

10. ERICA STREET – SAFETY CONCERNS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manage
Author:	Basil Pettigrew, Traffic Engineer – Community

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to review the implementation of the following low cost options for safety improvement in Erica Street:
 - (a) Yellow “No Stopping” lines on the bends;
 - (b) Reduction in the speed limit from 50 kilometres per hour to 30 kilometres per hour;
 - (c) Stop signs at either end of Erica Street;
 - (d) Other low cost safety options.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. During the Shirley/Papanui Community Board meeting on 17 December 2008, a petition from residents of Erica Street was submitted to the Board identifying safety concerns associated with speeding traffic in Erica Street.
3. In response to this petition, a memo from staff was circulated to the members of the Shirley/Papanui Community Board on 11 February 2009 explaining the reasons why Erica Street did not have significant traffic safety issues to warrant traffic calming.
4. Subsequently, during its meeting on 18 February 2009, the Board suggested that some low cost options could perhaps be implemented and resolved as follows:

*“The Board **decided** that staff be requested to provide a report on the installation of yellow lines on the bends and the speed limit reduced from 50 kilometres per hour to 30 kilometres per hour, and stop signs at each end of Erica Street and/or other relevant low cost safety options, including consideration of raised medians on corners.”*
5. A seven-day traffic count was carried out from 18 August to 24 August 2009 outside number 11 Erica Street with the following results:
 - (a) Average Daily Traffic Volume – 234 Vehicles
 - (b) 85 percent Speed – 42 kilometres per hour (85 percent travel under that speed)
 - (c) Average Speed – 34 kilometres per hour
 - (d) Peak Traffic volume – 30–36 per hour (3pm–4pm)
6. These figures, together with the absence of any crashes reported to the Police, did not support an application for capital funding to install traffic calming.
7. An assessment of the practicality of implementing the options promoted by the Board has been investigated, including talking to a selection of residents and business owners on site regarding their experience with the traffic issues.

(a) Yellow “No Stopping” Lines on Bend

This option has not met with any support from residents and from a traffic engineering perspective would be counter productive in terms of reducing speed. It is recognised that parking on street creates side friction which has a positive effect on reducing vehicle speed. Residents spoken to prefer not to park on the apex of a bend if an alternative adjacent park is available. Implementation of a parking restriction on the bends could

create issues for residents by eliminating existing parking space during times of peak demand.

(b) Reduction in Speed Limit

This is not an option that the Council promotes for an individual local street in Christchurch as it is recognised that the police do not have sufficient resources available to carry out effective enforcement of such speed limits. Consequently 40 kilometre per hour speed limits are normally only introduced on roads which form part of an area which has well defined boundaries and where physical traffic calming measures are already in place this results in the speed restriction being self-enforcing. An example of this is the 40 kilometre per hour speed zone which has been implemented in Charleston as an area-wide treatment in conjunction with extensive traffic calming and street enhancement with all entry points signed with distinctive speed limit signs.

The posted Speed Limit of 50 kilometres per hour is the maximum speed motorists can travel at. The Road Code states that "You must drive slower if conditions make the speed limit shown unsafe." The majority of motorists in Erica Street are complying with this, as the 85 percent speed is 42 kilometres per hour. There were only five occasions in the seven-day 24-hour period where speeds in the range 55-60 kilometres per hour were recorded. It is therefore concluded that the extreme speedsters reported by the community were not present during the survey period and may have moved to another area.

(c) Stop Signs at either end of Erica Street (Presently Uncontrolled Intersections)

These would have merit in formalising the Give way rule, although would have little influence over the average speed of traffic along Erica Street. There is no crash history to support their installation and the traffic volumes are very low at these locations. Research has shown and is now being promoted that for some situations a reduction in white lines creates uncertainty, thus encouraging drivers to reduce their speed. Road markings and signage have installation and ongoing maintenance costs and the streetscape can also change with their installation.

(d) Other Low Cost Options

(i) Centre line marking

This could be an option at the locations shown on the **attached** plan. The Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004 states that "A driver, when driving, must at all times drive as near as practical to the left side of the roadway unless this rule otherwise provides." However the installation of centrelines can result in motorists needing to cross the centreline when there are parked vehicles in the same area. Centrelines also provide a certain amount of direction to the motorist. The result of this is the average speed goes up.

(ii) Children Warning Signs

Consultation with local residents has determined that there is increasing use of Erica Reserve by young children. It is therefore appropriate to consider the placement of the standard PW – 31 Children Warning sign at the locations shown on the **attached** plan. This can be justified by the proximity of the park and the fact that there is children's playground equipment supplied.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$1,000.

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

9. The installation of road markings and signs is within the LTCCP Streets and Transport Operational Budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/ or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

11. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. 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?

13. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, Pedestrian Strategy 2001, Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

15. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. A selection of residents, including the original petition submitters and local business owners, have been visited to discuss their concerns over traffic safety in Erica Street. They have been given feedback on the traffic speeds recorded during the seven day survey and were advised that the data collected did not support capital funding for traffic calming. The other options reviewed above have also been discussed with them to see if any other low cost options could be supported.
17. They were apposed to the installation of "No Stopping Lines" but were told that the installation of the Children Warning signs at the locations shown on the **attached** plan would be promoted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley / Papanui Community Board:

- (a) Receive the above information;
- (b) Approve that centrelines, as shown on the **attached** plan, be installed;
- (c) Approve that the Children Warning signs be installed

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.