



Christchurch City Council

LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 20 JUNE 2007

AT 4.00 PM

**HOLY TRINITY CHURCH, MEETING ROOM
17 WINCHESTER STREET, LYTTELTON**

Community Board: Claudia Reid (Chairperson), Jeremy Agar, Stuart Bould, Ann Jolliffe, Dawn Kottier, Bob Parker

Acting Community Board Principal Adviser

Peter Dow

0274 893 749

Email: peter.dow@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 MEETING REPORT – 16 MAY 2007 |
| PART B | 3. | DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT |
| PART B | 4. | BRIEFINGS |
| PART B | 5. | PETITIONS |
| PART B | 6. | CORRESPONDENCE |
| PART B | 7. | NOTICES OF MOTION |
| PART B | 8. | SANDY BAY BEACH RENOURISHMENT PROPOSAL |
| PART A | 9. | SPARC RURAL TRAVEL FUND FOR BANKS PENINSULA WARD |
| PART C | 10. | PROPOSALS FOR LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT SCHEDULE F FUNDING 2007/08- 2009/10 AND
ALLOCATION OF DISCRETIONARY FUNDING 2006/07 |
| PART B | 11. | MARINE DRIVE - ZEBRA PEDESTRIAN CROSSING AT THE HUNTERS ROAD INTERSECTION |
| PART B | 12. | BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE |
| PART B | 13. | ACTING COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE |
| PART B | 14. | MEMBERS' QUESTIONS |

We're on the Web!

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

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 16 MAY 2007**

The report of the ordinary meeting of the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board held on 16 May 2007 has been **separately circulated**.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

4. **BRIEFINGS**

4.1 **David McNaughton**, Transport and Greenspace Unit, update on local roading projects.

5. **PETITIONS**

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**

The following items of correspondence have been **separately circulated** to members:

- Alison Ross re Community Development Project and Funding Assistance provided by the Council
- British Hotel Ltd re request to install planter boxes, corner Norwich Quay and Oxford Street
- Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society Inc. re local environs and heritage issues
- Diamond Harbour Tag Busters re funding request
- Chair, Joint Hearing Committee, Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy re response to Board's submission
- Diamond Harbour Medical Centre re maintenance of vegetation affecting pathway
- Lyttelton Gaol Trust re funding request
- Tug Lyttelton Preservation Society Inc re thanks for Board funding assistance
- Lyttelton Information and Resource Centre Trust re funding request
- Jane Smith, Diamond Harbour re Graffiti

7. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

8. **SANDY BAY BEACH RENOURISHMENT PROPOSAL**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, Jane Parfitt, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Manager, Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Rodney Chambers, Coastal Area Head Ranger

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To provide information as requested by the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Board about the feasibility of and the requirements for renourishment of Sandy Bay beach at Governors Bay.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Sandy Bay beach at Governors Bay is small picturesque local beach which experiences a slow rate of sand loss through natural erosion. The beach was previously renourished, possibly up to fifteen years ago, with imported sand. The local community has now requested that this sand be replenished to improve recreational amenity value by recreating a high tide sandy beach, as well as reducing further beach and foreshore erosion. A Coastal Permit from Environment Canterbury (ECan) is required for the placement of this sand.

8. Cont'd

3. This report supports sand renourishment as the most appropriate option to achieve the desired community outcomes and provides the information necessary to go forward and obtain the required permits from ECan under the RMA 1991. Consultation with the local community, the Department of Conservation and the local runanga will be required. Approximately 1800 cubic metres of sand will need to be transported to the site, at a cost of up to \$45,000. This volume should give the beach up to twenty years of sand residual.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. No budgetary allocation is in place. Cost estimates are \$45,000 for transport, purchase of sand and placement. The community has already applied for the Coastal Permit. The cost could be reduced to \$33,000 if the sand can be sourced for free. The local community has indicated they are willing to also contribute towards transport costs.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

5. No. As there is currently no budget for this project funding would need to come from either the community or various contributors including the Community Board Discretionary Fund. The Board could seek to have this included in the 2009/19 LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. Sandy Bay is within the Coastal Marine Area and is designated an 'Area of Significant Natural Value' under the Regional Coastal Environment Plan (RCEP), managed by Environment Canterbury, therefore a Coastal Permit is required. There are no resource consent requirements from Christchurch City Council.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

7. The activity is deemed to be non-complying under the rules of the RCEP but does meet the criteria for granting non-complying activities.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

8. Not specifically mentioned, but this project aligns with Encouraging Healthy and Active Life styles.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

9. No.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

10. Strategic Direction – Strong Communities:

- (a) Encourage healthy and active lifestyles by
 - providing parks, public buildings and other facilities that are accessible, safe, welcoming and enjoyable to use;
 - Providing and supporting sport, recreation and leisure activities;
- (b) Encourage residents to enjoy living in the City and to have fun, by:
 - Providing and supporting sport, recreation and leisure activities;
 - Providing a variety of safe, accessible and welcoming local parks, open spaces and waterways.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. Yes see above.

8. Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. Consultation will be needed when applying for Coastal Permit, which will involve the local community, the Department of Conservation and the local runanga.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Agree that staff work with the local community to source funds for this project.
- (b) Agree to support an application for a Coastal Permit to undertake the beach renourishment works at Sandy Bay.

8. Cont'd

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

13. Prior to amalgamation, and probably the enactment of the RMA (1991), Sandy Bay beach was replenished by the local community with imported sand after experiencing natural sand loss. Today, some ten to fifteen years after this renourishment, a small residual of sandy beach is left and wave action is now eroding the bank (road reserve) behind the foreshore.
14. Following an enquiry by the Governors Bay Residents' Association and a consequent request from the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board on 26 September 2006, a report has been prepared on the feasibility and requirements of sand renourishment (beach replenishment) for Sandy Bay (Governors Bay). Five thousand five hundred dollars was allocated for this purpose from the Transport and Greenspace Unit's existing 'Coast Care Development' budget.
15. Derek Todd of DTec Consulting Ltd has prepared a report which considers a range of options for beach management at Sandy Bay. The report supports the sand renourishment option as achieving improved recreational amenity value, as well as the reduction of beach erosion.
16. Sandy Bay is considered to be a major recreational asset by local Governors Bay residents but does not have the same high metropolitan use as nearby beaches such as Corsair Bay. The bay has narrow sealed road access with limited parking on site. The process of sand replenishment will see significant truck movements and may impact on local residents.

THE OBJECTIVES

17. To improve/repair recreational amenity value by recreating a wider high tide beach, as well as reduce beach and foreshore erosion, with minimal environmental impact.

THE OPTIONS

18. The options are as follows:
 - (a) Sand renourishment
 - (b) Bank toe protection
 - (c) Groynes
 - (d) Beach Drainage
 - (e) Offshore Wave Trip
 - (f) Bank Stability
 - (g) Stormwater control

THE PREFERRED OPTION

19. Sand Renourishment is the only option that achieves both the recreational, amenity and erosion protection objectives, with minimal environmental impact. To undertake the project up to 1800m³ of sand will be required to be sourced, purchased, transported and placed on the site. This will cost approximately \$45,000.
20. The report by DTEC Consulting provides sufficient information to meet the requirements for obtaining a coastal permit from ECan.

8. Cont'd

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option**

21. Sand Renourishment achieves both the recreational, amenity and erosion protection objectives, with minimal environmental impact. To undertake the project up to 1800m³ of sand will be required to be sourced, purchased, transported and placed on the site. This will cost approximately \$45,000.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Meets community aspirations for recreational facility	Nil
Cultural		
Environmental	Improved foreshore protection and erosion buffering	
Economic	Improved amenity will support visitor attraction	\$45,000

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

This project has a primary alignment with A City for recreation fun and creativity. It also benefits coastal protection - so aligns with a city of people who value and protect the natural environment

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:

There is no budget allocated to this project.

Effects on Maori:

Nil. Continuation of management

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Ongoing Coastal Management practises.

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:

Strong local community support. Wider consultation will be needed.

Other relevant matters:

A Coastal permit should be applied for 35 years to allow for tops ups at estimated 10 year intervals.

8. Cont'd**Maintain the Status Quo (if not preferred option)**

22. Beach loses all sand completely and foreshore toe erosion continues with threat to road access/amenity area behind the beach.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social		Community aspirations unmet for sandy all tide beach
Cultural		
Environmental		Continued coastal erosion and loss of beach erosion buffering capability
Economic		Cost of repairing/protecting road behind foreshore may be more costly in future.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

To allow continued erosion does not align with a city of people who value and protect the natural environment, or provide a recreational resource

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:**Effects on Maori:****Consistency with existing Council policies:****Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:****Other relevant matters:**

8. Cont'd

At Least one Other Option (or an explanation of why another option has not been considered)

23. Bank Toe Protection using rock revetment or gabion baskets

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social		Community aspirations unmet for 'sandy' all tide beach
Cultural		
Environmental	Provides erosion resistant material in front of toe	Does not raise beach profile and produce increased erosion buffering capacity elevation of the beach by providing an all tide (sandy) beach.
Economic		Cost of bank toe protection will most likely be more costly than renourishment.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Bank toe protection does not raise beach profile and produce increased elevation of the beach or produce the improved amenity values by providing an all tide (sandy) beach.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

9. SPARC RURAL TRAVEL FUND FOR BANKS PENINSULA WARD

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services DDI 941-8534
Officer responsible:	Unit Manger, Recreation and Sport, DDI 941 8303
Author:	Sue Grimwood Community Development Advisor (03) 304-8659 Simon Battrick Sport Liaison Advisor (03) 941 7137

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. For the Board to consider the 2006/07 applications for SPARC Rural Travel Funding in the Banks Peninsula area and to make a recommendation to the Council accordingly (refer attachments).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. SPARC Rural Travel Funds are provided to encourage participation in sport by young people living in rural communities. It is open to rural sports clubs and rural school teams in areas that have less than 10 people/km² and is for young people aged between 5-19 years who require subsidies to assist with transport expenses to local sporting competitions. The fund is not available for travelling to regional or national events. A school club team is defined as one participating in regular local sport competitions in weekends, excluding inter-school and intra-school competitions during school time. A sports club is defined as participating in organised, regular sport competition through membership outside of school time. 'Local' for Peninsula young people means travelling to other sub-unions such as Ellesmere, Waihora, Lincoln and further afield to participate in regular competitions.
3. For the 2006/07 funding round SPARC have allocated \$9,000 for the Banks Peninsula area. Five percent of funds may be allocated to advertising. Two advertisements were placed, one in the Akaroa Mail and one in the Bay Harbour News, for a total cost of \$286 leaving a total of \$8,714 for distribution.
4. In early December 2006 application forms were sent to every qualifying sports club and school within the Banks Peninsula Ward. No additional application forms were sought following the advertisements. Four applications were received by the closing date 9 February 2007. If the historic split of funds is maintained, once again there would be over-budget requests for the Akaroa/Wairewa area and a surplus left in the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert allocation. To ensure that young people are not disadvantaged and as many of them as possible are encouraged to participate in local sporting competitions it is suggested that the applications be considered, assessed and the available funds distributed across the Banks Peninsula Ward of the Christchurch City Council in an equitable manner.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. There are no financial implications; \$9,000 has been forwarded to CCC from SPARC. There is \$8,714 in the budget for distribution to qualifying rural sports clubs and rural school sports teams.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. There are no legal considerations.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

7. The recommendations contained within this report align with the LTCCP and Activity Management Plans.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

8. LTCCP outcomes will be met when more people participate in leisure activities; and more people participate in physical and sporting activities.

9. Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

9. Applications align with the Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy 2002.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

10. The recommendations align with Council Strategies.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

11. N/A.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board recommend to the Council the approval of the allocations of the 2006/07 SPARC Rural Travel Fund as follows:

Diamond Harbour Rugby Football Club	\$1,000
Banks Peninsula Rugby Football Club	\$2,000
Akaroa Area School BOT	\$4,000
Britomart Sea Scouts	\$1,714

9. Cont'd

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

12. The following applications were received for consideration.

- | | | | |
|-----|---|------------------|---------|
| (a) | Diamond Harbour Rugby Football Club
(participants to benefit 100) | amount requested | \$1,000 |
|-----|---|------------------|---------|

For transporting junior club teams to all away games in Ellesmere area. Transporting players from outside Diamond Harbour to practice once a week (coaches and parents operate a car pooling system for transporting the players).

- | | | | |
|-----|---|------------------|---------|
| (b) | Britomart Sea Scouts
(participants to benefit 25) | amount requested | \$2,000 |
|-----|---|------------------|---------|

To assist with travel to local training sessions and to compete in local regattas.

- | | | | |
|-----|---|------------------|---------|
| (c) | Banks Peninsula Rugby Football Club
(participants to benefit 100) | amount requested | \$2,000 |
|-----|---|------------------|---------|

For travel expenses for training during the week and local competitions for 1 April to 30 September 2007 season. 2007 grade team entries include under 7, 8¹/₂, 10, 11¹/₂, U13, U14, U16, and U18 which may include mixed age teams.

- | | | | |
|-----|--|------------------|---------|
| (d) | Akaroa Area School Board of Trustees
(participants to benefit 125) | amount requested | \$4,000 |
|-----|--|------------------|---------|

To assist with after-school travel costs to training and local competitions on Wednesdays and Saturdays. Sports involved include hockey, netball, basketball, soccer and sailing. Travel assistance for those in the school Touch Rugby team, living in the Outer Bays, who play in the Tuesday evening community Touch competition. Volley Ball weekend competition (players combine with the Cheviot Area School to form a team). Due to the small number of students, 125 in years 1-13, forming teams in any age-group specific category can be difficult therefore opportunities for combining with other Area Schools to form teams is supported by the BOT.

Success of this application will enable the School's \$4,000 budgeted allocation to be directed towards supporting students selected for Canterbury Area Schools and National Tournaments.

Total Funds requested	\$9,000
Total Funds available	\$8,714

THE OBJECTIVES

13. To distribute the SPARC Rural Travel Funds for the Banks Peninsula area according to the criteria established by SPARC.

THE OPTIONS

- (i) Allocate funds on a per participant basis i.e. \$24.90/person

Diamond Harbour Rugby Football Club	\$2,490.00
Britomart Sea Scouts	\$622.50
Banks Peninsula Rugby Football Club	\$2,490.00
Akaroa Area School BOT	\$3,112.50

However these do not reflect applications with Diamond Harbour Rugby Football Club and Banks Peninsula Rugby Football Club being allocated more than requested and the others less.

9. Cont'd

- (ii) Allocate requested funding to Diamond Harbour Rugby Football Club and to Banks Peninsula Rugby Football Club leaving \$5714.00 for distribution on a participant basis:

Diamond Harbour Rugby Football Club	\$1,000.00
Banks Peninsula Rugby Football Clubs	\$2,000.00
Using the formula above (in option i) per participant =\$38.09	
Britomart Sea Scouts would receive	\$925.25
Akaroa Area School BOT (more than requested)	\$4,761.25

- (iii) Allocate requested funding to Diamond Harbour Rugby Football Club, Banks Peninsula Rugby Football Club and Akaroa Area School BOT with the balance being allocated to Britomart Sea Scouts:

Diamond Harbour Rugby Football Club	\$1,000
Banks Peninsula Rugby Football Club	\$2,000
Akaroa Area School BOT	\$4,000
Britomart Sea Scouts	\$1,714

THE PREFERRED OPTION

14. Option (iii).

10. PROPOSALS FOR LYTTTELTON/MT HERBERT SCHEDULE F FUNDING 2007/08- 2009/10 AND ALLOCATION OF DISCRETIONARY FUNDING 2006/07

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Transport & Greenspace Manage
Authors:	Ann Liggett, Parks and Waterway Area Advocate Peter Dow, Acting Community Board Principal Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to propose that the Board:
 - (a) recommend to the Council, the allocation of Schedule F funding for 2007/08 to 2009/10.
 - (b) allocate its remaining discretionary funding for 2006/07.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**Schedule F Funding**

2. Each year the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board submits to the Council, recommendations for the allocation of some \$215,000 for capital projects within Lyttelton/Mt Herbert local reserves. Staff have put together a programme covering the period 2007/08 to 2009/10.
3. Therefore **attached** for the Board's consideration is a suggested funding programme.

2006/07 Discretionary Funding

4. The balance of the Board's discretionary budget for 2006/07 is currently \$8,905, comprising \$7,655 of discretionary funding and \$1,250 in the Board's Community Support Fund.
5. There is no provision to seek carry forwards into 2007/08 of any funds that have not been committed/expended by 30 June 2007.

10. Cont'd

6. The following projects have been identified from community requests, members and staff for consideration by the Board:

Lyttelton Cemetery - Memorial Seating/Plantings \$1,000

This project will complete the memorial seating area within the Lyttelton Cemetery which has been supported by the Board in the past. Once planting is complete a small dedication ceremony will be held.

Seating in Public Areas \$1,500

These seats can be purchased now and held in storage until sites are determined.

Tag Buster Programmes \$750

Provision of materials (paint etc) for the volunteers undertaking removal of tagging in Lyttelton and Diamond Harbour.

Grubb Cottage and Lyttelton Harbour Basin Pest Busters \$1,500

Grant contributions towards incorporation, establishment and initial operating costs of each group

Communications Fund for Community Groups \$2,500

Assistance towards printing and distribution costs of communications issued by local community groups

Local Heritage Projects/Initiatives \$2,000

Funding support towards heritage projects being undertaken by local groups

Holy Trinity Anglican Church \$8,500

Financial assistance towards the upgrading of the church and vicarage gardens used by the public (estimated costs for Stage 2 of \$6,200 (steps, pavers, seating and pergola) and for Stage 3 of \$2,300 (lighting and plantings)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. Schedule F funding is assigned to the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board for allocation by way of recommendations to the Council in each financial year, currently for the next ten years. The project proposals listed for the next three years, which, when approved, will be allocated to the Transport and Greenspace Unit's capital programme budget for implementation.
8. The requests received from discretionary sources of \$17,750 exceed the available 2006/07 budget balance of \$8,905.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

9. As above.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. There are no legal considerations.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

11. As above.

10. Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

**12. LTCCP
Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – Page 123**

Community – By providing welcoming areas for communities to gather and interact.

Environment – By offering opportunities for people to contribute to projects that improve our city's environment.

**13. LTCCP
Democracy and Governance**

Yes, the Board has a remaining balance of \$8905 available from its discretionary budget for 2006/07. Pages 113 and 177, Volume 1 of Our Community Plan 2006/16 refers.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

14. As in 13. above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

15. Social Wellbeing Strategy
Recreation and Sports Strategy
Natural Asset Management Strategy
Environmental Policy
Community Boards' Discretionary Funding Policy

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

16. As in 15. above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Considers the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert allocation of 2007/08 to 2009/10 Schedule F funding for recommending to the Council from the submitted proposed programme.
- (b) Considers and decides on the allocation of its remaining 2006/07 discretionary funding of \$8,905 from the list of suggested projects in paragraph 6. above.

11. MARINE DRIVE – ZEBRA CROSSING AT THE HUNTERS ROAD INTERSECTION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Transport & Greenspace Manager
Author:	Michael Thomson, Senior Traffic Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's reconfirmation of the zebra crossing facility on Marine Drive and the legalisation of this traffic control device and the approval of associated parking restrictions (refer attached).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Following observation of this crossing facility in response to a community concern, the Council's Transport and Greenspace staff consider this crossing to be no less safe than having no crossing facility at all. No other road crossing facility would be considered practical at this site in terms of economic or technical viability and additional signage and road marking will be an improvement.
3. The crossing facility completes a pedestrian linkage for the local community in regard to adjacent footpaths and provides a facility for school children walking to/from the Diamond Harbour School.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. Road marking and advance signage upgrades can be achieved using existing operational budgets.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

5. Signs & Road Marking Operational budgets are identified in the LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. Local Government Act 1974, Local Government Act 2002, Land Transport Rule-Traffic Control Devices 2004, Rule 54002.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

7. As above

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

8. Yes, as stated in clause 5.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

9. Yes, as stated above.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL STRATEGIES

10. Pedestrian Strategy and Parking Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. Yes, as above.

11. Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. The recent installation of the zebra crossing facility was as a result of consultation with the Diamond Harbour School community. Council staff have been contacted by a motorist who drives through this crossing with concerns about the crossing. The Diamond Harbour Community Association has been requested to provide their views on this crossing facility.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board resolve:

- (a) To reconfirm the continuing operation of the zebra pedestrian crossing on Marine Drive immediately east of the Hunters Road intersection.
- (b) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Marine Drive commencing at the Hunters Road intersection and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of 55 metres.
- (c) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Marine Drive commencing at the Ranui Crescent intersection and extending in a south westerly direction for a distance of 35 metres.
- (d) That a zebra pedestrian crossing be installed on Marine Drive, seven metres north east of the Hunters Road intersection pursuant to the Local Government Act 1974, the Local Government Act 2002, and the Land Transport Rule- Traffic Control Devices 2004, Rule 54002, Section 8.

11. Cont'd

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

13. The former Banks Peninsula District Council approved the installation of a zebra pedestrian crossing across Marine Drive on the east side of the Hunters Road/Marine Drive intersection, and just west of the adjacent Marine Drive/Ranui Crescent intersection. It is understood that the issues prior to the zebra installation were:
 - (a) Safety for children travelling to/from Diamond Harbour school (main entrance off Hunters Road) and needing to cross marine Drive as part of their walking journey.
 - (b) No linkage between the footpaths on Marine Drive east and west of the Hunters Road intersection. Note: East of Hunters Road, one only footpath exists on the south side of Marine Drive. West of Hunters Road, one only footpath exists on the north side of Marine Drive.

Road Environment

14. Marine Drive has a daily average traffic volume of 1800 vehicles. The speed limit is 50 km/hr. The roadway is relatively narrow, with the width at the zebra crossing being 7.5 metres. Lighting has been upgraded in recent times and a 70 watt low pressure sodium streetlight exists above, and to one side of the zebra crossing.

West approach

- (a) Coming from Charteris Bay, the road is relatively straight with an approach sight distance of 185 metres. This approach has a gentle grade uphill. A commercial premises exist on the north side, west of the crossing, with an angle parking area set back from the roadway. Two fluoro yellow/green permanent warning signs advise of the potential presence of children and the presence of the zebra crossing with the supplementary sign "school" underneath.

East approach

- (b) When approaching from the east, (Purau) traffic travels past an entrance to the school (a school sign is present), then around a left hand bend and downhill to the zebra crossing. The approach site distance is 90 metres. A fluoro yellow/green sign advises of the presence of the zebra crossing.

Zebra Crossing Warrant

15. A New Zealand Guideline is being developed by Land Transport New Zealand. Until this guideline document is completed and published for use by Road controlling authorities the current guideline document for installation of pedestrian road crossing facilities in New Zealand is TR11. This document recommends a minimum of 150 pedestrians crossing per hour before a zebra crossing is considered appropriate. If a school patrol is operated (with swing out stop signs) TR11 recommends a minimum of 50 school children crossing the roadway in a half hour period. Council staff surveyed the crossing on Tuesday 1 May 2007. In the peak afternoon half hour (school travel time), five school children crossed at the zebra crossing and two adults (not associated with the school) crossed near the zebra crossing. Diamond Harbour school. Staff advise that more children walk to school in the morning, using this crossing facility.
16. The guideline document is exactly that, a guideline only. Compliance with the TR11 document is not mandatory for a Road Controlling Authority. Pedestrian and traffic volumes at this site are way below the recommended minimum level to warrant a zebra crossing facility.

Zebra Crossing Safety

17. No guarantee can be given to provide 100% safety for any type of 'at-grade' road crossing facilities. While assessment of this zebra crossing reveals it does not meet the numerical TR11 warrant, the combination of new bright advance warning signs, the very narrow roadway crossing distance, good approach visibility, and very low traffic volumes indicates that this zebra crossing is unlikely to be less safe than having no crossing facility at all.

11. Cont'd

THE OBJECTIVES

18. Assessment of the existing Zebra pedestrian crossing in regard to safety and convenience for the users of this facility.

THE OPTIONS

Option 1

19. Retention of the existing Zebra Pedestrian Crossing

Option 2

20. Replace zebra with a central island crossing facility

Option 3

21. Note: all other options such as traffic signals, air bridge, and underpass have not been considered due to technical & economic viability.

THE PREFERRED OPTION

22. Retention of the existing Zebra Pedestrian Crossing

11. Cont'd

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option**

23. Retention of the existing Zebra Pedestrian crossing (status quo)

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Meets the needs of the local community	Nil
Cultural	N/A	N/A
Environmental	No change	No change
Economic	N/A	Ongoing routine road marking and road signage maintenance
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Meets the need of the local community to provide a road crossing facility.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities: This Traffic Control Device is consistent with the Council's Road Controlling responsibilities to provide a safe & convenient road environment for all road users.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: N/A</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Consistent with Council's Pedestrian Strategy, and Parking Strategy.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Diamond Harbour school Community, Local Diamond Harbour Community</p> <p>Other relevant matters: +</p>		

11. Cont'd

At Least one Other Option (or an explanation of why another option has not been considered)

24. Central Pedestrian Island

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Some benefit to the community, but less than the desired community option.	Potential Community dissatisfaction
Cultural	N/A	N/A
Environmental		Potentially loss of car parking facility at shop due to road widening requirements
Economic	Possible reduced collision costs by providing a potentially safer crossing device	Substantial due to infrastructural changes required
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Provision of a crossing facility, but possibly at the expense of provision of another facility elsewhere in the community.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Requires provision of a budget which is not currently specified in the LTCCP</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p></p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>Potential impact on parking for the adjacent commercial premises</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>This option would require widening of the roadway to accommodate a central island, as the existing roadway width (kerb to kerb) is 7 metres. Traffic engineering best practice prescribes a roadway width of 11 metres (2 x 4.5 traffic lanes- to accommodate vehicles and cyclists in both directions) and 2 metres for the central island.</p>		

12. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Board members are invited to provide any updates on community/Council issues.

13. ACTING COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE

13.1 CURRENT ISSUES

The Acting Community Board Principal Adviser will update the Board on current issues.

13.2 CUSTOMER SERVICE REQUESTS

Attached for members information for the period 8 May to 12 June 2007

14. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS