Removal of existing septic tank systems from beach environment. Enhancement of recreation facilities.	None identified.
Economic	No positive economic impact for the community identified.	Replacement of building \$177,275 already in capital programme for 2006/07 year; Ongoing maintenance costs may be less than for existing outdated facility.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome: "Our City's natural resources, biodiversity, landscapes, and ecosystem integrity are protected and enhanced". Also contributes to: "Our City's infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability".</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: No impacts on Council's capacity and responsibilities have been identified.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: No effects on Maori have been identified.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Parks & Waterways Access Policy Public Toilets Policy</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Local residents indicate good level of support of proposed plan; Sumner and Redcliffs Residents' Associations both in support of proposed plan; Other key stakeholder groups have not made a submission.</p> <p>Other relevant matters: None identified.</p>		

Maintain The Status Quo (If Not Preferred Option)

Do nothing/maintain the status quo

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	None identified.	Recreation experience is not enhanced by inadequate facilities; possible safety risks in older building design.
Cultural	None identified.	None identified.
Environmental	None identified.	Existing septic tanks will remain in coastal environment.
Economic	No immediate financial cost of replacement, however existing building will be at end of useful life.	Continuing maintenance and repairs/upgrade of older building.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: N/A</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: No impacts on Council's capacity and responsibilities have been identified.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: No effects on Maori have been identified.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: N/A</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Local community indicated a high level of support for the proposal, however five local residents considered that the existing facilities were adequate and/or Council should allocate funding to road improvements; Some key stakeholder groups did not make a submission.</p> <p>Other relevant matters: None identified.</p>		

8. MACROCARPA TREE REMOVAL – 81A TAYLORS MISTAKE ROAD

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Greenspace Manager
Author:	Graham Clark, Arborist Joanne Walton - Parks and Waterways Area Advocate

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the removal of a single macrocarpa tree (*Cupressus macrocarpa*) located outside 81A Taylor's Mistake Road. The tree is now perceived to be a nuisance by residents as it is causing structural damage to the boundary wall, and root lifting of the lawn, of the property at 81A Taylor's Mistake Road.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In March 2006 Harcourt's Real Estate Agents, acting as representatives of the property owners, approached the Council with a request to remove the macrocarpa tree which lies directly on the property boundary of 81A Taylor's Mistake Road and the Council road reserve. The tree is perceived to be a nuisance causing both structural damage to a boundary wall and raising the lawns of the adjacent property.
3. The tree that the applicant would like removed is a macrocarpa (*Cupressus macrocarpa*) which appears to be healthy, and is of reasonable size, approximately 7 metres in height with a canopy spread of 12 metres. The tree is situated mid way across the property boundary on the corner intersection between Smugglers Cove and Taylor's Mistake Road. It is located directly behind the large stone feature placed as an entranceway to Smuggler's Cove. It currently contributes significantly to the amenity of the street landscape being the largest tree of any notable size on this section of Taylor's Mistake Road. Photographs of the tree showing its form, position in the street, and predicted growth rates, **are attached**.
4. Due to the growth characteristics of macrocarpa trees, it will not be long before this particular specimen outgrows its current position. The tree canopy structure and growth rates predicted will lead to, within the next 3 – 5 years, the outer lateral limbs growing directly over the roof of the adjacent property and a height increase that will create view restrictions for neighbouring properties located to the west of the tree. The attached photographs of the tree show the predicted extent to which the canopy shall spread over the next 5, 10, and 20 years. The tree is already causing some structural damage to the adjoining property as the attached photographs indicate. Within the immediate area of the macrocarpa tree there has been significant landscape planting which will over time be shaded out by the tree as it matures. If these plantings are to be retained and enhanced, the tree must be either pruned severely or removed.
5. It is possible to carry out remedial maintenance operations on the tree to reduce its size and also to reduce its shading effect on the local area. With correct arboricultural treatments we can sustain the tree in its present condition, or carry out reduction pruning to provide a smaller tree. These operations, however, are not inexpensive, as each pruning operation would cost around \$500 - \$750, and in order to retain the tree at a set size, they would have to be repeated as a regular three-yearly maintenance programme. Although these operations would reduce the canopy growth, the main stem and roots would continue to expand, compounding the damage to the boundary wall and adjacent lawns.
6. To remove the tree in its entirety and replant with a more appropriate species, for example, pohutukawa, would be a fiscally more prudent option. It would also provide the potential to enhance the landscape planting that has already been completed in the immediate area. The estimated cost would be approximately \$1500 (excluding GST) for removal with a further \$300 - \$500 (excluding GST) to cover replanting and associated maintenance operations. Those neighbours adjacent and opposite would be notified prior to any work taking place.
7. Should the removal of the existing tree be approved by the Board, replacement planting of another tree must be considered. However, the exact species to be planted will need further investigation in conjunction with consultation with the surrounding neighbours. At this point, officers recommend planting two pohutukawa trees at either side of the rock feature.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. Funding is available in the Greenspace Unit operational budget under street tree maintenance.
9. The tree is not listed as protected under the Christchurch City Plan therefore resource consent is not required for this work.
10. All work will be carried out by a Council approved contractor with the appropriate health and safety and work site management controls in place.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board approves:

1. That the macrocarpa tree (*Cupressus macrocarpa*) located outside 81A Taylors Mistake Road be removed with all operations facilitated by the Christchurch City Council.
2. That replacement planting with a new tree or trees be undertaken to Christchurch City Council standards. The species and location of the replacement tree plantings shall be determined by a Greenspace arborist in consultation with the surrounding neighbours.
3. That the applicant shall pay 50% of the detailed costs of:
 - (a) The felling and removal costs to remove the macrocarpa tree (*Cupressus macrocarpa*).
 - (b) The purchase and planting of two replacement trees plus associated maintenance costs to establish the new trees over the next three years.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendations be adopted.

OPTIONS

11. There are three options:

- (a) Do nothing/maintain the status quo and decline the request to remove the tree.

This is not considered a viable option as the tree is already causing structural damage to the adjoining property. The predicted growth pattern and rate indicates that there will be further adverse effects on the neighbouring properties and the streetscape plantings.

- (b) Decline the request to remove the tree but undertake remedial maintenance operations.

It would be possible to undertake remedial maintenance operations to either maintain the tree in its current state or reduce its size. Although this would reduce the canopy size of the tree, the main stem and roots would continue to grow and cause further damage to the adjoining property. Significant costs would be incurred on an ongoing basis as the work would need to be repeated as a regular three-yearly programme. This option is not considered feasible from a financial perspective, nor will it prevent further damage to the adjoining property, and is therefore not recommended.

- (c) Approve the removal of the tree, and the planting of a replacement tree (or trees) following consultation with the surrounding neighbours, with the applicant meeting 50% of the costs.

This option will provide the simplest, cheapest and quickest option. The removal of the tree will prevent further damage to the adjoining property due to the trees predicted growth rate and pattern. The planting of a replacement tree (or trees) of a more suitable species for the location and conditions will mitigate the effects of the removal of the tree and improve the general landscape appearance of the streetscape.

PREFERRED OPTION

12. The preferred option is option (c).

Under this option, the proposed course of action would be as follows:

- (a) Removal of the street tree (including stump/roots).
- (b) Planting of a new tree or trees to Christchurch City Council standards. The species and location of the new trees shall be determined by a Greenspace arborist after consultation with the surrounding neighbours.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option**

Approve the removal of the tree and the planting of a replacement tree with the applicant meeting 50% of costs.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Nil	Nil
Cultural	Nil	Nil
Environmental	Nil	Nil
Economic	Economic benefit to applicant as no further damage to property or repairs required; May facilitate the sale of their property; Less financial cost than ongoing remedial work on the existing tree	Partial costs of removal and replacement met by applicant
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome: A city with a sustainable and natural environment.</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: None identified.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: None identified.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Yes; Consistent with Tree Planting in Streets Policy.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: No persons other than applicant were considered to be directly affected. Applicant seeks removal of the tree. It is proposed to notify neighbouring residents of intention to remove the tree and consult over replacement species.</p> <p>Other relevant matters: None identified.</p>		

Maintain The Status Quo (If Not Preferred Option)

Do nothing/maintain the status quo and decline the request to remove the tree.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Nil	Nil
Cultural	Nil	Nil
Environmental	Nil	Nil
Economic	No costs for removal incurred at present but may be negated at future date.	Economic cost to applicant in terms of ongoing damage and repairs to property; May affect future sale of property; May incur greater costs if removal is required at a future date.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome: A city with a sustainable and natural environment.</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: None identified.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: None identified</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Yes.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: No persons other than applicant were considered to be directly affected. Applicant seeks removal of tree due to damage to property and to facilitate sale of property.</p> <p>Other relevant matters: None identified.</p>		

Option 3

Decline the request to remove the tree but undertake remedial operations to either maintain current size, or reduce size, of the tree.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Nil	Nil
Cultural	Nil	Nil
Environmental	Nil	Nil
Economic	Nil	Significant ongoing financial cost to Council due to requirement for ongoing maintenance programme; Financial costs to property owner and/or Council due to continuing damage to property caused by roots and trunk.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome: A city with a sustainable and natural environment.</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: None identified.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: None identified.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Yes.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: No persons other than applicant were considered to be directly affected. Applicant seeks removal of tree due to damage to property and to facilitate sale of the property.</p> <p>Other relevant matters: None identified.</p>		

9. TENDER – SCARBOROUGH TEAROOMS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Corporate Services, DDI 941-8540
Officer responsible:	Acting Corporate Support Manager
Author:	Bill Morgan - Property Consultant

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of the report is to:

1. Advise the Board of the result of the tender process to lease the above facility.
2. Obtain the Board's support to a resolution from the Council to exercise its power under delegation to grant the Minister of Conservation's consent to the lease.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. When this matter was considered by the Board, it asked that the results of the tender process be reported back to it for its information. As a consequence of this the opportunity has been taken to seek from the Council a resolution to exercise its power under delegation to grant the Minister of Conservation's consent to the proposed lease. This will enable the lease to be executed without reference to the Department of Conservation and avoid undue delays in obtaining approval.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

4. The Minister of Conservation has granted delegated authority to administering bodies to exercise his consent to grant leases of public reserves in cases where the activity is an existing use and the effects of the use will be the same or similar in character, intensity and scale.
5. As the Council has met the requirements of the Reserves Act, it can exercise the Minister's delegation in this case because:
 - There is no proposed change to the use of the facility as a restaurant and café;
 - While there will be some cosmetic changes to the building, the footprint of the leased area will remain the same;
 - The tender was publicly notified and no objections were received;
 - The tender document clearly indicated the lease would be subject to the Reserves Act 1977;
 - The proposal has been considered by both the Residents Association and the Board and approved by the Council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board recommend that the Council resolve to exercise its power under delegation to grant the Minister of Conservation consent to the lease pursuant to Section 54(1)(d) of the Reserves Act 1977.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

BACKGROUND

6. At its meeting on 8 June 2006 the Council was advised that the lease of the Scarborough Fare Restaurant and Café had expired having been issued in 1990 and that because of strong interest in the facility it was proposed to call tenders for a new lease of the premises. It was proposed the lease term would be for a term of 6 years with right of renewal for a further 6 years.
7. A recommendation from the Board approving a delegation to the Corporate Support Manager to accept a tender for the lease of the facility subject to an appropriate evaluation process being complied with was adopted by the Council. The Council was advised that the acceptance of any tender was conditional upon the Department of Conservation's consent.

TENDER ACCEPTANCE

8. A total of 16 tenders were received to the invitation with Compass Group NZ Ltd being awarded the lease of the facility following completion of the evaluation process.
9. Compass Group NZ is part of the Compass Group PLC which is recognised as the largest food service group in the world with operations in over 98 countries at the present time. Within New Zealand the company currently services over 320 contracts daily. The company has been successfully operating the Botanic Gardens Tea Kiosk and Restaurant for some years and also has a strong presence within Christchurch through the provision of catering for the Koru Club for Air New Zealand and has been awarded a contract by the District Health Board.
10. As part of this proposal the company intends to substantially upgrade the facility both internally and externally. The proposed improvements include:
 - A reconfiguration of the service area to achieve a better work space for service staff;
 - Installing bi-folding doors from the café to the outdoor area to create an indoor/outdoor flow;
 - A reconfiguration of the kiosk service area to offer take-away service from two external service points. This will be achieved by closing off the kiosk service area in the café which current causes considerable congestion. The external service areas will be created in both the east and south facing walls which will be protected by new canopies above the outlets;
 - New toilets will be included providing wheelchair access;
 - New cabinetry and service counters will be incorporated.
11. The café service will focus on a modern innovative food offer catering to all markets by offering a deli style range of products available throughout the day which will include morning and afternoon tea. There will also be an a-la-carte menu available offering breakfast, dinner and lunch options. A small bar area is to be created to cater for casual visitors and to offer an area for patrons to enjoy pre-dinner drinks.
12. It was clear through the evaluation process that the company had the experience and financial resources to provide a first class service from the facility, and coupled with this experience in the food trade, it was believed their proposal was the best received. Accordingly the company has been awarded the lease of the facility in accordance with the delegation received from the Council.

10. CHESTER STREET EAST – PROPOSED RESIDENTS ONLY PARKING AT ANY TIME

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Transport and City Streets Manager
Author:	David Jackson - Traffic Engineer Assistant

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval for the installation of a "Residents Only Parking At Any Time" restriction outside 139 Chester Street East (**see plan attached**).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The owner of 139 Chester Street East has requested that the council consider the installation of a "Residents Only Parking At Any Time" restriction. The premises of 139 Chester St East are on a very narrow section and the house is situated right on the road frontage meaning there is no off street parking possibilities. The property is close to city businesses and parking in the area is taken by commuters for considerable amounts of time.

This request complies with the Council's policy for residents parking.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

Costs

3. The installation of road markings and a sign is within operational budgets.

Legal Considerations

4. The Land Transport NZ Rules provide for the installation of parking restrictions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board agree that the parking of vehicles be restricted to "vehicles displaying residents parking permits only at any time" on the north side commencing 125 metres east of Barbadoes Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 5.5 metres."

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

11. CHARLESTON CLUSTER KERB AND CHANNEL RENEWAL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Transport and City Streets Manager
Author:	Michelle Flanagan, DDI 941-8665

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is inform the Board of the outcome of the Charleston Cluster consultation process undertaken earlier this year.
2. The other purpose of this report is to seek the approval of the Board to proceed to final design, tender and construction of the kerb and channel renewals in Barbour Street (from Charles Street to Ferry Road), Grafton Street, and Henry Street, as shown in the concept plans in **Attachment 1**.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. The Charleston Neighbourhood Plan (NIP) was published in September 2001 and since that time the focus has been on implementation.
4. The Charleston Cluster project involves the kerb and channel renewal for Barbour Street (between Charles Street and Ferry Road), Grafton Street, Frederick Street, Grenville Street, Laurence Street and Henry Street. These streets have been grouped into a cluster for planning and design purposes.
5. The primary aim of the project is to renew the old kerb and dish channel and replace it with kerb and flat channel. Secondary objectives of the project relate to road user safety, enhancing the streetscape, to maximise parking in the industrial areas, create a buffer between residential and industrial areas, and reduce traffic speed and through traffic.
6. The estimated total cost for the six streets that comprise the Charleston Cluster is \$3,948,512.
7. Consultation with the community has been undertaken via a consultation newsletter distributed in April/May 2006, and an open day held in May 2006. The feedback from the community is generally in support of the concept plans for Barbour Street, Frederick Street, Grenville Street, and Laurence Street. Feedback on Grafton Street and Henry Street was generally in opposition to the concept plans. The feedback from the community has been considered and the concept plans amended where possible. The concept plan for Grafton Street has been amended to address the key concern of businesses. There is no change to Henry Street as the project involves the replacement of the kerb and channel on the existing alignment.
8. Approval is sought from the Board to progress the preferred option for Barbour Street to final design, tender and construction as this project features in the 2006/07 Capital Programme, and for Grafton Street and Henry Street as these projects are proposed for the 2007/08 Capital Programme. Plans for Frederick Street, Grenville Street and Laurence Street have also been attached for information (**see attachment 1**).

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. The kerb and channel renewal works within the Transport and City Streets 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 and Henry Street are proposed for construction in the 2007/08 year. Unfortunately the timing of the other three streets in the cluster is unknown at this point in time. This report therefore only seeks approval for Barbour Street, Grafton Street and Henry Street, however, it also discusses the consultation outcomes for the other streets in the Charleston Cluster.
10. The total estimated cost of upgrading these six streets is \$3,948,512 (the budget is \$3,768,000), which is comprised of the following estimates for each of the streets.
 - Barbour Street \$558,150
 - Grafton Street \$1,314,762
 - Frederick Street \$425,600

- Grenville Street \$779,700
- Laurence Street \$758,200
- Henry Street \$112,100

The potential budget overrun will be managed within the entire kerb and channel programme.

11. There are no legal implications for this project.
12. Board resolutions are required to approve the "No Parking" restrictions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board approve:

- (a) The Barbour Street, Grafton Street and Henry Street projects, as illustrated in **Attachment 1**, to proceed to final design, tender and construction.
- (b) The following No Stopping restrictions:

NEW NO STOPPING

Barbour Street

1. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Barbour Street commencing at a point 147 m north of its intersection with Charles Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 39 m.
2. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Barbour Street commencing at a point 52 m from its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 34 m.
3. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Barbour Street commencing at a point 146 m north of its intersection with Charles Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 38 m.
4. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Barbour Street commencing at a point 53.5 m from its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 28 m.

Grafton Street

1. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Grafton Street commencing at a point 30 m from its intersection with Henry Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 32 m.
2. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Grafton Street commencing at a point 94 m from its intersection with Henry Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 30 m.
3. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Grafton Street commencing at a point 95 m from its intersection with Charles Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 35 m.
4. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Grafton Street commencing at a point 100 m from its intersection with Grenville Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 34 m.
5. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Grafton Street commencing at a point 30 m from its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 35 m.
6. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Grafton Street commencing at a point 40 m from its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 27 m.

7. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Grafton Street commencing at its intersection with Short Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 16 m.
8. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Grafton Street commencing at its intersection with Short Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 12.5 m.
9. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Grafton Street commencing at its intersection with Grenville Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 15 m.
10. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Grafton Street commencing at its intersection with Grenville Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 13 m.
11. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Grafton Street commencing at its intersection with Laurence Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 12 m.
12. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Grafton Street commencing at its intersection with Laurence Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 11 m.
13. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Grafton Street commencing at a point 27 m from its intersection with Henry Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 28 m.
14. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Grafton Street commencing at its intersection with Henry Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 8 m.
15. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Grafton Street commencing at its intersection with Henry Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 5 m.
16. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Grafton Street commencing at a point 48 m from its intersection with Henry Street extending 12 m in a southerly direction, then 4 m in a westerly direction and 5 m in a northerly direction.

Henry Street

1. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Henry Street commencing at its intersection with Grafton Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 6 m.
2. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Henry Street commencing at its intersection with Grafton Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 6 m.

REMOVE EXISTING NO STOPPING

Barbour Street

1. That the existing no stopping restriction on the west side of Barbour Street commencing at a point 52 m from its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 27 m be revoked.
2. That the existing no stopping restriction on the east side of Barbour Street commencing at a point 53.5 m from its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 27 m be revoked.

MOVE EXISTING NO STOPPING TO NEW LOCATION

Grafton Street

1. That the existing no stopping be revoked from the west side of Grafton Street at its present position commencing from the intersection with Charles Street and extending

12. 7. 2006

- 20 -

32 m in a southerly direction, and reinstated on the west side of Grafton Street commencing from the intersection with Charles Street and extending 57 m in a southerly direction.

2. That the existing no stopping be revoked from the east side of Grafton Street at its present position commencing from the intersection with Ferry Road and extending 2.5 m in a southerly direction, and reinstated on the east side of Grafton Street commencing from the intersection with Ferry Road and extending 6 m in a southerly direction.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

BACKGROUND ON CHARLESTON CLUSTER PROJECT

13. The Charleston Neighbourhood Plan (NIP) was published in September 2001 and since that time the focus has been putting on it into action. A public meeting in September 2002 agreed to a co-ordinated solution for roading improvements in the area, and Charles Street, the southern end of Barbour Street (Charles Street to the end), and Short Street have recently been completed. Osborne Street is currently under construction.
14. The Charleston Cluster includes Barbour Street (between Charles Street and Ferry Road), Grafton Street, Frederick Street, Grenville Street, Laurence Street and Henry Street. These streets have been grouped into a cluster for planning and design purposes. This cluster methodology also ensures that there is consistency in treatments throughout the cluster, as well as providing the opportunity to achieve financial savings. The cluster works will integrate with already completed works.
15. The kerb and channel renewal works within the Transport and City Streets 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 and Henry Street are proposed for construction in the 2007/08 year. Unfortunately the timing of the other three streets in the cluster is unknown at this point in time. This report therefore only seeks approval for Barbour Street, Grafton Street and Henry Street, however, it also discusses the consultation outcomes for the other streets in the Charleston Cluster.
16. All of the streets in the Charleston Cluster are classified as local roads in the City Plan roading hierarchy. Most streets have an existing width of 10m. Grafton Street and Barbour Street are 10.3m wide at Ferry Road. Henry Street has an existing width of 10.4m.
17. The Charleston Cluster has a split City Plan zoning 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).
18. The primary aim of the project is to renew the old kerb and dish channel in the streets within the Charleston Cluster, and replace it with kerb and flat channel.
19. The objectives of the Charleston Cluster project include:
 - (a) To maintain and improve road user safety.
 - (b) Maximise landscape opportunities and enhance the streetscape consistent with the NIP objectives and the completed work in neighbouring streets.
 - (c) Where possible provide suitable parking to meet the needs of the residents and maximise the parking in the industrial zone.
 - (d) Create a visual buffer between the residential and industrial areas.
 - (e) Reduce traffic speed and industrial traffic in these local streets through traffic calming that is consistent with completed work.
20. A consultation newsletter was distributed to the Charleston community in April/May 2006 for formal consultation. This newsletter included an explanation of the project, concept plans for each of the streets, artists impressions/photographs of the seating area, landscaping, and heritage feature on Grafton Road, and a feedback form. The newsletter also included an invitation to an open day held in the Charleston Reserve on the 6 May 2006.
21. Some 100 responses were received to the consultation newsletter. A summary of the consultation outcomes for each of the streets is outlined in the table below. A full summary of the consultation feedback is included in **Attachment 2**.

Street	Responses Received	Support (%)	Oppose (%)	Neither (%)
Barbour Street	31	90	3	7
Grafton Street	21	38	57	5
Frederick Street	8	75	12.5	12.5
Grenville Street	14	93	7	0
Laurence Street	13	92	8	0
Henry Street	1	0	100	0
Total	88			

22. Five responses were received from residents in Charles St, four supported the concept plans, and one did not indicate support or opposition. Two responses were received from Ferry Road, both were in support of the concept plans. Three responses were received from residents in Osborne Street, all were in support of the concept plans. Two responses were received that concerned the Charleston Cluster in general.
23. Approximately 30 people attended the open day on the 6 May 2006. A meeting was also held with the Road Transport Association and project team members attended a Charleston Residents Association meeting.
24. A follow-up consultation newsletter was sent to the Charleston Cluster area at the start of July 2006 summarising the consultation outcomes, and providing plans of the preferred options. The newsletter also explained how we addressed the issues raised in the community feedback.
25. As construction of the streets within the Charleston Cluster will take a number of years, it is proposed to maintain contact with the community so that they are informed of progress throughout the cluster. As standard practice each street will receive a start work notice prior to construction commencing, however, it is also proposed to produce a six-monthly newsletter (or more/less regularly as required) to keep the community updated on the progress of the project.
26. The Charleston NIP signalled an intention to underground overhead services in the Charleston streets the year before the kerb and channel work are commenced. The recent LTCCP process has resulted in a change of budget for the undergrounding of overhead services in local roads. This takes effect from the 2006/2007 financial year. The draft 2006-2016 LTCCP 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 will be no further 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.
27. As the construction of the Charleston Cluster will take place over the coming years, should provision for the undergrounding of services be provided in the LTCCP then this can be incorporated without major changes to the preferred concept plans for the streets.

OPTIONS

28. A common option considered for each of the streets in the Charleston Cluster was the maintenance of the status quo (i.e. that the kerb and channel is not replaced).

Barbour Street

29. Four options were developed for comparison. Each of the options narrowed Barbour Street to 9m and retained the existing threshold at the Ferry Road end of the street. Options 1 and 2 were similar in that they included mid-block narrowings (two in Option 1, and three in Option 2). Option 3 included a mid-block, two-way angled road narrowing, and Option 4 included a mid-block one-way angled road narrowing.

Grafton Street

30. Three options were developed for comparison. Each of the options narrowed the carriageway to 9m between Ferry Road and Laurence Street, and between Laurence Street and the southern end of Grafton Street the kerb and channel would be replaced on the existing alignment (10m in width). Options 1 and 2 differed in the mid-block narrowing between Laurence and Henry Street (a kerb build out on one side versus a kerb build out on both sides). Options 1 and 2 anticipated the undergrounding of services on Grafton Street, and Option 3 did not anticipate the undergrounding of services.

Henry Street

31. Only one option was considered for Henry Street as it is a short, industrial local street. Option 1 renewed the kerb and channel on the existing alignment.

Frederick Street

32. Two options were developed for comparison. Both options narrowed the carriageway to 9m and narrowed the intersection with Isabella Place to 6m. Option 1 anticipated the undergrounding of services and included a mid-block, two-way angled road narrowing. Option 2 did not anticipate the undergrounding of services and included a mid-block, one-way road narrowing.

Grenville Street

33. Two options were developed for comparison. Both options narrowed the carriageway to 9m, and narrowed the intersection with Grafton Street to 6m. Both options included the installation of a splitter island at the Ensors Road end of Grenville Street. Both options included mid-block road narrowings between Grafton Street and Osborne Street, and between Osborne Street and Ensors Road. Option 1 included two mid-block, two-way road narrowings, and Option 2 included two mid-block, one-way road narrowings.

Laurence Street

34. Two options were developed for comparison. Both options narrowed the carriageway to 9m and narrowed the intersection with Grafton Street to 7m. Both options included the installation of a splitter island at the Ensors Road end of Laurence Street. Both options included mid-block road narrowings between Grafton Street and Osborne Street, and between Osborne Street and Ensors Road. Option 1 included two mid-block, two-way road narrowings, and Option 2 included two mid-block, one-way road narrowings.

CONSULTATION ON OPTIONS

35. Below is a summary of the main issues identified during consultation with the community. A full summary of the feedback received is included in **Attachment 2**.

Barbour Street

36. Option 4 was distributed for consultation with the community. In summary the following feedback was received:

- Slowing down the traffic is good.
- Concern that the one-way narrowing and threshold will remove on-street parking.
- Maintenance of grass berms and landscaping areas is an issue.
- Concern that the 9m width will not be safe, particularly with parking for games at Jade Stadium.

Grafton Street

37. Option 3 was distributed for consultation with the community. In summary the following feedback was received:

- Concern that the 9m width will create difficulties for cars passing and backing out of driveways.
- Street width will create difficulties for commercial vehicles – widen the street.
- Concern at the loss of on-street parking.
- Concern at accessing properties where these are located adjacent to the narrowings.
- Seating area at the end of Grafton Street will attract graffiti and loitering and takes up on-street parking spaces.
- Maintain existing landscape areas before installing new ones.

Henry Street

38. Option 1 (renewal of the kerb and channel on the existing alignment) was distributed for consultation with the community. In summary the following feedback was received:
- Narrowing the streets does not achieve the objective of maximising parking (This comment related to Grafton Street).

Frederick Street

39. Option 2 was distributed for consultation with the community. In summary the following feedback was received:
- Concern at the loss of on-street parking.
 - Hope the seats are not the same as in Charles Street.
 - Maintenance of grass berms and landscaping areas is an issue.
 - Support the concept.

Grenville Street

40. Option 2 was distributed for consultation with the community. In summary the following feedback was received:
- Concern at the loss of on-street parking.
 - Maintenance of grass berms and landscaping areas is an issue.

Laurence Street

41. Option 2 was distributed for consultation with the community. In summary the following feedback was received:
- Hope speeding traffic will be slowed.
 - Pleased the area is being upgraded.
 - Object to landscaping and trees – prefer a maintenance free street.
 - One-way narrowing will make access to Grafton Street by heavy vehicles very difficult.
 - Laurence Street is used for parking by staff from the industrial area – maintain width and on-street parking.

Project Team Response to Main Issues Raised in Consultation

Narrowing of the streets to 9m

42. Nine meters is the current standard width for local roads in Christchurch City. A 9m carriageway allows for parking on both sides of the street whilst still providing some traffic calming benefits. A 9m width is also consistent with other streets in the Charleston Cluster.
43. The southern end of Grafton Street and Henry Street are not being narrowed. The new kerb and channel will be replaced on the existing alignment. Some of the businesses at the southern end of Grafton Street requested that the street be widened to 10.4m to assist large vehicles accessing the businesses. The location of overhead services prevents Grafton Street being widened.

Seating area at the southern end of Grafton Street

44. Business owners/occupiers have advised that the end of Grafton Street often experiences vandalism, people loitering, and people breaking through the fence to access the railway land. Their desire is that nothing be placed in this area that would encourage people to congregate and as such there was opposition to the proposed seating and garden area. The businesses also indicated that more parking was required in this location, and that large vehicles already have difficulty accessing properties.
45. The southern end of Grafton Street is not being narrowed as part of the project, and the new kerb and channel will be placed on the existing alignment. The vehicle accesses on the street will be splayed which will assist access to properties. The seating area proposed has also been removed from the concept plan and an alternative arrangement of two parking spaces and vehicle turnaround area is proposed. Further parking spaces at the end of the street could not be provided as it is necessary to maintain a turnaround area. Trees and landscaping are proposed along the fence with the railway line to screen this fence.

Maintenance of grass berms, street trees and landscaping

46. It is Council policy to install grass berms with the intention of enhancing the streetscape. It is hoped that residents will maintain the berm areas, however, Council will mow berm areas if the grass grows over 150mm in height. Landscaped areas between the footpath and the road (for example at the intersection areas) are inspected as part of a regular six-week maintenance cycle. Landscaped areas between the footpath and property boundaries (e.g. the landscaped strips) are subject to an annual maintenance programme, although it is hoped residents will assist with maintenance.

Loss of on street car parking

47. Some respondents were concerned that they would lose on-street car parks outside their properties where the one-way road narrowings and thresholds were installed. Apart from the narrowings, thresholds and intersections, parking is maintained on both sides of the street. Approximately 42 parking spaces are lost across the six streets in the cluster through the no parking proposed at the one-way road narrowings and thresholds.
48. The one-way road narrowing in Frederick Street has been removed from the concept plans as it was not considered necessary as a traffic calming measure as the street is relatively short (250m). The one-way road narrowing has been retained in Grenville Street as it is a much longer street (460m) and the narrowing breaks up the 'straight line' of the street.
49. Where specific properties have indicated opposition to the loss of parking spaces, there are spaces available in the vicinity (i.e. usually outside adjacent properties). Whilst the loss of on-street parking is regrettable it is considered that the traffic calming benefits provided by the narrowings and thresholds outweigh the loss of parking. Residents have advised that speeding traffic and through traffic is an issue and the traffic calming measures assist with this.

Access for large vehicles to the southern end of Grafton Street

50. The Road Transport Association (RTA) were concerned about heavy vehicle access to the businesses on Grafton Street and Osborne Street. To assist with access the proposed one-way road narrowing outside 51 Laurence Street has been removed from the preferred option. This will assist large vehicles to access Osborne Street from Ensors Road. It will also encourage heavy vehicles to enter and exit via Ensors Road and not the other residential streets in the area.

Access to properties at the narrowed sections

51. Some residents were concerned that the narrowed sections would prevent them from accessing their properties with a trailer or boat. The project team has checked the access to these properties, and a vehicle and trailer will be able to access the property. The splayed driveways at these properties will assist with access.

Undergrounding of services

52. Only Barbour Street (from Ferry Road to Charles Street) will be undergrounded as part of the project. There is no funding available for undergrounding the remainder of the Charleston Cluster.

PREFERRED OPTIONS

Barbour Street

53. The preferred option for Barbour Street includes the following features:
- A 9m carriageway.
 - A mid-block one-way road narrowing outside 85/86 Barbour Street.
 - A 6m cobbled threshold at the Ferry Road end of Barbour Street.
 - A footpath on both sides of the street.
 - Street trees and grass berms on the western side of the street.
 - Landscaping strips against property boundaries on the eastern side of the street.
 - Landscaping and street trees at the mid-block narrowing and threshold.
 - A seat outside 85 Barbour Street, and retention of the existing seat at the Ferry Road end of the street.

Grafton Street

54. The preferred option for Grafton Street includes the following features:

- A 9m carriageway from 109 Grafton Street to Laurence Street.
- A 10m carriageway from Laurence Street to the southern end of the street (the kerb and channel will be renewed on its existing alignment in this section).
- The intersections with Short Street and Grenville Street are narrowed to 6m, and flush pavers are proposed at the intersections.
- The intersection with Laurence Street is narrowed to 7m and flush pavers are proposed.
- A 6m cobbled threshold outside 21 Grafton Street and 109 Grafton Street to mark the change in zonings from business to residential.
- The end of Short Street is 8m in width.
- Five street trees and landscaping at the southern end of Grafton Street.
- Two marked park spaces, and a turn around area at the southern end of Grafton Street.
- A seating and heritage area at the intersection of Grafton and Short Street comprising a seat, heritage panels, two cabbage trees, and heritage plaques in the pavement on Grafton Street and Short Street.
- A 1.65m footpath is proposed on both sides of the street.
- Grass berms, landscaping and street trees are proposed on the western side of the street between Charles Street and 111 Grafton Street.
- Landscaping strips are proposed against the property boundaries on both sides of the street at the southern end of Grafton Street, and on the eastern side of the street between 102 Grafton Street and Charles Street.

Henry Street

55. The preferred option for Henry Street involves the replacement of the kerb and channel on the existing alignment.

Frederick Street

56. The preferred option for Frederick Street includes the following features:

- A 9m carriageway,
- The intersection with Isabella Place is narrowed to 6m and a cobbled threshold is proposed.
- Grass berms and street trees are proposed on the northern side of the street, and at the intersection with Isabella Place.
- Landscaping strips are proposed against the property boundaries on the southern side of the street.
- A 1.65m footpath is proposed on both sides of the street.

Grenville Street

57. The preferred option for Grenville Street includes the following features:

- A 9m carriageway
- Two mid-block one-way road narrowings – one between Grafton Street and Osborne Street (outside 17 Grenville Street) and one between Osborne Street and Isabella Place (outside 56 Grenville Street).
- The intersection with Grafton Street is narrowed to 6m.
- A splitter island is proposed at Ensors Road.
- A seat is proposed outside 15 Grenville Street.
- A 1.65m footpath is proposed on both sides of the street.
- Grass berms and street trees are proposed on the northern side of the street between Grafton Street and 15 Grenville Street, and on the southern side of the street between 22 Grenville Street and Ensors Road.
- Landscaping strips are proposed against the property boundaries on the southern side of the street between Grafton Street and 15 Grenville Street, and on the northern side of the street between 19 Grenville Street and Ensors Road.

Laurence Street

58. The preferred option for Laurence Street includes the following features:

- A 9m carriageway
- One mid-block one-way road narrowing between Osborne Street and Grafton Street (outside 11 Laurence Street).
- The intersection with Grafton Street is narrowed to 7m.
- A splitter island is proposed at Ensors Road.

12. 7. 2006

- 27 -

- A 1.65m footpath is proposed on both sides of the street.
- Grass berms and street trees are proposed on the northern side of the street between Grafton Street and 15 Laurence Street, on both sides of the street between 16 Laurence Street and Osborne Street, and on the southern side of the street between Osborne Street and Ensors Road.

ASSESSMENT OF PREFERRED OPTIONS

The preferred options for streets in the Charleston Cluster meet the objectives of the project as follows:

- (a) **To maintain and improve road user safety**
The proposed carriageway narrowing to 9m width, and the one-way narrowings, thresholds and narrowing at intersections will reduce through traffic speeds.
- (b) **To maximise landscape opportunities and enhance the streetscape**
The narrowed carriageways allow for grass berms, landscape strips, and the planting of street trees. Street trees and landscaping are also proposed at the narrowed sections and at intersections. The street trees and landscaping are consistent with completed streets in the Charleston Cluster and the Charleston NIP.
- (c) **Where possible provide suitable parking to meet the needs of the residents and maximise the parking in the industrial zone**
On-street parking along both sides of all streets is retained, except at the narrowed sections and intersections. Two parking spaces have been created at the southern end of Grafton Street.
- (d) **Create a visual buffer between the residential and industrial areas**
Thresholds at the Ferry Road end of Barbour Street and Grafton Street mark the change between the business and residential zones. A narrowing and threshold at the southern end of Grafton Street (outside 21 Grafton Street) also marks the change between the residential and business zone. Street trees, grass berms, landscaping and seats are also proposed in the residential areas of the cluster
- (e) **Reduce traffic speed and industrial traffic in this local street through traffic calming that is consistent with completed work**
The one-way narrowings, thresholds and intersection narrowings will reduce traffic speed and make the residential area of the Charleston Cluster less desirable for heavy traffic. Laurence Street and the southern end of Grafton Street have been identified as the heavy vehicle route to the Osborne Street and Grafton Street business area, and as such there is no one-way road narrowing on Laurence Street. In addition, the kerb and channel is replaced on the existing alignment at the southern end of Grafton Street.

12. CHRISTCHURCH STREETS AND GARDENS AWARDS COMMITTEE - REPRESENTATIVE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
Officer responsible:	Community Board Principal Advisor
Author:	Kevin Roche - Community Secretary

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to the appointment of a representative on the Christchurch Streets and Gardens Award Committee.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Board has, together with other Community Boards traditionally had a representative on the Christchurch Streets and Gardens Award Committee.
3. At its meeting on 26 January 2005 the Board appointed Ms Linda Rutland, to this position. Ms Rutland has now, however, confirmed her wish to step down as the Board's representative and the Christchurch Beautifying Association has requested that an elected representative from the Board be appointed to replace her.
4. Relevant Council policy in respect to appointments to outside organisations is:

"That the Council appoint formal representatives on outside organisations only where the proposed appointment will be of clear public benefit or benefit to the Council, or where the appointment is required for statutory reasons, or under the provisions of the relevant Trust Deed or Constitution etc of the organisation concerned."

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

5. Where Board members are appointed to outside organisations attendance is covered by their elected members salary and no meeting allowance is paid. There are therefore no substantial financial implications incurred in attending such meetings, apart from the payment of mileage occurred in attending such meetings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board appoint an elected representative to the Christchurch Streets Award Committee.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

BACKGROUND

6. Community Pride Garden awards were first established in 1989 to encourage civic pride and to acknowledge residential and commercial gardeners efforts in contributing to the overall image of Christchurch as the "garden city". The selection of those properties deserving an award is made by members of the Christchurch Beautifying Association, in conjunction with a Community Board member. Assessments are undertaken during the period December - February each year. The Board has traditionally had a representative on the Committee.
7. At its meeting on 26 January 2005 the Board considered its appointments to outside organisations and the Board at that time resolved to appoint Ms Linda Rutland to be its representative on the Awards Committee. Linda has confirmed she no longer wishes to carry on in this position. In addition the Christchurch Beautifying Association has recently written requesting the appointment of an elected representative from the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board on the Awards Committee.

13. NOTICES OF MOTION