

7. HAREWOOD ROAD PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTIONS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Penny Gray, Traffic Engineer – Transport

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time along sections of Harewood Road adjacent to the proposed pedestrian refuge islands.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The installation of pedestrian refuge islands on Harewood Road is a priority scheme on our minor safety database. This scheme was first identified through a pedestrian and cycle study commissioned by the Council in 2007. Harewood Road is a major arterial road and carries a high volume of traffic which makes it a significant obstacle to pedestrians. There are a number of elderly persons residing in the area, as well as a significant number of school children, all with the desire to cross the road to access retail shopping, schools and churches.
3. Staff are proposing to install three pedestrian refuge islands along Harewood Road (refer **attachments 1 and 2**). One will be an upgrade of an existing island and the other two will be new islands. The position of these islands was recommended in the traffic management plan produced with the above study. Four islands were recommended for installation but only three are proposed to be installed. As part of the railway cycleway project, there is a proposed signalised crossing at the Harewood Road railway line which will render the fourth pedestrian island unnecessary. The introduction of these measures requires no stopping restrictions adjacent to the refuge islands. Staff are requesting that the proposed no stopping restrictions shown on the attached plans be resolved to allow for the installation of the pedestrian refuge islands.
4. Consultation forms were hand delivered to 27 residents and businesses with absentee owners also sent the forms. Forty six key stakeholders were also emailed the information. We received 15 responses, 11 in support of the proposal, three did not support it and one made a comment on a separate issue. Most submitters made comments with all comments addressed separately in letters to them.
5. The three submitters who did not support the proposal all had different reasons. One submitter questioned the design of the hand rails in the pedestrian refuge islands. The design has been altered to comply with our Council standards of two hand rails per refuge island.
6. A key stakeholder did not support the proposal as they do not support the mass installation of pedestrian refuge islands. Their concern was that there has been incidents where drivers have hit the refuge islands and they were concerned with the visibility of them, especially at night. This section of Harewood Road is a straight section with an existing flush median. The median will be widened around the islands but from a drivers perspective they will see little change in the road layout. The proposed pedestrian refuge islands will have 'keep left' signs at either end, two yellow hand rails in the refuge area, RRPM's and edge-line markings around the island. If a driver was to make contact with a refuge island it would be equivalent of them crossing the centre line of the road, which is obviously an unsafe driving practice.
7. An absentee owner was concerned about the loss of parking outside of their property (No.75 behind No.73) and wanted the refuge island located further west. There are generally two points of view when considering no stopping restrictions. Some people view no stopping restrictions as a disadvantage with the loss of on street parking. The other side see it as an advantage as it increases their sightlines when exiting their driveway. Generally people living on busy arterial roads with a high parking demand see no stopping restrictions as an advantage. Locating the refuge island further west would require more no stopping restrictions to be installed on the northern side of Harewood Road.

8. The current position is seen as the best position with one on street parking space outside of 69 Harewood Road retained. The remainder of the on street parking outside No.69 and No.73 Harewood Road is to be removed.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The estimated cost of this proposal is \$35,000, this will be funded through our Minor Safety Projects budget.

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

10. The Minor Safety Projects budget is a line item in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
12. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions.
13. 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?

14. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

15. 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?

16. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

18. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

19. Consultation leaflets were hand delivered to odd numbered houses 37-99 Harewood Road and even numbered houses 54-96 Harewood Road. Forty six leaflets were also sent out to key stakeholders. We received 15 responses, nine were from residents/absentee owners and six from the stakeholders list or have your say. Eleven responses were in support of the proposal, three did not support the proposal and one made a comment on a separate issue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board:

Revoke the following parking restrictions:

- (a) That any existing parking restrictions on the south side of Harewood Road between the intersection of Matsons Avenue and a point 45 metres east of this intersection be revoked.

- (b) That any existing parking restrictions on the north side of Harewood Road between the intersection of Chapel Street and a point 26 metres west of this intersection be revoked.

Approve the following:

- (c) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Harewood Road commencing at the eastern kerbline of Matsons Avenue and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 24 metres;
- (d) That a bus stop be installed on the south side of Harewood Road commencing at a point 24 metres east of the eastern kerbline of Matsons Avenue and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 14 metres;
- (e) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Harewood Road commencing at a point 8 metres east of the western kerbline of Matsons Avenue and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 29.5 metres;
- (f) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Harewood Road commencing at a point 6.5 metres west of the eastern kerbline of Chapel Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 26 metres;
- (g) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Harewood Road commencing at the western kerbline of Chapel Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 26 metres.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.