

7. TRAM EXTENSION STUDY

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8177
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Liveable City
Author:	Dave Hinman, Principal Adviser, Strategy and Planning

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. Following on from a Council seminar on 21 August 2007, this report summarises the findings of the consultants for the tram study and the staff response, and reports on some issues relating to “future proofing” the City Mall rebuild to allow for future inclusion of the tram.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In December 2006, following the consideration of submissions on the refurbishment of City Mall, the Council requested “a study into the viability of expanding the tram in the Central City that would serve both tourists and Christchurch residents”. Consultants were engaged to undertake the study, and their findings together with staff comments are suggesting a way forward. An update of a 1999 Light Rail Study was also undertaken. Also at the December meeting, the Council approved “the installation of a concrete base which is able to support a possible future extension of the tram, during the construction of the first section”.
3. After evaluating a number of route options, the consultants opted for a simple extension of the present city loop which leaves the current route at Worcester Bridge – then via Oxford Terrace, Cashel Street, High Street and back through the Square to rejoin the current route behind the Cathedral. It is shown as almost entirely off road, although no details of location are included. It also includes a turn from Cashel Street to High Street around the edges of “Hack Circle”. An alternative, second choice, was similar to the core route but continues along High Street, Manchester and Cashel Streets, back to High Street, to avoid the turn around Hack Circle and to extend further into the area where central city regeneration is currently focussed. These routes are shown in Attachment 1.
4. The report recommends that the Council acknowledge the opportunity and desirability of extending the tram through the Central City, including City Mall. It is further accepted that before a firm proposal can be considered it will require consultation with affected parties along the entire route, development of a complete funding package, and in the case of any route through City Mall, use of a Special Consultative Procedure to alter the status of the Mall. At present the Council is constructing a foundation through City Mall as part of its redevelopment, and it is considered pragmatic to ensure that this is designed with sufficient strength to accommodate any future possible tram extension, along the preferred alignment. To achieve this future proofing, confirmation of some of the details of the route (insofar as it affects City Mall) is needed at this stage.
5. The desirability of a route encompassing Oxford Terrace, Cashel and High Street (Mall) and back through Cathedral Square is acknowledged. The extended route to Manchester Street is preferred by the City Mall designers and Council staff and, when presented at the August seminar was considered to be a better option than the shorter “Hack Circle” route. Staff were asked to further investigate some sub options, including turning the tram at the western façade of the Holiday Inn Hotel as an alternative to continuing to Manchester Street. While the turn at Hack Circle is not favoured, both the extension to Manchester Street and the shorter turn at the Holiday Inn have positive attributes, but there are potential legal difficulties with the Holiday Inn option as it involves crossing a reserve. As the track alignment in the Mall is very similar for both options, the decision on which of these options to support does not need to be made immediately, and it is recommended that further work be undertaken in this regard.
6. In relation to Project City Mall the report reviews the options for future-proofing for later tram operation. Given the existence of a concrete base and tram rail in High Street, but the need to renew the concrete base, the question of re-installing the existing, or replacement rails was considered. While there would be savings in both cost and future disruption by including the rails now, to do so prior to further consultation is likely to raise legal issues of “predetermination” This is not considered an issue in respect of the concrete base only, as a base is an integral part of the mall reconstruction, and the design has been adapted to provide for possible later tram rail additions. There would be no visible signs of the tram option at this stage. The report recommends that as design proceeds for the Hack Circle and Cashel Street sections of the Mall, provision also be made for the installation of a concrete base as previously agreed for High Street.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. It is estimated that the cost of extending the tram from Worcester Street via the Mall and back to Cathedral Square would be in the region of \$4.0M for the Hack Circle option, and \$5.3M for the Manchester Street option. The Holiday Inn option would cost in the region of \$4.5M. Approving and sourcing this funding is not however requested at this stage. Within these totals, the cost of constructing a strengthened concrete base to support a future tram option is \$147,000 for Stage 1 (High Street) and \$314,000 for the subsequent Cashel Street stages. The Council has previously approved the installation of a concrete base in the first stage of Mall reconstruction and this report seeks approval to continue this installation through the latter Mall stages. It should also be noted that if the tram is subsequently added to the mall, part of the surface will need to be lifted to put the rails in place. While this will add a level of cost at that time, the option of putting the rails in place now is not tenable until any future process of consultation around the introduction of any tram per se' is undertaken.

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

8. The additional cost of adapting the concrete base has not been provided for in the City Mall budget. The first section of High Street (from Colombo St to the overbridge) is currently under construction, with the balance of High Street to commence early in 2008. Cashel Street will follow 2008/09. It is proposed to fund this work as a temporary substitution from the Major Amenity budget in the Transport and Greenspace 2008/09 capital programme. This will require the estimated costs to be brought forward to 2007/08. The substitution will be addressed in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. As indicated earlier in this report, the Council has previously approved the installation of a concrete base that is able to support a possible future extension of the current tram route through the City. The base is to be included in the construction of the first stage (High Street) of the improvements being carried out to the mall. This report is also requesting that the base be constructed in the subsequent stages (ie Cashel Street)
10. At present the City Mall is designated a pedestrian mall by way of a Special Order made by the Council in 1981. Allowing the area covered by the Special Order to be used as a road by vehicles (other than service vehicles as currently specified) or as a tram route would require the Special Order to be varied. A decision to do this could not be made by the Council without first consulting with the public by way of the special consultative procedure.
11. The intention at this stage is only to install the concrete base on which tram tracks could be laid at some future time. By doing this, the Council is taking no steps to vary the current use of the mall. The concrete base will be underneath a paved surface. A proposal to retain the existing (1920s) base and tram tracks in High St has proven to be impractical.
12. Consultation with the public in respect of the proposed improvements to the City Mall generated support for the future extension of the tram route. Therefore, it makes economic sense for the Council to make provision for this possibility during construction of those improvements. Any decision on whether or not to proceed with the tram proposal can only be made, however, after further consultation, including on the method of funding for such a project.
13. Also, a matter for consideration with regard to any future decision on the tram extension will be the effect of the Christchurch City (Reserves) Empowering Act 1971. This Act vested in the Council a number of pieces of land in the central city as reserves to be used as lawns, ornamental gardens and for ornamental buildings. The option for extending the tram route to include a turning circle at the intersection of Cashel and High Streets (Holiday Inn option) would require rails to be laid across one of these reserves, and one alignment shown of the track via Manchester Street crosses another. Using the land for this purpose is contrary to the provisions of the legislation.

14. The reserves are held and administered by the Council subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977. Whilst seeking an amendment to the Christchurch City (Reserves) Empowering Act may be an option, it might also be possible for a right of way to be granted under the Reserves Act that would enable the tram to pass over the reserve land. The matter will require further investigation.

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

15. It is the view of the Legal Services Unit that there are no legal implications arising from a decision by the Council to include in the construction of the improvements to the City Mall a concrete base that is able to support a possible future extension of the City's tram route.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

16. Funding for the City Mall project is included in the 2006-16 LTCCP. Extension of the tram is not funded. This report is not recommending extending the tram route at this stage, but rather to "future proof" for its possible extension later.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

17. An extension of the tram route is consistent with the Central City Revitalisation Strategy, Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy and the Christchurch Visitor Strategy. The proposal at this stage is not to extend the route, but to "future-proof" for its possible extension.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. Consultation on Project City Mall in 2006 favoured extending the tram through the Mall. As noted in paragraph 9 (legal considerations) further consultation will be needed to approve both funding and changes to the City Mall Special Order.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Acknowledge the desirability of extending the tram route to incorporate Oxford Terrace, City Mall (Cashel and High Streets), Colombo Street and Cathedral Square, joining the existing line behind the Cathedral.
- (b) Acknowledge the merits of the tram either continuing along High to Manchester to Cashel Streets or turning across the reserve to the west of the Holiday Inn Hotel and request a further report on which of these options should be recommended.
- (c) Authorise further work on the route details, cost estimates and funding options with a view to progressing the proposal through the 2009-19 LTCCP.
- (d) "Future proof" for the extension of the tram by
 - (i) Confirming the general route (as per (a) above) for future planning and investigative purposes.
 - (ii) Approve the design and construction of the strengthened concrete base for the later stages of the Mall reconstruction (ie Cashel Street) in addition to High Street (already approved).

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

19. The design for Project City Mall as consulted on during September - October 2006 included extending the tram through the Mall as an option, although it was not provided for in the Mall Project budget. The route as shown proposed that the tram be extended through Tramway Lane and Tattersalls Lane south to Cashel Street, then west along Cashel to Oxford Terrace, joining the existing line at the Worcester Bridge.
20. The consultation revealed significant support for extending the tram through the Mall, with nearly two-thirds of respondents in favour. A more detailed breakdown is as follows:

Q. "The extension of the tram is not funded as part of this project, however do you think that the tram route should be extended through City Mall?"

63% of all those who responded favoured tram (537)

63% of shoppers (312)

73% of business/property owners (55)

74% workers (90)

64% visiting café/restaurant (185)

67% residents (51)

44% students (82)

23% school pupils (26)

This compared to 16% (of 533) who supported a more modern form of transport eg the Shuttle, through the City Mall area.

21. The broad support for the tram (including business/property owners, shoppers, workers and residents) could be interpreted as an acceptable solution by those both strongly supporting and opposing having a road with private vehicles through the mall.
22. The tram operator (Christchurch Tramway Ltd) was also supportive, but considered that the route proposed by the designers was impractical, because of the very narrow nature of Tattersalls Lane and because it bypassed Cathedral Square, the stop used by more than 70% of patrons. It suggested other options which by changing the direction of the tram to anti-clockwise, ensured that the tram always passed through Cathedral Square.
23. The Council when considering the City Mall report at its meeting on 14 December 2006 included in its resolutions:

"(d) Approve the installation of a concrete base which is able to support a possible future extension of the tram, during the construction of the first section"

and

"(f) Authorise a study into the viability of expanding the tram in the Central City that would service both tourists and Christchurch residents, with an initial report by June 2007."
24. Following a tender process, consultants Maunsell Ltd were engaged to undertake the tram study, and an update of a 1999 Light Rail Study was also done by the original authors (Booz Allen Hamilton). Key stakeholders, including the Central City Business Association, Christchurch Tramway Ltd, the Heritage Tramways Trust, Environment Canterbury and Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism as well as relevant Council staff were consulted as part of the study. The report back to the seminar (and as set out below) has incorporated Council staff views as well as those of the consultant.
25. The study found that the current tram service is highly focused as a tourist attraction. In addition some 6000 local residents hold annual passes, which also give access to the Port Hills Gondola. An expansion of the existing route could achieve the following:

- Assist with the rejuvenation of the central city by bringing more movement and people.
 - Attract additional tourists - perceived value of a lengthened trip.
 - Expand the existing tourism experience by incorporating new attractions.
 - Create a route to attract locals to use the tram as an extension of existing mobility services in the central city e.g. buses, free shuttle.
 - Create a core route with potential as future light rail services loop.
26. The study considered a variety of route options and based its recommendations on the following route selection criteria:
- Promotion of tourism
 - Mobility around the City
 - Future compatibility for commuting
 - Continuance of Historic theme
 - Constructability
 - Infrastructure Cost
 - Operational Practicality
 - Safety
 - Impact on traffic and parking
 - Consistency with future development
 - Access to additional tram storage
27. The preferred route as recommended by the consultants was an anti-clockwise loop utilising the existing track from behind the Cathedral to the Worcester bridge, and travelling along Oxford Terrace to Cashel, along Cashel to High, then along High to Colombo and back through the Square to the existing line. (Attachment 1). It ensured use of the Cathedral Square stop, as requested by the tram operator, and could operate either with the existing route as a “figure of 8” or independently. The consultant also chose locations in both Oxford Terrace and Colombo Street/Cathedral Square where the tram could operate independently of street traffic.

Attractions along the route include:

- Oxford Terrace Strip
 - Avon River Views, inc Water Wheel
 - Bridge of Remembrance
 - Ballantynes
 - Other City Mall etc Retail (Cashel, High & Colombo St South of Cathedral Sq)
 - Connection to the (existing) Bus Exchange
 - Cathedral Square
28. The consultants also identified an option which further extended the preferred route with additional trackage along High Street to Manchester Street then back along Cashel street to the High/Cashel intersection. This is also shown in Attachment 1. A variant of this is to (in the future) continue the line along High Street towards the Catholic Cathedral and Polytechnic. The extended route also gets the tram in closer proximity to SOL, Lichfield Lanes/High St, focal points of central city revitalisation.
29. The mall designers do not support the tram turning at Cashel/High (“Hack circle”) and the extension to Manchester Street is favoured. This is also supported by Council staff. Given the decision already made to install a concrete base in the first stage of the Mall refurbishment (High Street) as future-proofing for the tram, an early indication of which route would be favoured is needed so that detailed mall design may proceed beyond the first stage.
30. At the seminar some variations of these two options were suggested and these have been investigated as follows:
- (a) Continue east along High and Cashel Streets but turn across the west face of the Holiday Inn (i.e. do not continue to Manchester Street). This option is shown as Attachment 2. This would overcome the Hack Circle turning issue and would avoid the tram having to mix with traffic in Manchester Street as well as being a less expensive option, but it has some disadvantages.

Firstly the triangular land in front of the Holiday Inn is designated as reserve "for the purposes of lawns, ornamental gardens, and ornamental buildings" (Christchurch City (Reserves) Empowering Act 1971), and this may mean considerable difficulties in obtaining consent. The adjoining owners may not be supportive of a tram/tram stop on what has been a quiet and passive public space. Also, the space available requires a full turn at a tighter radius than is ideal for tram operation, as well as affecting areas of car parking in both High and Cashel Streets. Finally the positive impact on penetrating a key revitalisation area is reduced.

- (b) Reverse the direction of the High- Manchester- Cashel extension by continuing the track along Cashel to Manchester with it crossing itself on the return via High Street. This option is shown as Attachment 3. This has the advantage of less curved track at Cashel/ High, but the disadvantage of an expensive and potentially noisy rail crossing plus the creation of a contra flow lane for the tram only in Manchester Street, eliminating the left turn lane into Cashel Street. At this stage it is considered that the consultant's option, detailed as Attachment 4, is the more suitable option, although some more work is needed to determine alignment as it enters Manchester Street and the issue of how general traffic would then access this part of High Street.

Costs of Each Option

31. The consultant for the tram study estimated that, if using all new rail, the route turning at Hack Circle is likely to have a total cost of \$4.6M. It appears that this may be conservative and that a more likely cost is \$4.0M. The consultant also suggested an additional cost of \$1M for continuing the track beyond Hack Circle in the form of the High/Manchester/Cashel loop (Attachment 4) Council calculations suggest \$1.3M for this extension. The shortened loop in front of the Holiday Inn would cost less because of its shorter distance, with an estimated additional cost of \$460,000, giving a total for this option of \$4.46M. The cost of the reverse direction loop (Attachment 3) would be higher than the consultant's option because of the need for crossing "special work" and for physical separation of the tram from other traffic in Manchester Street. The additional cost is estimated to be \$70,000.
32. Should the Council decide to pursue the tram extension proposal, more work will be needed on the actual locations in Oxford Terrace, the extended loop area (High, Manchester, Cashel Streets, and Colombo Street/Cathedral Square. There are some clear advantages in the off road locations as suggested by the consultant (including a possible future Light Rail loop) but there are also some negatives. The next stage of the study will be to evaluate the location options.

Economic Benefits

33. Economic benefits:
- Currently 156,000 tourists p.a. (hop on/off for up to 2 days)
 - Currently 6000 local annual passes (linked to Gondola). A change in charging regime may be needed to achieve greater local use. Slow speed and ease of access are seen as issues by some.
 - Tourist numbers may grow by up to 4% p.a. with extension
 - Visitor spend due to growth in tourist numbers may increase by \$350,000 p.a. No assessment was made of additional spend along the new route by current numbers of tourists.
 - The most significant economic benefit is to the new area served by tram with up to 150,000 more people visiting per annum
 - The tram is now an internationally recognised icon of Christchurch – new areas served by tram would benefit from image, publicity etc

No analysis of impact of any increase in local use has been undertaken. Spending by locals using the tram may also increase along the tram route, but not necessarily their net central city spend.

Operating Costs

34. Operating costs:

- Ongoing costs to Council of the extended line not identified in the study
- For the current route, the annual licence fee paid by operator more than covers Council's costs, other than costs of capital, now spread across total borrowings
- For 2006/07 there was a surplus in the tram account of \$112,000 after deduction of depreciation (\$95K) and Council share of maintenance.
- Operating costs for the tram company will increase with a longer route, (including requirement for extra tram(s)). Without a significant increase in patronage, any increase in Council licence fees may not be viable. Extra storage space will be required if more trams used.
- Ongoing Council costs for extension will be affected by method of funding - yet to be determined.

Funding Options

35. One or more of the following options were suggested by the consultants and need to be the subject of further investigation:

- Current capital funding
- Part LTNZ subsidy
- Local special rate
- Increased licence fee from tram company to fund borrowings
- Direct contributions from tram company and other businesses

36. Booz Allen Hamilton study and comments.

- Updated 1999 costs for on rail and on road light rail
- Confirmed Maunsell capital cost estimates
- Any light rail option must be integrated with Metro system
- ECan are leading a strategic review of Public Transport Future to 2041.
- Any study of rail needs to link to the Greater Christchurch UDS objectives
- Many variables to resolve before any confirmation that proposed new tram loop could be part of future light rail.

Concrete Base Issue

37. Following on from the Council decision in December, investigations carried out in March to confirm the location of services also confirmed an existing concrete base together with rails. (double track) However it is not complete - it had been cut by services, planting of trees etc. Tests showed that rail is suitable for reuse, though surface will need cleaning and grinding. It was proposed to leave track in situ, on the existing base, repairing both as necessary, and if the tram does not eventuate, rails would remain as an historic feature.

38. However, because of the uncertainty of the quality of existing base, built in the 1920s with little reinforcing, the need to remove a significant depth of concrete to accommodate new pavers, and the need for additional drainage because of levels (determined by top of rail), the decision has been made to replace the old concrete base.

39. This raises issues of whether to reinstate rail now or later, which rail to use (it may be better to use new or other rail - retrieved rail could be used elsewhere) and additional costs. Ideally rail would be reinstated now to avoid future disruption, and to save later costs. But this could be interpreted as pre-determining the decision of whether the tram route should be extended, a decision not yet made or tested through formal public consultation. The design of the base will provide for later retrofitting, if the tram is confirmed, but there are additional costs involved in the design solution which could be avoided if the rail was laid at the time of mall reconstruction. It would also require the temporary lifting of the new pavers which would therefore need to be loose laid on sand rather than the preferred solution of affixing to concrete.

40. Costs of constructing concrete base to allow for tram @ \$980 per lineal metre

High Street (mall)	150 metres = \$147,000
Cashel Street (mall)	320 metres = \$314,000

Additional costs @ \$1564 per metre of installing rail at same time, (assuming new rail)

High Street (mall)	150m = \$234,600
Cashel Street (mall)	320m = \$500,500

However if rail (new) is added later the costs increase to \$2017 per metre resulting in the following:

High Street (mall)	150m = \$302,550
Cashel Street (mall)	320m = \$645,460

That is an overall extra cost of \$212,910

- Note:
1. These cost estimates exclude contingencies and any provision for escalation.
 2. The purchase of new rail for both Cashel and High Streets has been assumed – if existing rail, retrieved from High Street, is reused, there will be some savings. The existing rail is being retrieved, partially cleaned and stored in the meantime, at an estimated cost of \$22,000.
 3. Because the dimensions of the rail to be used are not yet known, but it has been necessary to progress stage 1 design, a more complex design has been assumed, to allow for a range of sizes. For later stages, if rail size has been determined, the design can be simplified and costs reduced.

THE OBJECTIVES

41. Acknowledge the desirability of extending the tram in the future and where this should be (subject to public consultation and securing funding). Future proofing for tram extension - in particular in the Mall, but also the balance of the identified route. Allow City mall design and construction to proceed in a timely and cost-effective manner.

THE OPTIONS

42. A. Do nothing (most cost later/ most disruption).
- B. Agree on future route option, do detailed design of complete route, construct tramway now through the whole of the mall (High and Cashel).
- C. Agree on future route option (to the extent necessary for City Mall redevelopment) and construct concrete base only through the whole of the mall (High Street already approved).
- D. Agree on future route option and retain/reuse existing/replacement rails in High Street as part of current re-construction. Undertake consultation in time to also install rails in Cashel Street as part of mall construction programme. (least cost/least disruption).

THE PREFERRED OPTION

43. While Option D is the most cost effective and least disruptive, **Option C** is the preferred option. This has the advantage of future proofing for the tram extension, should it be agreed to later by Council while minimising commitment to it at this time. Inclusion of the rails as well as the base (option D) would be a cheaper option and would avoid having to dig up the service lane later and potentially having to replace parts of the new surface, but may be seen as pre-determining the Council's decision-making and consultation process to extend the tram.

Option A (do nothing) is not favoured as there is an immediate need to give some guidance to the City mall designers, and contractors. This is both in respect of the route of the future tram extension (should it be agreed to following consultation) and to allow for future proofing later stages of the project, noting that first stage demolition and construction, and stage two design work is now under way.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Preferred Option

44. Option C – add concrete base only (Cashel Street) (High Street already approved)

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	n/a	
Cultural	High Street – reconstruction of part of historic tram line, future possibility of heritage trams on original route	
Environmental	limited future disruption in Mall	Some disruption if tracks added later; temporary impact on business
Economic	Retrofitting costs reduced (c.f. option a) if tram goes ahead Businesses believe tram will bring significant economic benefit to area	Costs of adaptation of base not recouped if tram does not proceed Some possible temporary impact on businesses in mall
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Tram will contribute towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a city with a sustainable.. environment - a prosperous city - a safe city - a cultural and fun city - a liveable city <p>This option helps future proof for the tram</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Relatively minor - allocate a further \$314,000</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>n/a</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Central City Revitalisation Strategy, Greater Christchurch UDS, Christchurch Visitor Strategy.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>Strong support from Central City Business Association, Christchurch Tramway Ltd. May be opposed by those who do not favour a tram extension.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>Facilitates design and construction decisions for Project City Mall.</p>		

Maintain the Status Quo (if not preferred option)

45. Option A – do nothing

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social		Tram may be less likely to be built if newly completed mall has to be dug up again - tram adds to safety in the mall.
Cultural		Tram may be less likely to be built if newly completed mall has to be dug up again - tram in the mall adds liveliness, and heritage
Environmental		Noise and disruption for a second time if and when tram is extended
Economic	Less cost now, but adds to cost later if tram goes ahead	Most costly option for future extension of tram through mall
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Doing nothing would not help achieve the community outcomes identified in Options C and D</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>nil</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>nil</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Yes, to the extent that the tram extension is not currently included in the LTCCP, but no in that providing for a future extension would be consistent with Central City Revitalisation, Greater Christchurch UDS and Christchurch Visitor Strategy.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>Would be supported by those opposed to tram, and strongly opposed by those in support - especially Central City Business Association</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>City mall design compromised if tram agreed later</p>		

At Least one Other Option

46. Option D (Install concrete base + rails in both High and Cashel Streets)

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	More likely that tram will proceed later, bringing social benefits such as safety	
Cultural	More likely that tram will proceed later - bringing liveliness and heritage to mall.	
Environmental	No future disruption - mall is only dug up once	
Economic	Most cost effective option. Allows for simplified design, and no losses due to future re-excavation	

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Tram will contribute towards:
 - a city with a sustainable.. environment
 - a prosperous city
 - a safe city
 - a cultural and fun city
 - a liveable city

This option best helps future proof for the tram

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:

Significant - need to allocate, by substitution, up to \$1.048M

Effects on Maori:

NA.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Yes - Central City Revitalisation Strategy, Greater Christchurch UDS, Christchurch Visitor Strategy, but may be seen as pre-judging consultation.

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

Strong support from Central City Business Association, Christchurch Tramway Ltd. May be opposed by those who do not favour a tram extension.

Other relevant matters:

While rails in the mall do not in themselves change the status of the pedestrian mall, and the rest of extension would need to be constructed, wires erected etc before trams could use it, it will be interpreted by some as a decision to extend the tramway, ahead of an SCP. With mall design and construction proceeding now would be difficult to undertake SCP ahead of construction.