

8. ALBERT TERRACE – PROPOSED REVOCATION OF MOBILITY PARK

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| General Manager responsible: | General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608 |
| Officer responsible: | Transport and Greenspace Manager |
| Author: | Jon Ashford / Steve Dejong, Network Operations DDI 941-6428 |

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board's approval that an existing Mobility Park on the west side of Albert Terrace be revoked.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council have received a request from a local resident that an existing Mobility Park in front of number 2 Albert Terrace be removed, as it is no longer required. (refer to the **attached plan**).
3. Albert Terrace is a local road, running south from the Centaurus Road / Wilsons Road South roundabout.
4. The mobility park in question is currently marked as rectangular box on the road with yellow dashed lines. It has no mobility symbol painted on the road or posts with mobility signs to indicate it is a Mobility Park.
5. Staff understand that this mobility park was installed a long time ago to provide parking for a disabled resident of number 2 Albert Terrace. The current owner of number 2 Albert Terrace has advised staff that they have no need for a Mobility Park and they believe the existing mobility park was installed approximately 20 years ago.
6. As there is no further need for a mobility park in this location and it is not currently marked with a mobility symbol or signage, staff propose that the road markings be removed. Staff are unsure of the legal status of the existing mobility park and recommend that it be formally revoked before the markings are removed.
7. Consultation was carried out by phone with the current owner of number 2 Albert Terrace. The current owners advised staff that they have no need for a Mobility Park.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$180.

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw provides 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. 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 2006-16 LTCCP?

15. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

16. The recommendation aligns with the Council Parking Strategy 2003.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

17. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. Consultation was carried out by phone with the current owner of number 2 Albert Terrace. The current owners advised staff that they have no need for a Mobility Park.

19. There is no residents association for this area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board:

Revoke

(a) The existing Mobility Park on the west side of Albert Terrace commencing at a point 35 metres south from its intersection with Centaurus Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of eight metres.

CHAIRPERSONS RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be supported.