

3. FENDALTON ROAD CONSULTATION

Officer responsible City Streets Manager	Author Mike Calvert
Corporate Plan Output: Information and Advice to Council	

The purpose of this report is to inform the Committee of the results of the public consultation for the proposed improvements to Fendalton Road and to recommend an agreed design to the Council for the basis of the required resource consent application.

BACKGROUND

The issues and objectives for the redevelopment of Fendalton Road were agreed to by the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board and the City Services Committee in September 1999. As a result, two scheme options for the redevelopment of the road were developed and presented at the February 2000 round of meetings. One option featured a 2 metre solid median and the second incorporated a 3.4 metre solid median. At these meetings the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board and the City Services Committee resolved to proceed with the development of the option with the wider median.

The February 2000 meeting of the Council subsequently passed the following resolutions:

1. That subject to the design and engineering requirements and provision for cyclists, the Council endorse the proposal for the construction of the 3.4 metre solid median for Fendalton Road.
2. That the design ensure the maximum retention of significant trees.

A combined workshop of the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board and the City Services Committee was held on 3 August 2000 to discuss the proposed design for public consultation. As a result of this meeting a public consultation pamphlet was prepared and distributed to the residents of Fendalton Road, from the railway to Clyde Road, and to the affected side roads.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Public consultation was initiated on Friday 25 August 2000 when a pamphlet was sent out to the land owners along Fendalton Road from the railway line to Clyde Road. The households on the side roads which are affected in some way by the proposed works along Fendalton Road were also notified. The pamphlet distribution is shown in Table 1.

Where the postal address differed from the street address it was assumed that the property may be rented and a further pamphlet was hand delivered to each of these addresses (96 pamphlets) on the following Tuesday 29 August 2000.

The pamphlet was also sent out to the usual City Streets mailing list (approximately 200), which includes all Councillors, Community Board members and Council units.

Table 1: Pamphlet Distribution

Road	Range	Number Distributed
Fendalton Road	Railway to Clyde Road	105
Stratford Street	All	54
Jacksons Road	All	56
Idris Road	Fendalton to Snowdon	13
Straven Road	Fendalton to Royds	17
Heathfield Avenue	All	12
Snowdon Road	All	37
Tui Street	Fendalton to Weka	26
St Barnabas Lane	All	4
Makora Street	All	38
Glandovey Road	Fendalton to Thornycroft	33
Willowbrook Street	All	12
Waiwetū Street	All	58
Total		461

There were also pamphlets available for the general public at the Fendalton Service Centre (1,000), Civic Offices (100) at the local service station on Fendalton Road (50) and at the Students Association at Canterbury University (50).

A press release was sent out to the local newspapers, radio stations and television stations. The Star and the Press included articles on the proposed works on 26 August and there was also an article in the September City Scene.

Large scale plans of the proposal were on display at the Council's Fendalton office for those wishing to look at the detail of the plan, particularly the landscaping.

Written Submissions

A large number of written submissions have been received from the residents and from the people who use the road. A total of 260 submissions had been received by 6 October, which includes a submission from St Barnabas Church containing over 600 signatures. A number of the signatories have also sent in individual submissions.

It is anticipated that submissions will continue to arrive given the level of interest shown in this project. Any submissions which arrive after this time will be available at the City Services Committee meeting, as will all of the written submissions.

The consulting firm Francis and Cambridge were employed to prepare an analysis of the issues raised in the written submissions. Tables 2 & 3 shows a break down of the submissions received up to and including 6 October 2000. A copy of the full results of the analysis is attached (Attachment 1). Mr Francis will be available at the meeting to answer any questions regarding this analysis.

The response to question: 'Do you support the Garden City Gateway Plan?' is given in Table 2.

Table 2: Level of Support/Opposition

Feedback form question:	Number	Percent
Do you support the Garden City Gateway Plan?		
Yes	99	38.08
No	99	38.08
Conditional support	62	23.85
Total	260	100.00

It can be seen that unconditional levels of support and opposition are even although there was also a high level of conditional support for the plan. In the majority of cases the concept was supported but the submitters stated that more on-street parking should be provided.

The 260 submissions which were received up to and including Friday 6 October have been analysed and 1,164 points have been coded and were grouped under 23 headings:

Table 3: Breakdown of Written Submissions

	Comments	Number	Percent of comments	Percent of submitters
A	Comments of General Support	145	12.46	55.77
B	Comments of General Opposition	132	11.34	50.77
C	Comments on the Consultation Process	13	1.12	5.00
	Totals	290	24.91	111.54
D	Parking	348	29.90	133.85
E	Median	104	8.93	40.00
F	Planting / landscaping	89	7.65	34.23
G	Cycle facilities	78	7.65	34.23
H	Design Details	44	3.78	16.92
J	Traffic Signals	29	2.49	11.15
K	Traffic movements and flows	29	2.49	11.15
L	Intersections	29	2.49	11.15
M	Pedestrians	29	2.49	11.15
N	Property Values	26	2.23	10.00
P	Bus stops and Service	19	1.63	7.31
Q	Speed Limit and Safety	14	1.20	5.38
R	Planning and Cost	9	0.77	3.46
S	Gateway to City	6	0.52	2.31
T	Construction	6	0.52	2.31
U	Footpaths	4	0.34	1.54
V	Development	4	0.34	1.54
W	Services	3	0.26	1.15
X	Adjacent areas	3	0.26	1.15
Y	Street Lighting	1	0.09	0.38
	Totals of all comments	1164	100.00	447.69

The submissions were initially supportive of the proposed design with a number of submitters supporting the concepts subject to some concerns regarding particular aspects of the design. The concerns were mainly about the lack of on-street parking shown on the consultation plan, particularly with regard to St Barnabas Church.

A copy of the initial submissions was sent out to the members of the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board and the City Services Committee for their information on 21 September 2000. At about this time a resident of Fendalton Road also distributed a flier (Attachment 2) to the properties along Fendalton Road, from Deans Avenue to Clyde Road, and to the side roads. This resulted in a number of phone calls and written submissions being received.

Public Meetings

The pamphlets that were posted out to the land owners also included a letter (Attachment 3) which invited the land owner to attend a public meeting to discuss any concerns they may have regarding the proposed plans for Fendalton Road. Where a resident could not attend a meeting they were invited to ring the Council to make alternative arrangements. A number of people took advantage of this and either attended on another night or were visited individually at their homes. A number of people who could not attend also took the opportunity to ring to discuss the issues which concerned them.

Table 4: Workshop Timetable

Road	Length	Number Houses	Number Attended	Day	Date	Time
Fendalton	Clyde to Glandovey	24	5 (5)	Mon	4-Sep	7pm
Fendalton	Glandovey to Snowdon	20	8 (8)	Tue	5-Sep	7:30pm
Fendalton	Snowdon to Idris	7	7 (6)	Wed	6-Sep	7pm
Heathfield	All	13		Wed	6-Sep	7pm
Snowdon	All	37	6 (4)	Thur	7-Sep	7pm
Waiwetu	Sth half	29	4 (2)	Sat	9-Sep	10am
Waiwetu	Nth half	29	0 (0)	Sat	9-Sep	12.30pm
Glandovey	Fendalton to Thornycroft	33	3 (3)	Mon	11-Sep	7pm
Fendalton	Clyde to Makora	4	8 (7)	Tue	12-Sep	7pm
Willowbrook	All	12		Tue	12-Sep	7pm
Fendalton	Makora to Heathfield	6	2 (1)	Wed	13-Sep	7pm
Makora	All	38	7 (5)	Thur	14-Sep	7pm
Stratford	Sth half	27	4 (2)	Sat	16-Sep	10am
Stratford	Nth half	27	2 (1)	Sat	16-Sep	12.30pm
Tui	All	26	4 (4)	Mon	18-Sep	7pm
Fendalton	Idris to rail	25	7 (4)	Tue	19-Sep	7pm
Fendalton	Idris to rail	18	4 (3)	Wed	20-Sep	7pm
Idris	Fendalton to Snowdon	13	3 (3)	Thur	21-Sep	7pm
Straven	Fendalton to Royds	17		Thur	21-Sep	7pm
Jackson	Sth half	26	2 (2)	Sat	23-Sep	10am
Jackson	Nth half	30	0 (0)	Sat	23-Sep	12.30pm
Total		461	76 (60)			

There were a total of 18 public meetings held over a three week period as shown on Table 4. At each meeting the basis of the proposed engineering and landscape design and the process was presented. Questions and discussion were then invited from those in attendance, with each meeting lasting, on average, from 1 to 1.5 hours.

Table 4 shows the number of households that were invited to each workshop and the number of people who actually attended each meeting. It should be noted that in some cases there was more than one person from the property that attended. The number of properties represented is shown in brackets.

Individual presentations were also made to the Automobile Association, Taxi Federation and to the University of Canterbury Transport Committee at their request.

A record of the issues raised by the people who attended these meetings is attached (Attachment 4). The concerns expressed at each of the meetings were similar in nature and have been summarised as follows in order of priority:

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Parking | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- lack of parking for residents and church- need for compromise between landscaping and parking- clearways should be used- provision for visitors/trade vehicles needed |
| Cycle facilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- why provide for so few cyclists- replace cycle lanes with parking- arterial roads not safe for cyclists- make cyclists use other roads- make cycle lanes off-road paths |
| Speed Limit | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- work will increase speed |
| Planting | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- exotics preferred to natives- visibility for side streets and driveways- local concerns over individual plants- high level of maintenance required |
| Bus stops | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- safety concerns with stops in lane- need for car driver education |
| Idris/Straven | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- difficulty with right turns |
| Median | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- narrower median wanted- more turning bays wanted, also at side streets- safety of u-turn bays- position of u-turn bays- why have median at all |
| Footpaths | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- security lighting and planting- alignment- signalise crossing at Hollylea |

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| Consultation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - will Council make any changes - consultation process not adequate |
| Construction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - disruption associated with construction - length of time taken (approximately 18 months) |
| Services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - water mains need replacement |

There were also a large number of positive comments regarding the thought which has been put into the design with the majority of residents (certainly not all) in favour of the overall concepts but concerned about individual aspects of the design.

There were also a number of people who were concerned about individual aspects of the landscaping outside their properties. In most cases these concerns were addressed by either retaining the plants or offering to shift them at the time construction takes place.

The vast majority of those who expressed some concerns did so with regard to the lack of parking both for the residents and for St Barnabas Church. There were some residents who favoured the provision of landscaping over parking, commenting that people would need to learn to walk a bit further, but these people were in the minority.

Phone Calls and Visits

A number of people (39) who could not attend the meetings took the opportunity to phone to discuss issues with respect to the proposed plan. In some cases visits were made to look at individual issues on-site. A summary of the issues, both positive and negative, are attached (Attachment 5).

In each case the caller was encouraged to send in a written submission and the issues raised during the calls and visits are repeated throughout the written submissions.

DISCUSSION OF SUBMISSIONS

The consultation process has produced a number of issues with regard to the proposed design which submitters feel need to be addressed. Whilst in a perfect world all the submissions could be adequately addressed, in reality this is not possible due to the conflicting requirements of the variety of people using the road. Keeping this in mind, where appropriate the submissions have been considered in this section of the report and a number of resultant changes to the consultation plan have been recommended.

Starting with the easier issues and working up to the difficult ones:

Left Turn Lane at Glandovey

The left turn lane from Fendalton Road into Glandovey Road was minimised in the initial plan to retain a tree shown as high value in the Boffa Miskell survey. Further investigation has shown that this tree is in poor health and it has been recommended to be removed.

This being the case it is **recommended** the lane be extended to provide extra capacity for this movement.

Left turn slip lane at Straven Road

Several submitters seek the removal of this lane due to the potential impact on the safety of access to their properties. This lane has a low capacity due to the low number of vehicles which turn left into Straven Road from Fendalton Road and was included in the design to also act as a pedestrian refuge to reduce crossing times. The redesign of the intersection brings turning vehicles very close to a number of drives along Straven Road. A review of this feature shows that there will be no loss of capacity and the crossing distances for pedestrians will only increase minimally (maximum 1 second).

It is therefore **recommended** that the current lane layout be retained.

Landscaping

There are numerous issues regarding the proposed landscaping which have been raised through the submissions. A number of people have commented that it is good to see a proper landscape plan for the entire road and the retention of the substantial trees.

A number of submitters are concerned that landscaping takes precedence over parking and further that all the plan proposes to do is replace mature trees with young ones which are prone to vandalism. There are also a number of submissions which reject the planting of trees in the median in favour of retention of parking along the sides of the road.

A submission from the LTSA has highlighted their 'Guidelines for Planting for Road Safety' which suggest that in urban areas large trees must be at least 3 metres from the carriageway and frangible trees 1 metre. Given the planting which has been used in the reconstruction of Lincoln Road and Blenheim Road () it seems that the Council has not adopted these guidelines and has instead chosen to use larger trees to enhance the landscape values of these areas of public space.

A number of submissions have asked for particular plants to be retained and where the plant is healthy and does not compromise personal security they have been retained or will be shifted at the appropriate time.

Overall, the submissions are a mix of opposing views and opinions as to the best means to landscape the road, the major issues being the trees along the centre of the road, the impact on parking and the removal of substantial trees. The proposed design utilises a lot of the existing planting and builds on it to provide a well landscaped environment, rather than a random mix of plants which were previously part of a variety of private gardens.

It is **recommended** that the proposed landscape design used in the consultation be reaffirmed by the Committee.

Right turn arrows at Clyde/Straven

There is currently some delay for eastbound vehicles right turning right at the Fendalton/Straven intersection at peak times. The installation of right turn phases will however, incur overall delays at this intersection for all drivers. It is recognised that the introduction of the solid median may increase the right turns at this intersection in the short term but it is anticipated that this will reduce as drivers find new routes to their destinations.

It is therefore **recommended** that the installation of right turn phases be reviewed 6 months after the completion of the reconstruction of Fendalton Road.

Pedestrian Signals

Submissions have been received wanting the introduction of pedestrian signals on Fendalton Road outside Hollylea Residents Home. The consultation plan currently shows an uncontrolled crossing on this section of the road. Signals Engineer, Bill Sissons, has confirmed that signals could be installed at this location with minimal effect on the operational efficiency of the road if the crossing were operated as two separate phases. No surveys have been undertaken to ascertain the demand for a signalised crossing for pedestrians, but signals would increase accessibility for elderly pedestrians. There are currently plans to expand Hollylea which will increase the demand for crossing facilities in this vicinity.

It is therefore **recommended** that the installation of signals be further investigated and that the crossing point shown be moved east to allow for the installation of signals in the future.

Bus Stops

Some concern (and support) has been shown regarding the safety of the proposal to stop buses in the kerbside lanes rather than constructing bus bays. This concept has been used safely in both Auckland and overseas to better provide for public transport along major roads. The major difference with the design used in this case is the addition of the alternative cycle lanes to provide safe access around stopped buses. Along Fendalton Road the in-lane stops have the added bonus that they do not require the removal of planting to provide for the stops. The concept has been through an independent safety audit and has been viewed by LTSA and the Automobile Association as well as being discussed with internal staff and representatives of public transport and cycle groups. It is therefore recommended that the bus stops be retained in their proposed form.

The consultation plan shows the bus stop which is currently outside St Barnabas shifted to the area outside 163/165 Fendalton Road. The proposed shifting of the stop was mooted when the stops were reviewed with the redesign of the road to shift it closer to Glandovey Road. The residents of these units are not happy with the placement of the stop due to the proximity of the living areas of their houses (approximately 1.5 metres) to the stop combined with the low fence on their property frontage. It is seen that the bus stop will take away any privacy they currently have in the living areas of their houses.

It is therefore **recommended** that the stop is shifted to the east by approximately 60 metres. This will place the stop adjacent to two mature trees which will screen the stop from the house, which is well set back and which has a high concrete fence along its frontage.

Driveway Access

Safe access to properties is an issue with some submitters due to the lack of a parking lane to pull across into when entering/exiting properties. It is proposed to widen the crossings to each property by 0.5 metres to ease access problems. When the cycle lane is not being used this can be utilised in a similar fashion to that which a parking lane is currently used.

It is **recommended** that all driveways be widened by an extra 0.5 metres on the approach side of the crossing.

Cycle Facilities

A number of submitters have suggested that cyclists should use other roads, or that there are so few cyclists using Fendalton Road that the cycle lanes should be removed to provide for car parking outside properties. I'm not sure if the submissions suggesting that cyclists should be forced off Fendalton Road were intended to be treated seriously but this is not an option. The removal of the marked cycle lanes does not automatically free up 1.5 metres of road space which can then be used for car parking. Without the marked lanes the kerbside traffic lane would have to be increased from the proposed width of 3.1 metres to a minimum width of 4.2 metres to safely provide for cyclists (as legitimate road users) in this lane. The net gain in road space would therefore be 0.4 metres.

The concept of an off-road cycle path is attractive to many submitters to provide some separation between vehicles and cyclists. This would have the added attraction of moving the kerb construction further from the existing high quality trees which are to be retained.

There are however disadvantages with the paths, the major one being the inability to cross side streets safely. It has been noted in a submission from LTSA that if a cycle path is constructed behind a kerb cyclists do not legally have 'right of way' when crossing a side street and the situation at driveways is undefined. Therefore the cycle path would need to be brought back on to the road in areas where conflict is the highest, which begs the question – Why have an off-road path at all? It is also interesting to note that LTSA records do not show any cyclists being hit mid-block when using marked cycle lanes.

The marking of cycle lanes has also been brought up in several submissions with a number seeking the strengthening of the cycle lane markings and a number also seeking the colouring of the full length of the cycle lanes. Whilst understanding the desire to have a facility which is easily identified along its length it is still considered preferable to only colour the lanes at points of potentially high conflict. The markings for the lanes are currently being reviewed by Alix Newman to be advanced at a national forum.

It is **recommended** that the on-street cycle lanes be retained as proposed with red surfacing at the intersections.

U-turn facilities

A number of submissions were received regarding the provision and placement of these facilities ranging from the deletion of them to support for the design as shown on the consultation plan. There were also a number of submitters who questioned the safety of these facilities, or alternatively wanted more of them provided. With regard to the safety of these facilities an independent safety audit undertaken did not highlight any safety issues with these facilities and representatives of the LTSA were also satisfied with the safety of these facilities. They are similar in nature to the u-turn bays provided along Blenheim Road which work satisfactorily. The number of bays has been minimised to provide a satisfactory level of accessibility whilst minimising the areas of conflict, which will always introduce the chance for crashes to occur.

It is **recommended** that the u-turn bays as provided for in the consultation plan be reaffirmed as the final positions for these facilities.

Solid Median

Many of the submissions received towards the end of the submission period from residents question the need for a median and if one is required why not make it narrower. These issues have been canvassed in earlier meetings and reports, resulting in the Council resolutions quoted at the Background section at the start of this report adopting a design utilising a 3.4 metre wide median.

If, however, the issue is to be revisited the following facts should be kept in mind.

The construction of this road without a median, either painted or solid, is not an option which would ever be recommended due to the safety implications.

A concrete barrier, as suggested by some submitters, would provide a safe environment for motorists but would achieve little else. In fact, these barriers are very effective at splitting the road as nobody can cross other than at signalised intersections.

The minimum safe width for a painted median is also 2 metres to provide for turning vehicles and pedestrian islands. A painted median will not result in the same safety benefits as a solid median. A painted median also does not visually narrow the roadway, but rather provides large expanses of unbroken seal.

The minimum safe width for a solid median is 2 metres to allow for people with prams, wheelchairs and/or cyclists to cross the road. This width does not provide enough width for protected turning areas. This width will provide adequate space for low planting but will not provide for trees. The narrowing of the median by 1.4 metres does not provide enough space for a parking lane

The proposed 3.4 metre median makes provision for pedestrian crossing facilities, protected turning areas and landscaping. The alignment of the road has been chosen to avoid touching any of the significant trees along the road.

It is **recommended** that the Council decision to reconstruct the road with a 3.4 metre median be reaffirmed.

Parking

Parking has been the issue of most concern for submitters, particularly to residents of the area and members of St Barnabas Church. A number of earlier submissions support the concepts embraced in the consultation plan but saw the lack of parking as being too extreme. A common theme being that the design has concentrated on visitors to the detriment of residents and that there needs to be a compromise between landscaping and parking. Later submissions seem to concentrate solely on the lack of parking and appear to link this to the width of the median. It is questioned where trade vehicles will park and where visitors, particularly the elderly and infirm, will park when visiting residents along the road.

The removal of all parking has also had some support from submitters on the grounds of road safety and the maximisation of planting. It has also been suggested that St Barnabas should look to providing its own parking as is required by other activities around the City.

There have also been a number of suggestions of ways to provide parking through the submission process both at meetings and in the written submissions. All of the alternatives suggested have been reviewed by City Streets staff and the conclusions of these discussions are summarised as follows, or have been summarised in previous sections.

Clearways

The option of using clearways has been suggested by a number of submitters as a means to provide parking, particularly for St Barnabas. A clearway is a section of road along which people can park during off-peak times, but during peak hours parking is banned and the area of road is used as an extra traffic lane. Clearways do have the benefit of maximising the utilisation of road space available throughout the day by using the kerbside lanes for parking at off-peak times. The obvious disadvantage of these types of facilities is that the spaces are not permanently available and as traffic increases the clearways slowly become phased out for permanent traffic lanes. The submitters have quoted their successful use in such cities as Auckland and Sydney, but there are several issues which need to be addressed particularly with regard to their safety for cyclists.

Clearways have been used around Christchurch on some two lane roads previously but usually unsuccessfully due to the habit of drivers leaving cars parked on the clearway during the peak times. Just one car parked in this lane makes it unusable and therefore a clearway needs to be policed extremely vigorously, with cars being towed away (normally to adjacent side streets) immediately the clearway comes into effect. The Council has avoided this in the past.

A feature of clearways is also that they need to be sign posted clearly and regularly to ensure that drivers are aware of the parking restrictions which may apply to them. This does have connotations with respect to the amenity of the area.

Cycle lanes along the side of the road are something which do not normally need to be contended with in other cities where clearways are used. Whether the cycle lane (1.5 metres) is marked, or a wide (4.2 metre) inner lane is used, when the clearway is in force too much road space remains to the right of the parked cars. This leads to drivers still using this space (2.2 to 2.4 metres) as a pseudo traffic lane leaving no space for cyclists. Ideally, there should be a maximum width of 1.8 metres remaining to the right of the parked cars which provides enough space for cyclists but is too narrow to be used as a traffic lane. This issue has also been discussed with the LTSA who are against the use of clearways in this situation.

The clearway lane could be the lane to the right of a marked cycle lane but it is highly unlikely that drivers would be comfortable with the concept of parking in what would feel like the middle of the road. This could be resolved by physically separating the cycle lane from the roadway. The section on cycle facilities above outlines the legal problems with the provision of off-road cycle paths outside the kerb-line, but the physical separation could be in the form of a discontinuous separating strip on the roadway between the traffic lane and the cycle lane. This, however introduces problems with respect to cyclists travelling to the left of parked cars hidden from the view of motorists turning left into side roads or driveways.

The safety of all road users is important and to make road space available for cyclists when clearways are used seems to be an irresolvable problem with the present laws regarding the status of off-road cycle paths. It is therefore recommended that clearways are not used.

Parking Bays

Extending the use of parking bays along the length of Fendalton Road has been suggested as an acceptable compromise by a number of submitters.

The consultation plan made provision for some parking in bays, and maximised the landscaping. This approach has not found favour with local residents or members of the St Barnabas congregation who see the provision of on-street parking as a necessity to carry out normal every day activities.

There is space along Fendalton Road to provide further parking without compromising the health of existing significant trees. This does of course reduce the amount of new planting which can be undertaken to further enhance the landscape. It is possible, however to design parking bays in a way that can be fitted in with the surrounding planting to minimise the impact on the overall aesthetics of the area. These areas have been surveyed and it is estimated that an extra 28 spaces (total 39 spaces) could be provided without impacting substantially on the aesthetics of the surrounding area. These are proposed for the following sites:

Table 5: Proposed Parking Bay Positions

Number of spaces	Road number
1	182 Fendalton
1	178 Fendalton
5	Fendalton Park
1	156 Fendalton
3	1 St Barnabas
1	140a Fendalton
1	138 Fendalton
2	167 Fendalton
2	135/137 Fendalton
3	125 Fendalton (Quamby Pl)
1	88 Fendalton
2	91a/95 Fendalton
2	87 Fendalton
3	73 Fendalton

St Barnabas Church

A submission has been received from the congregation of St Barnabas Church (over 600 signatures attached to the submission) and there have also been a large number of individual submissions from members of the congregation. The submission outlines the number of community groups (27) which use the church facilities and the regular use made of an average of 40 spaces on Fendalton Road on Sunday mornings. Due to the potential loss to the church of this parking they have made several suggestions regarding the provision of parking. These take the form of:

1. *Make provision for more parking on Fendalton Road* – it is suggested that 36 car parking spaces can be accommodated between Glandovey Road and Snowdon Road on what is currently set aside for berm planting. Whilst this amount of parking could be accommodated it is at the expense of a large amount of proposed planting, not only of groundcover planting but also trees. The proposed additional parking outlined in Table 5 provides for a further 11 spaces in this block, further to the 6 spaces originally shown in the consultation plan. This is seen to give a balance between the provision of some parking and the desire for a high level of landscaping.
2. *Restore the original plan for angle parking in Tui Street* - the submission requests the reinstatement of the angle parking as originally proposed (additional 7 to 8 spaces) and also cites safety issues but does not detail them. The plan for Tui Street was changed as a result of feedback from residents who did not want parking for the church provided outside their properties in preference to landscaping. An on-site meeting with the Community Board, residents and church representatives did not resolve the issue with residents generally concerned that they were being made to suffer because of the lack of provision of parking by the church. The church representatives felt that with the potential loss of parking on Fendalton Road some effort should be made by the Council to provide alternative parking for their congregation. This is an issue involving a local residential street and it is recommended that the issue continues to be dealt with by Community Board.

3. *The parish provide more off-street parking on the church grounds* – the church currently provides 10 spaces on-site and it is considered by the representatives that a further 6 spaces can be provided on the site without compromising the existing and future buildings and environment. It is assumed from previous discussions that the land owned by the church on the Fendalton Road/Tui Street corner is not available for redevelopment for parking.
4. *The Council provide off-street parking in the area* – the submission states that up to 36 spaces could be provided on the piece of land at 2 Glandovey Road and there may be other pieces of land available which could be utilised. The piece of land on the corner of Glandovey/Fendalton Roads is owned by the Council and once the road widening has been utilised there will be an undersized (not large enough for L1 development) piece of land left. This land will be approximately 42x13 metres and it is calculated that once land has been set aside to landscape the boundaries of the property, as required by the City Plan, there will be space for approximately 13 spaces to be provided. There is also the likelihood that a notified resource consent may be required to construct a parking area on residentially zoned land.

It is **recommended** the Council continue discussions with representatives of the Church regarding possible areas where parking could be provided.

Reduce or Delete the Median

This has been discussed above.

Reduce or Delete the Cycle Facilities

This has been discussed above.

It is therefore **recommended** that further parking be provided in the positions indicated in Table 5.

RESOURCE CONSENTS

A resource consent is required for non-compliance under the Proposed City Plan with the following development standards:

- Work within 10 metres of protected trees
- Work within 5 metres of an open utility waterway
- Road and roadway width less than required by the Plan
- Removal of trees from Fendalton Road
- Pruning of trees on Fendalton Road

The Environmental Services Unit have indicated the consent will be considered on a notified basis due to the potential impact on adjacent land owners of the narrower roadway and the pruning/replacement of trees. The resource consent will be heard by an independent commissioner.

The Legal Services Manager has stated that there is no delegated authority for applications for resource consents applied for on behalf of the Council. This means that the Council will need to approve any plan for Fendalton Road to proceed with the application.

CONCLUSIONS

Public consultation regarding the proposed design for the reconstruction of Fendalton Road has produced a large number of responses, both for and against the design.

As a result of the submissions received a number of changes have been recommended to the original plan.

The plan which is approved by the City Services Committee will also need to be approved by the Council to proceed with the required resource consent application.

- Recommendation:**
1. That the Committee endorse the proposed changes to the scheme plan for Fendalton Road as follows:
 - (a) The left turn lane into Glandovey Road being extended to provide extra capacity for this movement.
 - (b) The current lane layout being retained on the eastern approach to the Fendalton/Straven intersection.
 - (c) The proposed landscape design used in the consultation being reaffirmed by the Committee.
 - (d) The installation of right turn phases at the Fendalton/Idris/Straven signals being reviewed six months after the completion of the reconstruction of Fendalton Road.
 - (e) The installation of pedestrian signals outside Hollylea being further investigated and that the crossing point shown be moved east to allow for the installation of signals in the future.
 - (f) The bus stop presently shown outside 163/165 Fendalton Road being shifted to the east by approximately 60 metres.
 - (g) All driveways being widened by an extra 0.5 metres on the approach side of the crossing.
 - (h) The on-street cycle lanes being retained as proposed with red surfacing at the intersections.
 - (i) The u-turn bays as provided for in the consultation plan being reaffirmed as the final positions for these facilities.
 - (j) The Council decision to reconstruct the road with a 3.4 metre median being reaffirmed.

- (k) The Council continuing discussions with representatives of the Church regarding areas where parking could be provided.
 - (l) A further 28 parking spaces being provided along Fendalton Road in the positions indicated in Table 5.
2. That the Committee support the application for the resource consents required to undertake the physical works.

Chairman's

Recommendation: To be provided.