

FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD
WORKS, TRAFFIC AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE
AGENDA

MONDAY 29 MARCH 2010

AT 8AM

IN THE BOARDROOM
FENDALTON SERVICE CENTRE
CORNER JEFFREYS AND CLYDE ROADS

Committee: Cheryl Colley (Chairperson), Sally Buck, Faimeh Burke, Val Carter, Jamie Gough, Mike Wall and Andrew Yoon

Community Board Adviser
Edwina Cordwell
Phone 941 6728 DDI
Email: edwina.cordwell@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 B 2. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
- PART B 3. BRIEFINGS**
 - 3.1 Shane Moohan – Westburn Reserve**
 - 3.2 Greater Christchurch Metro Strategy Review 2010**
- PART C 4. 50 CROFTON ROAD - PROPOSED TREE REMOVAL**
- PART C 5. ST ALBANS STREET – SUGGESTIONS FOR P120 (11AM – 3PM) PARKING RESTRICTION AND SPECIAL EXEMPTIONS FOR ST ALBANS - MERIVALE BOWLING CLUB USERS**
- PART C 6. WINSLOW STREET – REQUEST FOR PARKING RESTRICTION ON THE STREET**
- PART C 7. GREATER CHRISTCHURCH METRO STRATEGY REVIEW 2010 – BOARD SUBMISSION**

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

3. **BRIEFINGS**

3.1 **SHANE MOOHAN – WESTBURN RESERVE**

Shane Moohan, City Arborist, will be in attendance to speak to the **attached** memorandum.

3.2 **GREATER CHRISTCHURCH METRO STRATEGY REVIEW 2010**

Shannon Ussher, Strategic Planner Passenger Transport, Environment Canterbury will brief the Board on the Environment Canterbury's Greater Christchurch Metro Strategy Review 2010.

4. 50 CROFTON ROAD - PROPOSED TREE REMOVAL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Transport and Greenspace
Authors:	Jonathan Hansen, Street Tree Arborist Lorraine Correia, Consultation Leader

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend that the Works, Traffic and Environment Committee recommend to the Community Board that the request to remove two silver birch trees outside 1-50 Crofton Road be declined.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. A request has been made to the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board, from Beverley Goodall, the owner of number 1-50 Crofton Road, to consider the removal of both the silver birch trees outside this property (refer **attachment 1**).
3. The request is in relation to birch pollen allergy.
4. The Council's records show the trees were planted in October 1972.
5. An arboricultural assessment was carried out to evaluate the health, condition, value and hazard rating of the trees. Both of these trees are in a good condition and are typical of other silver birch trees in the area, with no health and safety issues, and only minor damage to the footpath.
6. There are 67 trees in Crofton Road of which 47 are silver birch. There are a further six silver birch in the reserve opposite 1-50 Crofton Road. Silver birch pollen is distributed by wind therefore it is doubtful that removing these two trees would have any significant effect.
7. In regard to removing silver birches and the effect it would have on the issue the Canterbury District Health Board have advised staff the following:
 - (a) "...when it comes to intervention the main problem is that the lack of research in this area, so it comes down to theorising. Obviously if there were no birch trees in New Zealand no-one would become allergic to them (assuming no immigration/emigration) - what is unclear is how many would then become allergic to something else, and whether their symptoms would be more or less severe. This scenario is also obviously entirely theoretical, and once you move to an actual practical situation things become even more complex.the arguments about selecting new trees for planting based on allergenicity are probably stronger in scientific terms than the arguments for removing existing plantings."
8. The Council direction to staff in August 2007 was:
 - (a) "There is to be no city wide removal and replacement of silver birches for supposed health associations. The removal of silver birches or similar, are to be evaluated on a case by case basis and only to be removed for tree health and safety reasons, with them being replaced by another tree species".
7. Given paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8, staff recommend that the request to remove the two silver birch trees be declined.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The cost to remove both the silver birch trees and replace them with a PB95 grade tree is estimated at \$4,232 (including three years watering and mulching).

4. Cont'd

9. The collective evaluation for the trees using STEM is 234 points (including nuisance value) and 257 points (excluding nuisance value).

The collective valuation (including nuisance value) using STEM is \$33,600.

The collective valuation (excluding nuisance value) using STEM is \$36,160.

STEM (A Standard Tree Evaluation Method) is the New Zealand national arboricultural industry standard for evaluating and valuing amenity trees by assessing their condition and contribution to amenity along with other distinguishable attributes such as stature, historic or scientific significance.

10. The cost to remove and replace all of the silver birch trees in Crofton Road (excluding the reserve) is estimated at \$95,000.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with LTCCP budgets?

12. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

13. The Greenspace Manager has the following delegation with respect to trees:
- (a) "In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of trees from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control".
14. While the Transport and Greenspace Manager has the delegation to remove the silver birch trees, current practice is that in most cases requests to remove healthy and structurally sound trees are placed before the appropriate Community Board for a decision.
15. Under the delegations to Community Boards, the Board has the authority to "plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves, parks and roads" under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council.
16. Protected street trees can only be removed by a successful application under the Resource Management Act. The silver birch trees in question are not listed as protected under the provision of the Christchurch City Plan.
17. The following City Plan Policies may be of some benefit when considering the options:

Volume 2: Section 4 City Identity

4.2.1 Policy: Tree Cover

To promote amenity values in the urban area by maintaining and enhancing the tree cover present in the City.

Tree cover and vegetation make an important contribution to amenity values in the city. Through the redevelopment of sites, existing vegetation is often lost and not replaced. The City Plan protects those trees identified as "heritage" or "notable" and the subdivision process protects other trees which are considered to be "significant". The highest degree of protection applies to heritage trees.

Because Christchurch is largely built on a flat plain, trees and shrubs play an important role in creating relief, contributing to visual amenity and attracting native birds.

The amount of private open space available for new planting and to retain existing trees is influenced by rules concerning building density and setback from boundaries. The rules do not require new planting for residential development but landscaping is required in business zones.

4. Cont'd

4.2.2 Policy: Garden City

To recognise and promote the “Garden City” identity, heritage and character of Christchurch.

A key aspect of achieving this policy will be maintaining and extending environments and vegetation types which compliment this image. A broad range of matters influence and contribute to this image, including the following:

- (a) Tree-lined streets and avenues
- (b) Parks and developed areas of open space.

14.3.2 Policy: “Garden City” image identity

To acknowledge and promote the “Garden City” identity of the City by protecting, maintaining and extending planting which compliments this image

Volume 3: Part 8 Special Purpose Zone

14.3.5 Street Trees

Nearly half the length of streets within the city contains street trees, but the presence of very high quality street trees which add considerable presence to streets and neighbourhoods is confined to a relatively small proportion of the road network. These streets add particular character and amenity of the city, either in the form of avenues which form points into the city, or an important part of the local character of particular streets.

- 18. An application to prune or remove the trees may be made to the District Court under the Property Law Amendment Act 1975.
- 19. The District Court can order the pruning or removal of a tree under the Property Law Amendment Act 1975.
- 20. Any work carried out in relation to the Silver Birch trees are to be completed by a Council approved contractor.

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

- 21. Yes, as per above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

- 22. Draft LTCCP 2009-19:

Streets and Transport – Page 81

- (a) Governance – By enabling the community to participate in decision making through consultation on plans and projects.
 - (b) City Development – By providing a well-designed, efficient transport system and attractive street landscapes.
- 24. Retention of the trees is consistent with the Activity Management Plan provided the trees are structurally sound and healthy.
 - 25. Removal and replacement of the trees is consistent with the Activity Management Plan.
 - 26. Removing and not replacing the trees is not consistent with the Activity Management Plan.

4. Cont'd

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the Draft 2009-19 LTCCP?

27. Yes, as per above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

28. Removing and replacing the trees would be consistent with the following strategies:
- (a) Christchurch City Council Biodiversity Strategy
 - (b) Christchurch Urban Design Vision
 - (c) Garden City Image as per the City Plan.
29. There is currently no policy for the pruning or removing of trees in public places. A draft Tree Policy is being worked on.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

30. Yes, as per clause 28 above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

31. In January 2010 a letter and a feedback form was delivered to eight properties neighbouring 50 Crofton Road, providing an opportunity for the community to indicate their preference along with any additional comments or feedback.
32. The consultation period was open from 26 January to 12 February 2010, submissions received until 17 February 2010 were also accepted and were included in the consultation document. The Consultation document has been circulated separately to the Board members.
33. The consultation resulted in eight responses (a 100 percent response rate) and community feedback was strongly in favour of the removal of both trees with one submitter also indicating they had mixed views:
- (a) Six submitters (75 percent) responded "I support the removal of both Silver Birch trees".
 - (b) One submitter (12.5 percent) responded "I support the removal of only the large tree".
 - (c) Two submitters (25 percent) responded that they had "Mixed views/some concerns".
 - (d) There were no submitters who responded "I do not support the removal of the trees".
34. The submitter who indicated only the large tree also had mixed views and empathised with the resident however she also raised the question as to the pollen from the other nearby silver birches and what difference it would make to the resident.
35. One submitter indicated that if the trees were removed they would prefer to see them replaced with a smaller tree.
34. The resident at 1-50 Crofton Road has offered to pay for a small replacement tree if both the silver birch trees are removed.
35. All respondents have been sent a final letter advising them of the results of the consultation, a copy of the comments received from this consultation process together with staff comments and information that the Board report would be presented for their approval.
36. Details of the Fendalton/Waimairi Works, Traffic and Environment Committee meeting (date, time and venue) were provided to enable residents to make a deputation to the Board prior to a decision being made.

4. Cont'd

Arboricultural Assessment

37. Both trees are in a healthy condition and show no signs of immediate failure which would warrant their removal for tree health and safety concerns. Silver birch trees are known to be a strong structural tree with good branch attachments. This has resulted in low silver birch tree failure rates in Christchurch City.
38. Staff carried out an inspection for damage to the footpath and kerb and channel. At present there is no significant damage to infrastructure that would warrant the removal of either trees or the programming of future work.
39. The two trees are to the north-west of the property at number 1-50 Crofton Road. Typically shading issues arise when trees are to the north of a particular property as the sun rises in the east, moves to the north and sets to the west. Silver birch trees are a deciduous tree. A benefit of deciduous trees is that they cool through the summer months and let light and warmth through in the winter months when they have lost their leaves. There is a period throughout autumn, which is normally a cooler time of year, where they still have most of their leaves and can cause some nuisance through shading.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Fendalton/Waimairi Works, Traffic and Environment Committee recommends to the Board:

- (a) That the request to remove either of the two silver birch trees outside number 1-50 Crofton Road be declined; and
- (b) That the trees continue to be maintained to internationally recognised and accepted arboricultural practices, standards and procedures.

4. Cont'd

BACKGROUND

40. The first recorded contact with Mr and Mrs Goodall was on 29 May 2002. Mr Goodall requested that the two trees be removed. The trees were not removed owing to no tree health and safety concerns at the time.
41. A second request to the Council was received on 30 May 2007 from Mr Goodall, advising that the footpath was beginning to crack possibly due to Council owned tree roots. The trees were inspected by the Council's tree contractor City Care Limited. City Care Limited commented on the customer services record saying that there are several slight cracks in the pavement radiating from the base of the tree. There was damage to the asphalt in the private drive but it is inconclusive as to whether this was caused by the street tree or the neighbour's shrubs.
42. The next recorded contact was in a letter from Mrs Goodall to the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board Chairperson dated 27 July 2009 (refer **attachment 2**).
43. The Council records show that the Silver Birch trees outside number 1-50 Crofton Road, were planted in 1972.
44. Consultation has resulted in requests to remove all of the silver birches in Crofton Road as well as those in the reserve next to 47 Crofton Road and opposite 1-50 Crofton Road.
45. There are a further six silver birches in the reserve plus some other species that have similar or higher allergen ratings to that of silver birch.
46. Silver birch pollen is very small, is dispersed by wind, and therefore can travel a considerable distance. The pollen is produced at the time of year that coincides with perennial ryegrass pollen and Canterbury's naturally windiest period.
47. The advice from the District Health Board is that it is unknown as to whether or not a lack of silver birch trees would mean that people become allergy free or whether they are allergic to something else and continue to suffer.
48. Grass pollen is a well known allergen because of the amount of pollen it produces. Perennial ryegrass is considered among the worst. Christchurch is surrounded by large amounts of perennial ryegrass which results in heavily pollen laden air in spring and summer. This is due to the amount of pollen that grass produces combined with the strong winds that naturally occur in Canterbury at the time the pollen is produced. The pollen producing season is longer than that of silver birch (early spring to late autumn) and overlaps the birch pollen season at both ends. This means that people who think they may be allergic to silver birch may in fact be allergic to grass pollen (or another tree or shrub).
49. There are a significant number of common trees and shrubs (both native and exotic) that have a similar or worse allergen rating to that of silver birch. Included are Christchurch's five most commonly planted street and park trees along with most of Christchurch's iconic trees. Similarly, there are many shrubs in both street and park gardens, as well as private gardens that have similar or worse allergen ratings to that of silver birch.

5. ST ALBANS STREET – SUGGESTIONS FOR P120 (11AM TO 3PM) PARKING RESTRICTION AND SPECIAL EXEMPTIONS FOR ST ALBANS/MERIVALE BOWLING CLUB USERS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Transport and Greenspace
Author:	George Kuek, Assistant Traffic Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Works, Traffic and Environment Committee's recommendation to the Board to approve the staff recommendation that the St Albans/Merivale Bowling Club's request for P120 (11am to 3pm) parking restriction on St Albans Street and special exemptions for the St Albans - Merivale Bowling Club (the Club) users be declined.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. This report is to respond to the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board Works, Traffic and Environment Committee's request for staff to "consider the suggestions made by the St Albans/Merivale Bowling Club for P120 (11am to 3pm) parking restrictions to be implemented on both sides of St Albans Street from Papanui Road to Browns Road, and the possibility of special exemptions for Bowling Club members and visitors".
3. A deputation from the Club made the above request at the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board Works, Traffic and Environment Committee meeting on 24 August 2009.
4. The Committee requested that staff take into consideration the particular needs of the bowling club given the predominance of elderly people involved and the challenges of walking longer distances, often with heavy bowls to carry.
5. St Albans Street is a collector road, running off the east side of Papanui Road which is classified a minor arterial.
6. The Club is situated on Donald Place (a cul-de-sac) which runs off the north side of St Albans Street, approximately 270 metres east of the St Albans Street/ Papanui Road intersection.
7. **Attachment 1** shows the following parking restrictions and bus stops which currently exist on St Albans Street:
 - (a) On the north side of St Albans Street, P30 and P60 parking restrictions apply between Papanui Road and 29 St Albans Street. The P30 parking restrictions were implemented in 2009 as part of the *Papanui Road Bus Priority Project*, while the P60 restriction had existed before that Project.
 - (b) On the south side of St Albans Street, P15, P30 and P60 parking restrictions apply from Papanui Road to Bristol Street. The P30 and P60 parking restrictions were implemented in 2009 as part of the *Papanui Road Bus Priority Project*, while the P15 restriction had existed before that Project for more than 15 years.
8. **Attachment 2** shows the following parking restrictions requested by the Club:
 - (a) The suggested P120 (11am to 3pm) restricted parking areas on St Albans Street, from Papanui Road to Browns Road
 - (b) The parking spaces on the side streets which are within the same maximum walking distance of 244 metres (the distance from near Papanui Road to the Donald Place/ St Albans Street intersection) to the Donald Place intersection.

5. Cont'd

9. Through an earlier Customer Service Request (CSR) on 10 July 2009, the club had expressed concern about the impact of the new parking restrictions under the *Merivale North Parking Plan* (the *Papanui Road Bus Priority Project* parking restrictions were implemented at the same time), and had requested special exemptions from P120 parking restrictions on St Albans Street (there are currently no P120 parking restrictions here) for members and visitors attending events at the club. The club had claimed that Merivale Mall workers were migrating to all-day parking spaces on St Albans Street, and that there were now very few available parking spaces on St Albans Street and nearby streets for members and visitors to park when going to the club.
10. Staff visited the St Albans Street area on Wednesday 22 July 2009 between 1pm and 1.30pm to observe parking patterns in the area. The parking pattern at that time would be typical of the parking on the working days of the week, and would include all-day parking by Mall workers.
11. It was observed during that site visit that the north side of St Albans Street, between 29 St Albans Street and 73 St Albans Street (intersection at Gordon Avenue), was fully parked. However, there was only one vehicle parked on the south side of St Albans Street east of the Bristol Street intersection, and parking was very sparse on the side streets, namely Devonport Lane, Bristol Street, Gordon Avenue and Browns Road.
12. The above findings were conveyed to the Club on 23 July 2009 via an email (copy including photos attached as **attachment 3** for information), which also pointed out that:
 - (a) there were ample opportunities to park on surrounding streets on a typical working day, all within easy walking distance to the club, and the club should advise their members and visitors to park there.
 - (b) all public roads, including kerbside parking, were for the use of all members of the public, and it was not possible for the Council to set aside portions of public roads for exclusive use by a certain group within the community.
13. In response to the above email, Mr Pat Gregory representing the Club requested staff to meet with him on site on 28 July 2009 to discuss options. At this meeting, Mr Gregory suggested that P120 (11am to 3pm) parking restrictions be implemented on both sides of St Albans Street between Papanui Road and Browns Road to allow club members and visitors to park when attending events at the club.
14. At this meeting, staff explained to Mr Gregory that there was strong opposition to the parking restrictions under the *Merivale North Parking Plan* and the *Papanui Road Bus Priority Project*, and expected that there would be similar negative reactions if more parking restrictions on St Albans Street were implemented.
15. Staff again pointed out to Mr Gregory that there were ample parking spaces on surrounding streets within easy walking distance of the club. These were reiterated to the club on 6 August 2009 via a second email (copy attached as **attachment 4** for information), which also:
 - (a) advised that the Merivale North Parking Plan would be reviewed in a years time, and the Council had no plans in the meantime to consider installing any more parking restrictions in St Albans Street.
 - (b) suggested that the bowling club members and visitors could drive up to the club to drop off their bags containing their bowls before parking their cars on nearby streets, which would save them having to carry their heavy bags between their parked cars and the club.
16. The Club was not satisfied with not being given what they had asked for, and had then approached the Board's Committee on 24 August 2009 for support, which resulted in the preparation of this report.

5. Cont'd

17. Staff do not support the suggested P120 (11am to 3pm) parking restrictions, and the special exemptions from these restrictions for club members and visitors, for the following reasons:

(a) Opposition to the Merivale North Parking Plan

Although there was general support for the parking restrictions under the *Merivale North Parking Plan* and *Papanui Road Bus Priority Project* during the consultation process in late 2008/early 2009, there was also very strong opposition to the proposed restrictions, before the proposed restrictions were finally approved by the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board on 10 February 2009. Based on the sentiments expressed by the objectors at that time, it is expected that any additional parking restrictions in the Merivale area will further inflame the situation.

(b) Lawn bowls during warmer months of the year

The two outdoor greens at the St Albans/Merivale Bowling Club mean that the sport is played only about five months of the year, usually between the end of October and end of March. According to the club's online calendar for January 2010 and February 2010, play usually takes place commencing between 1pm and 2pm, lasting for about two hours, on four afternoons of the week (including Saturdays, but not Sundays). Play also takes place on most Saturday mornings starting at 9am.

In contrast, parking restrictions operate throughout the year, and these will unfairly inconvenience residents and commuters while allowing club members and visitors to conveniently park in their area of choice over only five months of the year, on four days of the week, for part of the day.

(c) Surrounding streets are sparsely parked

Observations made during further site visits on 31 July 2009, 27 August 2009, 3 September 2009, 10 September 2009, 16 September 2009, 5 January 2010, 26 January 2010, 27 January 2010 and 28 January 2010 confirmed staff advice to the club in the 23 July 2009 email, that parking on surrounding streets is sparse, and there are ample opportunities for club members and visitors to park on side streets on a typical working day.

It should be noted that the club had approached the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board's Works, Traffic and Environment Committee in August 2009, before the start of the current summer bowling season in October 2009. All the site visits in January 2010 had coincided with events held at the club, and it was observed on these occasions that there were still many parking spaces available on the side streets. The concerns about the lack of parking raised by the club before the start of the current summer bowling season are not supported by actual parking patterns observed on site.

(d) Equal walking distances to/from side streets, while carrying heavy bowls

Before the *Merivale North Parking Plan* and *Papanui Road Bus Priority Project* parking restrictions were implemented in 2009, club members and visitors were able to park near the Papanui Road end of St Albans Street and walk to the club. The suggested P120 (11am to 3pm) parking restrictions would allow club members to park in this same area as before.

It can clearly be seen from attachment 2 that for the same maximum walking distance of 244 metres from the side streets to the Donald Place intersection, there are in fact more spaces available for parking on these side streets than there are, in the area suggested by the club. Staff had advised the club in both earlier emails that there were ample parking opportunities on the side streets closer to the bowling club.

5. Cont'd

- (e) Parking will be pushed further out, creating more parking problems.

Removing the current all-day unrestricted parking and replacing it with the requested P120 (11am to 3pm) would push all-day unrestricted parking further out along St Albans Street and into surrounding streets and this will create even more parking problems.

- (f) The Council cannot grant special exemptions for club members and visitors.

As explained to the club in the email dated 23 July 2009 (**Attachment 3**), the streets and roads in Christchurch are for the use of all members of the public, and the Council does not currently have any legal mechanism for granting special exemptions on parking restrictions for the exclusive benefit of a certain group in the community.

The **Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004** only allows the allocation of parking to specific classes of vehicles like taxis, motor cycles, buses, etc. The Council parking strategy and Council policy do not allow allocation of parking to specific groups within the community. If the Council were to change their policies, it would set a precedent, which would open the Council to requests from other groups in the community for special exemptions to satisfy their exclusive needs.

- (g) Bowls drop-off/pick-up would encourage and promote car-pooling.

At the site meeting with Mr Gregory on 28 July 2009 and in the subsequent email to the club on 6 August 2009, staff had suggested that club members and visitors could drive up to the club to drop off/pick up their bowls before parking on nearby streets.

If the Club recognises the merit in adopting this practice, they could also promote the practice of car-pooling and encourage their members and visitors to be pro-active in easing, rather than further contributing to, traffic congestion and the associated parking issues in the Merivale area.

18. In summary, staff do not support the suggested P120 parking restrictions and special exemptions for the club users because:

- (a) To consider implementing further parking restrictions would only reignite the issues raised by the objectors to the Merivale North Parking Plan.
- (b) Lawn bowls is played on the outdoor greens between end of October and end of March, and any parking restriction would only benefit club users while unfairly inconveniencing residents and commuters who need unrestricted parking in the area throughout the entire year.
- (c) It has been shown on the plan (attachment 2) that there is ample parking available on the side streets within the same walking distance (244 metres) as the area the bowling club requested restrictions and exemptions for in St Albans Street.
- (d) If the suggested P120 parking restrictions are implemented, commuter parking will be pushed further out along St Albans Street and into surrounding streets and this will create even more parking problems throughout the whole year.
- (e) There is no mechanism to create exemptions from parking restrictions for specific groups within the community.
- (f) The Club could consider promoting and encouraging their members and visitors to car-pool, and to practice drop-off/pick-up at the club while parking on the nearby side streets.

5. Cont'd

- (g) While some Mall workers are now parking on St Albans Street, there is no evidence to support the claim made by the Club about the lack of opportunities for other road users to park on St Albans Street and side streets. This is verified by observations made during a number of site visits.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

19. Nil.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

20. There will be no cost to the Council if the recommendation by staff is adopted.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

21. There are no legal implications for the Council if no changes are made to on-street parking.

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

22. There are no legal implications for the Council if no changes are made to on-street parking.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

23. No change recommended, therefore not applicable.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

24. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

25. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003 and the Road Safety Strategy 2004.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

26. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

27. No consultation was carried out as no changes are proposed to be made to the current on-street parking arrangement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board's Works, Traffic and Environment Committee recommends that the Board decline the suggested P120 (11am to 3pm) parking restrictions on St Albans Street and special exemptions for the St Albans/Merivale Bowling Club users.

6. WINSLOW STREET – REQUEST FOR PARKING RESTRICTION ON THE STREET

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Transport and Greenspace
Author:	George Kuek, Assistant Traffic Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board's Works, Traffic and Environment Committee of the findings of investigations into the request for parking restrictions on Winslow Street, and to recommend that the Committee recommend that the Board agree that the additional option (see Option 9 below) to install a median on Roydvale Avenue to restrict traffic flow to "left-turn in/left-turn out" on Winslow Street be adopted.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Works, Traffic and Environment Committee at its meeting on 23 June 2008, received a deputation from David Moyle and Gary Walker of Winslow Street who expressed their concerns about traffic issues in Winslow Street, Burnside. They explained that there was pressure on parking in the street and movement through the street caused by long-term parking. The submitters discussed a number of options for addressing these concerns and noted that their views were generally supported by other residents in the street.
3. The Committee decided to request that staff report back to a future meeting of the Committee on options for addressing the concerns of the residents in Winslow Street, with options to include converting the street into a cul-de-sac (no through traffic), parking restrictions (either "No Parking" or "P120" restrictions), and the possibility of restricting the exit from Winslow Street onto Roydvale Avenue to left-turn only (no right turn out).
4. Winslow Street is a local residential street approximately eight metres wide and 105 metres long, running generally in the east-west direction, and with a speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour (refer **attachment 1**).
5. Winslow Street intersects with the southeast side of Roydvale Avenue (a collector road), at a point approximately 80 metres northeast of the signalised Memorial Avenue/Roydvale Avenue intersection.
6. Winslow Street links with Burnside Crescent (a local road) at its eastern end and with Roydvale Avenue at its western end. Both these intersections are uncontrolled.
7. Sir William Pickering Drive runs off the northwest side of Roydvale Avenue, on the opposite side of, but offset from the Winslow Street/Roydvale Avenue intersection.
8. At the western end of Winslow Street, the threshold kerbs are at right angles with the kerb and channel on Roydvale Avenue and the carriageway is narrowed to 4.5 metres, with a speed hump. The eastern threshold has a nine metre radius curve kerb and channel linking with those on Burnside Crescent, and the street narrows to 3.5 metres, with a speed hump, at this point.
9. A total of nine properties line both sides of Winslow Street, but only seven of these properties, namely 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10 Winslow Street, and 27 Burnside Crescent, have direct vehicle access from Winslow Street. All these seven properties have sufficient space for on-site parking.
10. Number 50 Roydvale Avenue has direct vehicle access onto Roydvale Avenue. A permitted business operates from this address that provides assessment and rehabilitation services for people who have sustained a traumatic brain injury or who have been diagnosed with neurotoxicity.
11. The main vehicle access to 31 Burnside Crescent is from Burnside Crescent, with a secondary access (which appears to be used for trailer parking) from Winslow Street.
12. There are currently no restrictions on parking along Winslow Street.

6. Cont'd

13. Analysis of crashes for the last five years shows that no crashes have been reported on Winslow Street. The only reported crash was a car losing control and crashing into a tree as it sped round the right hand bend on Burnside Crescent at its intersection with Winslow Street.
14. A traffic survey in September 2009 yielded the following information:
 - (a) Average daily total traffic volume of 780 vehicles (418 eastbound, 362 westbound)
 - (b) Weekly total traffic volume of 5,459 vehicles
 - (c) Maximum speed of 57.9 kilometres per hour
 - (d) Mean speed of 31.2 kilometres per hour
 - (e) 85 percent speed of 36.4 kilometres per hour.
15. Since there are only seven residential properties in this street which have direct vehicle access, the relatively high average daily total traffic volume of 780 vehicles would indicate that the street is being used as a short cut ('rat run') between Roydvale Avenue and the residential area southeast of Roydvale Avenue.
16. Motorists travelling south on Roydvale Avenue and heading east into the city centre are turning left into Winslow Street, driving along Burnside Crescent and exiting onto Memorial Avenue via Kendal Avenue, to avoid having to stop when the signals are red at the Memorial Avenue/Roydvale Avenue signalised intersection.
17. Motorists travelling through the residential area on the southeast side of Roydvale Avenue are using the Winslow Street/Roydvale Avenue exit to head west along Memorial Avenue via the Memorial Avenue/Roydvale Avenue signalised intersection, to avoid possible delays turning right at the Memorial Avenue/Kendal Avenue unsignalised intersection, which is also viewed as a less safe intersection.
18. Long-term commuter parking is generated by employees from the business at 50 Roydvale Avenue, and from industries, offices and businesses along Sir William Pickering Drive, which is only 6.5 metres wide and has only 30 spaces available for on-street parking.
19. A door-knocking survey was carried out on 2 October 2009 to consult with residents on their views on the traffic issues on Winslow Street. Residents from only three properties were available at that time for comments, and all agreed that there is an issue with all-day commuter parking and indicated that they would be in support of time restricted parking on one side of the street. Note that these three residents did not include the two submitters.
20. Staff have visited the street on a number of other occasions to carry out observations, and it was noted during all those visits that the street was not fully parked.
21. In response to the Committee's request, the following options were considered, and the pros and cons identified:

Option 1 – Do-nothing option

22. Under this option, no action is proposed as the treatment of this street is working as intended, for example, the narrow thresholds and the narrowness of the carriageway are discouraging excessive rat running.

Option 2 – P120 Parking Restrictions on the south side of Winslow Street

23. Time restricted parking along a residential street should be sufficiently long for visitors and tradesmen to comfortably achieve the purposes of their visits. It is considered that allowing a maximum of 120 minutes of restricted parking from 8am to 5pm on Mondays to Fridays will be sufficient and appropriate in this instance.

6. Cont'd

24. There are three vehicle cutdown crossings on the north side of Winslow Street as opposed to five cutdown crossings on the south side. In order to make more spaces available for long-term commuter parking, P120 8am to 5pm Mondays to Fridays parking restrictions was considered for the south side of Winslow Street, while leaving the north side available for long-term commuter parking.
25. Currently when vehicles are parked on both sides of this narrow street, vehicles travelling in opposite directions are being forced to slow down and yield to each other. Such vehicular movements are desirable, and result in the street becoming safer for all road-users (including pedestrians and cyclists). The narrowness of the street is helping to traffic calm the street, and this is supported by the following findings:
 - (a) No crashes had been recorded on Winslow Street in the last five years.
 - (b) Speed data collected from the September 2009 traffic survey, which recorded the mean and 85 percent speeds of vehicles at 31.2 kilometres per hour and 36.4 kilometres per hour, respectively, with only six vehicles (out of a total of 5,459 vehicles for the week) travelling above the 50 kilometres per hour speed limit.
26. By introducing P120 parking restriction on the south side of the street as suggested in this option, the negative effect is that gaps between parked vehicles will occur more frequently resulting in wider trafficable lanes which will encourage higher vehicle speeds which in turn will result in the street becoming less safe for all road-users.
27. Wider trafficable lanes will smooth traffic flow, but this will also attract more traffic, hence traffic volume is likely to increase.
28. While the introduction of parking restrictions will alleviate parking pressure and improve traffic flow, it will create new problems like increased traffic volume and increased vehicle speeds. This option is therefore considered not suitable because of the expected increase in traffic volume and vehicle speeds, making the street less safe for all road-users.

Option 3 – No Parking restriction

29. While the introduction of a No Parking restriction on one or both sides of Winslow Street will help ease congestion and allow smoother traffic flow, it is also likely to encourage more motorists to 'rat run' at higher speeds along the street, making the street less safe than it currently is.
30. This option is considered not suitable because it will affect the safety of all road users.

Option 4 – Additional traffic calming

31. The September 2009 traffic survey found that speeding is not an issue on Winslow Street.
32. *Austroads Local Area Traffic Management Appendix A* recommends speed control device (speed humps in this case) spacing of 80 metres to 120 metres for speed control to be effective. Both ends of Winslow Street have already been narrowed, together with speed humps which are spaced approximately 86 metres apart.
33. There is no advantage in introducing additional traffic calming measures along this short street.

Option 5 – Convert street into a cul-de-sac

34. Converting the street into a cul-de-sac involves road closure which will require a resolution by the Council following extensive public consultation. Any objection to a proposed road closure is resolved through the Environment Court which can be a lengthy and costly process. If and when approved, planning and implementing the road closure would be carried out as a capital project.

6. Cont'd

35. There is an obvious desire line (travel route) in both directions through Winslow Street, and closing the street at one end will have the positive effect of eliminating 'rat running'. However, it will not eliminate long term commuter parking on the street. In addition, vehicles turning round to leave at the only entry/ exit have the potential to add to traffic congestion.
36. Apart from inconveniencing local residents, another negative effect is that motorists intending to travel west along Memorial Avenue can no longer take advantage of using the safer Memorial Avenue/Roydvale Avenue signalised intersection via Winslow Street, as opposed to the Memorial Avenue/Kendal Avenue unsignalised intersection.
37. This option is considered not suitable because of the inconvenience it will cause, the safety concerns, the potential for it to escalate to a lengthy and costly legal process should there be any public objection, and the much wider area than just the local residents that the public consultation process will involve.

Option 6 – Introduce one-way eastbound

38. While this option is possible, the negative impacts are that vehicle speeds and rat-running are likely to increase, given the wider trafficable lane achieved with this option. In addition, motorists intending to travel west along Memorial Avenue can no longer take advantage of using the safer Memorial Avenue/Roydvale Avenue signalised intersection via Winslow Street, as opposed to the Memorial Avenue/Kendal Avenue non-signalised intersection.
39. This option is considered not suitable because of the safety concerns for all road-users resulting from a likely increase in traffic speed and volume. The removal of the option for vehicles to use the safer signalised Memorial Avenue/Roydvale Avenue intersection is also a safety concern.

Option 7 – Introduce one-way westbound

40. Similar to Option 6, while this option is possible, the negative impacts are that vehicle speeds and 'rat running' are likely to increase, given the wider trafficable lane.
41. Motorists intending to travel west along Memorial Avenue can still take advantage of using the safer Memorial Avenue/Roydvale Avenue signalised intersection via Winslow Street, as opposed to the Memorial Avenue/Kendal Avenue unsignalised intersection.
42. This option is considered not suitable because of the safety concerns for all road users as a result of the likely increase in vehicle speed and volume.

Option 8 - Restrict exit from Winslow Street onto Roydvale Avenue to left-turn only

43. The positive aspects are that this will ease congestion for traffic exiting Winslow Street onto Roydvale Avenue, eliminate frustrations caused to drivers held up behind a vehicle waiting to turn right onto Roydvale Avenue, eliminate the potential for crashes caused by right-turning traffic into Roydvale Avenue from Winslow Street, reduce traffic volume by diverting right-turning traffic to alternative routes, and at the same time still allow motorists intending to head west on Memorial Avenue to use the Memorial Avenue/Roydvale Avenue signalised intersection via Winslow Street.
44. A "NO RIGHT TURN" sign requiring a Board resolution will need to be erected on Winslow Street at its intersection with Roydvale Avenue.
45. Analysis of crashes for the last five years show that no crashes have been reported at this intersection, so there appears to be no safety issue at this location.
46. While this option will have a positive impact at the Winslow Street/Roydvale Avenue intersection and should reduce traffic volume through the street, it should be noted that it will not eliminate or reduce long-term commuter parking. This option does not directly address the parking and related issues raised by the submitters, and is therefore considered not a suitable option for the purpose of this report.

6. Cont'd

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS

47. **Option 1, Option 4 and Option 8** will not create negative impacts on the traffic system on Winslow Street, of the eight options considered. The remaining five options are either not suitable for the purpose of this report, or have negative impacts, and should be ruled out.
48. The door-knocking survey on 2 October 2009 identified all-day commuter parking as an issue on Winslow Street, and data collected from the September 2009 traffic survey indicate that while Winslow Street is being used for rat-running, vehicle speeds are currently being restricted by the width of the trafficable lanes. This is a desirable situation for road safety. If **Option 1** is adopted, the safe environment on Winslow Street will be maintained for all road users.
49. Speeding is not an issue on Winslow Street, and there is no benefit in introducing additional traffic calming, as discussed in **Option 4**. This option should therefore be ruled out.
50. As previously discussed, **Option 8** will not resolve the parking issues raised by the submitters, and should therefore be ruled out for the purpose of this report.
51. While investigating the options suggested by the submitters, staff have identified another option which the Committee may wish to consider:

Option 9 – Restrict the Winslow Street/Roydvale Ave intersection to left-turn in only/left-turn out only (no right-turn in/no right-turn out)

52. Currently, vehicles queuing in the right turn lane at the Memorial Avenue/Roydvale Avenue signalised intersection may force vehicles intending to turn right into Winslow Street to pause in the middle of the northbound lane on Roydvale Avenue, and this has the potential to cause rear-end crashes.
53. Under this option, it is suggested that a traffic island be constructed on the median on Roydvale Avenue, across the Winslow Street intersection, to prohibit right-turn into Winslow Street from Roydvale Avenue, as well as right-turn into Roydvale Avenue from Winslow Street (refer attached plan).
54. Prohibiting the right turn into Winslow Street will remove the potential for rear-end crashes on Roydvale Avenue. Motorists will still have the options to use Kendal Avenue and Teesdale Street to access the residential area on the southeast side of Roydvale Avenue.
55. The positive aspects of prohibiting right-turn from Winslow Street onto Roydvale Avenue have already been discussed in **Option 8**.
56. By restricting access to, and exit from, Winslow Street, traffic volumes should reduce on Winslow Street, and this should in turn ease congestion on the narrow trafficable lanes caused by parked vehicles. However, the drop in traffic volume is not expected to be significant.
57. **Option 9** should also make the Winslow Street/Roydvale Avenue intersection safer, as it will remove the potential for conflicts arising from right-turning traffic.
58. The owners of all nine properties with boundaries on Winslow Street, and the motel owner at 45 Roydvale Avenue, were consulted on this option at the end of January 2010. Eight responses were received, of which six were for, and two were against, this proposal. This gives a response rate of 80 percent and a support rate of 60 percent.
59. For the above reasons, it is recommended that **Option 9** be adopted, that is, restrict traffic movement at the Winslow Street/Roydvale Avenue intersection to "left-turn in and left-turn" out.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

60. The estimated cost of the median, signs and road markings for this proposal is approximately \$6,500.

6. Cont'd

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

61. This proposal is not in the 2009-19 LTCCP.
62. If approved, funding for this proposal will be sought in the next LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

63. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated 23 December 2009. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of traffic islands and Traffic Control Devices.

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

64. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

65. Aligns with the Streets and Transport activities by contributing to the Council's Community Outcomes-Safety and Community.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

66. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

67. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Pedestrian Strategy 2001, Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

68. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

69. Consultation with residents was carried out, as discussed above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board's Works, Traffic and Environment Committee recommend to the Board to agree with the staff recommendation that:

- (a) The request for parking restrictions on Winslow Street, be rejected.
- (b) The request to convert Winslow Street into a cul-de-sac, be rejected.
- (c) The restriction of the Winslow Street/Roydvale Avenue intersection to left turn in only/left turn out only (ie. no right turn in/no right turn out) be supported by the Board for consideration by the Council for inclusion in the next LTCCP, to be achieved by installing a median, traffic signs and markings on Roydvale Avenue at the Winslow Street intersection.

7. GREATER CHRISTCHURCH METRO STRATEGY REVIEW 2010 – BOARD SUBMISSION

The Committee consider the Environment Canterbury Greater Christchurch Metro Strategy Review 2010 and prepare a draft submission on behalf of the Board if required.