

## 8. MALTA CRESCENT/PINE AVENUE “GIVE WAY” CONTROL

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and City Streets Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Jeff Owen / Paul Burden, Senior Traffic Engineer, DDI 941-8971

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board’s approval for the installation of a “Give Way” control against Malta Crescent at the Pine Avenue intersection.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council has received complaints from motorists concerning traffic movement priority and the wide extensive nature of the Malta Crescent/Pine Avenue intersection leading to safety concerns. The intersection is currently “uncontrolled” and as such the normal “Give Way” rules apply. Malta Crescent intersects Pine Avenue at two locations. This report refers to the northern “Y” junction and not the “T” junction to the south.
3. The complaints have been investigated and a number of issues have been identified. Both roads are classified as “local” roads in the City Plan and carry low volumes of traffic. Pine Avenue carries more than Malta Crescent as it provides direct connections to Southshore and New Brighton. The intersection forms an obtuse angle “Y” junction with equal offsets to both legs. The area of the intersection is large and open and priority is very unclear. There is significant potential for confusion particularly for motorists entering and exiting Malta Crescent assuming priority over traffic on Pine Avenue.
4. Three options were considered to improve the situation including the “status quo” (refer below).
5. The preferred option is the installation of “Give Way” signage and markings against Malta Crescent at the Pine Avenue intersection.

### FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. Cost is low and provided for in the operational budget.
7. Land Transport Rule, Road user 2004 rule and the Traffic Control Devices 2004 rule provides for the control of intersections by “stop” and “give way” signs.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board agree that a “Give Way” control be placed against Malta Crescent at the northern Pine Avenue intersection.

### CHAIRPERSON’S RECOMMENDATION

That the abovementioned recommendation be adopted.

## BACKGROUND ON MALTA CRESCENT/PINE AVENUE INTERSECTION

8. Local residents have expressed concerns at the level of safety at the intersection of Malta Crescent and Pine Avenue. This intersection currently forms an uncontrolled obtuse angle “Y” junction. The intersection is wide with generous corner radii that allows for higher vehicle cornering speeds. This, combined with the equidistance offsets of each leg results in a general lack of clear priority for any approach. Currently Pine Avenue traffic assumes priority, however, this is by no means clear and there is potential for vehicle conflicts.

## DISCUSSION

9. Both intersecting roads are classified “local” in the road hierarchy. Both have a speed limit of 50 km/h. In theory, as the status of each road is equal, then this should be reflected in the intersection control. However, “Y” and “T” junctions are difficult to treat in this manner without introducing a roundabout, traffic signals or other traffic control device. The fact that the intersection is not currently priority controlled may be attributed, in part to this consideration.
10. There has been one reported crash at the intersection within the last five years (*refer attachment 2*). The crash involved a solitary south bound vehicle on Pine Avenue travelling too fast to successfully negotiate the bend. Alcohol was a factor. This crash cannot be directly attributed to the lack of priority control at the intersection.
11. Observations of behaviour at the intersection reveal that traffic on Pine Avenue assumes priority over any vehicles on Malta Crescent. This includes any vehicles turning right out of Malta Crescent. This behaviour is akin to a priority control already being in place against Malta. While this may appear satisfactory, a motorist less familiar with the intersection could easily misinterpret the intersection or display untypical behaviour. As a result there is potential for conflicts to arise with a potential for crashes to occur.

## OPTIONS

Three options were considered to address the problem. These are outlined as follows:

### 12. **Status Quo (option A)**

Leaving the intersection uncontrolled would satisfy the issue of equal priority but would do nothing to address the problems of a high potential for conflicts.

### 13. **Stop Control against Malta (option B)**

In giving consideration to an option that introduces a control to a leg or legs of the intersection, it is more logical to introduce such a control on the side road rather than on the through road. Therefore this option would involve the installation of a “stop” control against Malta Crescent. While this would resolve both the priority and delineation issues and is cost effective, a “stop” control is not recommended due to the amount of visibility available on the Malta Crescent approach and the increased number of stops this would cause.

### 14. **Give Way Control against Malta Crescent (option C)**

This option would involve the installation of a “Give Way” control against Malta Crescent at the Pine Avenue intersection. There is adequate visibility such that this method of control is considered appropriate. This option would resolve both the priority and delineation issues and is cost effective and the visibility available will allow for the safe operation of the intersection resulting in only the minimum number of stops necessary producing a more efficient intersection.

## PREFERRED OPTION

15. **Option C** is the preferred solution to this problem.

## ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

### The Preferred Option

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Improvements to the level of road safety for road users	Cost savings from injury to persons and property
<b>Cultural</b>	N/A	
<b>Environmental</b>	N/A	
<b>Economic</b>	Cost savings from injury to persons and property	
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b> Primary alignment with community outcome "A safe city"</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b> Low</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b> Nil</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b> Road Safety Strategy, Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Strategy</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b> Not considered necessary as no-one is adversely affected</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		