

**RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD  
TRANSPORT AND GREENSPACE COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**MONDAY 19 JULY 2010**

**9AM (APPROX.)  
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE STRENGTHENING  
COMMUNITIES FUNDING BOARD MEETING**

**AT SOCKBURN SERVICE CENTRE  
IN THE BOARDROOM,  
149 MAIN SOUTH ROAD, CHRISTCHURCH**

**Committee:** Mike Mora (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Jimmy Chen, Beth Dunn, Judy Kirk, Peter Laloli and Bob Shearing.

**Community Board Adviser**  
Liz Beaven  
Telephone: 941-6501  
Email: [liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz)

**PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**

**PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

**INDEX**

	<b>CLAUSE</b>	
<b>PART B</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>3.</b>	<b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>4.</b>	<b>BRIEFINGS</b>
	<b>4.1</b>	<b>NEW ZEALAND POLICE TRAFFIC UPDATE</b>
	<b>4.2</b>	<b>SOUTHERN MOTORWAY PROJECT UPDATE</b>
	<b>4.3</b>	<b>WATERWAYS/DRAINAGE PROJECTS AND ISSUES UPDATE</b>
<b>PART A</b>	<b>5.</b>	<b>PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES</b>
<b>PART A</b>	<b>6.</b>	<b>HALSWELL ROAD – SHARED PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE PATH</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>7.</b>	<b>CHALMERS STREET – PROPOSED P15 PARKING RESTRICTION</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>8.</b>	<b>ELECTED MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE</b>

**1. APOLOGIES**

**2. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**3. CORRESPONDENCE**

**4. BRIEFINGS**

**4.1 NEW ZEALAND POLICE TRAFFIC UPDATE**

Inspector Al Stewart, Roding Area Commander New Zealand Police, will outline to the Committee Police traffic issues within the Riccarton/Wigram ward and the city.

**4.2 SOUTHERN MOTORWAY UPDATE**

Mr Will Doherty, Project Manager, Christchurch City Council and Geoff Griffiths, Senior Project Manager New Zealand Transport Agency, will update the Committee on the progress of the Southern Motorway.

**4.3 WATERWAYS/DRAINAGE PROJECTS AND ISSUES UPDATE**

Owen Southen, Senior Contract Manager (Land Drainage) will update the Committee on drainage projects and issues within the Riccarton/Wigram Ward.

## 5. PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941- 8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager Transport and Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Shane Moohan, City Arborist

## PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to request that the Committee consider and provide comments to the Board to refer to the Council on the proposed amendments to the Council's existing delegations on trees.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Workshops with Councillors were held in June and September 2008 to discuss suggested changes to the current tree delegations.
3. The Combined Community Board Chairs Forum on 13 October 2008 requested that a working party made up of staff and one nominated member from each Community Board be formed to work through issues relating to a City wide Tree Policy.
4. Since then the Tree Policy Working Party has met five times to prepare the Proposed Tree Policy document (**Attachment 1**). Issues that arose during these discussions that were outside of the scope of the Working Party are documented and were presented to the Council in a memorandum on 10 December 2010.
5. An initial draft policy was developed which encompassed suggested changes to the current delegations as well as operational issues for planting, maintaining and removing trees. It did not cover future direction for trees in Christchurch as this would be more appropriately addressed in a strategic document.
6. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs' Forum recommended –
  - (a) That this initial draft Proposed Tree Policy be presented to the Council for adoption.
  - (b) That the Working Party memorandum be presented to the Council for consideration.
7. The Council workshop on 23 February 2010 requested that an amended Proposed Tree Policy be presented to the Council with the recommendation that it be adopted for consultation with Community Boards.

The amendments to the Proposed Tree Policy included changes to –

- (a) 3.1 Tree Management
- (b) 3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces, clauses (i) (k) and (m).
- (c) 6 Definitions, Affected Community and Publicly Owned Land.
- (d) 4 Relevant Delegations, Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to Council for a decision.

A full break down of the amendments is found in paragraph 43.

8. On 25 March 2010 the Council adopted the amended Proposed Tree Policy for consultation with Community Boards.

**5 Cont'd**

9. The amended Proposed Tree Policy is now **attached**, together with a comments form template (**Attachment 6**), tree removal process map (**Attachment 3**), tree maintenance process map (**Attachment 4**) and tree planting process map (**Attachment 5**) to assist Boards with their discussions.
10. The recommendation is that the amended Proposed Tree Policy be adopted subject to formal consideration of the comments offered by all of the Community Boards.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

11. Adoption of the Proposed Tree Policy is not expected to have significant effects on operational or capital budgets.
12. The Proposed Tree Policy suggests that there is a “user pays” process for some tree planting (3.3.1 Commemorative Trees), some tree pruning (3.7 Pruning Trees in Public Spaces) and some tree removals (3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces, 3.5 Requests to Remove Trees in Public Spaces, 3.6 Cost of Removal of Trees in Public Spaces). This involves the actual cost to complete the work and the cost incurred in gathering sufficient information for Community Boards to make an informed decision where the requested service is not considered ‘business as usual’ and falls outside of approved Activity Management Plan levels of service.
13. The Proposed Tree Policy also suggests that for some tree removals that applicants pay for the value of the tree (3.6 Cost of Removal of Trees in Public Spaces). The value of the tree is based on the Standard Tree Evaluation Method (STEM) which is the nationally recognised system for evaluating and valuing trees (see “Definitions” in Proposed Tree Policy).
14. Should the suggested “user pays” process for tree removal and pruning be adopted, this will have financial implications for some members of the public.
15. Should the suggested user pays system be adopted this will need to be incorporated into the Council’s Fees and Charges Schedule under Section 12 Local Government Act 2002.

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

16. The recommendations align with the current LTCCP budgets.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

17. Alignment with Principal legislation –
  - (a) Resource Management Act 1991.
    - (i) Banks Peninsula District Plan.
    - (ii) City of Christchurch City Plan.
  - (b) Reserves Act 1977.
  - (c) Biosecurity Act 1993.
  - (d) Health and Safety in Employment Act 1992 plus amendments and regulations.
  - (e) Electricity Act 1992 plus regulations.
  - (f) Telecommunications Act 2001.
  - (g) Property Law Act 2007.

**5 Cont'd**

- (h) Public Works Act 1981.
- (i) Local Government Act 1974 and 2002.
- (j) Christchurch City Council Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008.

18. The following Council Policies will need to be rescinded –

- (a) Tree Planting in Streets Policy.
- (b) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404.
- (c) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636.
- (d) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236.
- (e) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178.

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

- 19. The Council has the legal right to adopt the Proposed Tree Policy.
- 20. Irrespective of Council Policies and Strategies the District Court can order the pruning or removal of trees under The Property Law Act 2007.
- 21. Irrespective of Council Policies and Strategies some pruning and removal of protected trees may require a resource consent be granted prior to work to being undertaken.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

- 22. Recommendation aligns with current LTCCP and Activity Management Plans.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?**

- 23. Supports the following Levels of Service –
  - (a) 6.0 Neighbourhood Parks.  
6.06 Planted areas and trees.
  - (b) 6.1 Sports Parks.  
6.1.8 Maintain planted areas and trees.
  - (c) 6.2 Garden and Heritage Parks.  
6.2.9 Planted areas and trees.
  - (d) 6.3 Regional Parks  
6.3.2 Protecting biodiversity values
  - (e) 6.4 Cemeteries.  
6.4.8 Maintain planted areas and trees.
  - (f) 6.5 Waterways and Land Drainage  
6.5.3 Cost of maintaining waterways and land drainage system.

5 Cont'd

- (g) 10.0 Road Network.  
10.0.11 Road landscaping and street trees.

24. Supports the Capital Tree Replacement Programmes for street and park trees.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

25. There is currently no overarching city wide policy for vegetation management. In the memorandum from the Tree Policy Working Party (**Attachment 2**) it is suggested that funding for the commencement of a City wide policy be included for consideration in the next LTCCP.

26. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with the following Strategies–

- (a) New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy.
- (b) Christchurch City Council Biodiversity Strategy 2008-2035.

27. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with Council Policies –

- (a) Traffic Calming Policy.
- (b) Sponsorship of Trees and Other Plantings on Reserves.
- (c) Proposed Central City Street Tree Plan.
- (d) Central City Streetscape Plan.
- (e) Consultation Policy.

28. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with the following sections of the Christchurch City Plan -

Volume 2: Section 4 City Identity.

4.2.1 Policy: Tree Cover.

To promote amenity values in the urban area by maintaining and enhancing the tree cover present in the City.

Tree cover and vegetation make an important contribution to amenity values in the City. Through the redevelopment of sites, existing vegetation is often lost and not replaced. The City Plan protects those trees identified as “heritage” or “notable” and the subdivision process protects other trees which are considered to be “significant”. The highest degree of protection applies to heritage trees.

Because Christchurch is largely built on a flat plain, trees and shrubs play an important role in creating relief, contributing to visual amenity and attracting native birds.

The amount of private open space available for new planting and to retain existing trees is influenced by rules concerning building density and setback from boundaries. The rules do not require new planting for residential development but landscaping is required in business zones.

4.2.2 Policy: Garden City

To recognise and promote the “Garden City” identity, heritage and character of Christchurch.

## 5 Cont'd

A key aspect of achieving this policy will be maintaining and extending environments and vegetation types which compliment this image. A broad range of matters influence and contribute to this image, including the following:

- (a) Tree-lined streets and avenues.
- (b) Parks and developed areas of open space.

14.3.2 Policy: "Garden City" image identity.

To acknowledge and promote the "Garden City" identity of the City by protecting, maintaining and extending planting which compliments this image.

Volume 3: Part 8 Special Purpose Zone

14.3.5 Street Trees

Nearly half the length of streets within the city contains street trees, but the presence of very high quality street trees which add considerable presence to streets and neighbourhoods is confined to a relatively small proportion of the road network. These streets add particular character and amenity of the city, either in the form of avenues which form points into the city, or an important part of the local character of particular streets.

### CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

- 29. All eight Community Boards appointed representatives to the Tree Policy Working Party to ensure their ward's views and concerns were represented.
- 30. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs Forum' recommended that the Proposed Tree Policy be presented to Council for adoption.
- 31. No public consultation has been undertaken as this document is intended for internal use.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee recommend to the Board to:

- (a) review and provide comment on the attached Proposed Tree Policy and the proposed changes to delegations.
- (b) recommend to the Council that the Proposed Tree Policy be adopted subject to formal consideration of the comments offered by all of the Community Boards.
- (c) recommend to the Council that the following policies be rescinded:
  - (i) Tree Planting in Streets Policy.
  - (ii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404.
  - (iii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636.
  - (iv) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236.
  - (v) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178.

**5 Cont'd**

- (d) recommend to the Council that the following delegations be rescinded:

Greenspace Manager:

"In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of trees from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control. (CR 23.10.96)"

Community Boards:

"To plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves, parks and roads under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council. (CR 13.12.07)"

- (e) recommend to the Council that the following changes to delegations be made -

That the following delegations for the policy be made:

- (i) The Transport and Greenspace Manager on the recommendation of the City Arborist and relevant infrastructure Manager where appropriate has delegated authority for the planting of trees under Section 3.3 and the removal of trees under Section 3.4 and the pruning of trees under Section 3.7 of this policy.
- (ii) The relevant Community Board has delegated authority in consultation with the Transport and Greenspace Manager and relevant infrastructure Manager to decide on any tree matter that either falls outside of the Transport and Greenspace Manager's delegation or, after consultation with affected parties, has remained contentious and is unable to be resolved by the Transport and Greenspace Manager.
- (iii) In emergency situations, the Transport and Greenspace Manager or the City Arborist have full delegated powers to negate immediate danger.
- (iv) Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to the Council for a decision.



5 Cont'd

**BACKGROUND**

32. On 12 June 2008 a workshop was held to discuss potential changes to the tree delegations.

Currently delegations are:

Greenspace Manager -

*"In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of trees from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control. (CR 23.10.96)"*

Community Boards -

*"To plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves, parks and roads under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council. (CR 13.12.07)"*

33. Changes were suggested to enable:
- (a) Clear parameters over what decisions staff can make.
  - (b) Greater clarity over when decisions are to be made by Community Boards.
  - (c) Timely and pragmatic decisions for residents requesting tree removals.
34. As a result of this meeting a Memo was issued to the Mayor, Councillors and Community Board Members on 1 August 2008 outlining the current tree delegations for the Community Boards and the Greenspace Manager, suggesting changes to the delegations, the reasons why the changes were being suggested and safe guards.
35. On 29 September 2008 a further workshop was held providing an outline of issues faced by the arborists. These included -
- (a) Removal, replacement, removing otherwise healthy trees.
  - (b) Pruning trees under power lines causing disfigurement to the tree.
  - (c) Removing trees which are overcrowded.
  - (d) Removing trees of poor shape.
  - (e) Removing trees which pose a health and safety risk.
36. Proposals to clarify staff delegations were mainly around tree removal and tree planting. Some guidelines around staff decisions on tree removal and planting were suggested. These included the significance of the tree to be removed and the agreement of affected parties. Guidelines around tree planting included aligning to strategies or plans or direction, maintaining design integrity (e.g. Living Streets), maintaining existing levels of service for provision of street and park trees, and agreement of affected parties.
37. On 13 October 2008 the Combined Community Board Chairs forum requested that a working party made up of both staff and one nominated member from each Community Board be formed to work through issues relating to a tree policy.
38. The Working Party was made up of the following Community Board Members –

Paula Smith	Lyttleton/Mt Herbert (Chairperson)
Matt Morris	Shirley/Papanui (Deputy Chairperson)

5 Cont'd

Tim Carter	Hagley/Ferrymead
Mike Mora	Riccarton/Wigram
Val Carter	Fendalton/Waimairi
Stewart Miller	Akaroa/Wairewa
Linda Stewart	Burwood/Pegasus
Karolyn Potter	Spreydon/Heathcote
Tim Scandrett	Spreydon/Heathcote (proxy)

39. The following Terms of Reference were drawn up to guide the Working Party in its discussions -
- (a) Clarify understanding around proposed changes to the tree delegations.
  - (b) Clarify staff and Community Board roles in tree maintenance i.e. business as usual vs pruning for views or shade or light and cost recovery with pruning for views or shade or light.
  - (c) Clarify staff and Community Board roles in tree planting and removals and cost recovery with tree removal and replacement planting.
  - (d) Consider the application of STEM (Standard Tree Evaluation Method) in its application to tree maintenance and removal decision making.
  - (e) Recommend any changes to existing delegations or the implementation of a Tree Policy following on from discussions over the above.
40. During Working Party discussions matters that were outside of the scope were raised. These were detailed in a Memorandum from the Working Party and presented to the Council.
41. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs recommended that the Proposed Tree Policy be forwarded to the Council for adoption.
42. On 10 December 2009 the Proposed Tree Policy went to the Council for adoption with the following recommendations –
- a) Rescind the following Policies –
    - (i) Tree Planting in Streets Policy.
    - (ii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404.
    - (iii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636.
    - (iv) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236.
    - (v) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178.
  - b) Adopt the Proposed Tree Policy including the following delegations:
    - (i) The Transport and Greenspace Manager on the recommendation of the City Arborist and relevant infrastructure Manager where appropriate has delegated authority for the planting of trees under Section 3.3 (Planting and Planting of Trees in Public Spaces) and the removal of trees under Section 3.4 (Removal of Trees in Public Spaces) and the pruning of trees under Section 3.7 (Pruning Trees in Public Spaces) of this policy.

5 Cont'd

- (ii) The relevant Community Board has delegated authority in consultation with the Transport and Greenspace Manager and relevant infrastructure Manager to decide on any tree matter that either falls outside of the Transport and Greenspace Manager's delegation or, after consultation with affected parties, has remained contentious and is unable to be resolved by the Transport and Greenspace Manager.

43. At a February 2010 workshop the Council requested that an amended Proposed Tree Policy be brought to the Council with the recommendation that it be adopted for consultation with Community Boards.

The suggested amendments were –

3.1 Tree Management

Delete - "ecology - by"

Insert - "Enhancing and protecting the surrounding environment and safeguarding biodiversity"

3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces

- (i) Delete - "significant" and insert "have only a minor detrimental effect".
- (k) Insert - "Control of roadside pests that are listed in the Canterbury Regional Pest Management Strategy 2005-2015 in Banks Peninsula remain the responsibility of the adjacent land owner".
- (m) Insert - "that is not listed as a threatened or endangered species either locally or nationally or internationally".

Section 4 - Relevant Delegations

Insert - paragraph 3.

"Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to the Council for a decision".

6. Definitions

Affected Community table – delete - "<" and insert - "approximate maximum"

Affected Community table Local Park – delete - "key stakeholders e.g. sports groups, lessees"

Affected Community (a) – delete - "significant" and insert - "important"

Publicly owned land - delete "regional parks, sports parks, cemeteries" after "road reserve either formed or unformed" insert "excluding arterial roads"

44. On 25 March 2010 the Council adopted the amended Proposed Tree Policy for consultation with Community Boards.

## 6. HALSWELL ROAD – SHARED PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE PATH

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, City Environment, DDI 941 8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Lorraine Correia, Consultation Leader, Capital Development Unit

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the recommendation of the Committee to the Board to recommend to the Council for approval of a shared pedestrian and cycle path adjacent to Halswell Road, and the installation of a pedestrian refuge on Halswell Road near the Templetons Road intersection, as shown in **Attachment 1** (TG103902 – Sheet 2) and **Attachment 2** (501328 – R01).

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. This project was initiated by the Transport and Greenspace Unit in 2009/10 as there is a need to improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists by providing a shared path along Halswell Road between Dunbars Road to Templetons Road.
3. The objective for the project was set as follows:
  - (a) Improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists by providing a shared pathway along the frontage of Aidenfield subdivision where none exists at present.
4. Concept plans for the proposed shared path are shown in **Attachment 1** (TG103902 – Sheet 2) and **Attachment 2** (501328 – R01) details are as follows:
  - (a) The shared pathway will run along the western side of Halswell Road from Dunbars Road to Templetons Road, linking with the existing footpaths at Aidenfield Drive.
  - (b) A pedestrian refuge is proposed near Templetons Road to provide a safe crossing point for pedestrians and cyclists using the path.
  - (c) The shared pathway will then continue on the eastern side of Halswell Road to Hendersons Road.
  - (d) Lighting along the shared path is proposed as part of this project. Existing signage will be re-positioned and new signage will be provided as required.
5. Halswell Road is a State Highway and is classified as a major arterial road from Curletts Road through to Templetons Road and is then classified as a minor arterial road the rest of the way through to Tai Tapu. New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) is the asset owners of this road.
6. NZTA intends widening Halswell Road to four lanes in future. Every effort has been made to ensure the path location will be compatible with future plans however, this cannot be guaranteed. NZTA have given preliminary approval of the alignment of the shared path, and final design plans will be submitted prior to tendering.
7. These works are scheduled for implementation in the 2010/11 financial year.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

8. Funding for the proposed works are provided for in the 2009-19 LTCCP, New Footpaths Programme, page 243 as follows:

2009/2010	\$237,500
2010/2011	\$246,193

## 6. Cont'd

Based on current estimates there is sufficient budget allocated in the 2009-2019 LTCCP to implement the project.

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Cycleways are established by the authority of the Council under section 332 of the Local Government Act 1974. Under Section 332 a cycle track is also a cycle path, defined as:
  - (a) means part of the road that is physically separated from the roadway that is intended for the use of cyclists, but which may be used also by pedestrians; and
  - (b) Includes a cycle track formed under section 332 of the Local Government Act 1974.
10. Signage will be provided as required in the Traffic Control Devices Rule under Schedule 1.
11. The project is on land under the control of NZTA but Council have their approval to proceed with the final plan.
12. A resource consent may be required.
13. No other legal issues have been identified.

### ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

14. This project aligns with the Transport and Greenspace Unit's Activity Management Plan. The funding for the proposed works in Halswell Road is provided in the 2009-19 LTCCP as New Footpaths Programme, page 243.

### ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

15. The recommendations in this report align with current Council strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, the Road Strategy 2004, the Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy 1998, the Cycling Strategy 1998 and 2004 and Pedestrian Strategy 2001; and are consistent with the requirements for arterial and local roads as defined within the City Plan.

### CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. Staff have been working in collaboration with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) as the road is their asset. NZTA have approved the **attached** concept plan which is expected to tie in with their future four laning project on Halswell Road. NZTA has no objection for Council to approve this proposal.
17. A memo to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board was sent through the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board Adviser on 2 June 2010 informing the Board of the proposed consultation plan.
18. On 2 June 2010 information on this project together with a copy of the plan was sent to the Halswell Residents' Association including 80 residents along the vicinity of Templetons Road and Hendersons Roads. A communications plan is currently being put in place and subject to this project being approved by the Council further external communications will be done.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Committee recommend to the Board to recommend to the Council for the Halswell Road Shared Path to proceed to final design, tender, and construction as shown in **Attachment 1** (TG103902 – Sheet 2), and **Attachment 2** (TG103902 – Sheet 2).

**6. Cont'd**

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

19. A safety audit on the initial concept plan was carried out on 23 March 2010, changes were made to the initial plan based on the report's recommendations, the amended plans are attached to this report.
20. A lighting assessment was carried out by an independent contractor in February 2010 who have recommended suitable lighting along the full length of the shared path; this will be included in the detailed design phase of this project.
21. A traffic count undertaken in November 2008 shows Halswell Road carries on average 21,027 vehicles per day. This count was taken near the intersection of Halswell Road and Aidenfield Drive.
22. There are no land ownership issues associated with this project.

**7. CHALMERS STREET – PROPOSED P15 PARKING RESTRICTION**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager Transport and Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Paul Forbes Assistant Traffic Engineer, Transport and Greenspace

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Committee's recommendation to the Board to approve a parking restriction (P15) be installed on the northern side of Chalmers Street.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. In November 2009 the Hornby Fruit and Vege shop opened at 53 Chalmers Street and in an attempt to increase the level of service for their customers, they applied to the Council staff to consider that the existing P120 parking restrictions on the north side of Chalmers Street be altered to a shorter time period to increase the efficiency of the parking available. Business owners commented that motorists often parked for longer than two hours in the P120 parking restriction.
3. Chalmers Street is classified as a local road and is located on the northern side of The Hub Hornby shopping complex (Refer to **Attachment 1**). The Hub Hornby has 650 onsite car parking spaces, of which 32 are P10, 68 are P60, 17 are Mobility parks (no time limit) and the remaining 533 spaces are P180 parking.
4. Businesses on this section of Chalmers Street are: Firestone, Hornby Fruit and Vege, Parrots Print and Copy Limited, Caveman Technology, Baby on the Move and there is presently one vacant shop immediately to the west of Hornby Fruit and Vege. Most of these businesses have a relatively short customer turn-over period and would benefit from a shorter time restriction than is currently in place.
5. Currently parking restrictions on the northern side of Chalmers Street are 60 metres (10 spaces) of P120 parking west of Firestone, 36 metres of no stopping (broken yellow lines) and 17 metres (3 spaces) of P120 parking to the west of the no stopping lines. Current parking restrictions on the southern side over the same length of Chalmers Street include a P30 (Bus only) Bus lay-by area, a section of no stopping (broken yellow lines) and 12 metres of unrestricted parking immediately west of the eastern vehicle entrance to The Hub Hornby.
6. Currently Hornby Fruit and Vege on site parking consists of 12 parking spaces, eight available to their customers and four allocated to The Hub Hornby for staff parking (lease requirement).
7. Five businesses as above (paragraph four) and The Hub Hornby were consulted on the proposal. Four replies were received, three were in support of the proposal and The Hub Hornby required that the restriction be P60 to support the proposal. Baby on the Move management also advised staff that they felt that the 17 metres of P120 outside their premises would also service their business more efficiently if changed to P15. Because the response from the businesses most affected by the proposal was in support of P15, the staff recommendation is for P15 to be installed. There is an opportunity for The Hub Hornby to request the unrestricted parking spaces on the south side to be restricted to 60 minutes if they feel there is still a need for medium term parking in Chalmers Street.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$200.

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

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

## 7. Cont'd

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides the Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
11. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated December 2009. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.
12. 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?

13. As above.

### ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

14. 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?

15. As above.

### ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

16. 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?

17. As above.

### CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. Refer to paragraph 7 for details on consultation.
19. There is no residents association representing this area.
20. The Officer in Charge- Parking Enforcement agrees with this recommendation.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Committee recommends that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board approve:

- (a) That any existing parking restrictions at any time on the north side of Chalmers Street within a distance of 161 metres west of its intersection with Carmen Road (SH1) be revoked.
- (b) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northern side of Chalmers Street commencing at its intersection with Carmen Road (SH1) and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 48 metres.
- (c) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 15 minutes on the northern side of Chalmers Street commencing at a point 48 metres in a westerly direction from its intersection with Carmen Road (SH1) and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 60 metres. This restriction is to apply to from 8am to 6pm every day.



**7. Cont'd**

- (d) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northern side of Chalmers Street commencing at a point 108 metres in a westerly direction its intersection with Carmen Road (SH1) and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 36 metres.
- (e) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 15 minutes on the northern side of Chalmers Street commencing at a point 144 metres in a westerly direction from its intersection with Carmen Road (SH1) and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 17 metres. This restriction is to apply to from 8am to 6pm every day.

**8. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**