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Strategic Framework

The Council’s Vision – Christchurch is a city of opportunity for all.
Open to new ideas, new people and new ways of doing things – a city where anything is possible.

Whiria ngā whenu o ngā papa Honoa ki te maurua tāukiuki
Bind together the strands of each mat And join together with the seams of respect and reciprocity.
The partnership with Papatipu Rūnanga reflects mutual understanding and respect, and a goal of improving the economic, cultural, environmental and social wellbeing for all.

Overarching Principle
Partnership – Our people are our taonga - to be treasured and encouraged. By working together we can create a city that uses their skill and talent, where we can all participate, and be valued.

Supporting Principles
Accountability
Affordability
Agility
Equity
Innovation
Collaboration
Prudent Financial Management
Stewardship
Wellbeing and resilience
Trust

Community Outcomes
What we want to achieve together as our city evolves

Strong communities
Strong sense of community
Active participation in civic life
Safe and healthy communities
Celebration of our identity through arts, culture, heritage and sport
Valuing the voices of children and young people

Liveable city
Vibrant and thriving central city, suburban and rural centres
A well connected and accessible city
Sufficient supply of, and access to, a range of housing
21st century garden city we are proud to live in

Healthy environment
Healthy waterways
High quality drinking water
Unique landscapes and indigenous biodiversity are valued
Sustainable use of resources

Prosperous economy
Great place for people, business and investment
An inclusive, equitable economy with broad-base prosperity for all
A productive, adaptive and resilient economic base
Modern and robust city infrastructure and community facilities

Strategic Priorities
Our focus for improvement over the next three years and beyond

Enabling active citizenship and connected communities
Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable 21st century city
Climate change leadership
Informed and proactive approaches to natural hazard risks
Increasing active, public and shared transport opportunities and use
Safe and sustainable water supply and improved waterways
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1. **Apologies**
   At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant and to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   That the minutes of the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board meeting held on **Monday, 3 December 2018** be confirmed (refer page 5).

4. **Public Forum**
   A period of up to 30 minutes will be available for people to speak for up to five minutes on any issue that is not the subject of a separate hearings process.

5. **Deputations by Appointment**
   Deputations may be heard on a matter or matters covered by a report on this agenda and approved by the Chairperson.
   
   5.1 **Woolston Village Improvements Project (Clause 16 of this agenda refers)**
   Rosemary Neave, local resident will speak to the Board regarding the Woolston Village Improvements Project.

   5.2 **Redcliffs Transport Project - Redcliffs School Transport Safety Requirements (Clause 17 refers)**
   Representatives of the Redcliffs School Board of Trustees will speak to the Board on the Redcliffs Transport Project Report.

6. **Presentation of Petitions**
   6.1 During the consultation for the Improvements to Woolston Village Centre – WL1 staff received a petition regarding the proposed removal of 14 on-street car parks on Ferry Road as part of the submissions received. Item 16 of this agenda refers.

   The petition will be tabled at the meeting.
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The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   
   **Part C**
   
   **Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00175**
   
   That apologies from Jake McLellan and Brenda Lowe-Johnson for absence, and an apology from Deon Swiggs for early departure, be received and accepted.
   
   Sally Buck/Tim Lindley  
   
   **Carried**

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   **Part B**
   
   Sally Buck declared an interest in Item 13, Riccarton Avenue- Christchurch Hospital Emergency Vehicle Access.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   
   **Part C**
   
   **Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00176**
   
   That the minutes of the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board meeting held on Wednesday, 14 November 2018 be confirmed.
   
   Deon Swiggs/Tim Lindley  
   
   **Carried**

4. **Public Forum**
   
   **Part B**
   
   **4.1 Sumner Cameras Project**
   
   **Part B**
   
   Kath Preston updated the Board on the Safer Sumner Camera Project. She advised that the group has a shortfall in funding.
   
   After questions from the members, the Chairperson thanked Ms Preston for her presentation.

   **4.2 Living Earth Organics Processing Plant**
   
   **Part B**
   
   Local resident Geoffrey King spoke to the Board regarding his concerns about the odour being emitted from the Living Earth Organics Processing Plant (OPP). Mr King expressed his frustration about the time it is taking to have the matter dealt with. He also mentioned that there is odour
from the nearby Metro Refuse Station and queried whether it is being operated in compliance with resource consent conditions.

After questions from the members, the Chairperson thanked Mr King for his presentation.

The Board decided to request staff to investigate the concerns raised about the odour from the Organics Processing Plant and from the Metro Refuse Station.

5. Deputations by Appointment

Part B

5.1 Bays Area Skatepark – Site Selection

Part B

Roger Evans, Business Owner, Sumner, spoke to the Board regarding the selection of a site for the Bays Area Skatepark. Mr Evans outlined his concern that construction of a skatepark at the Nayland Street, Sumner will result in adverse noise at his nearby business.

Mr Evans also expressed his view that use of the Bays Area Skatepark will entail a major expenditure on rockfall protection and result in a smaller park. Mr Evans said that he does not think this site represents best value for money.

After questions from members, the Chairperson thanked Mr Evans for his presentation. Item 14 of these minutes refers.

5.2 Bays Area Skatepark – Site Selection

Part B

Mike Sleigh and Cam Haylock, of Sumner Green and Skatepark addressed the Board on the selection of a site for the Bays Area Skatepark and expressed their support for the use of the Nayland Street site.

After questions from members, the Chairperson thanked Messrs Sleigh and Haylock for their presentation. Item 14 of these minutes refers.

5.3 Inner City East Revitalisation Project Annual Report

Part B

Jane Higgins, and Jenny Smith, members of the Inner City East Revitalisation Project Working Group updated the Board on the work the group is undertaking. After questions from members, the Chairperson thanked Jane Higgins and Jenny Smith for their presentation.

6. Presentation of Petitions

Part B

There was no presentation of petitions.
7. **Correspondence**  
    Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00177

**Part B**

That the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the correspondence report dated 03 December 2018
2. Requests staff advice on the proposal for reduced speed limit through Redcliffs

Sara Templeton/Tim Lindley  
Carried

8. **Forth Street at Vogel Street, Richmond - Proposed No Stopping Restrictions**  
    Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00178 (Original staff recommendation accepted without change)

**Part C**

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles on the part of Forth Street as shown by broken yellow lines on drawing TG133464 issue 1 dated 18/10/18, attached to the agenda for the meeting is prohibited.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in 1. are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1. are in place.

Tim Lindley/Alexandra Davids  
Carried

9. **Francellla Street, Bromley - Proposed Give Way, Stop Control and Modified P120 Restrictions**  
    Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00179 (Original staff recommendation accepted without change)

**Part C**

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That pursuant to section 334 of the Local Government Act 1974 and clauses 2.1 and 10.1 of the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004, Give Way control is imposed at all times and road markings and signs erected on Tanya Street, at its intersection with Wickham Street, as indicated in drawing TG133448 issue 1 dated 29/10/2018 attached to the agenda for the meeting.

2. That pursuant to section 334 of the Local Government Act 1974 and clauses 2.1 and 10.1 of the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004, Stop control is imposed at all times and road markings and signs erected on Francellla Street, at its intersection with Wickham Street, as indicated in drawing TG133448 issue 1 dated 29/10/2018 attached to the agenda for the meeting.
3. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Francella Street and Wickham Street, as indicated drawing TG133448 Issue 1, dated 29/10/2018, attached to the agenda for the meeting is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 120 minutes (between 1pm and 6pm on school days).

4. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles on the part of Francella Street and Wickham Street as shown by broken yellow lines on drawing TG133448 issue 1 dated 29/10/18, attached to the agenda for the meeting is prohibited.

5. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in 1., 2., 3., or 4. are revoked.

6. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1., 2., 3., or 4. are in place.

Darrell Latham/Sara Templeton Carried

10. St Johns Street and Linwood Avenue Intersection, Bromley – Safety Improvements

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00180 (Original staff recommendation accepted without change)

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. The proposed minor improvement works as specified in drawing TG133500 issue 1 dated 12/11/18 attached to the agenda for the meeting.

2. That under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles on the part of St Johns Street as shown by broken yellow lines on drawing TG133500 issue 1 dated 12/10/18, attached to the agenda for the meeting is prohibited.

3. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in 1. or 2. are revoked.

4. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1. or 2. are in place.

Tim Lindley/Alexandra Davids Carried

11. Barbadoes Street near Nova Place - Proposed P60 Restrictions

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00181 (Original staff recommendations accepted without change)

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Barbadoes Street, as indicated in drawing TG133481 Issue 1, dated 12/11/2018, attached
to the agenda for the meeting is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 60 minutes.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in 1. are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1. are in place.

Deon Swiggs/Sally Buck  
Carried

12. Cannon Hill Crescent at Challis Place, Mount Pleasant - Proposed No Stopping Restrictions

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00182 (Original staff recommendations accepted without change)

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles on the part of Cannon Hill Crescent as shown by broken yellow lines on drawing TG133454 issue 1 dated 16/10/18, attached to the agenda for the meeting is prohibited.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in 1. are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1. are in place.

Tim Lindley/Sara Templeton  
Carried

The Chairperson, having declared an interest in Item 13 vacated the chair and took no part in the Board’s discussion and/or voting on that item.

Election of a Chair

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00183

It was resolved on the motion of Member Sara Templeton, seconded by Member Yani Johanson that Alexandra Davids be appointed acting Chairperson for Item 13.

Sara Templeton/Yani Johanson  
Carried

13. Riccarton Avenue- Christchurch Hospital Emergency Vehicle Access

Board Comment

The Board noted that the proposed changes include the removal of bus stops on the Hagley Park side of Riccarton Avenue and discussed the possible access arrangements for those visiting the Hagley Park Oval area.

Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:
1. Approves that any previous resolutions pertaining to parking or stopping restrictions made on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue, from its intersection with Hagley Avenue to a point 522 metres northwest of its intersection with Hagley Avenue are revoked.

2. Approves that any previous resolutions pertaining to parking or stopping restrictions made on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue, from a point being described as the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line, and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, to a point 531 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, are revoked.

3. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at its intersection with Hagley Avenue and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 284 metres.

4. Approves that a Bus Stop be created on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 284 metres northwest of its intersection with Hagley Avenue and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 31 metres.

5. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes and controlled by Parking Meters, (including Pay by Plate machines or any approved means of payment) on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 315 metres northwest of its intersection with Hagley Avenue and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 66 metres. This restriction is to apply Monday to Thursday 9:00am to 5:00pm, Friday 9:00am to 8:30pm and Saturday to Sunday 9:00am-6:00pm.

6. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 381 metres northwest of its intersection with Hagley Avenue and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 43 metres.

7. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 494 metres northwest of its intersection with Hagley Avenue and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 28 metres.

8. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point being described as the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line, and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 55 metres.

9. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes and controlled by Parking Meters, (including Pay by Plate machines or any approved means of payment) on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 55 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 83 metres. This restriction is to apply Monday to Thursday 9:00am to 5:00pm, Friday 9:00am to 8:30pm and Saturday to Sunday 9:00am-6:00pm.

10. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 138 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 193 metres.

11. Approves that a Small Passenger Service Vehicle stand (Taxi Stand) be created on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 331 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the...
12. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 357 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of four metres.

13. Approves that a Bus stop be created on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 361 metres northwest of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 31 metres.

14. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 392 metres northwest of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 17 metres.

15. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 508 metres northwest of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 23 metres.

16. Approves that these resolutions take effect when parking signage and/or road markings that evidence the restrictions is/are in place (or removed in the case of revocations).

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00184

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approves that any previous resolutions pertaining to parking or stopping restrictions made on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue, from its intersection with Hagley Avenue to a point 522 metres northwest of its intersection with Hagley Avenue are revoked.

2. Approves that any previous resolutions pertaining to parking or stopping restrictions made on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue, from a point being described as the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line, and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, to a point 531 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, are revoked.

3. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at its intersection with Hagley Avenue and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 284 metres.

4. Approves that a Bus Stop be created on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 284 metres northwest of its intersection with Hagley Avenue and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 31 metres.

5. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes and controlled by Parking Meters, (including Pay by Plate machines or any approved means of payment) on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 315 metres northwest of its intersection with Hagley Avenue and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 284 metres.
direction for a distance of 66 metres. This restriction is to apply Monday to Thursday 9:00am to 5:00pm, Friday 9:00am to 8:30pm and Saturday to Sunday 9:00am-6:00pm.

6. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 381 metres northwest of its intersection with Hagley Avenue and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 43 metres.

7. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 494 metres northwest of its intersection with Hagley Avenue and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 28 metres.

8. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point being described as the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line, and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 55 metres.

9. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes and controlled by Parking Meters, (including Pay by Plate machines or any approved means of payment) on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 55 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 83 metres. This restriction is to apply Monday to Thursday 9:00am to 5:00pm, Friday 9:00am to 8:30pm and Saturday to Sunday 9:00am-6:00pm.

10. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 138 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 193 metres.

11. Approves that a Small Passenger Service Vehicle stand (Taxi Stand) be created on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 331 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 26 metres.

12. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 357 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of four metres.

13. Approves that a Bus stop be created on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 361 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 31 metres.

14. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 392 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 17 metres.

15. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Riccarton Avenue commencing at a point 508 metres northwest of the intersection of the prolongation of the Hagley Avenue north western kerb line and the Riccarton Avenue
north eastern kerb line, and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 23 metres.

16. Approves that these resolutions take effect when parking signage and/or road markings that evidence the restrictions is/are in place (or removed in the case of revocations).

Deon Swiggs/Yani Johanson  
Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00185  
Carried

Part B:

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Request staff to investigate options for replacement bus stops in the vicinity of Hagley Oval.

Deon Swiggs/Yani Johanson  
Carried

Sally Buck resumed the chair at this time.

14. Bays Area Skate - Site Selection

Board Comment

Staff in attendance spoke to the accompanying report. The Board also took into consideration the deputations from Messrs Evans, Sleigh and Haylock (Items 5.1 and 5.2 of these minutes refer.

Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approve 26 Nayland Street, Sumner as the location for a skate park in the Bays Area.
   a. This option is subject to 20/24 Nayland Street being transferred from Crown ownership to Council ownership.

2. Note that further discussion with the community will occur through the next phase of community engagement the future use of the balance of land at 20/24 Nayland Street.

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00186  
Carried

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approve 26 Nayland Street, Sumner as the location for a skate park in the Bays Area subject to 20/24 Nayland Street being transferred from Crown ownership to Council ownership.

2. Request staff to provide an update on the process for transfer of the land to Council.

3. Note that further discussion with the community will occur through the next phase of community engagement on the future use of the balance of land at 20/24 Nayland Street that is not within the proposed skate park area.

Sara Templeton/Darrell Latham  
Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 4.55pm and reconvened at 5.05pm.  
Deon Swiggs left the meeting at 4.55pm.

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00187 (Original staff recommendations accepted without change)

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Note that at time of writing the staff report no submissions on the proposed lease of an area of Old School Reserve (172 Major Hornbrook Road) to the Scout Association of New Zealand had been received as a result of the public notification process undertaken under Sections 119-120 of the Reserves Act 1977.

2. Request that in the event that if any objections are receive on the proposed lease of an area of Old School Reserve (172 Major Hornbrook Road) to the Scout Association of New Zealand are received and cannot be satisfied, staff follow the procedure under the Reserves Act 1977 to convene a Reserves Act Hearings Panel to consider any such objections and make a recommendation to the Council for a decision,

3. Resolve in the event that there are no objections to the proposed lease that cannot be satisfied, to approve the grant a lease of an area of approximately 260 square metres, of Old School Reserve (172 Major Hornbrook Road, being the land encompassing the Mt Pleasant sea Scout building footprint) to ‘The Scout Association of New Zealand’ for a term up to 33 years, and:
   a. recommend that the Chief Executive in her capacity as delegate of the Minister of Conservation’s Delegation, gives consent to the lease in accordance with 54(1) (b) of the Reserves Act 1977.
   b. Authorise the Property Consultancy Manager to manage and conclude all issues, processes and documentation associated with the lease of the property.

4. Note that approval of the ground lease to ‘The Scout Association of New Zealand’ is consistent with Council policy (“to publicly tender properties for sale or lease unless there is a clear reason for doing otherwise”), as there are clear reasons for doing so, being:
   a. The group has had long tenure at the site.
   b. The group’s activity offers a unique local benefit.
   c. The group has made a financial contribution towards a refurbishment of the building and
   d. Should the Council sell the building currently on the site to the group, ‘The Scout Association of New Zealand’ will be the logical Lessee of the land.

Tim Lindley/Sara Templeton Carried

Community Board Recommendation LCHB/2018/00188

Part A

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board recommend to the Council to:

5. Receive and consider the results from the public notification process tabled at the meeting as required under Section 78 of the Local Government Act 2002, as related to the transfer of the building located at Old School Reserve (172 Major Hornbrook Road):
Unless the results of the public notification process give cause to determine otherwise, sell the Mount Pleasant Sea Scout building located at Old School Reserve (172 Major Hornbrook Road) to ‘The Scout Association of New Zealand’ for the nominal sum of $1, noting the group will refurbish the building including an investment of $120,000 + GST.

Authorise the Property Consultancy Manager to manage and conclude all issues, processes and documentation associated with the transfer of the property.

Note that to authorise the sale of the building to ‘The Scout Association of New Zealand’ is consistent with policy “to publicly tender properties for sale or lease unless there is a clear reason for doing otherwise”, as there are clear reasons for doing so, being:

a. The group’s long tenure at the site
b. The group’s unique local benefit offered by their activity
c. The group’s financial contribution towards a refurbishment of the building and
d. Should the Council sell the building to the group, ‘The Scout Association of New Zealand’ will be the only logical Lessee within the granting of a new ground lease.

Tim Lindley/Sara Templeton

15. Coastal Pathway Project - Shared Pathway Resolutions

Board Comment

The Board discussed the coastal pathway and noted that it is being used by a variety of users.

Staff Recommendations

That the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Receive the information in Attachment A to this report.
2. Resolve the traffic resolutions for the Coastal Pathway as detailed in the plans at Attachment A to this report.
   a. Make the following resolution(s) relying on its powers under Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 and Part 21 of the Local Government Act.
3. Approve that a bi-directional shared pedestrian / bicycle path be established for a distance of 3.5 kilometres along the route known as the “Coastal Pathway” between Ferrymead Bridge and Tram Stop, Redcliffs as detailed on Attachment A, in accordance with section 11.4 of the Land Transport Act – Traffic Control Devices Rule: 2004 and Clause 1.6 of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004.
4. Approve that a bi-directional shared pedestrian / bicycle path be established upon commencement of construction for a distance of 780 metres along the route known as the “Coastal Pathway” between Shag Rock and Sumner Surf Lifesaving Club as detailed on Attachment A, in accordance with section 11.4 of the Land Transport Act – Traffic Control Devices Rule: 2004 and Clause 1.6 of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004.
5. Approve that a bi-directional shared pedestrian / bicycle path be established upon commencement of construction for a distance of 820 metres from Tram Stop, Redcliffs as detailed on Attachment A, in accordance with section 11.4 of the Land Transport Act – Traffic Control Devices Rule 2004 and Clause 1.6 of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004.
6. Approve that a bi-directional shared pedestrian / bicycle path be established upon commencement of construction for a distance of 1.6 kilometres from Sumner Surf Lifesaving Club to Scarborough as detailed on Attachment A, in accordance with section

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00189

Part C

That the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the report on the Coastal Pathway Project and Attachment A to the report attached to the agenda for the meeting.

2. Approve under its powers under Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 and Part 21 of the Local Government Act, that a bi-directional shared pedestrian / bicycle path be established for a distance of 3.5 kilometres along the route known as the “Coastal Pathway” between Ferrymead Bridge and Tram Stop, Redcliffs as detailed on Attachment A, to the report attached to the agenda for the meeting in accordance with section 11.4 of the Land Transport Act – Traffic Control Devices Rule: 2004 and Clause 1.6 of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004.

3. Approve under its powers under Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 and Part 21 of the Local Government Act, that a bi-directional shared pedestrian / bicycle path be established upon commencement of construction for a distance of 780 metres along the route known as the “Coastal Pathway” between Shag Rock and Sumner Surf Lifesaving Club as detailed on Attachment A, to the report attached to the agenda for the meeting in accordance with section 11.4 of the Land Transport Act – Traffic Control Devices Rule: 2004 and Clause 1.6 of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004.

4. Approve its powers under Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 and Part 21 of the Local Government Act that a bi-directional shared pedestrian / bicycle path be established upon commencement of construction for a distance of 820 metres from Tram Stop, Redcliffs to Shag Rock as detailed on Attachment A, to the report attached to the agenda for the meeting in accordance with section 11.4 of the Land Transport Act – Traffic Control Devices Rule: 2004 and Clause 1.6 of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004.

5. Approve its powers under Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 and Part 21 of the Local Government Act, that a bi-directional shared pedestrian / bicycle path be established upon commencement of construction for a distance of 1.6 kilometres from Sumner Surf Lifesaving Club to Scarborough as detailed on Attachment A, to the report attached to the agenda for the meeting in accordance with section 11.4 of the Land Transport Act – Traffic Control Devices Rule: 2004 and Clause 1.6 of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004.

Part B

6. Request staff advice on how the shared pathway is working and whether there is a need for speed limits or other measures to be implemented to manage potential conflicts.

Sara Templeton/Darrell Latham

Carried
17. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote 2018-19 Youth Development Scheme
Application - Various

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00190 (Original staff recommendation accepted without change)

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board resolve to:

1. Approve a grant of $250 from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to Bella Richelle Lister towards competing in the Touch Nationals in Rotorua in February 2019.

2. Approve a grant of $350 from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to Brayden Peter Keep towards competing in the 2018/19 rowing regatta season.

Yani Johanson/Alexandra Davids

Carried


Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approves a grant of $1,000 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Bamford School towards Rock Band Equipment.

2. Approves a grant of $3,000 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Delta Community Support Trust towards Advocacy services.

3. Approves a grant of $4,000 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Richmond Residents and Business Association towards set-up and projects.

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00191

Part B

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Lay the Discretionary Response Fund Applications from Bamford School, Delta Community Support Trust and the Richmond Residents and Business Association on the table until the next meeting pending a discussion of funding matters at a Board workshop in January 2019.

Sally Buck/Tim Lindley

Carried
19. Linwood-Central-Heathcote Recess Committee 2018/19
Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00192 (Original staff recommendations accepted without change)

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Appoints a Recess Committee comprising the Board Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson and at least two Board members to be authorised to exercise the delegated powers of the Linwood Central Heathcote Community Board for the period following its ordinary meeting on 3 December 2018 up until the Board resumes normal business on 4 February 2019.

2. Requires that the Committee report back to the Board, the application of any such delegation, for record purposes.

3. Notes that any meeting of the Recess Committee will be publically notified and details forwarded to all Board members.

Darrell Latham/Sara Templeton
Carried

20. Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Meeting Schedule 2019
Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00193 (Original staff recommendation accepted without change)

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Adopt the following meeting schedule from 4 February to 18 September 2019:
   - Monday 4 February 3pm
   - Wednesday 20 February 10am
   - Monday 4 March 3pm
   - Wednesday 20 March 10am
   - Monday 8 April 3pm
   - Wednesday 24 April 10am
   - Monday 6 May 3pm
   - Wednesday 22 May 10am
   - Tuesday 4 June 3pm Monday is Queens Birthday Observance
   - Wednesday 19 June 10am
   - Monday 1 July 3pm
   - Wednesday 17 July 10am
   - Monday 5 August 3pm
   - Wednesday 21 August 10am
   - Monday 2 September 3pm
   - Wednesday 18 September 10am
2. Agree that each meeting will host Public Forums.

3. Delegate to the Community Governance Manager the ability to make any changes to the schedule as necessary to meet circumstances as required.

Yani Johanson/Tim Lindley  Carried

21. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Area Report - December 2018

Staff in attendance spoke to the accompanying report.

The Board also took into consideration the deputation on behalf of the Inner City East Revitalisation Project Working Group (Item 5.3 of these minutes refers).

**Staff Recommendations**

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:


2. Consider items for inclusion for the Board Report to the Council’s 6 December 2018 meeting.

**Community Board Resolved LCHB/2018/00194**

**Part B**

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:


2. Identify the following item for inclusion for the Board Report to the Council’s 4 February 2019 meeting.

- Linwood Pool information sharing session.

Alexandra Davids/Darrell Latham  Carried

**Community Board Decided LCHB/2018/00195**

**Part A**

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Recommends that the Council identify the funding shortfall for FR4 project, Woolston Transportation Improvements and approves the additional funding necessary to complete the project with urgency to ensure the safety of school students.

Alexandra Davids/Darrell Latham  Carried

Sara Templeton left the meeting at 06:07 p.m.
22. Elected Members’ Information Exchange

Part B

Elected members shared the following information:

- **Parking Restrictions** – the Board discussed the need for 10 minute parking in Lismore Street.

- **Roadwork Disruptions** – the Board noted that some Redcliffs business owners are concerned at the disruption of roadworks.

- **Scarborough Reservoir Reserve** – Concern has been expressed from a community member that the trees at the Scarborough Reservoir are not being regularly trimmed.

- **Woolston Pavilion War Memorial** – The Board noted that the plaque from the Woolston Pavilion war memorial has been missing for some time.

Meeting concluded at 6.22pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2019.

SALLY BUCK
CHAIRPERSON
7. Correspondence

Reference: 19/8017
Presenter(s): Liz Beaven, Community Board Adviser

1. Purpose of Report

Correspondence has been received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redcliffs Residents’ Association</td>
<td>Requesting support for the installation of a pedestrian crossing at Barnett Park, Redcliffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Pleasant Residents’ Association</td>
<td>Proposed Establishment of a small community garden/barbeque area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Williams</td>
<td>Towpath Walkway – Woolston Cut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Staff Recommendations

That the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the correspondence report dated 04 February 2019.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Correspondence from Redcliffs Residents' Association requesting support for the installation of a pedestrian crossing at Barnett Park, Redcliffs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Mt Pleasant Residents' Association - Proposed Establishment of a small community garden/barbeque area.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>P Williams - Towpath Walkway - Woolston Cut</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Redcliffs RRA [mailto:redcliffs.ra@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, 7 December 2018 11:10 p.m.
To: Grace, Arohanui <Arohanui.Grace@ccc.govt.nz>  
Cc: Committee RRA <committee@redcliffs.org.nz>; Dr Darrell Latham <lathams@xtra.co.nz>; Templeton, Sara <Sara.Templeton@ccc.govt.nz>; Neville, Joshua <josh.neville@ccc.govt.nz>  
Subject: Request for a pedestrian crossing to Barnett Park, Redcliffs

The RRA would like to ask the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to support our request to Council for the provision of a pedestrian crossing near the entrance to Barnett Park in Main Road, Redcliffs.

There are a number of reasons why this is thought to be essential for the safety of residents at this particular time.
1. Barnett Park is a well-used local facility with a pre-school, playground, sports fields, public toilet, dog-walking and barbeque areas and walking tracks. It contains the only public toilet near the Coastal Pathway between Scott Park and the Sumner Surf Club.
2. The Coastal Pathway is on the opposite side of Main Road and is expected to get increasing use in future years as further sections are completed and Redcliffs School returns to the area. Many users are likely to want to cross to Barnett Park to use the facilities.
3. The painted median in the road has been reduced in width due to the widening of the footpath to accommodate the Coastal Pathway.
4. The only pedestrian crossing in the area is at the traffic lights at Augusta Street, which is 240m west of the entrance to Barnett Park and not a natural crossing point. There are no pedestrian crossings at all to the east of Barnett Park for people coming from the Sumner direction.
5. Main Road will become significantly busier when the Evans Pass road reopens in 2019 and will also be used for the port traffic which is not suitable for the tunnel. There will also be an increased number of cyclists using the through route to Lyttelton.

There is no provision in the Main Road Master Plan for a crossing at this location, but the Plan was drawn up some years ago in different circumstances. The RRA requests that Council consider the provision of a suitable pedestrian crossing here at the earliest opportunity.

Pat McIntosh  
Sec, for RRA

Redcliffs Residents Association

Website: www.redcliffs.org.nz  
Committee members - see website.  
Phone: Secretary Dr Pat McIntosh, on (03) 376 6133  
Email: secretary@redcliffs.org.nz
Tēnā koe Sally and Tēnā koutou to your fellow Board members

I am writing to let you know that I have, on behalf of the Mt Pleasant Memorial Community Centre and Residents’ Association, applied to the Innovation and Sustainability Fund to enable us to establish a small community garden/BBQ area between our community centre and KidsFirst Kindergarten. I applied for the funding before the December cut-off as we are keen to get the project underway as soon as possible in the hope that we could have the raised beds etc established before the autumn planting season. I realise we should have applied to the Community Board first – please accept my apologies for the rather contrary process I have adopted in this case.

As the area we intend establishing the garden on is reserve land we seek the Community Board’s permission or approval to proceed. The area between our new centre and the kindergarten is currently planted with a number of well-established older shrubs and trees as well as with some new trees. Our intention is that these remain and that the raised beds will be scattered amongst them. The BBQ area will be re-established where there are the remains of old pergola & sand-pit at the back of the site; this will be generally tidied up and improved.

I believe in the past our Association has applied to the Board in relation to the landscape plans for our centre’s rebuild; this is a ‘next-step’ in our desire to make the whole area an ‘active’ community space. Currently the zone I am referring to is a rather ‘dead’ area between the Centre and the new kindergarten.

Prior to my sending in our application to the I&S Fund I was in email discussion with Tony Moore regarding our plan and he passed me on to Dieter Steinegg who suggested that I speak with Kyle McQuilkan and Jonathon Hansen but due to the Christmas break I have not as yet established a direct discussion with them. I aim to gain a face-to-face meeting with them once the holiday period is over. I have also gained support for our plans from Michael Reynolds from the Food Resilience Network and from the principal of the Bay KidsFirst Kindergarten; it will be exciting to work in with both these organisations, particularly the kindy. Michael has also offered his support in order to facilitate soil testing for contaminants.
I have attached here our rough draft of the site layout but to explain further our intentions let me provide some details. The project will incorporate 3 small raised beds for growing vegetables and herbs plus 2 similar beds for raising berry fruits. Placed along the boundary with the kindergarten car park will be 2-3 heritage fruit trees (apple, pear, plum). We know it is essential to provide composting facilities so intend purchasing three large enclosed bins as well as a rain water tank to collect run-off from the pergola roof. The current rather tired outdoor BBQ area will be redesigned and brought up to standard to become a wonderful landscaped open-air community space.

Our aim is to provide a shared garden space where both learning and community ‘bumping-in’ can occur. It has been a long-term plan of the Association to have such a space as a way of incorporating resilience into our community rebuild post-quake. It is very much about seeing an opportunity now the kindergarten is also back ‘home’ to improve and enhance the look of the ‘in-between’ area, creating a communal link between two wonderful facilities.

The establishment team consists of Jocelyn Paprill, Kate Rawlings, Tessa Fenton (MPCC Committee Members); Di Richardson (Volunteer); Kathy Bartlett (Community Coordinator); Niki Jones (Coordinator and Team Leader for Sumner Food Forest). Other people from our community have expressed an interest and enthusiasm for helping once the establishment team has done the paper-work.

I am more than happy to attend a Board meeting to speak to our proposal or to answer any questions you may have. I look forward to hearing from you.

Nāku noa, nā

Jocelyn Paprill
Committee member
Mt Pleasant Memorial Community Centre and Residents’ Association (Inc.)
Draft plan Mt Pleasant Memorial Edible Garden site

We have not had time to secure a properly dawn landscape plan but hope to be able to complete one over the Christmas break after further face to face contact with council park staff.

The approx. Total Area: 387.68 m² - rectangular in shape.

This is a photo of the site from the corner of community centre looking toward Main Road.

A closer shot of area showing the nature of surface. Note the patchy grassed area.

Stylised layout – VERY draft

16.80M x 25.10M

- BBQ covered area
- Native tree
- Large older tree
- Bushy area (to be cut back, tidied up)
- Picnic Table
- Enhanced covered area/ Shade sail
- Raised gardens
Further photos of the site
Towpath Walkway – Woolston Cut

Report prepared by Peter Williams

Dated August 2017

Resubmitted 2018

Resubmitted January 2019

Report on the condition of part of the Towpath walkway:

The majority of the Towpath walkway is in good condition and maintained on a regular basis, by ‘City Care’ under contract with the ‘City Council’.

Area of concern:

However, part of the track appears, not to be within the contract, and therefore neglected, apart from being lawn mowed, occasionally.

The area on the Towpath Walkway of concern, is located behind, Gould Cres, Woolston. It is a grassed strip that runs from the paved path in Gould Cres and finishes at the concrete underpass at the Lyttleton Tunnel Road.

![Map of the area](image)

On the map above the Towpath Walkway is shown on the northern side of the ‘Heathcote River Estuary’ with a ‘--------’ line. On this map, the Towpath Walkway starts at Gould Cres and finishes at the Ferrymead Bridge.

The area of concern is minimal in comparison to the whole walkway;

As mentioned the area of concern is from Gould Cres to the Lyttleton Tunnel Road.

The rest of the walkway is well maintained and included are some photos of that standard.
The following is a picture of an entry just completed off Ferry Road onto the Towpath walkway.

As mentioned the Towpath extends from Gould Cres to the Ferrymead bridge and is well maintained from the Lyttleton Tunnel Road to the Ferrymead Bridge.

As this report is being written the Towpath Walkway from Settlers Cres to the Ferrymead Bridge, known as the ‘Ferrymead Esplanade’ is being upgraded, because of the resent high levels of water in that area.

**Gould Cres to Lyttleton Tunnel Road:**

This part of the Towpath walkway is regularly used by, walkers, cyclists and runners. It is a popular entry safe point to the rest of the walkway from the Woolston area.

It is not only a safe point for the above users but it also is used regularly by people walking or cycling to their workplaces, along Ferry Road, and returning to their homes.

**Why?**

Because it is safer using this walkway to commute, or recreationally, than Ferry Road and the roundabout, that has four entry, and exit points, where there are regular road accidents, by the traffic that use it.

**Present Condition:**

Included are photos of the Towpath section in question and needing an upgrade.
The area shown in the above photos is very moist, and retains water for a major part of the year. However, it is, as mentioned a safe entry point for walking, running and cycling into the existing towpath walking track.

It also should be noted, that there is an existing, ‘City Council’ sign indicating its existence as a walk/cycle track.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that this part of the ‘Towpath Walkway’ be upgraded to the standard of the remaining walkway from the Lyttleton Tunnel Road to the Ferrymead Bridge.

That standard being an ‘all-weather compacted metal pathway’.

This work would then improve another cycle/walk-way within the Christchurch City Council network of such facilities.

Peter Williams, 10 Woolston Court, Christchurch. 3848687
8. 185 Peterborough Street, Central Christchurch - Proposed P60 Restrictions

Reference: 19/57845
Presenter(s): Barry Hayes – Traffic Engineer, Traffic Operations Team

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

   Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to approve the installation of P60 restrictions on Peterborough Street in accordance with Attachment A.

   Origin of Report
   1.2 This report was staff generated in response to a request from a local business who requested more parking opportunities for their visitors and clients.

2. Significance

   2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

       2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by comparing factors relating to this decision against the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

       2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

   That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

   1. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Peterborough Street, as indicated in the attached drawing TG133713 Issue 1, dated 4/2/2019, forming part of the resolution is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 60 minutes between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday.

   2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

   3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in the staff report are in place.

4. Key Points

   4.1 The recommendations in this report are consistent with the anticipated outcomes of the Traffic Safety & Efficiency Service Plan in the Councils Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028).

   4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
      • Option 1 - Provide P60 restrictions (preferred option)
      • Option 2 – Do nothing

   4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)
4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:
- Increases opportunities for short stay parking, visitors, for customers and couriers
- Improves turnover of parking spaces throughout the day
- Benefits multiple businesses due to shared use

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Displaces all day parking to other locations

5. Context/Background

5.1 Council staff were approached by a business based at 185 Peterborough Street known as the New Zealand Aids Foundation (NZAF). This property does have a small on-site car park, with provision for 2-3 vehicles though these are shared with other business owners and residents who are close to this address. The NZAF referred to substantial difficulties each day that are experienced by their visitors and clients and requested some short stay parking opportunities.

5.2 Staff investigated the site and local parking activity. This location is situated approximately half way between Manchester Street and Madras Street. The adjacent land uses are primarily residential and business related. Unrestricted parking is available on both sides, with the south side comprising right angled parking, whereas the north side consists of parallel parking.

5.3 The kerbside area near 185 consist of a road narrowing, which functions as traffic calming and includes some no stopping restrictions. Consequently parking is not feasible immediately outside 185. However, immediately to the east, there is a group of businesses which have four parallel parks along the frontage. There is an off-street car park available to the rear with provision for approximately 25 spaces, though this is privately operated with a gate. Consequently this parking location is unavailable to the NZAF.

5.4 It is evident from several site visits at different times of the day that parking demands are consistently intensive. It is expected that most of the on-street spaces are used to park all day, probably by commuters who walk into the central city. Staff consider that new P60 restrictions would benefit visitors and customers to multiple businesses in this area.

5.5 Staff discussed the preferred period of operation with NZAF. A Monday to Friday restriction for the usual working day was considered appropriate. This would enable residents and their visitors to park for longer overnight and weekends if required.

5.6 Consequently the proposal is considered to be beneficial to local business activity in this area.
6. Option 1 – Install P60 Restrictions (preferred)

Option Description
6.1 Provide P60 restrictions on Peterborough Street in accordance with Attachment A.

Significance
6.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua
6.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
6.4 Letters of consultation with a site plan were issued to all tenants and property owners of 183-202 Peterborough Street and central city business association.
6.5 Two responses were received of which both supported the proposal.
6.6 The Team Leader of Parking Compliance was also consulted and indicated his supports for this option.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
6.7 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.
6.8 Within the Parking Strategy for The Garden City, the kerb space parking priority for on-street parking in Policy 6G (Business Areas) states that short-stay private vehicle parking for businesses has a priority greater than that of commuter parking. This proposal is consistent with this policy.

Financial Implications
6.9 Cost of Implementation - $400 to provide road markings and signs plus $750 for the consultation and preparation of this report.
6.10 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Covered under the area maintenance contract and effect will be minimal to the overall asset.
6.11 Funding source - Traffic Operations Budget.

Legal Implications
6.12 Part 1, clauses 7 and 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
6.13 The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Board includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.
6.14 The installation of any sign and/or road markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

Risks and Mitigations
6.15 Some parking displacement of all day parking is likely, though since this on the edge of the central city these risks are in line with those expected to arise due to effects of the suburban parking strategy near the central city.

Implementation
6.16 Implementation dependencies - Community Board approval.
6.17 Implementation timeframe - Approximately six weeks once the area contractor receives the request.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

6.18 The advantages of this option include:

- Increases opportunities for short stay parking, for visitors, customers and couriers
- Improves turnover of parking spaces throughout the day
- Benefits multiple businesses due to shared use

6.19 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Displaces all day parking to other locations

7. Option 2 – Do Nothing

Option Description
7.1 Retain unrestricted parking.

Significance
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua
7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
7.4 This option is inconsistent with the request to increase short stay parking opportunities at this location.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
7.5 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications
7.6 Cost of Implementation - Not applicable.
7.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Not applicable.
7.8 Funding source - Not applicable.

Legal Implications
7.9 Not applicable.

Risks and Mitigations
7.10 If the restrictions are not installed there is a substantial risk that the local business will continue to have limited opportunities for visitors, clients and customers to park, which affect their business performance.

Implementation
7.11 Implementation dependencies - Not applicable.
7.12 Implementation timeframe - Not applicable.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.13 The advantages of this option include:

- Retains four unrestricted parking spaces
7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Does not support the concerns of the local businesses

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>185 Peterborough St P60 site plan</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

(i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and

(ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Barry Hayes - Traffic Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Ryan Rolston - Team Leader Traffic Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Cass Street near Durham Street South, Sydenham - Proposed Loading Zone

Reference: 19/5079
Presenter(s): Barry Hayes – Traffic Engineer, Traffic Operations Team

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to approve the replacement of part of an existing P30 restricted area with a P5 Loading Zone on Cass Street in accordance with Attachment A.

Origin of Report
1.2 This report was staff generated in response to a request from a local business who requested more opportunities for loading operations.
1.3 These measures have been requested to provide more appropriate parking restrictions at this location to assist servicing and deliveries in this area.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by comparing factors relating to this decision against the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Cass Street, as indicated in the attached drawing TG133705 Issue 1, dated 13/12/2018, forming part of the resolution is specified as a loading zone for goods vehicles only and be restricted to maximum period of five minutes.

2. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Cass Street, as indicated in the attached drawing TG133705 Issue 1, dated 13/12/2018, forming part of the resolution is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 30 minutes.

3. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

4. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in the staff report are in place.
4. Key Points
   4.1 The recommendations in this report are consistent with the anticipated outcomes of the Traffic Safety & Efficiency Service Plan in the Councils Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028).
   4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
      - Option 1 - Provide a P5 Loading Zone (preferred option)
      - Option 2 – Do nothing
   4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (preferred option)
      4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:
         - Increases opportunities for safe loading and delivery operations.
         - Increases the efficiency of use of the P30 parking area.
         - Benefits the adjacent business.
      4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
         - Displaces some short stay P30 parking to other locations.

5. Context/Background
   5.1 Council staff met with a local business operator who referred to the difficulties for loading and delivery operations in this section of Cass Street throughout the working day.
   5.2 Staff investigated the site and the local parking activity. Cass Street is situated between Colombo Street and Orbell Street. This particular section is immediately east of the Durham Street overbridge. There are light industrial premises throughout this area.
   5.3 This section of the street consists of a continuous row of unrestricted right angled parking on the north side. P30 restrictions are in effect on the south side. The unrestricted parking is consistently in use during the working day between Monday and Friday. The P30 parking is used sporadically and is used by cars and commercial vehicles.
   5.4 Site observations indicated that the P30 spaces were typically 30-50% occupied at different times of day. Whilst this provides some space for loading operations, the parked vehicles were randomly located and presented difficulties for longer commercial vehicles to manoeuvre parallel to the kerb. On one occasion staff noticed a truck double parked, despite short gaps being available in the P30 section.
   5.5 Staff agree with the business operator’s concerns and recommend a revision to the existing restrictions. This consists of converting approximately one third of the existing P30 area to a P5 loading zone, which would be close to where inward goods would be received by the business. This location is also close to the adjacent business, so is expected to also benefit their operations.
   5.6 Consequently the proposal is considered to be beneficial to local business activity in this area.
6. Option 1 – Install P5 Loading Zone (preferred)

Option Description
6.1 Provide a P5 Loading Zone and reduce the P30 restrictions on Cass Street in accordance with Attachment A.

Significance
6.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua
6.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
6.4 Letters of consultation with a site plan were issued to all tenants and property owners at the nearest 10 properties on Cass Street and Sandyford Street which backs onto Cass Street. The Sydenham Business Association was also contacted.
6.5 Only one response was received which supported the proposal.
6.6 The Team Leader of Parking Compliance supports this option.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
6.7 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications
6.8 Cost of Implementation - $400 to provide road markings and signs plus $750 for the consultation and preparation of this report.
6.9 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Covered under the area maintenance contract and effect will be minimal to the overall asset.
6.10 Funding source - Traffic Operations Budget.

Legal Implications
6.11 Part 1, clauses 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
6.12 The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Board includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.
6.13 The installations of any sign and/or road markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

Risks and Mitigations
6.14 The proposal could result in P30 demands being displaced elsewhere. However, based on the site observations staff are satisfied the reduced P30 parking bay will meet the short stay parking demands.

Implementation
6.15 Implementation dependencies - Community Board approval.
6.16 Implementation timeframe - Approximately six weeks once the area contractor receives the request.
Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

6.17 The advantages of this option include:

- Increases opportunities for safe loading and delivery operations.
- Increases the efficiency of use of the P30 parking area.
- Benefits the adjacent business.

6.18 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Displaces some P30 parking to other locations.

7. Option 2 – Do Nothing

Option Description

7.1 Retain the current extent of P30 parking restrictions.

Significance

7.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua

7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

7.4 This option is inconsistent with the request to improve loading operations at this location.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

7.5 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications

7.6 Cost of Implementation - Not applicable.
7.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Not applicable.
7.8 Funding source - Not applicable.

Legal Implications

7.9 Not applicable.

Risks and Mitigations

7.10 If the restrictions are not installed there is a substantial risk that the local business will continue to have limited opportunities for safe loading operations, which affect their business performance.

Implementation

7.11 Implementation dependencies - Not applicable.
7.12 Implementation timeframe - Not applicable.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.13 The advantages of this option include:

- Retain the current extent of P30 restrictions

7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Does not support the concerns of the local business.
Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Barry Hayes - Traffic Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Stephen Wright - Senior Traffic Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. 173 Waltham Road, Sydenham - Proposed P60 Restrictions

Reference: 19/589
Presenter(s): Barry Hayes – Traffic Engineer, Traffic Operations Team

1. **Purpose and Origin of Report**

   **Purpose of Report**
   
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to approve the installation of P60 restrictions on Waltham Road in accordance with Attachment A.

   **Origin of Report**
   
   1.2 This report was staff generated in response to a local business who requested more parking opportunities for customers and couriers.
   
   1.3 These measures have been requested to provide more turnover of parking spaces, to meet the requirements of several businesses in the area.

2. **Significance**

   2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
   
   2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by comparing factors relating to this decision against the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
   
   2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. **Staff Recommendations**

   That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:
   
   1. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Waltham Road, as indicated in the attached drawing TG133490 Issue 1, dated 20/11/2018, forming part of the resolution is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 60 minutes between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday.
   
   2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.
   
   3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in the staff report are in place.

4. **Key Points**

   4.1 The recommendations in this report are consistent with the anticipated outcomes of the Traffic Safety & Efficiency Service Plan in the Councils Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028).
   
   4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
   
   - Option 1 - Provide P60 restrictions (preferred option)
   - Option 2 – Do nothing
   
   4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (preferred option)
4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- Increases opportunities for short stay parking, for customers and couriers
- Improves turnover of parking spaces throughout the day
- Benefits multiple businesses in the area

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Displaces all day parking to other locations

5. Context/Background

5.1 Council staff received a request from the café business situated near this location, who referred to parking demands being high in the area and that short stay opportunities were very limited.

5.2 Staff investigated the site twice and have driven passed on many occasions. This section of Waltham Road is median divided and has a parking shoulder on both sides and lacks any formal restrictions along this section. Besides the café, there are several other businesses and a beauty salon near to this location. Some on-site parking is available, although is mainly occupied and used by staff at the other businesses. The on-site layout is quite tight for manoeuvring and not ideal for customers or visitors to use.

5.3 The café often attracts pass-by customers who would appear to prefer to park on Waltham Road, to minimise their delay returning into the main traffic stream. The café owner indicated that many commuter drivers who park here walk elsewhere and are assumed to work in a different part of town. The high parking demands were only reported as an issue Monday to Friday.

5.4 Staff agree with the café business operator’s concerns. Initially a P30 restriction was considered appropriate though further to consultation was changed to a P60 restriction.

5.5 Consequently the proposal is considered to be beneficial to local business activity in this area.
6. Option 1 – Install P60 Restrictions (preferred)

Option Description
6.1 Provide P60 restrictions on Waltham Road in accordance with Attachment A.

Significance
6.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua
6.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
6.4 Letters of consultation with a site plan were issued to the Sydenham Business Association and tenants and property owners of the 10 nearest properties on Waltham Road.
6.5 Six responses were received of which five supported the proposal, though requested an amendment to P60. One of the supporters is the owner of 1-171, 2-171, 173A, 173D as well as 175 Waltham Road.
6.6 One objection was received by a resident who works shifts and often leaves his vehicle on-street during the working day.
6.7 Consequently, staff have changed the proposal to P60 and consider that it is generally supported.
6.8 The Team Leader of Parking Compliance supports this option.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
6.9 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.
6.10 Within the Parking Strategy for The Garden City, the kerb space parking priority for on-street parking in Policy 6G (Business Areas) states that short-stay private vehicle parking for businesses has a priority greater than that of commuter parking. This proposal is consent with this policy.

Financial Implications
6.11 Cost of Implementation - $300 to provide road markings and signs plus $750 for the consultation and preparation of this report.
6.12 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Covered under the area maintenance contract and the effect will be minimal to the overall asset.
6.13 Funding source - Traffic Operations Budget.

Legal Implications
6.14 Part 1, clauses 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
6.15 The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Board includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.
6.16 The installations of any sign and/or road markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

Risks and Mitigations
6.17 No risks identified.
Implementation
6.18 Implementation dependencies - Community Board approval.
6.19 Implementation timeframe - Approximately six weeks once the area contractor receives the request.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
6.20 The advantages of this option include:
   • Increases opportunities for short stay parking, for customers and couriers
   • Improves turnover of parking spaces throughout the day
   • Benefits multiple businesses due to shared use
6.21 The disadvantages of this option include:
   • Displaces all day parking to other locations

7. Option 2 – Do Nothing

Option Description
7.1 Retain the unrestricted parking.

Significance
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua
7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
7.4 This option is inconsistent with the request to increase short stay parking opportunities at this location.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
7.5 This option is inconsistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications
7.6 Cost of Implementation - Not applicable.
7.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Not applicable.
7.8 Funding source - Not applicable.

Legal Implications
7.9 Not applicable.

Risks and Mitigations
7.10 If the restrictions are not installed there is a substantial risk that the local businesses will continue to have limited opportunities for customers or visitors to park, which may affect their business performance.

Implementation
7.11 Implementation dependencies - Not applicable.
7.12 Implementation timeframe - Not applicable.
Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.13 The advantages of this option include:
   - Retains two unrestricted parking spaces

7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:
   - Does not support the concerns of the local businesses

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>173 Waltham Rd P60 site plan</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Barry Hayes - Traffic Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Stephen Wright - Senior Traffic Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Ferry Road near Hart Street, Woolston - Proposed P10 Restrictions

Reference: 19/5045
Presenter(s): Barry Hayes – Traffic Engineer, Traffic Operations Team

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to approve the installation of P10 restrictions on Ferry Road near Hart Street in accordance with Attachment A.

Origin of Report
1.2 This report was staff generated in response to a request from a local business who requested more parking opportunities for customers.

1.3 These measures have been requested to provide more turnover of parking spaces, to meet the requirements of local businesses in the area.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by comparing factors relating to this decision against the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Ferry Road, as indicated in the attached drawing TG133711 Issue 1, dated 20/12/2018, forming part of the resolution is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 10 minutes at any time.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in the staff report are in place.

4. Key Points

4.1 The recommendations in this report are consistent with the anticipated outcomes of the Traffic Safety & Efficiency Service Plan in the Councils Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028).

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 - Provide P10 restrictions (preferred option).
- Option 2 – Do nothing.

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option).
4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:
- Increases opportunities for short stay parking, for customers and couriers.
- Improves turnover of parking spaces throughout the day.
- Benefits multiple businesses due to shared use.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Displaces all day parking to other locations.

5. Context/Background

5.1 Council staff met with a local business operator, who referred to the lack of short stay opportunities in the local area. The business operator and the adjacent business significantly depend on pass-by customers who prefer to park along Ferry Road rather than turn off onto Hart Street and have to turn around.

5.2 Staff investigated the site and local parking activity. The business is located between Hart Street and Ensors Road which has a single traffic and cycle lane in both directions.

5.3 Currently the three spaces under consideration on the south side are unrestricted for on-street parking and are occupied for most of the working day, probably by staff based at the nearby businesses. As this is located close to the signalised Ensors Street intersection and the uncontrolled Hart Street intersection, the remaining sections have extensive lengths of no stopping restrictions which restrict alternative opportunities to park on the south side of Ferry Road.

5.4 On the opposite (north) side of Ferry Road, the parking spaces have a P60 restriction.

5.5 Staff agree with the business operator’s concerns. Consequently a P10 restriction was agreed to be appropriate and ‘at any time’ since they operate early in the morning and late in the evenings. The adjacent takeaway shop is also considered to benefit from the same type of restriction, especially during the evenings.

5.6 Consequently the proposal is considered to be beneficial to local business activity in this area.
6. **Option 1 – Install P10 Restrictions (preferred)**

**Option Description**

6.1 Provide P10 restrictions on Ferry Road in accordance with Attachment A.

**Significance**

6.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

6.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**

6.4 Letters of consultation with a site plan were issued to all tenants and property owners the nearest 10 properties on Ferry Road and Hart Street. The Woolston Community Association and the Woolston Development project were also consulted.

6.5 Three responses were received in support and no objections were received or requests to amend the proposal.

6.6 The Team Leader of Parking Compliance was also consulted and has confirmed his support for this option.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**

6.7 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

6.8 Within the Parking Strategy for The Garden City, the kerb space parking priority for on-street parking in Policy 6G (Business Areas) states that short-stay private vehicle parking for businesses has a priority greater than that of commuter parking. This proposal is consistent with this policy.

**Financial Implications**

6.9 Cost of Implementation - $400 to provide road markings and signs plus $750 for the consultation and preparation of this report.

6.10 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Covered under the area maintenance contract and effect will be minimal to the overall asset.

6.11 Funding source - Traffic Operations Budget.

**Legal Implications**

6.12 Part 1, clauses 7 and 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.

6.13 The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Board includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.

6.14 The installations of any sign and/or road markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

**Risks and Mitigations**

6.15 There is the risk of displaced all day parking causing a problem elsewhere. There are several other available spaces on Hart Street, which should accommodate these demands.

**Implementation**

6.16 Implementation dependencies - Community Board approval.
6.17 Implementation timeframe - Approximately six weeks once the area contractor receives the request.

### Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

6.18 The advantages of this option include:
- Increases opportunities for short stay parking, for customers and deliveries.
- Improves turnover of parking spaces throughout the day.
- Benefits multiple businesses due to shared use.

6.19 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Displaces all day parking to other locations.

### 7. Option 2 – Do Nothing

#### Option Description

7.1 Retain unrestricted parking.

#### Significance

7.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

#### Impact on Mana Whenua

7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

#### Community Views and Preferences

7.4 This option is inconsistent with the request to increase short stay parking opportunities at this location.

#### Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

7.5 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

#### Financial Implications

7.6 Cost of Implementation - Not applicable.
7.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Not applicable.
7.8 Funding source - Not applicable.

#### Legal Implications

7.9 Not applicable.

#### Risks and Mitigations

7.10 If the restrictions are not installed there is a substantial risk that the local business will continue to have limited opportunities for customers to park, which affect their business performance.

#### Implementation

7.11 Implementation dependencies - Not applicable.
7.12 Implementation timeframe - Not applicable.

#### Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.13 The advantages of this option include:
- Retains three unrestricted parking spaces.
7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Does not support the concerns of the local business.

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>378 Ferry Rd P10 site plan</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Confirmation of Statutory Compliance**

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

(i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and

(ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Barry Hayes - Traffic Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Ryan Rolston - Team Leader Traffic Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Major Hornbrook Road at Muritai Terrace, Mount Pleasant - Proposed Amendment to Time Restricted Parking

Reference: 19/3563
Presenter(s): Barry Hayes – Traffic Engineer, Traffic Operations Team

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

   Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to approve the amendment to time restricted parking to P10 restrictions on Major Hornbrook Road in accordance with Attachment A.

   Origin of Report
   1.2 This report was staff generated in response to the local scout group who requested more suitable restrictions to correspond with their visitors.
   1.3 These measures have been requested to enable the restrictions to be more readily enforced and maintain the level of road safety at this location at all times.

2. Significance

   2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
   2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by comparing factors relating to this decision against the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
   2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

   That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:
   1. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Major Hornbrook Road, as indicated in the attached drawing TG133008 Issue 2, dated 04/01/2019, forming part of the resolution is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 10 minutes at any time.
   2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.
   3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in the staff report are in place.

4. Key Points

   4.1 The recommendations in this report are consistent with the anticipated outcomes of the Traffic Safety & Efficiency Service Plan in the Councils Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028).
   4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
   - Option 1 – Replace the P5 with P10 restrictions (preferred option).
   - Option 2 – Do nothing.
4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- Enables enforcement to be possible during evenings when scout meetings are scheduled.
- Provides a more reasonable waiting period for parents, if scout meetings end late.
- Deters overnight parking and the associated risk of unsafe overtaking during this time.
- Retains the discouragement of most parking activity at an unsafe location.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- None identified.

5. Context/Background

5.1 On 16 July 2018 the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approved a proposal to introduce parking restrictions at this location, which included P5 restrictions between the two successive bends at this location. The restrictions apply to two parking spaces on the downhill side of the road and have been in operation for approximately six months.

5.2 This was proposed to deter most parking demands at a location where there is a risk of drivers, including of buses, overtaking parked vehicles close to tight bends, which could cause head on collisions with a high risk of severe injury.

5.3 The purpose of the short stay restrictions is to enable drivers to either drop off or pick up at the scout hall, deliver goods, assist rubbish collection in this area or use the public toilets at the domain.

5.4 Further to discussions with the Group Leader of the Mount Pleasant Scout Group it has become apparent that it would be appropriate to amend the restrictions slightly, to match the parking demands. The scout hall does have a car park, though with limited capacity, which results in some parents waiting on-street to drop off or pick up.

5.5 Firstly, the approved restriction applies to the standard working day of 8am to 6pm. Since most meetings at the scout den occur later in the evenings, the specified period should be extended to take effect when parents arrive before or after meetings. Drivers are generally recognising the existing restriction, though should a parking ticket be disputed, Council could not justify an infringement after 6pm. Consequently, by amending the restriction to ‘at any time’ this addresses the issue.

5.6 Secondly, it is apparent that a P5 restriction is an unreasonable short time during the scout collection periods. Meetings can run late and a 10 minute period allows more flexibility for waiting parents. Since this is still a short period, it still functions as a deterrent for parking activity for most of the day to reduce the frequency of unsafe overtaking.

5.7 In summary this proposal provides a more suitable time restriction for the local parking demands and maintains the level of road safety benefits.
6. **Option 1 – Replace P5 with P10 ‘At Any Time’ Restrictions (preferred)**

**Option Description**
6.1 Replace the existing P5 (8am-6pm) restrictions with P10 (At any time) restrictions on Major Hornbrook Road in accordance with Attachment A.

**Significance**
6.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**
6.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**
6.4 This proposal only affects the Mount Pleasant Sea Scout Group and consequently they have been the only consultee. The Group Leader of the Sea Scout Group fully supports the proposals.
6.5 The Team Leader of Parking Compliance supports this option.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**
6.6 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.
6.7 Within the Parking Strategy for The Garden City, the kerb space parking priority for on-street parking in Policy 6G (Business Areas) states that short-stay private vehicle parking for businesses has a priority greater than that of commuter parking. This proposal is consistent with this policy.

**Financial Implications**
6.8 Cost of Implementation - $200 to replace two signs plus $750 for the consultation and preparation of this report.
6.9 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Covered under the area maintenance contract and effect will be minimal to the overall asset.
6.10 Funding source - Traffic Operations Budget.

**Legal Implications**
6.11 Part 1, clauses 7 and 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
6.12 The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Board includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.
6.13 The installation of any sign and/or road markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

**Risks and Mitigations**
6.14 No risks identified.

**Implementation**
6.15 Implementation dependencies - Community Board approval.
6.16 Implementation timeframe - Approximately six weeks once the area contractor receives the request.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**
6.17 The advantages of this option include:
Enables enforcement to be possible during evenings when scout meetings are scheduled.

- Provides a more reasonable waiting period for parents, if scout meetings end late.
- Deters overnight parking and the associated risk of unsafe overtaking during this time.
- Retains the discouragement of most parking activity at an unsafe location.

6.18 The disadvantages of this option include:
- None identified.

7. **Option 2 – Do Nothing**

**Option Description**
7.1 Retain the existing P5 (8am-6pm) restricted parking.

**Significance**
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**
7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**
7.4 This option is inconsistent with the request to provide more realistic time restrictions.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**
7.5 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

**Financial Implications**
7.6 Cost of Implementation - Not applicable.
7.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Not applicable.
7.8 Funding source - Not applicable.

**Legal Implications**
7.9 Not applicable.

**Risks and Mitigations**
7.10 If the restrictions are not installed there is a risk that the P5 restrictions will be ignored during evenings, resulting in overnight parking and the resultant safety risks.

**Implementation**
7.11 Implementation dependencies - Not applicable.
7.12 Implementation timeframe - Not applicable.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**
7.13 The advantages of this option include:
- None identified.

7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Cannot be enforced during evenings before and after scout meetings.
- Could result in legitimate overnight parking which would cause unsafe overtaking during this period.
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13. Mount Pleasant Road - Proposed No Stopping Restrictions

Reference: 19/5027
Presenter(s): Barry Hayes – Traffic Engineer, Traffic Operations Team

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

   Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to approve No Stopping restrictions on three separate sections of Mount Pleasant Road as indicated on Attachments A, C and D.

   Origin of Report
   1.2 This report was staff generated in response to residents who expressed concerns for traffic safety at these location.

2. Significance

   2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

   2.2 The level of significance was determined by comparing factors relating to this decision against the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

   2.3 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

   That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

   1. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles on the parts of Mount Pleasant Road as shown by broken yellow lines on the attached drawings TG133482 issue 1 dated 8/11/18, TG133478 issue 1 dated 8/11/18 and TG133479 issue 1 dated 8/11/18 is prohibited.

   2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

   3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in the staff report are in place.

4. Key Points

   4.1 The recommendations in this report are consistent with the anticipated outcomes of the Traffic Safety & Efficiency Service Plan in the Councils Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028).

   4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

       • Option 1 - Provide No Stopping restrictions (preferred option)
       • Option 2 – Do nothing.

   4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

   4.4 The advantages of this option include:

       • Improves road safety at locations with poor forward sight lines
       • Assists large vehicles turning in these areas such as rubbish trucks and delivery vehicles
• Improves sight lines for drivers turning out of The Rise and various residential driveways

4.5 The disadvantages of this option include:
• Displaces parking to other locations

5. **Context/Background**

5.1 Council staff were approached by local residents, who expressed concerns about parking activity that occurs along different sections of Mount Pleasant Road, which is considered to cause high risk safety issues, particularly near bend locations. Three locations were identified to warrant specific attention, namely:

1. Section near to 104 Mount Pleasant Road (S bend layout)
2. Mount Pleasant between Billy’s Track and The Rise
3. Mount Pleasant Road west of Soleares Avenue (S bend layout)

5.2 The residents indicated that at these locations parking activity occurs only occasionally and can often be trade vehicles. Nevertheless the parking occurs at locations where sight lines are poor, yet could be possible a short distance further away which would reduce the safety risks.

5.3 Staff investigated this request. Mount Pleasant Road is subject to a 50 km/h limit and is marked throughout as one lane in each direction with unrestricted parking on both sides for most of its length. Curve speed advisory signs are installed at the bend locations and their approaches.

5.4 Location 2 includes 2 tee-intersections, Billy’s Track which has give way control and The Rise which is uncontrolled. Location 3 includes Soleares Avenue which is also uncontrolled.

5.5 All three locations are in residential areas with a steep incline and close to a succession of residential driveways, which also have steep inclines and poor sight lines upon turning out onto the road. Mount Pleasant Road has a winding alignment, which all contributes to poor forward sight lines at several locations.

5.6 Staff visited the site on several occasions and it was apparent that on-street parking occasionally takes place close to these bend locations and accesses. Sometimes, the vehicles park partly on the footpath, which suggests the risks are known by the driver. However, this still requires passing vehicles to drive over the centre lines whilst approaching a blind bend in the opposite direction, or still severely reduces the sight lines from accesses nearby. Parking on the footpath is considered to be undesirable anyway since it is illegal due to blocking pedestrians or causing damage to the surface.

5.7 Staff checked the crash history of this location.

5.8 At location 1, 2 crashes have been recorded; a non-injury crash in 2008 near the upper bend involving 2 x car driving in opposite directions and a vehicle parked on-street. In 2016 a serious crash occurred between a car and a cycle near the lower bend.

5.9 At location 2, 2 crashes have been recorded; in 2004 a car driving out of The Rise collided with a motorcycle causing a minor injury. In 2009 a car lost control and hit a tree with no injuries.

5.10 At location 3, one crash has been recorded in 2008 which involved 2 opposing vehicles and a parked vehicle. This occurred near the lower bend of this location.

5.11 Staff have consequently recommended no stopping restrictions at these locations along different sections of Mount Pleasant Road, to ensure parked vehicles do not block cause unsafe overtaking or block the sight lines of residents leaving driveways that are already at acute angles or have a steep incline with inherent safety issues.

5.12 Staff consider that the proposed restrictions will improve safety for drivers and cyclists approaching from both directions on Mount Pleasant Road, as well as adjoining driveways.
6. Option 1 – Provide No Stopping Restrictions (preferred)

Option Description
6.1 Provide no stopping restrictions on three sections of Mount Pleasant Road in accordance with Attachments A, C and D.

Significance
6.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua
6.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
6.4 Letters of consultation with a site plan were initially issued to all tenants and property owners at:

- Location 1 – 88 to 107 Mount Pleasant Road
- Location 2 - 127 to 136 Mount Pleasant Road and all properties on The Rise
- Location 3 – 185 to 212 Mount Pleasant Road and 185-212 Soleares Avenue

6.5 The Mount Pleasant residents’ association was also consulted.

6.6 In total, 18 emailed responses were received and are summarised for each of the 3 locations as follows:

6.7 For location 1, 6 responses were received. Amongst these 4 fully supported the proposal and 2 requested amendments, which have been incorporated, though one of these does still not fully meet the resident’s request, which relates to the section of no stopping between the driveways to no. 99 and no. 103/105.

6.8 The resident requested a space here to assist whilst they trim the council owned trees/shrubs. Staff consider this to be a dangerous location to park which causes uphill drivers to overtake a parked vehicle here. Consequently this preferred option still proposes no stopping at this location, which improves the level of safety at this location.

6.9 Option 3 of this report proposes one space here which is explained later in this report.

6.10 For location 2, 5 responses were received which were all in support.

6.11 For location 3, 7 responses were received of 5 were in support or requested amendments which have been included.

6.12 The 2 objectors are the residents of 187 and 207 Mount Pleasant Road. The resident at 187 stated that ‘...this no stopping would not allow members of our household or visitors to park and access our property’. In response, the proposed no stopping begins approximately 20m east of their driveway. Consequently, there is space for 3 vehicles in this area, as well as opportunities on the opposite side, since no restrictions are proposed here.

6.13 The resident at 207 states that ‘...the proposals are not necessary and will serve only to move an already problem-parking area elsewhere along the road’. Staff disagree with this statement, as there are substantial alternative opportunities to park along this section of road, where is it safer to overtake a parked vehicle.

6.14 The Team Leader of Parking Compliance was also consulted and has not objected or requested any amendment.
Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
6.15 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications
6.16 Cost of Implementation - $1,000 to provide road markings, plus $750 for the consultation and preparation of this report.
6.17 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Covered under the area maintenance contract and effect will be minimal to the overall asset.
6.18 Funding source - Traffic Operations Budget.

Legal Implications
6.19 Part 1, clauses 7 and 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
6.20 The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Board includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.
6.21 The installations of any sign and/or road markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

Risks and Mitigations
6.22 No risks identified.

Implementation
6.23 Implementation dependencies - Community Board approval.
6.24 Implementation timeframe - Approximately six weeks once the area contractor receives the request.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
6.25 The advantages of this option include:
- Improves road safety at locations with poor forward sight lines
- Assists large vehicles turning in these areas such as rubbish trucks and delivery vehicles
- Improves sight lines for drivers turning out of The Rise and various residential driveways
6.26 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Displaces parking to other locations
- Prevents the resident near 99 to park near to his tree trimming activity

7. Option 2 – As Option 1 with reduced no stopping at 104 Mt Pleasant Road

Option Description
7.1 Provide no stopping restrictions on three sections of Mount Pleasant Road in accordance with Attachments B, C and D.

Significance
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua
7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact
Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**

7.4 Letters of consultation with a site plan were initially issued to all tenants and property owners as stated for Option 2.

7.5 For location 1, this option provides some concession to meet the request of a local resident, which relates to the section of no stopping between the driveways to no. 99 and no. 103/105.

7.6 Whereas option 1 proposes no stopping for the whole length between these driveways, the request was for 1 or 2 spaces along this section. Staff consider this to be a dangerous location for parking activity, though have provided this option to potentially accommodate the needs of the local resident as they carry out trimming activity.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**

7.7 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

**Financial Implications**

7.8 Cost of Implementation - $1,000 to provide road markings, plus $750 for the consultation and preparation of this report.

7.9 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Covered under the area maintenance contract and effect will be minimal to the overall asset.

7.10 Funding source - Traffic Operations Budget.

**Legal Implications**

7.11 Part 1, clauses 7 and 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.

7.12 The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Board includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.

7.13 The installations of any sign and/or road markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

**Risks and Mitigations**

7.14 Results in parking that would cause dangerous overtaking near a bend with poor forward visibility.

**Implementation**

7.15 Implementation dependencies - Community Board approval.

7.16 Implementation timeframe - Approximately six weeks once the area contractor receives the request.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**

7.17 The advantages of this option include:

- Improves road safety at locations with poor forward sight lines
- Assists large vehicles turning in these areas such as rubbish trucks and delivery vehicles
- Improves sight lines for drivers turning out of The Rise and various residential driveways
- Provides some legitimate parking space for the resident to use trailer during trimming operations

7.18 The disadvantages of this option include:
Displaces parking to other locations
- Enables parking to occur in a potentially dangerous location (at location 1)

8. **Option 3 – Do Nothing**

**Option Description**
8.1 Retain the unrestricted parking.

**Significance**
8.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**
8.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**
8.4 This option is inconsistent with the request to improve safety at this location.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**
8.5 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

**Financial Implications**
8.6 Cost of Implementation - Not applicable.
8.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Not applicable.
8.8 Funding source - Not applicable.

**Legal Implications**
8.9 Not applicable.

**Risks and Mitigations**
8.10 If the restrictions are not installed there could be issues raised with the Council for allowing inconsiderate parking to continue after appropriate deterrent measures have been recognised.

**Implementation**
8.11 Implementation dependencies - Not applicable.
8.12 Implementation timeframe - Not applicable.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**
8.13 The advantages of this option include:
- Retains unrestricted parking spaces

8.14 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Does not support the safety concerns of local residents
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Mount Pleasant Road near Billys Track
Proposed No Stopping Restrictions
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14. Beachville Road, Redcliffs - Proposed Accessible Parking

Reference: 19/5085
Presenter(s): Barry Hayes – Traffic Engineer, Traffic Operations Team

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to approve the conversion of an existing off-street parking space to an accessible parking space adjacent to Beachville Road in accordance with Attachment A.

Origin of Report
1.2 This report was staff generated in response to a request from the Christchurch Coastal Pathway Group. The nearest public accessible parking spaces to this location is located approximately 500m away, along James Street, which is an unacceptably long distance for users of the Coastal Pathway.

1.3 These measures have been requested to enable an appropriate space to be available within a convenient distance of the Coastal Pathway.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by comparing factors relating to this decision against the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That the parking of vehicles be reserved for vehicles with an approved disabled person’s parking permit, prominently displayed in the vehicle, in accordance with section 6.4.1 of the Land Transport - Road User Rule 2004 on the north east side of Beachville Road as shown on the attached drawing TG133488 issue 1 dated 15/11/2018.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in the staff report are in place.

4. Key Points

4.1 The recommendations in this report are consistent with the anticipated outcomes of the Traffic Safety & Efficiency Service Plan in the Councils Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028).

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 - Provide an accessible parking space (preferred option).
- Option 2 – Do nothing.
4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (preferred option).

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:
- Provides a convenient location for drivers with a mobility impairment to access the Coastal Pathway and any adjacent amenities.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Displaces existing parking to other locations.

5. Context/Background

5.1 A representative of the Christchurch Coastal Pathway Group (CCPG) approached the Council highlighting the lack of accessible parking close to the new Coastal Pathway in Redcliffs. A stated commitment of the CCPG was to provide access for all to the Coastal Pathway. Consequently a dedicated space was requested, close to the Coastal Pathway.

5.2 The CCPG had indicated a preference for the space to be at the south eastern end of Beachville Road, though a precise location was not specified.

5.3 Staff investigated the local site environment to identify an appropriate location. Currently, Beachville Road has unrestricted parking on both sides. There are off-street right angled spaces provided on the seaward side (equivalent to the north east side) of Beachville Road and a location at the end of this row of parking spaces is proposed for an accessible parking space, as shown in the site plan.

5.4 This location is immediately adjacent to the Coastal Pathway and is therefore considered ideal. The installation of the accessible parking space would enable a convenient space to be consistently available for visitors to the area who have mobility issues.

6. Option 1 – Install an accessible parking space on Beachville Road (preferred)

Option Description

6.1 Provide an accessible parking space on the north east side of Beachville Road in accordance with Attachment A.

Significance

6.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua

6.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

6.4 Staff contacted all tenants and owners at the nearest 10 properties on Beachville Road, as well as the Coastal Pathway Group. The Coastal Pathway Group confirmed their support and no responses were received in opposition or requesting amendment.

6.5 The Team Leader of Parking Compliance also supports for this option.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

6.6 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications

6.7 Cost of Implementation - $400 to provide road markings with a sign and post plus $750 for the consultation and preparation of this report.
6.8 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - covered under the area maintenance contract and effect will be minimal to the overall asset.

6.9 Funding source - Traffic Operations Budget.

Legal Implications
6.10 Part 1, clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to limit the stopping, standing or parking of vehicles on any road to any class of vehicles. Classes of vehicle include those displaying an appropriate permit, which is in this case would be a Mobility Parking Permit.

6.11 The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Board includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.

6.12 The installations of any sign and/or road markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

Risks and Mitigations
6.13 There is a risk of parking being displaced to other locations. However, this proposal affects only one parking space and the effects are expected to be negligible.

Implementation
6.14 Implementation dependencies - Community Board approval.

6.15 Implementation timeframe - Approximately six weeks once the area contractor receives the request.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
6.16 The advantages of this option include:
   • Provides a convenient location for drivers with a mobility impairment to access the Coastal Pathway and adjacent amenities.

6.17 The disadvantages of this option include:
   • Displaces one unrestricted parking demand to another location.

7. Option 2 – Do Nothing

Option Description
7.1 Retain the unrestricted parking.

Significance
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua
7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
7.4 This option is inconsistent with the request to improve accessible parking at this location.
Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
7.5 This option is not consistent with Council’s Transport Strategic Plan 2012-42, which includes objective 1.2: Balancing the network and states that ‘Council will deliver better connectivity and accessibility for people with mobility impairments’.

Financial Implications
7.6 Cost of Implementation - $750 for the consultation and preparation of this report.
7.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Not applicable.
7.8 Funding source - Not applicable.

Legal Implications
7.9 Not applicable.

Risks and Mitigations
7.10 This option is inconsistent with the request for accessible parking to assist users of the Coastal Pathway with mobility issues.

Implementation
7.11 Implementation dependencies - Not applicable.
7.12 Implementation timeframe - Not applicable.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.13 The advantages of this option include:
- Retains one unrestricted parking space.
7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Does not meet the needs of visitors with mobility issues.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>Beachville Road accessible parking site plan</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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15. Ocean View Terrace near Awaroa Lane - Proposed No Stopping Restrictions

Reference: 19/44317
Presenter(s): Barry Hayes – Traffic Engineer, Traffic Operations Team

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to approve no Stopping restrictions on Ocean View Terrace as indicated on Attachment A.

Origin of Report
1.2 This report was staff generated in response to residents who expressed concerns for traffic safety at this location.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by comparing factors relating to this decision against the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles on the part of Ocean View Terrace as shown by broken yellow lines on the attached drawing TG133715 issue 1 dated 11/01/19, is prohibited.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in the staff report are in place.

4. Key Points

4.1 The recommendations in this report are consistent with the anticipated outcomes of the Traffic Safety & Efficiency Service Plan in the Councils Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028).

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

• Option 1 - Provide No Stopping restrictions (preferred option)
• Option 2 – Do nothing.

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

• Improves road safety at a location with poor sight lines.
• Improves sight lines for drivers turning out of residential driveways.
4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Displaces parking to other locations.

5. **Context/Background**

5.1 Council staff were approached by local residents, who expressed concerns about parking activity that occurs close to this location, which is considered to cause high risk safety issues, since it consists of a hairpin bend.

5.2 The residents indicated that the inconsiderate parking activity occurs only occasionally and sometimes occurs at locations where sight lines are poor, yet alternative parking places are possible a short distance away which would reduce the safety risks.

5.3 Staff investigated this request. Ocean View Terrace is subject to a 50 km/h limit and is marked throughout as one lane in each direction and has a winding alignment. There are some lengths of No Stopping already in effect further south and uphill of the proposal.

5.4 This part of Sumner is a residential area with a steep incline and close to a succession of residential driveways, which also has steep inclines and poor sight lines upon turning out onto the road.

5.5 Staff visited the site and it was apparent that on-street parking occasionally takes place close to the bend locations and residential accesses. Sometimes, the vehicles park partly on the grass berm or narrow shoulder, which suggests the risks are known by the driver. However, this still requires passing vehicles to drive over the centre lines whilst approaching a blind bend in the opposite direction, or still severely reduces the sight lines from accesses nearby.

5.6 Staff checked the crash history of this location which showed that no crashes had been recorded. Nevertheless, staff consider that there are considerable safety risks at this location, which warrant the introduction of No Stopping restrictions.

5.7 Staff have consequently recommended extending the existing stopping restrictions at this location. This would ensure parked vehicles do not cause unsafe overtaking or block the sight lines of residents leaving driveways, which are already at acute angles or have a steep incline with inherent safety issues.

5.8 Staff consider that the proposed restrictions will improve safety for drivers and cyclists approaching from both directions on Ocean View Terrace, as well as adjoining driveways.
6. **Option 1 – Provide No Stopping Restrictions (preferred)**

**Option Description**
6.1 Provide No Stopping restrictions on Ocean View Terrace in accordance with Attachment A.

**Significance**
6.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**
6.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**
6.4 Letters of consultation with a site plan were initially issued to all tenants and property owners at 1-24 Ocean View Terrace, 113 Heberden Ave and properties on Awaroa Lane.
6.5 Eight responses were received which all supported the proposal.
6.6 The Team Leader of Parking Compliance was consulted and has indicated his support for this option.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**
6.7 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

**Financial Implications**
6.8 Cost of Implementation - $400 to provide road markings, plus $750 for the consultation and preparation of this report.
6.9 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Covered under the area maintenance contract and effect will be minimal to the overall asset.
6.10 Funding source - Traffic Operations Budget.

**Legal Implications**
6.11 Part 1, clauses 7 and 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
6.12 The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Board includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.
6.13 The installations of any sign and/or road markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

**Risks and Mitigations**
6.14 No risks identified.

**Implementation**
6.15 Implementation dependencies - Community Board approval.
6.16 Implementation timeframe - Approximately six weeks once the area contractor receives the request.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**
6.17 The advantages of this option include:
- Improves road safety at a location with poor sight lines.
• Improves sight lines for drivers turning out of residential driveways.

6.18 The disadvantages of this option include:
• Displaces parking to other locations.

7. Option 2 – Do Nothing

Option Description
7.1 Retain the unrestricted parking.

Significance
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua
7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
7.4 This option is inconsistent with the request to improve safety at this location.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
7.5 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications
7.6 Cost of Implementation - Not applicable.
7.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Not applicable.
7.8 Funding source - Not applicable.

Legal Implications
7.9 Not applicable.

Risks and Mitigations
7.10 If the restrictions are not installed there could be issues raised with the Council for allowing inconsiderate parking to continue after appropriate deterrent measures have been recognised.

Implementation
7.11 Implementation dependencies - Not applicable.
7.12 Implementation timeframe - Not applicable.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.13 The advantages of this option include:
• Retains unrestricted parking spaces.

7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:
• Does not support the safety concerns of local residents.
Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
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Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Barry Hayes - Traffic Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Ryan Rolston - Team Leader Traffic Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ocean View Terrace, Sumner
Proposed No Stopping Restriction
For Board Approval
16. Improvements to Woolston Village Centre - WL1

Reference: 18/786011
Kelly Griffiths, Project Manager
Bill Homewood, Traffic Engineer
Philippa Upton, Engagement Advisor

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to recommend to the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board that they approve the improvements to Woolston Village Centre WL1, which are part of the Ferry Road Master Plan, to proceed to detailed design and construction.

Origin of Report

1.2 This report is staff generated following completion of public consultation for the improvements to Woolston Village Centre WL1 project.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of medium significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the number of businesses, property owners and the local community affected by the changes proposed in the project area, as well as the wider effects on the transport network on Ferry Road for drivers, pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment of medium significance.

3. Staff Recommendations

For the purposes of the following resolutions:

(a) An intersection is defined by the position of kerbs on each intersecting roadway; and

(b) The resolution is to take effect from the commencement of physical road works associated with the project as detailed in this report; and

(c) If the resolution states "Note 1 applies", any distance specified in the resolution relates the kerb line location referenced as exists on the road immediately prior to the Community Board meeting of the 3rd December 2018; and

(d) If the resolution states "Note 2 Applies", any distance specified in the resolution relates the approved kerb line location on the road resulting from the resolution as approved on 4 February 2019 for resolutions 1 – 13, and at the following Council meeting for resolutions 14 – 91.

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board recommend to Council that it:

1. Approves the improvements to Woolston Village Centre (WL1) preferred option for detailed design and construction as shown in Attachment A.

a. Approves that all traffic controls except the speed limit on Ferry Road, commencing at a point 16 metres west of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to a point 71 metres east of its intersection with St Johns Street be revoked.

b. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of south-eastbound cycles only, be established on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 20 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.

c. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of south-eastbound cycles only, be established on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with St Johns Street, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.

d. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of south-eastbound cycles only, be established on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with St Johns Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 146 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.

e. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of north-westbound cycles only, be established on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 82 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.

f. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of north-westbound cycles only, be established on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Catherine Street, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.

g. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of north-westbound cycles only, be established on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Catherine Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Maronan Street, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.

h. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of north-westbound cycles only, be established on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 71 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.

i. Approves that a signalised pedestrian crossing be duly established and marked in accordance with sections 6 and 8.5 (3) of the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Devices 2004, on Ferry Road, located at a point 28 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street, as detailed in Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

j. Approves that a signalised pedestrian and cycle crossing be duly established and marked in accordance with sections 6 of the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Devices 2004, on Ferry Road, located at a point 22 metres southeast of its intersection with Catherine Street, as detailed in Attachment A. Note 2 applies.
3. In pursuance of the powers vested in it by Section 8.3(1) of the Land Transport Rule- Traffic Control Devices 2004 (Rule 54002), and pursuant to the powers vested in it by the Local Government Act 1974 and 2002, the Christchurch City Council hereby authorises the head teacher of St Anne’s Catholic School to appoint appropriately trained persons to act as school patrols at the Ferry Road school crossing point as shown on Attachment A, located at a point more or less 36 metres southeast of its intersection with Maronan Street.

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

4. Approves all intersection traffic controls at the intersection of Ferry Road with Portman Street be revoked.

5. Approves all intersection traffic controls at the intersection of Ferry Road with Oak Street be revoked.

6. Approves all intersection traffic controls at the intersection of Ferry Road with Catherine Street be revoked.

7. Approves all intersection traffic controls at the intersection of Ferry Road with St Johns Street be revoked.

8. Approves all intersection traffic controls at the intersection of Ferry Road with Maronan Street be revoked.

9. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 16 metres be revoked.

10. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with St Johns Street be revoked.

11. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with St Johns Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 145 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

12. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 82 metres be revoked.

13. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Catherine Street be revoked.

14. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Catherine Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Maronan Street be revoked.

15. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 71 metres be revoked.

16. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northwest side of Portman Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 68 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

17. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southeast side of Portman Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 70 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.
18. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northwest side of St Johns Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 29.5 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

19. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southeast side of St Johns Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 81 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

20. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northwest side of Oak Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction to its intersection with Heathcote Street be revoked.

21. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southeast side of Oak Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction to its intersection with Heathcote Street be revoked.

22. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northwest side of Catherine Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 45 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

23. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southeast side of Catherine Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 150 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

24. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northwest side of Maronan Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 30 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

25. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southeast side of Maronan Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 13 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

26. Approves the lane marking changes, kerb alignment changes, pedestrian refuge islands, landscaping, tree planting and road surface changes, on Ferry Road, Portman Street, Oak Street, St Johns Street, Catherine Street and Maronan Street, as detailed in Attachment A.

27. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 116 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

28. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 75.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

29. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 15 minutes on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 75.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 16.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

30. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 92 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 10 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

31. Approves that a Bus Stop be created on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 102 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

32. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 116 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and
extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 52.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

33. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of ten minutes on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 168.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 23 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

34. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 191.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with St Johns Street, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

35. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with St Johns Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 77 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

36. Approves that a Bus Stop be created on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 77 metres southeast of its intersection with St Johns Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

37. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 91 metres southeast of its intersection with St Johns Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 55.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

38. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 15 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

39. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point 15 metres northwest of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 16.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

40. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 31.5 metres northwest of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 50 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

41. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 21 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

42. Approves that a Bus Stop be created on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point seven metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

43. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 21 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

44. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point 35 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 46 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

45. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 81 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 16 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.
46. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point 97 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 53.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

47. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 150.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 13.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

48. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point 164 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 26 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

49. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 190 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Catherine Street, as detailed on Attachment A.

50. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with Catherine Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of four metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

51. Approves that a Bus Stop be created on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point four metres southeast of its intersection with Catherine Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

52. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 17.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Catherine Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Maronan Street, as detailed on Attachment A.

53. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 13 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

54. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point 13 metres southeast of its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 18.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

55. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 31.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 24 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

56. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of three minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at a distance of 55.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 16.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. This restriction is to apply between the times of 8.15am and 9.15am and 2.30pm and 3.30pm on school days only.

57. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Portman Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 15.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

58. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the northwest side of Portman Street commencing at a point 15.5 metres northeast of its intersection
with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 53 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

59. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southeast side of Portman Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 16 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

60. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the southeast side of Portman Street commencing at a point 16 metres northeast of its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 53 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

61. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of St Johns Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 16 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

62. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the northwest side of St Johns Street commencing at a point 16 metres northeast of its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

63. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southeast side of St Johns Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 25 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

64. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 30 minutes on the southeast side of St Johns Street commencing at a point 25 metres northeast of its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 56 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

65. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Oak Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction to its intersection with Heathcote Street, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

66. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southeast side of Oak Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction to its intersection with Heathcote Street, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

67. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Catherine Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 20 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

68. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the northwest side of Catherine Street commencing at a point 20 metres southwest of its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 25 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

69. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southeast side of Catherine Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 150 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

70. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Maronan Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 12 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

71. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the northwest side of Maronan Street commencing at a point 12 metres southwest of its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 18 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.
72. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southeast side of Maronan Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 13 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

73. Approves that a Stop control be placed against the Portman Street approach to its intersection with Ferry Road, as detailed on Attachment A.

74. Approves that a Stop control be placed against the Oak Street approach to its intersection with Ferry Road, as detailed on Attachment A.

75. Approves that a Give Way control be placed against the St John Street approach to its intersection with Ferry Road, as detailed on Attachment A.

76. Approves the installation of a bus shelter at the following locations:
   a. 729 Ferry Road (Attachment A),
   b. 650 Ferry Road (Attachment A), and
   c. 608 Ferry Road (Attachment A).

77. Approves that the pathway on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with St Johns Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 51 metres, be resolved as a bi-directional shared pedestrian/cycle path. This shared path is authorised under clause 21 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, as detailed on Attachment A.

78. Approves that the pathway on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 28 metres, be resolved as a bi-directional shared pedestrian/cycle path. This shared path is authorised under clause 21 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, as detailed on Attachment A.

79. Approves that the section of road reserve situated between the north-western boundary of 689 Ferry Road and south-eastern boundary of 687 Ferry Road, be resolved as a bi-directional shared pedestrian/cycle path. This shared path is authorised under clause 21 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017. As detailed on Attachment A.

80. Approves the removal of nine trees as identified on Attachment A.

81. Approve that these resolutions take effect when parking signage and/or road markings that evidence the restrictions is/are in place (or removed in the case of revocations).

4. Key Points

4.1 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

4.1.1 Activity: Active Travel

- Level of Service: 10.5.2.0 Improve the perception that Christchurch is a cycling friendly city - =53%
- Level of Service: 16.0.10.0 Improve the perception that Christchurch is a walking friendly city = 84%

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 – The Preferred Option
- Option 2 – Original Consulted Option 2016
- Option 3 – Do Nothing
4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages of the Preferred Option

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- A pedestrian focused environment
- A trial speed limit of 30km/h for one year with the possibility of a permanent 30km/h speed reduction.
- New gateways to identify the start and end of the village.
- Upgraded crossing facilities.
- Improved passenger transport facilities.
- Improved safety at St Anne’s school.
- Wider cycle lanes.
- Wider footpaths.
- Increased landscaping.
- Links Woolston Village with the Major Cycleway Route network.
- Smallest impact on parking of all schemes considered.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Loss of 11 parking spaces.
- Potential for some minor delays to traffic due to the slower speed environment.

5. Context/Background

Ferry Road Master Plan

5.1 Council adopted the Ferry Road Master Plan in 2014. This was developed to support the recovery of suburban centres along Ferry Road from Fitzgerald Avenue to the Ferrymead Bridge, and to improve the safety and amenity of this road corridor. The Master Plan forms part of the Council’s Suburban Centres Programme and was prepared in response to the damage caused in suburban centres from the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes. The Master Plan was prepared in consultation with the Ferry Road community and is divided into individual projects focusing on specific areas along Ferry Road.

5.2 The improvements to Woolston Village Centre project (WL1) aims to improve the streetscape along Ferry Road through Woolston Village. The aim is to enhance Woolston’s appeal as a destination, highlight the distinctive industrial character of the village centre and balance the needs of all users.

5.3 Public consultation on a draft proposal for improvements to Woolston Village Centre took place in May and June 2016.

5.4 In response to the 2016 proposal there was strong support for enhancing and beautifying the village. However, significant concern was raised about the negative effects the proposed removal of 56 on-street parking spaces would have on the viability of businesses and the local community.

5.5 More details of the 2016 proposal and the community views and preferences can be found in Section 7 of this report.

5.6 A workshop was held with the Community Board to discuss next steps. At this it was agreed to proceed with investigating a revised proposal, taking into account the feedback received. Revised project objectives were agreed by the Community Board and Project Sponsor.
5.7 At the same time, it was discovered that the old tram tracks and kerb-to-kerb concrete foundations are still in place in this section of Ferry Road. The kerb-to-kerb concrete limits the use of certain treatments in the scheme e.g. landscaped medians.

5.8 During investigations for the new scheme a number of different options were considered, taking into account consultation feedback received, physical limitations such as the tram tracks and concrete, and budget constraints.

5.9 Public consultation on the revised proposal was open for four weeks from Tuesday 5 June until Tuesday 3 July 2018.

6. Option 1 – Preferred Option

Option Description

6.1 The preferred option aims to create a pedestrian focused environment, while improving access to the village centre for all modes of transport and creating a village feel. The details of the plan can be seen in Attachment A.

6.2 The pedestrian environment will be improved through the use of wider footpaths at key locations, such as the busy shopping area between Portman Street and Oak Street. The wider footpaths will allow pedestrian movements, as well as encouraging pedestrians to stop and meet.

6.3 The number of pedestrian crossing points will increase from four to five, and will include two signalised crossings and three pedestrian refuges.

6.4 The existing signalised crossing currently outside New World supermarket’s loading area will be relocated to link with the car park at the rear of the Woolston Community Library and increase the accessibility to these spaces. The existing pedestrian refuges will also be upgraded to meet current design standards.

6.5 Public transport is a vital component of the transport options in Woolston, and the public transport provision will be upgraded as part of this proposal. The bus stops will be brought into the village centre to reprioritise their use, and will be paired with signalised crossings to improve their accessibility.

6.6 Cycle infrastructure will be upgraded with wider cycle lanes provided through the village centre. The scheme also incorporates a signalised cycle crossing on Ferry Road to the east of Maronan Street, which will link the village centre and allow cyclists to move between the major cycle routes to the north and south of Woolston, as well as helping to provide safe cycle access to the shops, churches and school.

6.7 Gateways will be created at either end of the scheme to clearly identify the extent of the village. The gateways use a combination of vertical elements and changes in material pallet, through landscaping and road narrowings to signal the arrival into the village and to prompt drivers to reduce vehicle speeds.

6.8 A 30km/h design speed is one of the project objectives. It is proposed to trial a 30 km/h speed limit along Ferry Road between Portman Street and St Anne’s School. Reducing vehicle speeds is seen as being essential to allow safe pedestrian crossing movements, particularly for those who cross using the flush median, and contribute to the village feel.

6.9 The landscape design includes replacing and increasing the amount of street furniture. There will be eight new seats and nine new rubbish bins. In addition, there will be five cycle stands which can accommodate six cycles each, creating a total of 30 cycle parking spaces throughout the scheme. The preferred option includes new paving along the footpaths and at pedestrian crossing points and approximately 36 new trees.
Significance
6.10 The level of significance of this option is medium and consistent with Section 2 of this report.

6.11 Engagement activities for this level of significance includes:
6.11.1 ‘Have Your Say’ community consultation with both online and hard copy documentation and feedback forms.
6.11.2 Social media and communications coverage.
6.11.3 Public information sessions and meetings with affected stakeholders and community representatives.

Impact on Mana Whenua
6.12 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
6.13 Those affected by this proposal include businesses in Woolston Village and residents in the local community, as well as members of the wider community traveling through or visiting Woolston for work or leisure. This includes drivers, pedestrians, bus users and cyclists.

6.14 Staff introduced the proposal to directly affected businesses and key stakeholders before public consultation started at an information evening at St Johns Church on 30 May 2018, which was attended by fifteen people including three Community Board members. Separate pre-consultation meetings were also held with Foodstuffs Ltd, St Anne’s School and Church, and the MP for the Port Hills who is based in Woolston.

6.15 Public consultation on the revised proposal was open for four weeks from Tuesday 5 June until Tuesday 3 July 2018.

6.16 Council ‘Have Your Say’ leaflets and feedback forms were available online and approximately 800 copies were hand-delivered or posted to businesses, residents, schools and preschools, community groups, absentee landowners and stakeholders. Attachment B shows the 2018 consultation leaflet and feedback form.

6.17 A drop-in consultation information session attended by ten people was held in St Johns Church on 13 June 2018, and ongoing communication and meetings with businesses and property owners took place during and beyond the consultation period. The project team also presented the revised proposal at a well-attended Greater Linwood Community Forum at Te Waka Unua School.

6.18 There were 114 responses to the revised proposal. Forty-four submitters (38%) indicated support including Woolston Plunket, Environment Canterbury, Holy Smoke Building owners, Three Boys Brewery and St Anne’s School. Forty-two submitters (37%) indicated support with suggestions including NZ Heavy Haulage Association, Canterbury District Health Board and St Anne’s Catholic Church. Twenty-five submitters (22%) did not support the proposal including SPOKES Canterbury, Woolston businesses such as Woolston Pharmacy, Rangiora Holdings as owner representing 12 shops in the village centre, and Woolston Dairy at 701 Ferry Road. The remaining three submitters provided concerns or suggestions only, including Foodstuffs representatives.
6.19 Key positive comments included commendations for a revised plan that better balances the need for revitalisation and a sense of place, with parking provision. There was support for improving the village for locals and visitors, including walking space and seating for pedestrians, and facilities for cyclists and bus users. Several noted that improving the village will make it more attractive for prospective residents and existing business committed to being in the area. There was support for a general tidy up and enhancement – a number of those keen to see landscaping and trees improved also providing alternative suggestions.

6.20 Key issues raised during consultation were

- Parking removal (in particular the proposal for one parking space outside the pharmacy)
- Requests for alternative tree and landscaping species

6.21 Approximately 40% of submitters requested all or some of the existing parking spaces be retained, and a petition document received as a submission included 1038 signatures requested: ‘We, the undersigned, do not agree with the proposal to remove 14 car parks from the Woolston village and ask that these car parks be retained’. The petition is presented to the Community Board along with this report.
6.22 Sixty-seven submitters gave Woolston as their address, and seven were from nearby suburbs of Linwood, Redcliffs, Sumner and Clifton Hill. The remaining 40 were from other Christchurch suburbs. Of those from Woolston, 26 indicated support, 27 indicated support with suggestions and 14 did not support the proposal.

Parking issues

6.23 Key parking-related comments included the need for access for elderly and mobility impaired drivers, in particular close to the pharmacy and adjacent businesses. There was also some concern about the proposed loss of parking outside St Anne’s School, although this concern was not raised by the school.

Project team response to parking issues

South side of Ferry Road parking

6.24 As part of the proposal and in response to submissions to the 2016 concept plan, there is an increased number of car parks on the south side between Oak and Catherine Streets, as detailed in Attachment C - Parking Comparison Plan. This is because although most businesses on the south side have private off-street car parking at the rear, drivers may not be aware of this and some people find these car parks difficult to access.

North side of Ferry Road parking

6.25 In response to requests for more on-street car parking outside the pharmacy and adjacent shops, parking outside 683 – 687 Ferry Road has been increased from one space to three spaces.

6.26 There is a considerable amount of easily accessible private off-street parking on the north side of Ferry Road for those visiting private businesses. Some businesses on this side of the road do not have parking on-site. A number of on-street car parks in this location have been retained. The Council car park behind the Woolston Community Library also provides 32 spaces.

St Anne’s School & Church parking

6.27 Feedback also identified some concerns with the loss of parking around St Anne’s School. Since consultation, two additional parking spaces have been included on the south side of Ferry Road outside number 670, which is opposite the church and school. Recent discussions with St Anne’s Church have removed three parking spaces outside 733 Ferry Road to allow for a bus stop location that meets the needs of both the project and the church. This means that between
Maronan Street and the eastern boundary of St Anne’s School, the number of car parks has decreased by two - from the existing 17 to the now proposed 15.

6.28 Feedback from St Anne’s School requested removing the P3 parking restrictions to the west of the kea crossing outside 733 and 664 – 666 Ferry Road. These parks are now proposed to have P60 restrictions.

6.29 There was little comment and no formal opposition for the relocation of the bus stops at Portman Street to central Woolston.

6.30 The overall parking provision proposed in the village is now 56 spaces, which is a decrease of 11 spaces when compared to the existing number of on-street parks in this section of Ferry Road. Recent parking survey information shows that demand can be met in the remaining on-street and off-street car parks.

Other improvements for parking and access in the village centre

6.31 Signs have now been installed to direct drivers to the car park behind the Woolston Community Library from Ferry Road via Portman Street.

6.32 The Council car park behind the Community Library has 32 spaces. This is four more spaces than previously provided, including two designated mobility parks which are only a short distance from the pharmacy and shopping area, and a well-lit, level shared path from the car park provides easy access to Ferry Road for pedestrians.

6.33 The signal-controlled pedestrian crossing has been moved closer to the Woolston Community Library car park so that people can park here and safely cross to the businesses on the south side of Ferry Road.

6.34 Summary of proposed parking changes following consultation feedback

- Two further short-term car parks will be retained outside the pharmacy and adjacent shops, now three car parks in total.
- Three car parks removed from outside 733 Ferry Road due to changes to the bus stop location.
- Two further car parks included outside 670 Ferry Road.
- P60 parking restrictions outside 733 and 664 – 666 Ferry Road

6.35 Following discussion with adjacent business owners seven parking spaces proposed on the north side of Ferry Road will have time restrictions:

- Four parking spaces outside the dairy at 701 Ferry Road will be restricted to ten minutes.
- Three parking spaces outside the pharmacy and adjacent shops will be restricted to fifteen minutes.

Trees and landscaping

6.36 Approximately 20% of submitters commented on the proposed trees, 5% in support of the proposal and 7% requesting more natives/evergreens instead of the deciduous trees proposed as part of the Master Plan. Key opposition comments stated a preference to prioritise wider footpaths and trees over parking retention.

Project team response to suggestions for trees and landscaping

6.37 The Woolston Village improvements project is part of the Ferry Road Master Plan which was developed with the community through workshops and consultation in 2014. This resulted in a plan for trees with a red and white colour theme, a maximum height of 8 metres, and seasonal variety and interest (deciduous).
6.38 The tree selection has been reviewed in response to requests from a number of submitters that native and evergreen trees be considered for Woolston. New Zealand Kauri trees will now replace the Upright Hornbeams at the village entrances and the English Oaks at St Johns Church. Native plants will also be incorporated into the under-planting. Magnolia Kobus will be retained as the main street tree.

6.39 The set of four Pin Oak trees at the west end of the village will now all be removed and will be replaced with Magnolia Kobus. This is in response to concerns raised by the NZ Heavy Haulage Association regarding the ability for oversized vehicles to move through this section of road. Magnolia kobus are smaller than Pin Oaks and replacing the trees on the south side of the road will enable the new trees to be moved back slightly from the kerb thereby further increasing the road space.

6.40 New Zealand Kauri (Agathis australis) is a slow growing, evergreen conifer which makes an attractive specimen tree. It has a narrow, pyramid form which lasts for more than fifty years.

6.41 Changes to the layout outside 669 Ferry Road - the old ANZ bank building - and proposed layout changes at 683 Ferry Road have meant the privately owned space for two racks of six cycle stands and two seats proposed for these locations is no longer available. Staff are continuing to work with the property owners to find available space for the cycle stands on their property.

6.42 More detailed response to and including other issues raised such as requests for rubbish and recycling bins, the 30km/h speed limit and cycle provisions are available in Attachment D – Issues/Suggestions and Project Team Response.

6.43 Full submissions with names only can be viewed online at https://cccgovtnz.cwp.govt.nz/the-council/consultations-and-submissions/haveyoursay/show/151

6.44 Changes to the 2018 consulted plan that have resulted in this final plan for Community Board and Council approval are:

- Two further short-term car parks will be retained outside the pharmacy and adjacent shops, now three car parks in total. These parks will be restricted to 15-minute parking.
- Three car parks removed from outside 733 Ferry Road due to changes to the bus stop location. The bus stop and shelter outside 729 Ferry Road has been relocated to outside 733 Ferry Road.
- Two further car parks included outside 670 Ferry Road.
- P60 parking restrictions outside 664 – 666 Ferry Road
- Four parking spaces outside the dairy at 701 Ferry Road will be restricted to ten-minute parking.
- Moving the 30/50 speed limit threshold to the eastern boundary of the St Anne’s school.
- The shared path on the south side of Ferry Road has been extended onto Maronan Street, so cyclists do not have to cycle on Ferry Road to use the signalised crossing if travelling from the major cycleway on the other side of the Heathcote River.
- Extension of the cycle lane on St Johns Street so it extends past the existing indented parking to help guide cyclists around the short term parking.
- The island outside New World has been shortened in length to allow right turns into the Salvation Army access (636 Ferry Road), however this will still restrict right turns into New World super market, as outlined in their resource consent.
- The island outside New World has been narrowed slightly to improve the alignment for vehicles and cyclists.
The island in the road outside 622 Ferry Road has been shortened in length to allow right turning into the access for the bakery.

The island outside St Anne’s Church and St Anne’s School has been relocated slightly to the east to make it easier to turn right into the adjacent driveways.

In response to requests for more native and evergreen trees, we are now proposing to plant six NZ Kauri instead of the two English Oaks outside St Johns Church. This change in conjunction with the proposed street upgrades and existing activity at the St Johns/Catherine Street intersection makes this area the more natural gateway for the eastern entrance of the Woolston Village.

The two trees proposed outside St Anne’s School have been removed, as this location is no longer the eastern gateway.

The set of four Pin Oak trees at the west end of the village will now all be removed and will be replaced with Magnolia Kobus.

The rack of six cycle stands and two seats proposed outside 669 Ferry Road, and the rack of six cycle stands proposed outside 683 Ferry Road have been removed.

To make room for the additional two parking spaces outside the pharmacy and adjacent shops, two small existing trees will be removed along with the two proposed trees along the kerb. To balance this and create a more vegetated and defined feel to the public space we are now proposing to replace the two small existing trees with three Autumn Blaze maple trees.

An extra rubbish bin has been added outside 630 Ferry Road due to the volume of food shops and take-away outlets along this stretch of Ferry Road.

One extra street light will be added on both Catherine and Maronan streets.

**Parallel consultation - shared path proposal**

6.45 Sixty-eight submitters were in support of the proposed shared path from Ferry Road to the Woolston Community Library car park, which was presented in the same consultation document. Twenty-nine didn’t support and 18 didn’t answer the question.

6.46 The shared path has been installed as part of the construction of the Community Library. The resolution to formalise this change to a shared path status is included in this report.

**Next steps**

6.47 Thirty-three submitters would like to be kept informed about how we will be including reminders of Woolston’s cultural history and meaning in the detailed design and following our work with Matapopore.

6.48 The Community Board has been sent the full submissions including contact details, ahead of the meeting. Submitters have been sent a letter with a summary of consultation, and a link to the plan including full submissions with names only, the final proposal and details of the meeting and how to request speaking rights.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**

6.49 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies – Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan, which designates Woolston Village as a ‘Walkable Centre’ and also forms part of the ‘Local Cycle Network’.

**Financial Implications**

6.50 Cost of Implementation – The estimated total project cost to implement WL1 is $3,174,939.
6.51 There is a shortfall in funding of $507,472 which is proposed to be met from funds currently sitting at program level in the Suburban Master Plan – Ferry Road programme. A budget change will be processed according to financial delegations and process. The tender will not be let until the budget is available.

6.52 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – There will be an increase in maintenance costs due to the regular maintenance required on the new green cycle lane surfacing, new landscaping and trees, and new street furniture, e.g. rubbish bins. Following the first years defects liability period, this has been calculated as an increase of approximately $9,870 per annum, which will be included in the annual maintenance schedule.

6.53 Funding source – Funding of $2,667,467 has been allocated in the Council’s Long Term Plan to implement the Improvements to Woolston Village Centre – WL1 (named Ferry Road Master Plan - Project WL1 in the Long Term Plan) with the balance from Suburban Master Plan – Ferry Road programme as above. Ongoing costs will be funded from the budgeted annual maintenance schedule.

Legal Implications

6.54 There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.

6.55 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

Risks and Mitigations

6.56 There are no significant risks with this option.

Implementation

6.57 Implementation dependencies – The following consents may be required:

- National Environmental Standards (NES) consent from CCC for management of contamination of the road e.g. coal tar & contaminated soil.
- Stormwater Authorisation under the Interim Global Stormwater Consent, Environment Canterbury may also require a construction stormwater consent.
- Removal and works around trees may be able to be covered under the CCC Global Tree consent.

6.58 Requires Council approval of traffic controls by resolution including cycle lanes and traffic signals.

6.59 Implementation timeframe – Council approval is scheduled for March 2019. After detailed design and tender, construction is currently anticipated to commence in January 2020 and take approximately five months.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

6.60 The advantages of this option include:

- A pedestrian focused environment
- A trial speed limit of 30km/h for one year with the possibility of a permanent 30km/h speed reduction
- New gateways to identify the start and end of the village
- Upgraded crossing facilities.
- Improved passenger transport facilities.
- Improved safety at St Anne’s school.
- Wider cycle lanes.
6.61 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Loss of 11 parking spaces.
- Potential for some minor delays to traffic due to the slower speed environment.

7. **Option 2 – Original Consulted Option 2016**

**Option Description**

7.1 The original option went to public consultation in 2016, however it was not taken to the Community Board for approval due to the significant community concerns about the proposed loss of parking.

7.2 This option included:

- A pedestrian focused environment, with wider footpath and four new pedestrian refuge islands.
- New gateways to identify the start and end of the village.
- A trial speed limit of 30km/h for one year with the possibility of a permanent 30km/h speed reduction.
- A paved flush median along the centre of the road, with some raised landscaped sections.
- Wider cycle lanes.
- Updated street furniture and landscaping, including new seating and tree planting.
- A reduction in parking from 77 to 21 spaces.

**Significance**

7.3 The level of significance of this option is medium and consistent with Section 2 of this report.

7.4 Engagement activities for this level of significance includes:

- 7.4.1 ‘Have Your Say’ community consultation with both online and hard copy documentation and feedback forms.
- 7.4.2 Social media and communications coverage.
- 7.4.3 Public information sessions and meetings with affected stakeholders and community representatives.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

7.5 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**

7.6 Those affected by this proposal include businesses in Woolston Village and residents in the local community, as well as the wider community traveling through or visiting the centre for business or leisure. This includes drivers, pedestrians, bus users and cyclists.
7.7 Also see Context/Background Section 5 of this report and Attachment E - 2016 Consultation Leaflet.

7.8 168 written submissions were received. A significant number of the submissions received indicated their opposition because of concerns that the negative effects of parking removal, and to a lesser extent speed reduction, would outweigh the benefits of the proposal. There was a strong sense from these submitters that Woolston’s business centre currently relies on passing traffic and easy access. The full submissions can be viewed in Attachment F.

7.9 Those indicating support focused on the wider travel choice and pedestrian benefits of the proposal, and supported the improvements to the village streetscape as a way of attracting people to visit and spend time in Woolston.

7.10 Ninety-four submitters (56%) - approximately half of whom were local residents, businesses or property owners indicated they generally opposed the scheme, focusing on concerns about business and community viability due to the proposed parking loss.

7.11 A petition with 770 signatures, largely from residents, business or property owners in Woolston and surrounding areas, was presented the Community Board on 19 September 2016, with these key points: highlighting the need to support the beautification of Woolston Village, opposing the removing of car parking between St Johns Street and Portman Street, and noting that most shops in Woolston Village are not ‘browsing shops’ but ‘purchase and leave’.

7.12 72 submitters (43%) indicated they generally supported the scheme, wanting to see the benefits of improvements to Woolston despite some having reservations about aspects of the proposal that were mainly parking related.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

7.13 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies – Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan, which designates Woolston Village as a ‘Walkable Centre’ and also forms part of the ‘Local Cycle Network’.

Financial Implications

7.14 Cost of Implementation – The total estimated project cost for the original consulted option for WL1 in 2016 was originally estimated to be $2,200,000. This does not take into account the additional costs to construction as a result of the tram track and concrete foundation. These additional costs are anticipated to be in the order of $1,500,000.

7.15 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – There will be an increase in maintenance costs due to the regular maintenance required on the new green cycle lane surfacing, new landscaping and trees, and new street furniture, e.g. rubbish bins.

7.16 Funding source – Funding of $2,667,467 has been allocated in the Council’s Long Term Plan to implement the Improvements to Woolston Village Centre – WL1 (named Ferry Road Master Plan - Project WL1 in the Long Term Plan).

Legal Implications

7.17 There was not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.

7.18 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

Risks and Mitigations 7.19 There are no significant risks with this option.

Implementation

7.20 Implementation dependencies – The following consents may be required:

- National Environmental Standards (NES) consent from CCC for management of contamination of the road e.g. coal tar & contaminated soil.
• Stormwater Authorisation under the Interim Global Stormwater Consent, Environment Canterbury may also require a construction stormwater consent.

• Removal and works around trees may be able to be covered under the CCC Global Tree consent.

7.21 Would require Council approval of traffic controls by resolution including cycle lanes and traffic signals.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.22 The advantages of this option include:

• A pedestrian focused environment, with wider footpath and four new pedestrian refuge islands
• New gateways to identify the start and end of the village
• A trial speed limit of 30km/h for one year with the possibility of a permanent 30km/h speed reduction
• Improved safety outside the school
• A paved flush median along the centre of the road, with some raised landscaped sections
• Wider cycle lanes
• Updated street furniture and landscaping, including new seating and tree planting

7.23 The disadvantages of this option include:

• A reduction in parking from 77 to 21 spaces
• Potential for some minor delays to vehicle due to the slower speed environment

8. Option 3 – Do Nothing

Option Description

8.1 Do nothing

Significance

8.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with Section 2 of this report.

8.3 There are no engagement requirements for this option.

Impact on Mana Whenua

8.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

8.5 This option does not implement the aims or objectives of the Ferry Road Master Plan, which was adopted by Council following extensive consultation with the local community.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

8.6 This option is inconsistent with Council’s Plans and Policies

8.6.1 Inconsistency – Doing nothing does not fulfil the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan, which designated Woolston Village as a ‘Walkable Centre’ and as forming part of the ‘Local Cycle Network’.

8.6.2 Inconsistency – Doing nothing does not fulfil the aims and objectives of the Ferry Road Master Plan, which has been approved by Council for implementation.
8.6.3  Reason for inconsistency – Doing nothing offers no improvements to Woolston Village.

Financial Implications
8.7  Cost of Implementation – There are no financial implications.
8.8  Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – There is no increase in maintenance costs. The required footpath resurfacing would need to be funded from the existing footpath maintenance budget.
8.9  Funding source – Funding is not required.

Legal Implications
8.10  There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.
8.11  This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

Risks and Mitigations
8.12  Non applicable

Implementation
8.13  Implementation dependencies – Non applicable

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
8.14  The advantages of this option include:
• Maintains existing level of car parking

8.15  The disadvantages of this option include:
• Does not implement the aims or objectives of the Ferry Road Master Plan, which was adopted by Council following extensive consultation with the local community
• Does not provide a pedestrian focused environment
• Does not upgrade the crossing facilities
• Does not improve safety at St Anne’s School
• Does not improve the amenity values of the village.
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HAVE YOUR SAY

Improvements to Woolston Village Centre

We’re getting back to you with a revised proposal and we’d like to hear your views

Open until Tuesday 3 July

ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay
Improvements to Woolston Village Centre

The renewal of Woolston village centre is a significant Council streetscape project from the 2014 Ferry Road Suburban Master Plan. It aims to transform and revitalise Ferry Road through the village, and reinforce its growing vibrancy.

The improvements will complement Woolston’s distinctive character while improving the way the village looks and feels, so that visits are more pleasant and enjoyable, and more people are attracted to spend time in the centre.

The upgrade will include new trees and plants, new footpaths, additional street furniture, and car parking.

In 2016 we consulted on a plan to upgrade Woolston Village. There was strong support for many of the ideas, but concerns were raised about the extent of parking loss proposed, and how this would affect local businesses and the community.

In response, we considered a number of alternative designs to get the best overall outcome. We aim to create an attractive and distinctive street that also takes into account the needs of people passing through and stopping in the village. This has led to the development of a revised draft plan for you to consider.

This plan retains more parking spaces than the previous proposal, while also including features to support Woolston’s special character as a village and destination. It also includes safety improvements for people walking, biking and using the bus on this busy section of road.
Planned timeline

- Consultation closes
  - Tuesday 3 July 2018

- Summary to submitters and decision meetings
  - Sep/Oct 2018

- Detailed design
  - Oct 2018 – April 2019

- Construction
  - July – Dec 2019

Please make sure your feedback reaches us by 5.00pm Tuesday 3 July
What we are proposing

The proposal extends along Ferry Road from Portman Street to St Anne’s School.

The new plan aims to:

- Improve the appearance of the centre while retaining the unique industrial character
- Create a regular row of trees and landscaping as a distinct and attractive part of the street
- Create a centre with a distinct sense of place – a look and feel that people recognise and enjoy
- Create individual spaces in the streetscape that are attractive places to walk through, stop and stay

A place for walking

The plan includes:

- Wider footpaths and improved crossing facilities in the village
- Two signal controlled crossings outside the community library and St Johns Church
- Three upgraded crossings with pedestrian refuges and handrails
- Upgraded street lighting

A place to park

- 55 on-street car park spaces on this section of Ferry Road (this is a reduction from 69 existing car parks and an increase from 21 in the previous plan)
- 32 off-street public car park spaces behind the library with improved pedestrian access and signage to direct vehicles
- Time-restricted parking to allow for higher turnover
Catching the bus

- Two pairs of bus stops in the village located next to the two signal-controlled crossing points
- Two new bus stops in central Woolston replace those at Portman Street
- The bus stop outside St Johns Church moved to 729 Ferry Road
- The bus stops near the corner of Catherine Street moved slightly to the east
- Passengers waiting for the bus outside the library can use the covered area, and we are proposing purpose built shelters for all other stops

Going by bike

- Wider cycle lanes though the village
- Thirty-six cycle parking stands spread throughout the village

The signal-controlled crossing outside St Johns Church allows people on bikes to cross safely to reach the church and school, and link the major cycle routes to the north and south.
Lower speed limit
A one year trial 30km/h speed limit on Ferry Road between Portman Street and St Anne's School will:

• help make the village safer for all road users and pedestrians
• make drivers aware they are entering a village environment

We will be monitoring the trial and if it is effective, further consultation will be needed to approve a permanent lower speed limit.

Proposed Shared Path from Ferry Road to Community Library car park
(plan on next page)

We are planning to upgrade the laneway linking Ferry Road to the public car park and pre-school behind the library, for use by pedestrians and cyclists only. This laneway is not currently used for public vehicle access, and drivers can enter the car park from Portman Street or an alternative access beside the Night and Day Dairy. To do this, the Community Board will need to change the legal status of the road to a shared path.

The path will link to the courtyard area of the library. It will be well lit and include a South Island Kowhai tree which will act as a bollard, along with a coronation stone from 1911, which was part of the original Woolston library. The area also includes some planting along the new building wall and three cycle stands.
More planting

- Approximately 30 new trees, spaced to create a regular canopy where possible (7 existing trees may be removed due to poor condition or road re-alignment). The number and location of trees are subject to underground services.

- New garden beds in a mixture of low native and exotic species in red and white.

**Oak** planted to replace trees to be removed in poor condition near the existing large Oak tree at St Johns Church.

**Upright Hornbeam** at the village entrances. This upright tree with bright autumn colour reaches approximately 12m in height.

**Pin Oak** replacement of two Pin Oak trees near Portman Street to allow a change to the kerb. This will retain the existing set of four Pin Oak trees.

**Magnolia Kobus** the main street tree. This vase shaped tree grows approx 7m tall, produces star-shaped white flowers in the spring/summer and is hardy to withstand the local Woolston conditions near the coast.
Seating and paving

- Replacement of existing seats with a combination of seating with back and arm supports, and larger square seating to allow flexible use and socialising
- Use of building setback areas to create ‘mini-plazas’ with seats and landscaping
- Furniture selected to reflect the industrial character of Woolston using a mixture of materials including iron, wood and steel
- A mixture of grey paving with a contrasting lighter colour, selected to reflect the industrial character of Woolston

Remembering Woolston’s past

Woolston has a long established industrial heritage and strong cultural connections to the Heathcote River. We are proposing to celebrate these through the use of etched paving stones, which could include images of historic buildings, the natural environment, and Māori culture and history.

Matapopore Charitable Trust is an organisation established by Ngāi Tūhuriri to work with Christchurch City Council to provide cultural advice on Ngāi Tahu values, narratives and aspirations for Council projects.

Matapopore will be working with the Council and the community to bring to life the cultural stories of this landscape and weave these stories through the projects identified in the Ferry Road Master Plan. This work in progress will be finalised later in the design stage, and we will get back to interested submitters to let them know how this will be done in Woolston village.
Parking comparison

Existing parking | 69 Car parks

Proposed parking | 55 Car parks
Drop-in session
Come and talk to staff about the proposal

Wednesday 13 June
4.30pm to 6.30pm
St Johns Church Lounge
Corner of Ferry Road and St Johns Street
There will be a short staff presentation starting at 4.45pm, and again at 5.45pm.

Engagement Team

03 941 8808
philippa.upton@ccc.govt.nz
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch
PO Box 73016, Christchurch 8154
ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay
PARKING COMPARISON

EXISTING PARKING
67 CAR PARKS

PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED PARKING 2016
20 CAR PARKS

PROPOSED PARKING 2018
56 CAR PARKS

2 additional spaces following consultation
### Woolston Village Centre improvements

#### Issues/suggestions and project team response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key issues and suggestions</th>
<th>Project team response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Concerns about parking loss, in particular outside the pharmacy and adjacent shops | Parking outside the pharmacy  
We acknowledge community concerns expressed through consultation feedback about the need for additional parking outside the pharmacy in particular. In response to this feedback we have increased parking outside the pharmacy from the previously proposed one space to three spaces. |
| General parking concerns  
South side of Ferry Road |  
As part of the proposal and in response to submissions to the 2016 concept plan, we have increased the number of car parks on the south side between Oak and Catherine Streets, as detailed on the attached parking comparison plan. This is because although most businesses on the south side have private off-street car parking at the back, drivers may not be aware of this and some people find the car parks difficult to access.  
North side of Ferry Road |  
There is a considerable amount of easily accessible private off-street parking on the north side of Ferry Road for those visiting private businesses, such as the car park at 669 - 681 Ferry Road (42 parks) and New World (114 parks). We are also aware that some businesses on this side of the road don’t have parking on-site and we have retained some on-street car parking in these locations. We have taken into account the improved layout and security of the redeveloped Council car park behind the Woolston Community Library that has 32 car parks.  
Signs have now been installed to direct drivers to this car park from Ferry Road via Portman Street. |
| St Anne’s School & Church |  
Feedback also identified some concerns with the loss of parking around St Anne’s School. Since consultation, two additional parking spaces have been included on the south side of Ferry Road outside number 670, which is opposite the church and school. Recent discussions with St Anne’s Church have removed three parking spaces outside 733 Ferry Road to allow for a bus stop location that meets the needs of both the project and the church. This means that between Marion Street and the eastern boundary of St Anne’s School, the number of car parks has decreased by two - from the existing 17 to the now proposed 15. |
| Overall parking provision in the centre |  
This brings the total proposed parking spaces to 56, which is a decrease of 11 spaces when compared to the existing number of on-street parks in this section of Ferry Road. Recent parking survey information shows that demand can be met in the remaining on-street and off-street car parks. |

Note: The consultation leaflet shows there are currently 69 existing car parks in this section of Ferry Road. This does not take into account that two car parks outside New World on Ferry Road have already been removed as part of the supermarket development, bringing the number of proposed parking spaces down to 67, and those removed as part of the proposal consulted on from 14 to 12. We apologise for any confusion this may have caused.

#### Other improvements for parking and access

The signal-controlled pedestrian crossing has been moved closer to the Council-owned car park at the rear of the Woolston Community Library so that people can park here and safely cross to the businesses on the south side of Ferry Road. For mobility access there are two car parks to the rear of the library, which are only a short distance from the pharmacy and wider shopping area. These spaces are fully accessible and linked to the village by a new level footpath.

#### Summary of proposed parking changes following consultation feedback

- Two further short-term car parks will be retained outside the pharmacy and adjacent shops, now three car parks in total
- Three car parks removed from outside 733 Ferry Road to relocate the bus stop to this location
- Two further car park included outside 670 Ferry Road opposite the church and school
- Following discussion with adjacent business owners seven parking spaces proposed on the north side of Ferry Road will have time restrictions:
  - four parking spaces outside the dairy at 701 Ferry Road will be restricted to ten minutes
  - three parking spaces outside the pharmacy and adjacent shops will be restricted to fifteen minutes
- Signs have now been installed to direct drivers to the car park behind the Woolston Community Library from Ferry Road via Portman Street
### Concern about loss of parking outside St Anne’s School

Two additional parking spaces have been included since the consultation on the south side of Ferry Road outside number 670, which is opposite the church and school. Recent discussions with St Anne’s Church have removed three parking spaces outside 733 Ferry Road to allow for a bus stop location that meets the needs of both the project and the Church.

This means that between Maronan Street and the eastern boundary of St Anne’s School, the amount of available parking has decreased by two parking spaces, from the existing 17 to the now proposed 15.

### Trees and landscaping

**Trees**

The Woolston Village improvements project is part of the Ferry Road Master Plan which was developed with the community through workshops and consultation in 2014. This resulted in a plan for trees with:

- red and white colour theme
- maximum 8 metres height
- seasonal variety and interest (deciduous)

When selecting trees we also needed to make sure we took into account that:

- Ferry Road is an over-dimension route requiring 11 metres of clear space of for wide vehicles
- Woolston is a dry site with a windy coastal environment

Deciduous trees provide interest through seasonal change, and access to sunlight in winter while providing shade in summer. Although evergreen trees don’t lose their leaves all at once, they drop leaves all year long and limit sun in winter. However, we have reviewed the tree selection in response to requests from a number of submitters that native and evergreen trees be considered for Woolston. New Zealand Kauri trees will now replace the Upright Horibeams at the village entrances and the English Oaks at St Johns Church. Native plants will also be incorporated into the under-planting. Magnolia Kobus will be retained as the main street tree, as the leafy nature and fragrant star-shaped flowers in spring/summer will create a strong feature in the village as well as meeting the constraints of the site described above.

New Zealand Kauri (Agathis australis) is a slow growing, evergreen conifer which makes an attractive specimen tree. It has a narrow, pyramidal form which lasts for more than fifty years.

To make room for the additional two parking spaces outside the pharmacy and adjacent shops, two small existing trees will be removed along with the two proposed trees along the kerb. To balance this and create a greener, defined feel to the public space we are now proposing to replace the two small existing trees with three Autumn Blaze maple trees.
Footpath Width

In designing Woolston Village we are planning for future users including visitors and locals, as well as meeting the needs of existing users including the young and the elderly.

We know the community wants Woolston to be an attractive place that is welcoming to use, to visit and to stop and stay.

We are designing an inclusive environment which enables people of all ages and ability to move around safely regardless of their choice of transport, age or physical ability.

 Widening the footpath on the north side of the road will help us achieve our aims to benefit everyone in the community in the following ways:

- Ease of movement, especially for people with push chairs, wheelchairs and mobility scooters
- Plenty of room for people to stop and chat while others can still move around them
- Room for business signage, cafe seating and other outdoor use
- Space for trees which will improve the look and feel of the centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other issues and suggestions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement of trees will limit visibility for vehicles and pedestrians</td>
<td>Trees are located based on road visibility guidelines and plantings are kept to a maximum of 600mm in height. Trees will have lower branches removed as they get larger, maintaining 2.5m of clear space to allow visibility below the canopy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 km/h speed limit</td>
<td>The one year trial 30 km/h speed limit on Ferry Road between Portman Street and St Anne’s School will help make the village safer for all road users and pedestrians. The lower speed limit reduces the likelihood of a crash and the severity if one does happen. Drivers will be aware they are entering a village environment, and will be travelling at a speed that will make the centre more inviting and accessible for pedestrians and cyclists. This short section of reduced speed limit is unlikely to have any noticeable effect on vehicle travel times in Ferry Road and for most people there will be no or minimal delay to their total journey, given the waiting times already expected at traffic lights and pedestrian crossings. During peak travel times traffic is likely to be travelling at 30 km/h or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why not extend it the 30kph speed limit to Hargood and Rutherford Streets?</td>
<td>Reduced speed limits are typically used in areas with high pedestrian movements, this is why it is not proposed to extend the 30 km/h speed limit outside of the village centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mobility parking**  
Two mobility parking spaces have been included in the Council-owned car park to the rear of the Woolston Community Library. This is seen as the best location in this area for mobility parking because there is room for people who use mobility aids such as wheelchairs or crutches. It is not possible to provide enough space for mobility parks on Ferry Road without users encroaching into the cycle or vehicle lane when getting into or out of the car.  
The spaces to the rear of the library are centrally located and approximately 30 metres from the pharmacy.

**Accommodating the over-dimension route**  
The plan has been designed to allow over-dimensioned vehicles to continue to use this section of Ferry Road. This includes vehicles and loads up to 11 metres wide.

**Charging stations for electric cars and bikes**  
At this stage there is no plan for any council-funded charging stations in this section of Ferry Road.

**Tidyng footpaths and making them safer**  
All footpaths in the project area will be resurfaced and relvelled during construction.

**Request to install traffic signals at Ferry Road/St Johns Street intersection**  
Traffic signals can only be justified at an intersection if they resolve a significant safety or efficiency issue. In the past five years there have been two recorded crashes at this intersection, both involving cyclists. The updated design of the intersection aims to reduce the potential for this type of crash, and signalising the intersection would be unlikely to offer any further significant benefit to cyclist or vehicle safety. This intersection is not on the Christchurch City Council’s list of the 100 most dangerous intersection in the city, and unnecessarily signalising the intersection could result in more accidents than currently experienced through additional queuing and delays.

**Request for recycling bins**  
The request has been forwarded to the appropriate area within Council. At the moment Council is not installing public recycling bins in the suburbs because of the costs involved and issues with contamination when rubbish is mixed with recycling.

**Will there be vehicle access on the shared path next to the Woolston Community Library?**  
The shared path is already in place and is for pedestrians and cyclists only, there is no vehicle access.

**Request for higher provision for cyclists**  
Ferry Road is designated as part of the local cycle network. As such, the cycle lanes have been upgraded so that they are between 1.6 and 1.8 metres wide. Where parked vehicles are present the lanes will be a minimum of 1.8 metres so that cyclists can safely cycle past a car where the doors may be open. The 1.8 metre cycle lane width allows more opportunities for cyclists to overtake other cyclists. In some locations the cycle lanes are 1.6 metres wide when the cycle lane is against the kerb. This narrower width is sufficient for a safe cycling environment when there is no adjacent parking.
The cycle lanes comply with the guidance in the NZTA Cycle Network Guidance and in the Christchurch Cycle Design Guide.

**Opposition to cycle facilities**  
The existing cycle lanes on Ferry Road are too narrow, at between 1.1 and 1.6 metres wide. This is not sufficient to allow cyclists to use the cycle lane safely, particularly when cycling adjacent to parked cars where doors may be open. The wider cycle lanes, which are now between 1.6 metres wide and 1.8 metres wide, provide a safe facility for cyclists. No changes to the cycle lanes are proposed following consultation.

**How long will the construction be?**  
Construction will take approximately six months.

**Has a parking survey been carried out in Woolston Village since the new supermarket has been open?**  
A June 2017 parking survey informed the design.

**The proposed island in front of 622 Ferry Road will cause traffic flow issues as well as issues for business owners and their customers entering and exiting their private driveways.**  
The island does not block any driveways, except the New World service yard which is restricted to left in - left out as part of their resource consent. The island has been reduced in length to make it easier for vehicles to turn right into 622 Ferry Road.

**Concern about is the proposed island outside New World supermarket, if a car was driving east towards town they would not be able to turn right into the supermarket carpark.**  
New World car park access onto Ferry Road was secured as part of their resource consent. During the consenting process a compromise was reached between the developer and Council, permitting access onto Ferry Road if an island was constructed to stop right turns in and out of the supermarket carpark, and encouraging drivers to use the St Johns Street access instead. The island is planned as part of the development of the site but has not yet been constructed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern about exiting the New World carpark onto Ferry Road if turning right. This can be a dangerous area and very hard to see oncoming cars, especially bicycles.</td>
<td>Once the island outside the New World carpark is constructed right turns will not be possible (see above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the deep dish gutters on Oak Street be upgraded?</td>
<td>There is a separate upgrade project for Oak Street which is currently funded in the Long Term Plan in 2021, 2022 and 2023. There will be separate consultation for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the plans for landscaping and parking between Portman and Heathcote Streets?</td>
<td>There will be no change to the existing landscaping between Heathcote and Portman Streets. Moving the bus stop from the current location near Portman Street means the number of car parks between Heathcote and Portman Streets will increase by two spaces on the north side and be reduced by one space on the south side of Ferry Road. There will be no time restrictions on these car parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it be difficult for the bus to turn into the stop outside the new library with signal pole on the footpath?</td>
<td>The bus stop has been designed to allow buses to pull in and out, based on the largest size bus currently in service and checked with vehicle tracking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are not aware of the car park behind the new library, it needs signage.</td>
<td>Signs have now been installed to direct drivers to the car park behind the Woolston Community Library from Ferry Road via Portman Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could a safe crossing point on St John Street to link the Church and aged housing developments and the super market be considered?</td>
<td>The request has been forwarded to the appropriate area within Council and will be investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will wheel chair access be provided on the shared path linking Ferry Road and the carpark behind the new library?</td>
<td>Wheel chair access has been provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no give way lines on the Maronan and Catherine Street intersections.</td>
<td>The request has been forwarded to the appropriate area within Council and will be investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the Catherine Street pedestrian bridge be rebuilt?</td>
<td>The Ferry Road Master Plan includes Heathcote Street Pocket Park and Pedestrian Bridge as a separate project. Further consultation on this is planned for early 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will there be a rubbish bin outside 630 and 630a Ferry Road?</td>
<td>An additional rubbish bin has been included outside 630 and 630a Ferry Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you surveyed the amount of pedestrians and cyclists using the shopping area?</td>
<td>Surveys to see how people use the village centre have been undertaken and identified up to 130 pedestrians crossing the road in a single hour period. Shopper surveys show that 31% of people using the centre typically walk, 6% cycle and 7% take the bus. These figures include people visiting the centre as well as people travelling through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is the school not getting a School Speed Zone or an upgraded crossing?</td>
<td>A 40 km/h school speed zone would not be needed in a full-time 30 km/h zone. The proposal includes changes to the crossing layout to make it more accessible and easier for school children to use. The only suitable upgrade would be to include a signalised crossing, which is not needed as a new set of signals to the west that can be used to access the school is being provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed concept for Ferry Road at Woolston Village

We want to know what you think about plans to enhance Woolston Village by creating a more inviting public space and making this section of Ferry Road safer for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

Community feedback as part of the 2015 Ferry Road Master Plan highlighted the need for improvements around Woolston Village. Based on what local residents told us, the Council is proposing a series of street enhancements that highlight the distinctive industrial character of the village centre, balance the needs of road users and attract more people to visit and spend time in Woolston Village.

Summary of improvements
Key changes and improvements proposed as part of the Woolston Village upgrade include:

- Creating a pedestrian focused environment, with extra crossing points at locations and paving that guides people in public spaces.
- Installing a flush pedestrian island along the centre of the road to help identify the suburb centre and control vehicle speeds.
- Introducing cycle lanes and additional cycle parking.
- Introducing a 30km/h speed zone.
- Installing a stormwater retention system.
- Extending pedestrian alternative nearby parking sites to make the area safer for pedestrians and cyclists, and make space for more landscaping. This would reduce the number of parking spaces on this section of Ferry Road from 7 to 5, as well as free parking spaces from side streets.
- Enhancing the look and feel of the area by planting trees of various sizes and improving landscape planting. The aim is to make the street appear narrower and achieve a “village feel”.
- Upgrading street furniture like seats, rubbish bins and cycle stands, and improving street lighting.
- Creating “gazebos” that clearly show where the village begins and ends.

Key points we have thought about
The Ferry Road Master Plan indicated public support for enhancements to Woolston Village, which will encourage people to visit and improve road safety along this busy stretch of Ferry Road. The proposal outlined in this document considers existing strategic plans for the city and is based on review of the key issues – however, we need to know what you think about our proposal before we go any further.

PEDESTRIANS
Improved street crossings, pedestrian islands and wider footpaths will make it safer and more pleasant for pedestrians to visit the village.

CYCLISTS
Paved cycle lanes and advanced cycle stop boxes at the traffic lights will make the road safer for cyclists.

SPEED REDUCTION AND ROAD LANES
Narrowing the road and introducing a safety speed zone aims to encourage motorists to slow down through the busy village and make it safer for all road users.

Lighting, Furniture and Landscaping
Street lighting will be improved, new year, rubbish bins and cycle stands installed and a variety of trees and plants will help make the area more appealing to plan and visit time. The materials and planting schemes will reflect the character and heritage of the village. The proposal puts on trees to be removed and replaced with new trees, however the number and location of trees is subject to the placement of underground services and will be finalised at the time of planting.

Historic and Cultural Context
Based on feedback through the 2015 Ferry Road Master Plan consultation process, the design for the new Woolston Village project draws heavily on the industrial heritage of the area. The colour and tone of the landscape and street furniture have also been chosen to reflect the Port Hills and heritage aspects. References to the area’s early Boat history will also be incorporated in final plans.

Parking
The proposed redefinition of motorists in-street parking and side roads aims to make the area safer for cyclists and improve the way it looks and feels. We commissioned an independent parking survey which confirmed that the parking proposed for removals could be a concentrated either on side roads or through existing off-street spaces (e.g. on Hotham, Catherine, and Pountney Streets). Clear signage would direct motorists to parking areas on side roads, remaining on-street parking on Ferry Road will be a mix of Pay and Free spaces, and Pay and Free spaces on side roads to encourage parking retrieval.

Trees

Landscape concept

How people currently get to Woolston Village
The survey showed how frequently each of these groups visited Woolston. Seventy six per cent of visitors walked to the shopping area two to three times a week, with the majority of pedestrian visits classified as “regular visitors”, as 61% of people and 60 per cent of buses. This is compared to 52 per cent of drivers and 50 per cent of car passengers.

Most of the people surveyed were in the area briefly to visit the shops and stay for less than 30 minutes.

People driving cars indicated that parking was important, however to per cent of drivers had no preference between on-street parking and off-street parking. Seventy per cent of drivers indicated that parking restrictions were important. The peak occupancy of parking spaces on Ferry Road during the survey was 50 per cent, with typical occupancy of parking spaces being below 50 per cent.

Timelines
Consultation opens Wednesday of May
Consultation closes Wednesday 8 June
Report proposed for the Community Board July/June 2016
If approved Community Board and Council to comment August/September 2016
If approved construction anticipated September/July 2017
If approved construction to be completed December 2017

H ave your say
This concept plan attempt to address the public call for improvements to the village through the Ferry Road Master Plan, while balancing the requirements of safety and more attractive environment with the need for parking near businesses. It is anticipated that the proposed improvements will attract more people to spend time in the village and therefore benefit commercial activities.

It is important that you tell us what you think of the concept plan before we go any further. Please make sure your comments reach us by 5pm on Wednesday 8 June.

If you give us your contact details on the submission form, we will send you the final plan and a summary of consultation feedback before the decision is made. We will also let you know the date and time of the meeting where this plan will be considered by the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board.

Contact
Philippa Upchurch, Engagement Advisor
Christchurch City Council
P.O. Box 7013
Christchurch Mail Centre
Christchurch 8140
Phone 941-8888
Email philippa.upchurch@christchurch.govt.nz

Further information
ccc.govt.nz/woolston

Attachment E
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.: 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Item No.: 16 | 18 | W | Hi Dear:  
| |  | | I wish to keep all on road parking maybe (P10).  
| | | | because where I work mainly for customer takaways lunch break, so if all parking remove, will mean maybe less business, so I could lost my job if no business, Please keep all on road parking.  
| | From: |  |
| | 19 | W | Hi Dear:  
| |  | | I wish to keep all on road parking maybe (P10).  
| | | | because where I work mainly for customer takaways lunch break, so if all parking remove, will mean maybe less business, so I could lost my job if no business, Please keep all on road parking.  
| | From: |  |
| | 20 | Y | I love the idea of Woolston shopping centre being more of an attractive village, being more pedestrian and cyclist friendly, having more trees and seating. It’s fine to have slower traffic for a short section through the village. Great plan!  
| | 21 | Y | Hi there  
| | | | Great news that Woolston is getting a revamp, I think the reduction of parks is a bad idea though. At the moment the biggest reason I stop is the on street parking, convenience to pop in and out of a shop without hunting for a park. If you can meet half way with the parks then the new concept has my vote.  
| | 22 | Y | I completely support the proposed changes outlined in the Ferry Road at Woolston Village project consultation plans it will do alot for businesses around the area and it would encourage people who shop at “the tannery” as well.  
| | 23 | Y | These look great but I would like to encourage the details people to get the details right with the road width and cycle lane widths please.  
| | | | I bike down Matipo St from Blenheim Rd and find it one of the most dangerous stretches of road I use. Where the traffic islands exist, they narrow the road but don't slow the traffic down. So as a cyclist I get squished into a narrower space with parked cars in front that I have to come back out around, and with cars squeezing past in between me and the traffic island and then me and the parked cars.  
| | | | This isn’t the only place in ChCh this squishing happens - there are some much newer sections that have a similar outcome. Often where pedestrian crossings have the concrete islands sticking out from the footpath (like the ones planned in Woolston) and a cycle way plus road way squished in between the bump and the island, all it does is make the space smaller and push cars and bikes closer together. I know the theory is that the car slows down, but they don’t. They just push on through.  
| | | | It’s especially bad with cars being wider than they used to be on average. So if engineers are working on some average car width, please make sure that it’s the average car width on ChCh roads, not some 1995 engineering spec!  
| | | | This is a long winded way to say, please check that the space for road plus cycle way is wide enough to fit both cars, small trucks, and cycles easily. It’s no fun gripping the handle bars and praying as I go through bits of road that were designed with the best intent, but with a poor grasp on reality.  
| | 24 | N | 1. Without parking people will not stop and use the proposed shopping area.  
| | | | 2. The side streets are already congested, Portman Street has cars parked on both sides so usually there is only room for one car to safely use the road.  
| | | | 3. There aren’t many family friendly shops in the area and with the banks, post office and Doctors departing what is left to encourage people to stop. There will be a chemist, hairdresser, bike shop, second hand shop, garage and supermarket plus numerous takeaway bars and liquor outlets.  
| | | | As the banks, doctors, post office etc are moving to either Eastgate or Ferrymead it will be more convenient for many to go where they are situated.  
| | | | 4. It doesn’t matter how "pretty" you make the area if the amenities and parking aren’t there people WILL NOT stop.  
| | | | 5. Maybe you would be better to concentrate on making the area cleaner, eg channels kept clean and rubbish picked up and repair the footpaths and roads to a decent standard.  
| | From: |  |
I object to the removal of the parking outside the Dairy, Bakery and other small businesses in that area. Not all people are young and fit, some of us have mobility problems necessitating easy access to those places we need to go. Most of those who use those parking spaces take more than five minutes to make their purchases before leaving again. Restricting the numbers of parking spaces will only inconvenience and already large problem in that area.

As it is, the New World Supermarket makes it quite clear that its parking is for its customers only - thus denying short term parking to those who wish to go to the Bakery, a fast food outlet or a Dairy in the area. It's called choice, and soon, some will have no choice but to go elsewhere - to the detriment of the many small shop owners and their staff.

I am all for greening up an area, but not at the expense of losing short term car parking near shops who depend on those passing through Woolston, for their livelihoods.

26 N

Adding to my submission please:

1. Please remove the median strip in front of our shop because we cannot turn right into our drive way completely block.

2. Please remove the cycle way on ferry road, make Linwood Ave more cycle friendly instead, it too pack full on ferry road to have cycle lane, replace more express parking please.

3. Speed limit 30kph way too slow will hold up the traffic and a lot of car may avoid to go pass Woolston, my suggestion is at least 40kph or keep it 50kph.

4. Please keep all the 30min parking possible add more, because all the small retail like us on ferry road mainly survive on the express on road parking, maybe P10 or P30.

Thank you and I hope my massage could be heard.

Have nice day.

27 Y

Yes I think some improvements need doing of upgrading woolston, but I'm really confused as a parent of Te Waka Unua School we got told from you last year that reducing the speed limit around the school would cause major disruption to the flow of the people getting to work but you want to make the whole of woolston 30km all the time!!!

I don't get how you can not think about these kids and their families I walk across the designated crossing 4 times a day and it is so dangerous ever time. People do not slow down in school hours or see us on the crossing I kids was hit last year.

Please put in a flashing sign near the school so people will slow near our school first please, soon have school has one and we need one.

28 Y

We do like your propose Village concept for Ferry Road. A 30kph speed limit is welcome, I see from your plans the controlled crossing will still remain in place opposite 620 Ferry Road. Together with pattered surface crossing point. Adjacent to the Community Library is a small road it looks like you are going to ballard off this exit onto Ferry Road. Is this an adopted road? Eating the New World Supermarket appears to be left turn only? A rear exit from this Supermarket onto Glenroy Street will see increased traffic on to St John Street. Could I suggest a pedestrian crossing on St John Street around the Scout hut area so as to cross safety, from the on street parking and bus route on this road. Will traffic lights be required at the Junction off St Johns and Ferry Road? Turning right on to Ferry Road from this exit appears close to the paved crossing (640 Ferry Road) and could create a traffic choke point here. The off street car parking needs to be clearly sign posted. This could be an issue as lots of advertising boards could distract from the village look we wish to achieve. The Square 669 Ferry Road is well supported commercially and is a very busy access and egress pinch point I hope the speed restrictions will avoid any accidents here. I see no plans on your proposals to improve the street lighting?

29 Y

Generally support with this suggestion. It should be a dual carriageway in both directions through the Village still retaining 30 km limit. Reasons: 1) In the summer there are long queues of vehicles, that includes weekend with beach goers. 2) With further development of Ferry road it will increase both private as well as commercial traffic.

30 Y

Denuding street car parks on Ferry Road East of St John's Road seems inconsistent with retained car parking East of Portman Street. Especially as the road width is the same in both locations. I would ask you to review this aspect as road parking is so valuable. Even the road speed is reduced to 30km so it is hard to fathom that it is a safety issue.

31 Y

Looks good to us. It will give the area a more relaxed feeling.

32 N

We agree on the beautification of trees and seating spaces but it's not going to be good to reduce parking and lowering the speed limit as this road is a thoroughfare, and will discourage users from wanting to pass through. We generally pass and park and grab food on the way home or into city. Please review Village plans to allow drivers and people to do their quick stops. In addition it's a shame that the Post Office and Bank is closing down in the area. It was a good reason to stop come via Ferry Road to go to the Post Office and Supermarket.

33 Y

Certainly looks more pedestrian friendly. The “crossing” bays will improve things no end. 1. One of the parks on each side could be a disability car park.

34 N

With old gutter in front of houses on my side of street. Where as it is, the Council trees beside me fill the road, my Section and Gutter with Leaves. Also parked cars drop rubbish in gutters now. "Who going to keep it tidy and clean as it's not now. I'm nearly 80 so can't do as I've always done clean up the mess? And with cars either side of street hard to drive out onto road. (no room for visitors to park. I walk and drive to centre and I work volunteer in Centre at.

35 Y

I think it would lift the people of Woolston by having a lovely village, there are some very proud people, living around there and trees, etc, would be lovely especial, with a drive through to Summer. I am a older person, who is very proud of my home, and garden. St Johns Street, badly needs a safe crossing, for the elderly, also mothers, with children. Thank you for thinking of us people.
Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board
04 February 2019
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Reducing the number of parking spaces is an unfair move on small businesses in the village. How growth encouraged when the customers have no where to park? I am also concerned that removing those parking spaces will drive people away from the village entirely. I think they will continue on to Ferrymead or somewhere else if parking is not easily available. I also believe that removing those spaces will encourage shoppers to park near or outside of St Anne’s school, where parking is already at a premium. It will mean parents will struggle even more to get a park close to the school and will mean more pedestrian traffic crossing Ferry Rd which, as we know, is not a very safe practice round here!

Parking at the moment is ridiculous and there will be 50 or so less parks! As pretty as the plans look, who the hell is going to stop to shop there or shop there when there is nowhere to park?? How are parents supposed to pick up children from St Anne’s? The allocated parks there now have extremely restrictive time limits on them and it will only get worse. Get more car parks, not less!

Parking is already a nightmare! This will put people off shopping in the area and ruin businesses! If anything, there needs to be more parking made available. Not a good plan at all!

This project is crazy and out of touch with reality. Ferry Road will continue to be a major thoroughfare for motorists (Linwood Ave is far less convenient for a large proportion of people travelling to and from the suburbs) and the 30kph limit, plus people trying to get into one of the few parking spaces will just add to the bottlenecks that occur at peak time. Decimating the main street parking will not encourage people to park in side streets - they will just carry on driving. At best, the New World carpark will become the de facto carpark for Woolston. Perhaps the most practical thing that the CCC could do is purchase the Auto Electrician and a few other buildings that protrude into the road, so that a wide carriage way can be constructed through the village! Think things through - we don't want another Victoria Park proposal!

As a resident of the Eastern suburbs all my life and a resident of Woolston for the last 23 years I wish to voice my opposition to many aspects of the Council’s proposal for Woolston Village.

Woolston residents are very loyal and avidly support their local shopping centre. My concerns about this proposal are primarily regarding the removal of over 50 on street car parks. There are over 50 businesses in the affected area of this proposal, it seems ludicrous to not have more parking to support growth of both the local businesses and the population as the suburb is painfully repaired. Surely this removal of parking contravenes the city plan. The Council is OK with insisting a bar & cafe provide “X” amount of parking in proportion to the size of their premises on private land, yet the Council won’t maintain a few dozen on-street parks to support a whole village!

Woolston consists of people from all walks of life, with many being retired, elderly or disabled. This proposal does not provide any on-street parking for these people. Parking supply, availability & turnover is such that Mobility spaces are not needed currently, but that would change if the parking supply was so drastically reduced. By completely removing parking from some places means those less mobile residents may no longer physically be able to access the same businesses they used to.

It is cruel to spend millions on grand beautification schemes & cycle-ways when every road in Woolston is in extreme need of repair. The roads & footpaths are in such awful condition that they’re not suitable for mobility scooters or wheelchairs. The lack of action in road repairs is preventing many people from having decent accessibility in and around their own properties and suburb. My elderly Mother ended up in a great deal of pain

You are pushing the cars off the main road onto the side roads. I don’t feel safe walking around some of these back roads in the dark or during the day. Glenroy Street would need to be upgraded as well, as the road is narrow and the road is uneven. With the new supermarket going in, a lot of people will just park in that carpark, do you have a deal with the property owners which would allow this. It is crazy that you are going to chop down trees because they are the wrong kind and replace them with the right type. How is this saving money for rate payers??? There is a church on St Johns St which would be effected in regards to the parking if you push it off Ferry Road and on to the side streets. Please consider leaving more car parks on Ferry Road and not cutting down so many trees.

My children go to school on Ferry Road and there isn’t much parking there at the moment. Reducing the parking will make it worse when dropping off and picking up children from school

30km speed limit I agree with very good as local schools and preschools. Do not like or agree with no parking on Ferry Road. Will affect all small businesses and also school drop off/pick up

Don’t think the no parking spaces on Ferry Road is a good idea - There are a lot of bakeries, cafes etc and people park and run in and out - not a browsing area so much! You will have heaps of people using the n.w. carpark and the video shop carpark! Also the noticeboard outside the christchurch medical rooms is very dilapidated and not user friendly. We need a board the community can use.

Love it, Woolston needs this. I live on Ferry Road and would enjoy a new environment. Hope it goes ahead.

I’ve been a local for 10 years and I don’t want to loose parking outside the local shops it will be a inconvenience to a lot of people

No car parking = no business, support the local businesses!

Parking on Heathcote Street makes it very hard to back out of our driveways as we have telephone poles at end of drive as I have to manœuvre to avoid hitting cars I look up and a car has come round that bend end of road and I have nearly caused a few accidents. Very dangerous. May be parking on one side please. Would be nice to have a bigger playground with swimming pool to play in all year round

Proposed Woolston Village Concepts. Thank You for the opportunity to comment. Concern is at the Reduction in parking spaces from 77 to 21. Through traffic will no longer be able to stop briefly. There will be loss of patronage. To pause and pick up lunch is not an option with the proposed “No stopping” lines. Bankruptcy of many food outlets may well ensue. It is understood that there was consultation in 2012. (That is a year after the major Quake. Were we not desperate for nice calming stable “village”-type places then??) But that is Four years ago. Since then three big commercial players have moved into the area. Their input deserves consideration. Please re-consult. The views will undoubtedly be fresh, and quite different, but will express concern at Commercial viability at the proposed changes. This is a bricks n mortar shopping not an online provision. Parking: There is a new preschool proposed near No 580. When mentioned to the presenter on 25th May, her reply was along the lines of “if there was, how do I not know?” I trust she read the hoarding on the site as she left that afternoon. The concern is where will the parents park to pick up the pre-schoolers if there is this significant reduction in parking space? At No. 655 the IHC Day care vans have considerable difficulty getting out into the traffic flow after 3:30pm onwards ever now. This would not have been seen at the times the planners state they were observing in the area. The collection van drivers from other come from other suburbs. Neighbouring properties’ established trees lean over their fences and tend to block their view, especially in summer months. Likewise anyone parking right adjacent to their driveway. Please check all this out before proceeding. Side roads are proposed as parking spaces. Right now there is a yellow broken line along one side of these roads. No further parking can be created. It will be down to one lane only. How can it possibly absorb “Proposed 120 parking”? There is a 2 metre median strip proposed middle of Ferry Road. The driver of the purple bus on which I travelled yesterday had no knowledge of the proposals (there have been a large number of new drivers employed recently), but was scathing as to manoeuvrability of large vehicles. Essentially the traffic flow...
through from Summer will be hindered. It may well divert to other routes i.e. the reverse of what is trying to be achieved with these proposals. The landscape planting in front of the Supermarket likewise deserves deletion. The patterned paved median; suggest the city planners spend a day in a wheelchair being pushed over such areas. Please do not create a disability problem when there was none before. (Was not accessibility-friendly city one of the broader aims of the rebuild?) The medical centre is still marked on this plan. Is it not about to relocate? Request: rework these Woolston proposals. Avoid medians, reduction in this number of parking spaces, congestion of side streets and above all ask the newer players in the commercial sector about their concerns. Your deliberations are awaited with real interest. Thank you.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Submission to Christchurch City Council Re: Proposed Woolston Village Development

Improving the look of the area with landscaping, trees and furniture is a great idea and would line up with the more modern buildings.

I object to some aspects of the current proposed street layout for Woolston Village development, i.e. speed limit, median strip and parking.

I believe that to reduce the traffic flow in Ferry Road would force the flow down Humphreys Drive through the wide layout of Linwood Avenue (60 km/h) or to turn left at the lights on Radley Street and along to garlands Road via the Tannery complex to the city.

Many of the smaller shops in Woolston depend on passing traffic and require that they are able to stop with on-street parking.

The Woolston shops also are going to have to compete with around 40 shops becoming available in Ferrymead.

Should businesses be forced to shift we will have empty shops and return to the lower standard of the past.

If one looks at Lincoln Road or Papanui Road in Merivale there are no speed restrictions.

With existing traffic lights and school patrols I think traffic speed would be self-regulating as happens in Merivale/Papanui.

A village concept may be alright for Sumner, Lyttelton or Brighton which are end-of-road destinations but does not fit on a main road into the city.

This road should be clear of obstacles allowing full traffic flow and parking.

The current proposed plan does not fit these criteria and would be a backward step in Woolston's development. It will be less attractive to large food outlets, i.e. chicken and burger fast food chains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>My husband has bad knees and I have varicose veins and we are unable to walk great distances. Can you not increase the parking along Ferry Road more than proposed at present in your plan? The majority of the cyclists will cycle through the Village without stopping but we who shop there will not get a park anywhere near where we wish to shop. This plan appears to appease cyclists but will ruin the lively hood of the shop owners who will suffer miserably because of this idea. Can you not still achieve your agenda without taking away so many car parks? How does wider footpaths make it safer for pedestrians when there will be a cycle lane beside it also?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>See end of document for PDF of full submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>The low percentage of cyclist &amp; pedestrians using Ferry Road does not warrant the over the top loss of car parking proposed. If you are trying to encourage more cyclists &amp; pedestrians travelling through the Woolston village I feel that the results will be marginally effective. The idea of beautifying the area is good, but the largely older population in the area will be severely hampered by having to walk long distances to visit the atm's, takeaway bars, hairdressers &amp; retail shops. More so in inclement weather like present. By pandering to cyclists &amp; pedestrians to such an extent you are letting the tail wag the dog, as they are in the vast minority. New Brighton Mall was redeveloped to cater for pedestrians &amp; cyclists &amp; failed miserably! It is difficult enough now for us &quot;oldies&quot; who use the shopping there now, it will be far far harder if this plan goes ahead, leaving us to shop in an area that has as yet not been &quot;tampered with&quot;. Why not re-route a cyclepath along the river instead &amp; let us older residents use our local shops &amp; amenities without having to struggle to reach them. The whole scheme needs to allow for more parking - even if only time zoned for certain hours. A survey of cyclists in February will differ vastly form a survey on cyclists &amp; pedestrians in the cold wet winter months!!1111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| N | Submission to Christchurch City Council
Re: Proposed Woolston Village Development

I am glad a business owner that the Council are seeking to improve the current Woolston village; however there are some real concerns over the issue of parking.

In conjunction with Foodstuffs SL Ltd I am opening a new store on Ferry Road in late August/early September 2016. I am looking at have approximately another 8,000 customers per week shopping at our new store. This store is my livelihood and I am very concerned about the parking on Ferry Road that is proposed to go as what will happen will be those people will park in my car park. This will affect my sales and more importantly the ability to have safe and secure jobs for our employees.

I think it is prudent that Council undertake a parking survey once our new store is open, as I believe the results will be totally different to the survey that was done. It has not taken into account the Post Office
being closed along with the impending closure of ANZ bank. I believe a new survey would show that many people drive to the village, and that many potential customers of the village are not that shopping at Woolston now, will do so, once the supermarket is open.

We all want people to stop in the village and spend money with local retailers and this is based on convenience. With no car parks potential customers will just drive straight through without stopping. We need to ensure we retain all car parks.

New trees alone will not make people stop and shop in the Woolston village.

I am concerned also about over-width vehicles travelling to the Port that will potentially mount kerbs with the new design – and this is dangerous and a serious risk that needs to be considered.

On-street parking works well outside Merivale Mall on Papamoa Rd and also Sydenham is another good example of how on-street parking works well – a business is vibrant.

I simply cannot emphasise how important the on-street parking is for not just me but all the retailers within the Woolston village. We are not Copenhagen, we are not in Amsterdam, we are in Woolston and the only way this village will succeed will be because people can stop on the way through and have access to convenient car parks.

Yours faithfully,

---

84 Y We generally support the proposed changes outlined in the Ferry Road at Woolston Village project consultation plans.

85 N The car parks on the Ferry Road are extremely important. 1. They bring people to Woolston. 2. Current carpark not enough anyway. Library and public toilet is must.

86 Y Great idea

87 N Disagree with your logic of trying to stop people driving through Woolston. You are taking away car parking - you will turn Woolston into another Brighton. You stuffed up Brighton by stopping cars driving right through - access, access is the important thing especially for old people. The other day I went to Cafe on main road for lunch and then dinner at Everest - both times I had to park on the back road.

88 N I do not support the reduced speed zone or the reduced parking. I have worked in this area for 26 years and parking for my clients is an issue. Despite the survey results, the majority of people do come in by car, and to retain access to the businesses in important - loss of parking can result in loss of business. Reducing the speed zone will just add to the congestion. Cars tend to reduce when it is busy anyway. I am not aware of any accidents attributed to a speed zone of 50km/h. Otherwise the pretty bits look nice.

89 N Mobility parks need to be on Ferry Road near Post Office, Doctor's (both) and Chemist, ANZ Bank and Dairy and by Physiotherapy/ATM (WPAC). This area has a lot of elderly and disabled people. If Ferry Road is narrowed how will buses cope without blocking traffic and also keep to time? There also needs minimum P60+ parking outside both Churches on St John Street and Ferry Road to enable parishioners to attend Sunday's, funerals, weddings etc. (During School hours parking in St Anne's School is not available except to staff). Native trees and planting a must (Kowhai's can be big!)

90 N The Council may be trying to force us all into the buses but I can drive to Harvey Norman from here in about 10 minutes. By bus it takes three separate buses and half the afternoon. These dotted yellow lines will wipe out the shopping centre. There is little enough parking as it is. New World refuses to let people use any of their car park and have gone to the trouble and expense of employing staff to clear people out of it. It will cost the Council more to look after gardens and plant trees everywhere and it narrows the road to the extent that parking places have to go. Questions - Where will business staff and customers park? Why were no copies of the plan booklet sent out to homes? When was it sent out? I've only just been given this. 61 on-street car parks have been removed.

91 N Dropping the speed limit - it is a main route between the City and Sumner, I don't see this being kept to, what is the point? People are not likely to stop and shop if they have to drive around or away from main road to find parking. Is it really necessary to cut down existing trees? Great idea to add more trees but bare in mind sight lines for both cars and cyclists for turning out of drives and side streets. The choice of trees - surely natives, which don’t drop leaves, would be tidier and easier to maintain. The diagram shows 18 car parks on Portman Street. It is very unrealistic - it is hard enough at the moment to get in and out of this street. If your waiting to turn into Portman Street when someone is waiting to come our there is not enough room so your forced to wait on Ferry Road holding up flow of traffic.

92 N See end of document for PDF of full submission

93 Y I have ticked both boxes for the following reasons. On one hand I accept that the Woolston Village is in dire need of a makeover but not at the expense of the removal of all the parking on the South side of Ferry Road. As a business owner of 14 years I have observed that the majority of businesses, cater for fast turn over items, which would indicate that shoppers do not shop for timeframe indicated on the plan – proposed P120 parking.

That is mall timeframes. Woolston is not a mall.
Further I believe the proposed P120 parking is cynical at best. Presumably enforced, it provides revenue by way of taking away parking and repositioning it to benefit the Council. How does this benefit business? If you hinder business, then you are simply jeopardising the very fabric that creates the hub, that is and has become, an essential part of the community.

A small drop in turnover can have a drastic effect on a business that may already operate on thin margins. I find this irresponsible and indicates to me that the council doesn’t have an understanding of how businesses work. Not every business model is that same so generic concepts don’t always work.

In my view the Woolston shops need to retain close car parks for the convenience of their shoppers.

The existing homeowners on the proposed P120 parking streets are also being disadvantaged by way of being time constrained and may have to move vehicles around in order to mitigate fines. These proposed streets are also narrow in existence therefore will create a narrowing effect if both sides are parked on, particularly Heathcote and Catherine St. Presumably the staff at the soon to be completed New World will occupy side streets making less available parking for shoppers and I usually go to at least one of the businesses on a daily basis. The talk around the village indicates a lot of opposition to removing the majority of parking on Ferry Rd.

I see a reduction in speed as a positive move however a speed of 40kph would be less abrupt reduction and if it is considered safe past a school then I would have thought safe enough through a village.

Overall I see the concept as a positive move for the Woolston Community. There just needs some consideration and tweaking to some major issues that may have major impacts on the people that create the community in the first place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S4</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Re: Woolston Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|    |   | Well done to your whimsical proposal in making Woolston another Brighton, (dead). The slower speed will make more traffic congestion, than it currently has, & people will cease using that part of Ferry Road altogether. No thought has been given to those who require an invalid's parking space. 1 park, really, can you spare it? Or those who cannot walk far. Parking is hard to get now, your new 7 parks of 60mins, & 3 parks of 30 minute parking won’t work, is a parking warden to be on duty every day, waiting to pounce when the time expires (how will they know?) (Will there be metres or are you relying on people’s honesty? Yah right) what about the off street parking where do visitors to those who live in those streets park? Then there are shops who will suffer from a down turn in walk in customers. Some will go out of business. Poor Plunket already has no parking outside. Where are parents supposed to park to drop off & pick up children from St Anne’s School? There are too few parks at St Johns Anglican Church now where do vans drop off & pickup church goers & other groups who use the church? I for see people filling up New Worlds car park to do non supermarket shopping. As there is no longer a Kiwibank in Woolston everyone now has to go to either Ferrymead or Eastgate for some it’s too far either way.

Why remove trees what did they do to piss you lot off? They do give off oxygen.

The new proposed trees information found on Wikipedia,

Trident Maplett is small to medium sized deciduous tree reaching a height of 5-20 m with a trunk up to 50 cm diameter. Who’s going to clean up when leaves drop & blow into shops, gutters etc. Oh I know, more money as council employees will get to do it wasting my rate money.

Magnolia Kobus, known as the Kobushi magnolia or Kobus magnolia, is a species of Magnolia native to Japan and occasionally cultivated in temperate areas. 2) it is deciduous, small to tall tree which has a slow growth rate but can reach 8-15 m (25-27 ft) in height and up to 30 m (35ft) in spread. Really are you planning on having all shops in the dark??? Those that survive that is. Have any of you even looked at a picture to see how HUGE these trees get? Or did you just go with what the botanist recommended?

What the hell is the Council thinking? Use my rates to fix the roads, footpaths, & other public amenities, e.g. parks. Avon river, sports grounds, swimming pools etc.

I hate what you propose for Woolston, as does everyone I know. Stop trying to make Woolston another quaint English rural town, it won’t work. Woolston folk are down to earth & don’t want/need this poncing about with our area. I don’t pay my rates for the Council to waste them on projects that are not needed. Quote don’t fix what ain’t broken. I know you’ll just plow ahead & do it anyway, as you have done with everything else. Thanks for nothing.

I’ll take my custom & money elsewhere, & avoid Woolston altogether as I do Brighton.

Unhappy rate payer & local Christchurch resident.
95 N While the look of the proposed changes is, I think, great, the reality would be the death of most small businesses in the Woolston Village. Woolston needs more carparks on Ferry Road, not fewer, and the drastic reduction proposed would be disastrous. Motorists would simply carry on to the next set of shops where they can park. I have some specific suggestions: 1. Abandon the median strip so that parking can be retained; 2. rather than narrowing the carriageway, narrow the already generously wide footpaths so that more parking spaces can be added; 3. Move the cycle tracks to the other side of the padlocked cars (between the road and the curb) to provide a cost-free safety barrier for cyclists; 4. Do not increase the number of pedestrian crossings, as a pedestrian I can report that the existing three are more than sufficient; 5. Do not change the speed limit to 30kph, this is unnecessary and would tend to irritate motorists, making them less, not more, likely to stop in the Village; 6. Move the Village “gateway” from opposite Heathcote Street to the natural place at the intersection of Ferry Road and Radley/Hargood Streets; 7. Bear in mind that most traffic is passing through our Village, it is not their destination, and they stop and do business with us more on impulse than intention and that on street parking plays a large part in such decisions. 8. Also bear in mind the already heavy demand for parking spaces in the evenings (for diners and the patrons of takeaway shops), and that curtailling parking will adversely affect such businesses. All in all, I recommend that the existing plan be abandoned it’s entirely and that consultations with local businesses and residents form the basis, the starting point, of any future plan.

96 N Cycle ways are a good idea but don’t take away any Ferry Road on street car parks in front of the shops because they’re convenient. When the Churches are being used just where are we all supposed to park our cars? Don’t reduce speed to 30kms, it’s a main thoroughfare, it will hold up traffic. I would rather see Ferry Road widened not narrowed for safety.

97 N Regards to the woolston upgrade my main concern would be parking which is a problem now and we have had problems with parking around St Johns church at present and would only be compounded with the proposed changes. My other concern is the 30 km, as this is the only way through to fermyead / Summer its bad now at peak times and its not uncommon to have cars backed up in the village, or do you have another means for the traffic flow regard.

98 Y I think this is a wonderful revitalization plan for Woolston Village, and as a local resident I’m excited about it. I live on Rutherford st. and my only concern with the concept, and it is a big one, is about the proposed reduced speed limit. What will the impact be on traffic, given this is a main thoroughfare from Sumner/MT Pleasant etc into the city? Will it mean more of a traffic burden onto Rutherford and Linwood Ave? Will it cause backups/delays at peak times? How will this be managed?

99 N I am pleased that the council recognises that Woolston Village is in need of much of an upgraded streetscape. I approve of much of the cosmetic design and better provision for pedestrians and cyclists. However, the planned significant reduction of designated parking spaces on Ferry Rd will be detrimental to many businesses. Many of the small businesses do not have any provision for private parking and rely upon street parking for their customers. Most/all of the approx. 350 off street parks, indicated on the council plan, are/will be on private property. The proposed plan retains a little street parking on the east side of Ferry Rd and reduces parking from 19 to only 3 parks on the west side. The proposed side street parking is inconvenient; it is out of sight and unlikely to be used by passers by. The purpose of many of the small businesses requires customers to make a brief stop e.g. dairies and take-aways. Being able to stop right beside these businesses is essential to their successful operation. The suggested 30kph speed limit may actually deter car drivers from driving through the Village and may only encourage them to take another route! Introducing more pedestrian crossing points will naturally slow traffic without drivers feeling they are being legally required to reduce their speed. Cyclists should be encouraged to use the enhanced cycle paths.

100 Y Great to see the proposed improvements to Woolston Village. I also appreciate the effort to identify the level of available car-parking nearby, and also the proportion of shoppers coming by different modes, to put some context to concerns about losing parking - this approach should be used more often. Here are a few comments and suggestions: - The proposed 30km/h speed limit is welcomed, but it seems incongruous to then return to a 50km/h limit on the adjacent narrow local streets (especially when they will eventually provide a connection to the Heathcote River Major Cycleway). Suggest expanding the 30k zone to include the adjacent back-streets. - The project proposes “more bike parking”, although it only seems to show about seven bike stands in the plans; hardly a dramatic increase. If cycling is to be encouraged more, then more bike parking is required. If footpath space is at a premium, why not replace single car-parks with a “bike corral”, where e.g. 2m-kerb-protected bike stands will support 8-10 customers? With a couple of popular taverns in the area, that could be the way to easily boost patron numbers. - Around Portman St, the placement of the bus stops and the central islands produces pinch-points for cyclists where a passing motorist may try to squeeze through. Reconsider the location of these features.

101 N You must have rocks in your head to come up with such a stupid plan for Ferry Rd., Woolston. Do you not realise that Ferry Road is major road in and out of the city for people living, visiting or doing business in the Eastern part of Christchurch? Have you not observed the traffic that uses this road in the mornings and afternoons? Your “policy” to force traffic to use Moorhouse Avenue now as a major route across the city and to the eastern suburbs, etc. as Ferrymead, Lyttelton, MT Pleasant, Summer etc., makes it an important route- not some suburban “village” restricting the flow of traffic east and west. To say that people wishing to shop in the Woolston shops, can park in the narrow already congested streets off Ferry Road is ridiculous-the shops will have to close and the shoppers will of course shop elsewhere where access and parking is good!

102 N I despair of this council’s approach to infrastructure, particularly transport infrastructure, based as it is on the economics of the duck-pond combined with a mangling of the English language. So, as a frequent walker or busier to Woolston (usually to the Hop!), I shall simply say this: LEAVE IT ALONE! The proposal you’re floating will do no good, will almost certainly cause much harm, and would (again) not pass the most rudimentary of cost-benefit tests.

103 N My husband and I have always enjoyed stopping for a delicious lunch at the Woolston bakery. The charming owner (from Cambodia) always makes his customers welcome. Hot soup is always available in the winter. Now he is faced with no parking outside his shop. Because we are elderly and I have had recent foot surgery I am unable to walk far. So we will no longer be able to stop close to the Bakery. I imagine there will be congestion. We would be very upset - as many others in the area will be! If people stop going there because parking will be impossible especially during the lunch hour. Mostly elderly and mothers with children and of course many tradesmen. Where are all these people who sit down for their lunch going to find enough parking. They are not : and like us we simply have to drive past and find another place to eat. We don’t want to do that as we have never found a more enjoyable place to date. We come from Summer and don’t mind travelling to Woolston to get such lovely service. We have looked at the plan and it is going to stop people stopping in the area.... The bakery is always full during 12noon and 3 pm with many people just popping in to buy a takeaway lunch. so. where are all the cars and work vans going to be able to park ???

104 N As one who frequently drives through the area in question and sometimes stops to visit shops, especially the barber, I am not in favor of decreasing the amount of parking on Ferry Rd in Woolston Village. This would inconvenience me and I cannot believe that it would be good for business for the shops. Decreasing speed limit and pedestrian crossings and, perhaps islands, would be OK, though if the speed limit is decreased there would be less need for the islands. Ferry Road is a main thoroughfare to and from the city centre, views of people in position should be taken seriously. I am neither for nor against the proposal as a whole but will tick No since apparently I have to tick Yes or No.
I do not agree with the proposal to impose a 30km speed limit on Ferry Road through Woolston. This is main road access from the Sumner, Redcliffe, Mt Pleasant and Ferrymead area to other areas of Christchurch. Slowing this traffic to 30km is not reasonable or useful. When the area is congested, the traffic slows to below 50km anyway. When it is not congested, there is no need to slow down. The pedestrians light provide crossing for pedestrians and slows the traffic down when the area is actually in use. Setting the speed to 30km will only encourage motorists to avoid the area, causing additional congestion on Linwood Ave.

Thank you for the opportunity of discussing the Ferry Road at Woolston development. I have put in a submission, however from discussion with other business owners, I get the feeling that each individual business and property owner should be visited by council staff regarding this matter.

I cycle through Woolston often and use the shops and Twisted Hop and I think this plan is great - I love the focus on increased pedestrian and cycle use, the reduction in parking and the reduced speed limit. They will all make Woolston a much nicer and safer place to visit.

Happy with the overall plan but would like to see more car parks retained....a few businesses here that rely on pop in customers who need the ability to park, run in, purchase and out again without having to drive round side streets looking for a park....

I fully support this submission. I regularly cycle down this road, sometimes towing a trailer. The proposed layout will improve the feel of the Woolston area. Please don't compromise the plan for more car parks. My only suggestion is that I would have preferred the central median strip to be narrower, or non-existent to help slow traffic. Also this would create space for a marked separation between cycle lanes and parked cars.

My husband and I are very happy to see this work proceed. We were aware of the Ferry Road Masterplan when we bought in Woolston 20 months ago - so pleased this work is going to happen. Will be great for the little town and hopefully attract more business.

I strongly oppose the proposed change to the parking reduction. Especially the change to time limits on Maroran Street. Our business is operated on volunteer labour. Most of the volunteers are 65 plus, a lot have difficulty walking. The proposed 120 limit is not long enough for a shift. Our shifts are 3.5 hours. I would like to see a change in parking duration to 3.5 instead of 2 hours.

I oppose the alterations to Ferry Road that have been proposed for the following reasons: 1. Live at 661 Ferry Road and I need the parking from my family. 2. It would be very hard to turn into my driveway and dangerous. 3. The speed restrictions would clog up traffic and stop the flow. 4. The loss of parking would ruin a lot of the businesses as they rely on parking. 5. At night time, there would be a lot of people hanging around drinking with the bars in close proximity. 6. The doctors are going. The ANZ is going, the Post Office is going. Who would want to go to Woolston if you haven't got parking? It would turn Woolston into a slum area.

I oppose the proposed parking restrictions on Maroran Street and the loss of two car parks on the corner of Maroran Street and outside my property on Ferry Road. The loss of car parks on Ferry Road and the parking restriction would cause unnecessary hardship for my wife and myself and visiting family and friends. I oppose the narrowing of the entrance and loss of a park at the entrance to Maroran Street and the planting of Magnolia Kobus and the fives paved median pavers. I oppose the proposed 30km restriction on Ferry Road as I believe it will cause traffic congestion and frustration for through traffic to City - Sumner-Lyttelton etc. Thanking you for the opportunity to have my say.

Though it would be nice to see the area 'prettyed up', I am against the loss of so many street parking spaces. The available off street parking has always been piecemeal. - Why not establish a better carpark? The suggestion that motorists could park on the side streets is rather like the quote "let them eat cake." Most of the side streets are narrow with some still having the dated deep gutters. Trying accessing the footpath across them when pushing a pram or using a stick. I'm sure those residing on these streets don't want the congestion and the likelihood of driveway access being blocked. With several apartment blocks built with probably more to come parking is more difficult near the churches. The elderly parishioners need ready, safe access, especially at night. Ferry Road is a through street, not a destination in itself like a mall. Unless an alternative route is developed to service the Park, congestion will get worse. While it seems to have become the norm to push for cyclists/pedestrians merging from experience I have found it more dangerous than safe with too many cyclists tending to ride among those on foot without making their presence heard. Bear in mind that with it being an area where the older citizens reside that many don't and can't walk a long way, especially when carrying shopping as well. Why should a mall have to provide a number of parks but a shopping are doesn't? Parking should not be at the extreme/detrimen of residents close to the area.

We believe the creation of an island in front of our property will severely impact on the viability of our tenants and the tenants of the building next to us on.... This island will compromise access to our 2 buildings by preventing cars on Ferry Road from turning right into the shared driveway between our buildings, and prevent cars leaving our buildings from turning right onto Ferry Road. Having been forced to turn left out of our driveway, motorists will have to stop, possibly disrupting traffic and make a U-turn over a flush paved median should they have wanted to turn right. A similar problem would be faced by motorists unable to turn right off Ferry Road directly into the driveway. Would it be possible for the planned island to be removed to give all motorists safe access to our shared driveway. We do not support the removal of street car parks from the front of the buildings in our vicinity. Our tenants rely heavily on these car parks for customer convenience and access. We have an ATM on our premises. Westpac customers are often observed to use these street parks as quick and convenient parks while using the ATM, and this is also true for the customers of our other tenants. We do not believe they would stop otherwise. We believe that the removal of over 70% of street parking will make Woolston Village a place to drive through rather than stop, because of the inconvenience of having to look for off-street parks. In conclusion, we are very concerned that a landscaped island in front of .... will harm access to these 2 buildings, and the removal of street parking between .... will be another blow to our tenants hoping to attract customers. Thank you for the opportunity of entering a submission.

We who live in Woolston have lost so much already. Now we are to lose our medical centre and Post Office. I am a disable 77 years old, While I can get a car park outside a shop I can manage to still do my own shopping. Even then with a crutch to help me it is a real effort. Our roads are a disgrace and the Heathcote River from the Radley Street bridge really stinks. It is especially bad from the Tannery complex to the Estuary. The Tannery complex is stunning. The one good thing to happen for us. The sewage and stormwater drains have never been sorted out and when you go out early in the morning the stink is vile. My house is the second from Sumner Terrace. About four years ago they replaced the drains and sealed the road to the fourth house from the corner and no further. Rain like we had this week it floods on both sides almost to the middle of the road. It can't get away at the corner. Please help us.

I am very upset to hear about the reduction in parking spaces on Ferry Road at the Woolston Village. I volunteer at the Sallies and I know that so many of our customers drive to us. If they can't get a park they won't stop. The Sallies provide a great service to the public, locals and further a field. We need parks please.
119 N  Why deciduous trees? Ferry Road shopping centre is untidy enough, deciduous trees will make it worse. The gardens are rarely tidy. Rock roses were placed in all the garden plots, hardly every tended, these extend right along Ferry Road. Colour is what is needed to brighten the area. Like Summer plots. If you take the parking away businesses will close, some are struggling now. I do agree with the lower speed restriction, especially with schools in the area.

120 N  What a moronic idea! I use Woolston Village regularly and if this proposal goes through I will not go there. I will not park on side streets and walk to the shops. As for 30 kph, through traffic will avoid Ferry Road, also not using the shops thus putting local business livelihoods at risk. Having spoken to several business owners and staff they are very worried about the impact this proposal will have on their lives. (If it’s not broken don’t fix it). Perhaps the CCC should concentrate on fixing out broken city and spend the money it would cost to funk Woolston where it is really needed. MORONIC!

121 Y  We are glad the proposed changes in the Ferry Road at Woolston Village project consultation plans. However, as a small business ship running in the Ferry Road over three years. Our customers are happy with our foods as an important reason as customers could easy park their cars beside the Ferry Road and then coming the shop to pick up their orders. During the three years we’re operating the shop, there are many customers who had been complained about the car parking where they still were feeling hard to find in sometimes. Finally, we generally think the Woolston Village project consultation plans are great. But we do not agree the existence car park beside the road where will be changed. We hope the car park beside the road where can be remained. Thank you very much indeed.

122 N  I have been working for the for 13 years now. A lot of our customers are regular and were customers at the old shop on this site. The parking is very important not only for convenience but also for people coming from the outside area. I wouldn’t stop here myself if there were no parking.

123 Y  Overall a good plan. Disadvantages are: 1. Reducing parking outside businesses will definitely reduce their turnover - Motorist will go to the easiest shop (e.g. Ferrymead). 2. Reducing speed to 20 kph through this area will certainly improve safety but will bump up the traffic at peak times - this will encourage regular motorist to select Linwood Ave -This will also reduce turnover in the business. I think that when the new library is constructed it should be in the new Supermarket carpark - it would get much more use as that’s where the most people will be coming and going.

124 Y  I think this will be wonderful for Woolston, however I believe there needs to be more carparks on Ferry Road. Catherine Street is very narrow and is not ideal for off-street parking for shoppers, especially as residents use it for parking.

125 Y  Overall a good plan. Disadvantages are: Reducing parking outside businesses will reduce their turnover. People will not drive around looking for a space to park, they will leave the area and go to Ferrymead. Reducing speed is good in off-peak traffic. On peak traffic - not a good idea. The library should be by the new supermarket so it is easy access to the elderly and mum’s with children.

126 N  I am absolutely appalled at the CCC changes to Ferry Road. I would be interested to know how much the ‘down’ who came up with the idea got paid! Any parking up side streets will be so chaotic!! Where will the workers park all day?? I fear with the proposed changes involved! Its hard enough now for them to make a living, with the proposed changes they will be all out of business in 6 months, leaving the way open for the rich fat cats to take over! As for reducing speed to 30 kph get real! Its a main route from one side of the city to the other. If the CCC has so much money to spare perhaps they could start tidying brighton up. It looks like a 3rd world city down there! Dirty brooks and buggar all shops! An absolute disgrace! Forget about Ferry Road!!! Spend our rate money wisely!! I live in Woolston!

127 N  I am extremely upset that you will be taking away the parking spaces outside the shops in Woolston Village. I use this Centre to do a lot of my shopping as I don’t like going to Eastgate Mall as it is hard to get disabled parking spaces close to where I want to shop. I regularly use the bakery, gift shop, takeaway and the Salvation Army Family Store. I take my family and friends shopping here and if you take away the parking outside the shop we will not be able to donate goods and buy goods as I cannot walk all the way from Catherine Street or St John Street as I use a stick to walk. I have osteoarthrits and am waiting for a hip replacement. I have a lot of friends in the area who are in the same predicament as I am. Please do not take away the few parking spaces that are already there. Trees are nice but they do not make shopping more convenient, parking spaces do!!

128 Y  I love living in Woolston. With the proposed project I think it can only enhance and improve what we already have. But keep the ‘small’ village concept.

129 Y  While the proposed streetscape plan for Woolston Village, Ferry Road will be a huge visual improvement and unifying factor for this vibrant area, the sever reduction in on-street parking adjacent to dairies and cafes, and popular shopping venues like the wonderful Salvation Army Family Store (#036 Ferry Road) will disuade casual visitors and shoppers from shopping. The supermarket carpark is not a suitable alternative to council provided close car parks.

130 N  I am vehemently opposed to this plan and the over-riding reason for this is the loss of parking. I use and shop in this area at least 5 to 6 times per week. It has a good variety of shops and it’s all very convenient and quick to shop there. I can’t always get a park immediately but don’t have to wait long as most shoppers time there is brief. There is a bit of a problem sometimes with pub patrons occupying parking spaces in front of other shops because their cars are left for hours. I think the alternative parking suggested in the plan is wholly inadequate. St John’s Street is often full and cars don’t seem to move off as quickly as they do in Ferry Road itself. The other roads proposed have cars parked in them by people working in the area and are left there all day. Marston Street is a residential suburb and it would be very unfair to the residents (if not dangerous) to have shoppers park there. I am sure that businesses will suffer as some shoppers going to and fro through Ferry Road will find an alternate route to avoid the 30 speed limit. Some beautifying would be great but please don’t put this thriving and friendly shopping area at risk. Local communities need our protection or they are forever lost to the shopping malls and the future hyper-markets. Thank you.

131 N  I have a retail shop at and strongly object to the prospects as I rely heavily on people (customers) being able to stop and park outside my shop if they can’t do so they will not stop which will be detrimental to all the shops. Most of my customers have also said to me that they object to these proposals as well.

132 Y  Thank you for the opportunity to submit to this project. We live in Woolston, and are excited by the developments planned for our local shops, which we visit via foot and bicycle, and travel through by car and bus, on a regular basis. We think the 30 k/h speed restriction is a good idea - we currently drive through the village well below the 50 k/h speed limit, as it feels unsafe for the environment. We appreciate the improved pedestrian crossings, especially the wider island outside the Post Shop, which will no doubt be more comfortable to cross with a pram then the current narrow island. Would it be possible for the pedestrian access to the village from the Woolston Cut/Heathcote River and Radley Park to be improved? The section of pathway between the footbridge and Marston Street feels dangerous to walk through as it is narrow and surrounded by tall plants. There is often rubbish, bottles, and graffiti through there. With the old Catherine Street footbridge removed, this pathway is the only pedestrian access to the village from the network of pathways along and to the south of the river. We are sure there will be a lot of opposition to the loss of parking. A petition seen in a local shop stated that parking was proposed to be
removed throughout the village. We understand that there needs to be a trade-off between the use of space for parking and for other uses, as well as for safety, and that the removal of some parking to enable this scheme to proceed will overall be a good thing for the village. We feel regardless of these improvements, that some of the existing parking around accesses needs to be removed, as vehicles trying to look for a gap in the traffic often pull out and stop in the cycle lane, often not seeing approaching cyclists. Please don’t narrow the cycle lanes next to parking in an attempt to fit more parking in. They are too narrow at the moment to use safely with the risk of car doors opening. Would it be possible to change some of the parking time restrictions along Ferry Road to something like P15? The businesses most affected by the loss of convenient parking would be the likes of the dairies, bakeries and takeaway shops. A lot of cars parked in the middle of the village seem to be there quite a while. Making parks P15 or shorter would make the remaining parks more useful to the businesses most affected by parking removal. We would expect that if a person was going to be somewhere for a longer period of time that the trip would be more planned, and that parking further away wouldn’t be so much of a problem.

133 N I do not agree with the proposal to impose a 30km speed limit on Ferry Road through Woolston. This is main road access from Summer, Redcliffs, M Pleasant and Ferryhead area to other areas of Christchurch. Slowing this traffic to 30km is not reasonable or useful. When the area is congested, the traffic slows to below 50km anyway. When it is not congested, there is no need to slow down. The pedestrian lights provide crossing for pedestrians and slows the traffic down when the area is actually in use. Setting the speed to 30km will only encourage motorists to avoid the area, causing additional congestion on Linwood Ave.

134 N It would be great to improve the village of Woolston, but not to the detriment of the surrounding streets. Glenroy Street is already suffering from excess traffic due to the consent given to the supermarket, without any consideration given to its neighbours, including a pre-school. If the plan goes ahead, people will avoid ferry road, and speed down Glen Roy street in order to avoid the lower speed limit, and try to make some time, this is a danger to the preschool children as well as residents. Glenroy Street cannot handle the current traffic, due to the road being weakened by the new waste water system. We are constantly getting new damage to our house. I would support the plan, if traffic control measures were taken on Glenroy Street. My other concerns are for local businesses that struggle with lack of car parking spaces as it is. It will be near impossible to let out any further premises, as there is no customer parking, leaving Woolston to be derelict and run down.

135 N I am retired and use the Woolston shops regularly. My wife and I enjoy having our lunch at the Woolston Bakery. If several of the car parks are removed access to many of the shops will be difficult. If we are forced to park on the opposite side it will be very difficult for us to cross the road as my wife has a foot injury. The bakery is very busy with many tradesmen and road workers popping in to buy take aways. I feel many of these small shops will suffer due to the lack short term car parks.

136 N 4. Any reduction to the on street parking will further hinder patient access to health services from both the GP and the Pharmacy at 687 and 685 Ferry Road. There is no need to widen foot paths as they are plenty wide enough for our current users. Removing street parks will force more people to need to CROSS the road on foot as there will not be a park on 1 side of the road and will also increase the need to CROSS the centre lane when driving due to the need to cross it when parking. Simon Payne of Woolston Pharmacy get several comments for my patients that they were unable to find a suitable park and many are elderly or immobile so removing any parking will only increase this problem.

Thank you for the opportunity at discussing the Ferry Road at Woolston development. I have put in a submission, however, from discussions with other business owners, I get the feeling that each individual business and property owners should be visited by Council Staff regarding this matter.

138 Y We are very concerned about the lack of parking in the current plan. We were shocked to see that car parking was to decrease from around 70 down to 21. We feel that car parking needs to stay at the very least at 45 spaces. The lack of car park spaces will affect us very much as home owners/residents. It will make it much harder for our parents to drop by and visit us, and as our parents get more elderly it will get less and less to no make them walk down a side street. If this plan went through, we would struggle to make guests have to over to watch a movie, or to have dinner with friends. As many of my friends are single females in their twenties, I can see them being frightened to come to my house if it meant walking down a dark side street to get to their car at the end of the night. This reduction of carparks will devalue our property. If our property is devalued, we will expect reimbursement. I like most of the plan. We notice a large amount of litter being dropped in the landscaping we already have. Has litter been thought about when considering this new attractive landscape?

139 Y The loss of convenience for a great deal of customers, not having parking outside the door. A lot of people are time poor these days and would sooner go to a shop with convenient parking in close proximity than not. Woolston can still be beautiful while retaining the very important carparking.

140 Y Overall a good idea. It would be safer for bikes if the bike lane was between the pedestrian foot path and the parked cars rather than between the road and parked cars. (if a car user opens a door without looking as they commonly do, I would prefer to see and fall from my bike onto pavement than under a car/truck on the road as has happened outside Dunedin Hospital). I would like to see more bike rack / lock point.

142 Y Overall, I fully support the proposed changes to Woolston Village. However, I would like to see several changes made. Firstly, in the stretches where the cycle lane is adjacent to the kerb, I would like to see the cycle lanes separated from the traffic. This would be by using delineator posts, creating ‘Copenhagen style’ bike lanes (like on Colombo St) or similar, I believe the cycle lanes should be separated as there is more than enough room to do so. This will make it that much safer for people to cycle into the village. Secondly, I don’t support the flush medians, as these usually make drivers speed up as there is more separation between oncoming vehicles. Why not have more of the medians on the plans planted for more green space- even better, have trees in the median like Bealey Ave or what’s being done on Riccarton Road. This will make Woolston Village that much more greens, less asphalt. Thirdly, I would like to see some priority given to public transport in Woolston Village, as one of the five main bus lines travels along the corridor. Whether the priority be having the bus stops in the traffic lane (so buses don’t have to wait to merge), by having an advanced stop at the pedestrian crossing next to AroundAgain Cycles (by removing the median in that 20-30m approach). In whatever form it may take, I would like to see some priority for public transport. Furthermore, it would be an excellent opportunity to extend the proposed 30km/h zone to nearby streets, such as Heathcote, Catherine, Portman, and Glenroy Streets. These are all narrow streets, so naturally traffic-calmed, so it makes no sense to have a 50km/h limit on them. Now would be the perfect opportunity to extend this proposed lower limit. Lastly, make sure plenty of cycle parking is provided in the area, as the racks provided at the moment are often full! Thanks to the CCC for persevering with these plans, as they will definitely make our streets safer and more attractive for all.

143 Y Overall, I fully support the proposed changes to Woolston Village. However, I would like to see several changes made. Firstly, in the stretches where the cycle lane is adjacent to the kerb, I would like to see the cycle lanes separated from the traffic. Whether this be by using delineator posts, creating ‘Copenhagen style’ bike lanes (like on Colombo St) or similar, I believe the cycle lanes should be separated as there is more than enough room to do so. This will make it that much safer for people to cycle into the village. Secondly, I don’t support the flush medians, as these usually make drivers speed up as there is more separation between oncoming vehicles. Why not have more of the medians on the plans planted for more green space- even better, have trees in the median like Bealey Ave or what’s being done on Riccarton...
Road. This will make Woolston Village that much more green, less asphalt. Thirdly, I would like to see some priority given to public transport in Woolston Village, as one of the five main bus lines travels along the corridor. Whether the priority be having the bus stops in the traffic lane (so buses don't have to wait to merge), or by having an advanced stop at the pedestrian crossing next to Around Again Cyclics (by removing the median in that 20-30km approach). In whatever form it may take, I would like to see some priority for public transport. Furthermore, it would be an excellent opportunity to extend the proposed 30km/h zone to nearby streets, such as Heathcote, Catherine, Portman, and Glenroy Streets. These are all narrow streets, so naturally traffic-calmed, so it makes no sense to have a 50km/h limit on them. Now would be the perfect opportunity to extend this proposed lower limit. Lastly, make sure plenty of cycle parking is provided in the area, as the racks provided at the moment are often full! Thanks to the CCC for persevering with these plans, as they will definitely make our streets safer and more attractive for all.

145 N With regards to the proposed changes to the Woolston Village streetscape, I would like to make the following comments as a resident of Woolston and co-owner of [redacted] Overall I am supportive of enhancement of the Woolston Village corridor. However, I feel there are several elements that need to be amended in order to find a happy median between the needs of local businesses and the look/feel of the streetscape. Parking - Before getting into specifics, I would like to raise my concerns about the survey data which is being referenced throughout the proposal. From feedback I received from CCC staff at an information evening for the Woolston Business Association, I am led to believe the data was collected over one 2 hour period (2pm-4pm), one weekday during summer, February 2016. The nature of the majority of businesses in the area (convenience based) means that peak parking demand typically occurs around 12pm - lunchtime - and from 4-6pm with after-work/dinner traffic. My opinion is supported by comments Consultant Traffic Planner Andrew Metherell, of Traffic Design Group, made in his review of the resource consent RM014204571 - New World Ferry Road - where he stated that he felt peak parking demand was 4-6pm weekdays. A second concern I have around the survey data is the referencing of 31% of respondents walking to the village - I would question if this level would be similar in the middle of winter or if some of those respondents would in fact drive during the cooler months. I will now raise some of the specific issues I have with the proposed removal of 56 street parks from Ferry Road. Firstly, in my opinion, the removal of 20 street parks on Ferry Road and Oak and St Johns Streets will have a significant negative impact on the businesses located within this block. The majority of these businesses have limited, if any, off-street parks for customers and the nature of the majority of these businesses means that there is plenty of competition nearby and customers will choose the most convenient option when deciding which businesses to frequent. Removing these parks will likely see the vast majority of motorists keep driving to Ferry lane in the east, Hilltopstown/Charleston to the west or Eastgate to the north where parking is much more convenient. The proposal states that the loss of parks on Ferry Road can be accommodated by side street parking on Heathcote, Portman and Catherine Streets. I somewhat agree with this statement for the parks which have been ear-marked for removal west of Oak Street, however I do not see acceptable alternatives for the 20 parks mentioned previously. From the pedestrian traffic lights on Ferry Road, Portman Street is approximately 160m away, Heathcote Street 170m away and Catherine Street 140m away. Bearing in mind that 56 parks are being proposed for removal, the actual distance someone may have to walk to get a park could end up being far higher. Again, if there is an alternative business nearby with better access, I feel most people would choose the alternative. From a personal point of view, our business at [redacted] currently has access to 14 on street parks and 3 off street parks within an approximate 30m radius. The number of on street parks in this radius is proposed to reduce to 3. The nature of our business means that quite often our clients are injured and walking 100+ meters to receive treatment is not practical or acceptable. Again, clients will find an alternative business with better access and businesses in the village will suffer. Secondly, the side streets offered as alternatives are also narrow and the parking is very narrow, especially Catherine Street which would be the closest for our business at [redacted].

Traffic flow could become a serious issue on these side streets as they will essentially be one lane roads if their parks are full. Overall these master plans are designed to strengthen suburban shopping centres and provide a sense of convenience. Given Woolston's close proximity to Eastgate and Ferry lane, which have abundant car parking, every care must be taken to ensure the plan adopted for Woolston Village does not force businesses to close their doors. Already the community has lost the ferry lane on the west side and the Woolston Medical Centre doctors are relocating to the new community well-being hub at Eastgate. Any plan must adopt the regeneration of the area, not put further roadblocks in the way. Road layout changes - Overall I'm very supportive of the proposed changes including the paved median strip and increased planting. I have a few areas of concern though. Firstly, I can see potential for conflict on the median outside 616 Ferry Road. Is there enough even more obstacles for shoppers and residents in the area. Planting/lighting upgrade/street furniture - I am very supportive of the proposed upgrade to all these elements but would like to make the following comments: Planting. Are there no suitable native trees that can be used as feature trees in the landscaping? I feel we have a duty to reinstate as many native plants as possible to help regenerate native wildlife.
I strongly support better street lighting (or more lights), mores seats, rubbish bins and cycle stands. I prefer Magnolia Kopus (tree type). I am not really like the idea of 30 km/hour speed zone but 40 km/hour is more preferable. I support that more P30 and P60 cars park on the side of the Ferry Road other than those unlimited.

I drive through Woolston most evenings on my way to Mill Valley. At least twice a week I stop on Ferry Road in Woolston to either: Go to the Post Office; Go to my hairdresser; Go to New World; Go to the 2nd hand shop; Go to the ANZ; Go to the bakery. I believe I will only stop at these shops if I get a convenient park on Ferry Road. On Saturday I went to the Salmon Shop. I also attend St Anne’s Church and know that as well as the parishioners there are lots of people who park on the road. I think Woolston will die a death. New World will be the only business which survives.

I oppose the narrowing of the road alongside my entrance at with the landscape planting and the Flush paved medium. I oppose the loss of two carparks alongside my driveway and one carpark across the road. I oppose the loss of car parks on Ferry Road and the subsequent parking restrictions on Ferry Road and the side street. I oppose the 30km/h speed restriction on Ferry Road and the narrowing of Ferry Road which I believe it will cause traffic congestion and be dangerous for cyclist and all road users. Thanking you for this opportunity to have my say.

The plan provides a good balance for all modes of travel along this busy corridor. Removing parking on Ferry Road will make this route more enjoyable for me to cycle on as there is less chance of being doored and being cut in front of people trying to get into one of the parallel parks. I would never try to park on an arterial road as it is too busy and I don’t want to hold up people so always use the side streets and off-road car parks when I visit Woolston. The cycle lane looks narrow outside of 733 and 739? How wide are the lanes? The improved crossings for pedestrians will make it easier when having to get a number of items from Woolston in one visit as it is very difficult to cross the road at busy times. The trees and landscaping will really improve the environment and look of Woolston and help it be a great centre for us residents. Is it possible to include colourfull flowers/planting in the median strip? Can the 30km/hr zone be extended around Heathcote Street and north on Portman Street and along Glenroy Street? This will make it easier for users to know where it is 30 and where it is 50. Is it possible to introduce a right turn green arrow for the right turn from Ferry Road into Rutherford Street? During peak times, especially in the evening and on weekends, only one or two cars can make the turn at the end of the phase due to the demands going into the city.

The submission for the proposed concept for Ferry Road at Woolston Village. We, The are delighted that there are plans to enhance the Village that will highlight its character to an unprecedented level. There are some outstanding plans for lighting, furniture and landscaping which will all help create the village feel that we need as a community so ultimately people will stop shop and spend time within. This amibence is not to be under-rated and we are glad it will be designed with the colours and tones that have made Woolston known from early pre-European times. However, the proposed concept for Ferry Road at Woolston Village also raises some areas of great concern for us as a business association. Appendix Four: Recovery Framework, of the 2014 Ferry Road Master Plan states “An overarching framework was prepared by the Suburban Centres Programme to guide the framing of Master Plan goals and actions. A framework provides goals for recovery-driven development.” Multiple overlapping concepts are then listed, two of which have great relevance to the objectives we will outline ahead. Those are: Economic development: Prosperous businesses; quality employment and job security; creating opportunities for training and employment and encouraging business opportunities; supporting existing businesses. Parking: Providing convenient and off-street parking opportunities for the commercial core to encourage people to park and spend. Working within the framework of the Parking Strategy to utilise parking efficiently. Keeping the above goals in mind - which are designed to enable recovery-driven development - we question how the decision to propose the removal of 96 of 91 on-street parks from Ferry Road was made? The current proposal seems to be at odds with the need for the Ferry Road to be a mix of, in Woolston, an needs of the existing businesses in the area. Removal of convenience based retail and parking trade has reduced the long term resilience of the centre.” Whilst there is undeniably an element of truth in that statement, doe the proposed removal of 63% of the convenient on-street parks, from outside ‘convenience based retail and parking trade’ dependent businesses, indicate that Christchurch City Council (CCC) has limited interest in ‘supporting existing businesses’ of this nature in Woolston Village? Unfortunately, Woolston Village has already lost a great deal of the anchor tenancies that a resilient community depends on (Banks, Post Shop, and Medical Centre) to the newer, more easily accessible, centres of Eastgate and Ferrymead. It is therefore paramount the remaining businesses get all the assistance they can from CCC to ensure their survival, and that of the village itself. Removing 56 convenient on-street car parks does not facilitate the survival, or growth, of the existing businesses. One reason that has been offered by CCC staff, to try and validate the removal of these 56 parks from Ferry Road, is the survey data gathered between 2 and 4pm on a weekday in February 2016. During the peak hour periods was noted that the peak occupancy of parking spaces on Ferry Road was 56%, with typical occupancy below 50%. As an association, we find it extremely concerning that CCC seem to have based the entire parking plan for Woolston Village on a single set of survey data that was collected at an off-peak time for the village. The only other reference to parking studies we can find is of the 2013 corridor study for Ferry Road, where one of the findings was; On-street parking capacity along Ferry Road exceeds demand except through Woolston and adjacent to Woolston Park during sporting events. We can therefore only assume this finding was overlooked when the decision to remove 56 car parks from Ferry Road was proposed as it clearly states demand exceeds capacity through Woolston. Content in the Master Plan also clearly shows that CCC recognise there is a high level of convenience based businesses in the area. The question must therefore be asked, why weren’t multiple surveys undertaken to include lunch and dinner time data where peak occupancy of parking spaces occurs? Consultant Traffic Engineer Andrew Metherell, stated in RMA9202457 - New World Ferry Road - that he felt peak parking demand on Ferry Road was 4-8pm on weekdays. Coupled with the fact the survey was undertaken off-peak is the fact that it was undertaken during summer. Local knowledge suggests that car usage increases during the winter months for obvious reasons. Another answer offered by CCC is justification for the proposed removal of on-street car parks from Ferry Road, is that the parking proposed for removal could be accommodated on side streets or through existing off-street parks. There are several reasons why we strongly disagree with this suggestion. The section of Ferry Road between Portman and Katherine Streets - two of the proposed side streets that would accommodate the parks lost from Ferry Road - is approximately 300m long. From this section of road, 26 of 37 on-street parks are being earmarked for removal and the majority of the businesses in this area do not have any off-street parking available. As previously mentioned, the majority of businesses in Woolston Village are convenience based. Customers that frequent these types of shops want to stop outside the shop, go in, grab what they need, get back in their car and leave. Asking these customers to park their cars on a side street and walk a minimum of 100 meters to get to the shop is far from convenient. It was mentioned to the association that shoppers would eventually retrain their minds and the proposed parking changes would before long become the new norm for Woolston Village. We believe this is a very naive comment, and the reality is that the shoppers would simply stop shopping in the village and find a more convenient alternative close by, seriously compromising the survival chances of the existing businesses in Woolston Village. Appendix 6 of the Ferry Road Master Plan also recognises “...The needs of
businesses dependant on passing traffic can be balanced with the amenity and safety effects of on-street park, large car parks at the front of buildings and frequent car park accesses on amenity and safety for pedestrians and cyclists." It also states that ‘traffic congestion occurs in Woolston during peak hours due in part to ‘side friction’ from parking manoeuvres and vehicles turning onto the road from side streets and car parks’ and ‘it is difficult for drivers to make movements in and out of Ferry Road outside of signalised intersections, particularly in Ferry Meadow’ and "This again raises more questions. Removing on-street parks from Ferry Road will arguably improve the amenity and safety effects of on-street parking, but has this been done in a balanced way with the needs of the businesses reliant on convenient car parks being fairly considered? Proposing alternative on-street parking on side streets will surely just increase traffic congestion on the side streets and increase ‘side friction’ caused by vehicles turning onto Ferry Road from streets which are already deemed difficult for vehicles to move in and out of? Given their width, will these side streets actually be able to accommodate two-way traffic flow if all their on-street car parks are full? At no point in the Ferry Road Master Plan can we find reference to the need to reduce on-street car parks in Woolston. However, W14 - Woolston Parking Plan - makes reference to “Monitoring any requirements for additional parking in Woolston, including assessing the most appropriate locations for on-street parking for mobility and short stay parking; Undertake a parking plan for Woolston and, if necessary, purchase an additional site for off-street parking. Investigate opportunities to consolidate car parking facilities behind businesses on the south side of Ferry Road.” Reducing car park numbers seems to be at odds with the action points of W14. One gets the feeling that any reduction of on-street car parks was meant to be offset by the creation of a convenient off-street carpark that would be purchased by CCC, not by shuffling customers down side streets a considerable distance away from businesses. A third answer to why on-street car parks need to be removed was offered, and this was due to the road not being wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides of the road once the requirements of cycle lanes, carriageways and median strips were factored in. The question here is, why has it been deemed there is not enough space to accommodate everything? Figure 37 in the Ferry Road Master Plan shows a generic cross-section of Ferry Road as it stands today. This cross-section shows a 3m wide footpath on either side of the road, 1.5m wide cycle lane on each side of the road, 3m wide carriageways and a 1.2m wide median strip. A total width of 20 meters. However, it would appear that cycle lanes need to be 1.8m wide - even when they are only a local network and the much publicised Rapanui, Opawa River and Heathcote Expressway Major Cycle routes are situated nearby - and that car parks need to be a minimum of 2m in width. Going by those numbers, a cycle lane and car park on each side of the road would take up 7.6 meters. Figure 37 shows carriageways are currently 3m wide, so two of these would be another 6 meters - 13.6m in total, with two footpaths and a median strip left to accommodate. The question then is why can adjustments not be made to the width of the footpaths and median strip instead of removing car parking? The current median strip is 1.2m wide, according to figure 37, but has been proposed at 2m wide in the concept plan. The carriageways have increased from 6m combined to 6.4m. Already that’s 1.2 extra meters that appears to be unnecessary. The proposed concept cross-section adds up to a total width of 20.5m, so if a 1.2m median strip was retained, 3m wide carriageways, 1.8m wide cycle lanes and 2m wide car parks could be accommodated on both sides of the road if the footpaths were reduced by a mere 30mm on each side of the road (2.7m wide). The width of the median strip plus a carriageway (1.2 + 3 = 4.2m) would still be wide enough for cars to pass by each other.

We request that this design is reviewed as we are against any streetscape upgrades that directly lead to the reduction of on-street car parks. We are also against the installation of planted medians if they restrict entry and exit from existing businesses (616, 630 and 636 Ferry Road). Again, we can’t stress enough how important it is to have ease of access to all these businesses to ensure their survival. There is also concern that raised medians are going to be dangerous obstacles for reticulated delivery trucks to navigate around and they may cause trucks to mount footpaths - for example, a truck exiting left onto Ferry Road from the New World supermarket has a limited turning arch due to the planted median strip.

Finally, we are against the proposed speed reduction to 30km/h through the village. We do not share the belief that slowing traffic will suddenly make motorists want to stop and shop. People will stop in the village if they need to buy something. The most likely outcome of a reduction in speed of the proposed magnitude will be that drivers will decide to bypass this section of Ferry Road and travel via Linwood Avenue or the Rutherford Street/Brougham Street expressway. The impact of that occurring on a business community largely dependent on passing trade would be crippling. We are also curious how this proposed speed limit was determined given that a suggested speed limit of 60km/h was recommended that a speed limit of 50km/h speed limit should be maintained and feel changes to the road layout, especially the addition of several pedestrian crossing points, will naturally slow vehicles through the village anyway. In summary, we object to the removal of any on-street parks from Ferry Road because existing businesses rely heavily on the convenience of these parks for their trade; most existing businesses have limited or no off-street parking; the proposed speed limit is too low and is an incentive for drivers to bypass the village; we do not believe slowing vehicles will increase patronage to shops; we feel road layout changes and existing traffic flow restrictions will naturally slow vehicles through the core anyway. We ask that priority is given to fostering the survival and growth of Woolston Village by supporting the many small businesses that have invested in the community. We strongly encourage the enhancement of the physical environment of the village but only if it incorporates the existing carparking numbers that so many rely on. What is the priority here? A streetscape with extra wide footpaths, cycle lanes and median strips from which the community can view the empty shops. Or, a design that enhances the streetscape without compromising the livelihood of the businesses that promote a sense of community and bring people to the village in the first place? We thank you for your consideration of our points.
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I think the plan provides a great opportunity for Woolston to become a destination in itself and reduce the negative impacts of thousands of vehicles a day passing through without stopping and adding to the vibrancy of the village. When we visit the area with children to shop it is not a nice experience to get from one side of the road to the other with limited safe crossing places meaning that we tend to stay on one side of the village or the other. The emergence of places like the Twisted Hop show the potential for the area, on a core bus route, to be a retail and hospitality destination. I cycle along the corridor daily on my commute and it is currently very unsafe. I have had many near misses with parked cars opening doors into the cycle path, and cars exiting car parks and side roads pulling into the cycle lanes as they can’t see past parked cars. There are large amounts of off street parking and on side roads and this again would encourage shoppers in cars to visit multiple destinations in the village, adding to the vibrancy.

N

Petition signed by 770 people: We, the undersigned, support the beautification and street enhancement of the Woolston Village but strongly oppose the removal of the car parking throughout the Village (from St John St to Portman St) and ask that this car parking be retained. The shops in the Woolston Village are not "browsing shops" but "purchase and leave" shops in the main, such as pharmacy, bakery, dairy, sushi, fish and chips and other food outlets.
Spokes Canterbury is a local cycling advocacy group with approximately 1,200 members that is affiliated with the national Cycling Advocates Network (CAN). All submissions are developed online and include member input. Spokes is directed to including cycling as an everyday form of transport in the greater Christchurch area. We would like the opportunity to appear at any public hearing that is held to consider submissions on these projects. So if you require further information or there are matters requiring clarification, please contact our Submissions Convenor Dirk De Lu in the first instance. Appreciation: CCC continues the effort to let people choose to cycle safely to get to the places and services they need to access. While this plan may not appear to appeal to the interested by concerned cyclist or the 80’s at first blush, with some concerted education, promotion and enforcement it may well help us all transition to the ease of using bicycles for every day transport. CCC is committed for starting to show what we can to encourage a change in transport habits. General Observations: Thank you for the 30km/h speed limit in this busy centre. Pedestrian crossings will help to alert drivers of the need to slow down, especially as they create pinch points for people on bicycles who will either be forced to take the lane or hope that drivers leave them sufficient room when passing. Signage alerting drivers that they are now expected to share the road and to slow down will be required. With some of the side streets being barely wide enough for two cars extending the speed limit to surrounding streets is clearly needed for road safety. On Street Parking: Move the 3 on street parks from the south side of Ferry Road and consolidate all on street parking to the north side of Ferry Road. Take 90cm from central median to create door buffer zone on north side by cycle lane. Having drivers crossing the road will assist the cyclists being forced into pinch points in communicating to cars that this is a go slow environment. This will go a long way to create both a sense of safety and greatly improved safety. Bus Stops by Portman Road: Bus stops on both sides by Portman Road with pedestrian crossings and dividers will force people on bicycles into the flow of traffic or require them to come to a full stop when buses are present. Alternatives: Moves north western bus stop to east of Portman Street and move the parking place there to where the proposed bus stop is now. This saves money by allowing the north western pedestrian crossing to be dropped which also removes a cycle pinch point. At the very least move the central raised dividers from here to the crossing east of Portman Street. Move stop at 596 Ferry Road so as to free up intersection with Portman Street. Bus Stops by St. John’s Street: Bus stops on north and south sides of Ferry Road by St John’s Street will also create pinch points for people on bicycles while adding to congestion in this intersection dominate stretch of Ferry Road. Alternatives: Move northern side bus stop to in front of 739 Ferry Road, St Anne’s Catholic School and Church. Move southern side bus stop to in front of 672 Ferry Road. Both offer better sight lines for people on bicycles to see stopped buses and pull into traffic while also reducing congestion created by cars accessing on street parking on Maroran, Catherine and St John’s Streets. Cycle Parking: With the recognition CCC has received for the Cycle Design Guidelines it is disappointing not to find cycle parking provided in accord with it. The 12 cycle parks indicated will be insufficient. With supermarkets, library, community centre, dairies, medical centre, restaurants additional cycle parking will be required. Creating bike corrals near popular stopping points can free up footpath space.

I go to the Salvation Army / Building and the Woolston Bakery and I feel that putting double yellow lines for no parking would affect these businesses quite a bit, but the over all picture looks really great.

I intended typing out this rough submission but an Energy Action Official called in and this took over an hour so I didn't manage to give you a decent copy. Today I went to the ANZ Bank and as there was heavy constant traffic going both ways, I turned left and went along St Johns Street which was 1 block only because of a detour. I then travelled along the street parallel to Ferry Road to turn left at Hargood Street towards Linwood Ave. There wasn't any parking places until nearly up to Hargood Street so that means quite a long walk, so people with poor walking ability or in a hurry won't be popular with would be shoppers so they'll go elsewhere. I have lived at Sumner since 1996 and as shopping banking etc facilities have deteriorated over the years, I have been a regular Woolston shopper, but those days are over, I think, because this present scheme looks good on paper, but practically speaking is not suitable. 1. First and foremost it must be recognised that the Woolston shopping area is each side of a main thoroughfare to Sumner, and is used as such all day and night. I use it often and do shop there, because I have used the two banks, ANZ and Kiwi. Unfortunately, one bank has transferred to Ferrymead and the other will do so in August. 2. As things are now, there is very little parking in the surrounding streets, and parking is limited in the Ferry Road so won't be stopping very often. 3. Any attempt to have green verges and a village atmosphere will be doomed. Heavy traffic flows involve unpleasant vehicle odours and emissions. A little further by the bridge may provide a little green space. The village atmosphere and green spaces should be off-road main road. 4. A new supermarket is being constructed. If we can't park easily, and have no bank and no post services, why stop for groceries etc there instead of going to Ferrymead with its banks, shops etc and large parking areas and cheaper super market. 5. NZ post has reduced its usage at Sumner. The Hardware had to close down because the shop needed the full postal services to survive so, NZ Post has joined with petrol stations, banks, Kiwi and other banks, to erode our village life and we waste petrol going elsewhere which is a poor response to conservation, leading to global warming. People are hoping the Council will review their ideas for Woolston. Finally, not all of the information will be useful to reviewer. A whole district level route to get to Summer emerging at either Rutherford Street or the roundabout or even Heathcote bypassing Woolston entirely. Yours sincerely Nancy Meherne - long time resident of Sumner who felt good about bringing some revenue to Woolston shops.

I compute through Woolston Village twice each day on route from NZ Pleasan to Pinkland. I support the proposed changes as outlined. I may not support all of the detailed proposals and reserve full support until such times as they are available. Travelling through in a west-bound direction the route is straightforward and with no undue hazards. Travelling through in an east-bound direction the route is hazardous due to car parking on the road side, access/egress from the 'Mad Butcher/Dominos' off-street parking area and the intersection with St Johns Street. The hazards are multiplied in the hours of darkness and in inclement weather. The level of street lighting is poor and the road surface deteriorated. This makes it difficult to hold a straight line, in an already narrow cycle lane, against parked cars with drivers who look for blind spots and cyclists. I am not in the habit of using the route either, as I am not an experienced cyclist. When the cars slow it is only because they are looking to pull over or into the car park or St Johns Street, rarely in a manner that is considerate to the cyclist they just overtake or with sufficient indication to the cyclist approaching from the rear. I note that the newly refurbished New World supermarket is likely to increase traffic flow and increase the hazards to east-bound travel. I trust that access and egress to Ferry Road has been better designed than the St Andrews Hill intersection.

First off all I like to say thank you to council for thinking about spending huge amounts of money to make Woolston village more attractive but I disagree with this plan. We need more on street parking on ferry road not less. I have been working in this business for the last 22 years (standing by window while serving customers) I have never seen parking outside empty since the proposal I have been talking to customers. Every single customer agree with me that we need more parking on ferry road not less. They sometimes have to drive around twice or three times to get parking which is very inconvenient. They told me if there is no parking in front of the shop they would not stop and take their money somewhere else. yrll also pay my rates regularly since past 22 years. Since we do not have rear parking my customers need parking in front of the shop. I also disagree with 30km speed limit because drivers at the moment slow down in there area because off traffic. There are not many or any accidents happen in Woolston village which make us consider that this area is unsafe or need 30km speed limit. By if forcing 30km speed in this area people likely will not avoid passing and take alternative routes. By putting island in the middle it would be hard to turn in the driveway and causing traffic block behind the car that is turning. I strongly disagree with the tree planting or garden between my driveway (701 ferry road) and supermarket driveway. Because before earthquake when next door building was bit forward on councils land when we come out of driveway it blocked our view and there have been many near miss incidents even though we drive very slowly. Since its going to be supermarkets exit for big truck it will be very busy and unsafe for people walking on the footpath going towards crossing lights.
Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board
04 February 2019

159 N Improving the Woolston Village is an excellent idea apart from the following: With the closing of the ANZ Bank, Post Office and the Local Doctor moving there will be less foot and car traffic in the area. To reduce on street parking will have an extra negative impact on the businesses in the area as people who travel by car pull in to get what they need and carry on. If they have to find alternative places to park they will drive right through and shop elsewhere. Also dropping the speed limit to 30K per hour will also deter through traffic and they will take the alternative option to travel down Linwood Ave and Bypass Woolston Village altogether.

160 N No. U/We generally do not support the proposed changes outlined in the Ferry Road at Woolston Village project consultation plans. My family and I have operated the - for approximately 28 years.

Last year our business was hugely interrupted and affected financially for approximately 1 month without when necessary wastewater services were installed for the New World Supermarket development - our property - this involved the placing of no stopping or no parking restrictions and cones on both sides of the street by traffic management from St Johns Street up to the pedestrian crossing - then once again for most of April this year all the parking in front of my business was fenced off while electrical services were installed again for the supermarket. As a very large proportion of our and the surrounding businesses visit our premises using cars they simply could not stop and park - the ones that did manage to park further away and walk a distance certainly expressed their frustrations on having to do so - many angrily exchanged words with the contractors and traffic management people for taking away their parking. Even though I have always known the availability of the convenient parking opportunity outside my business and have seen first hand how busy and essential the parking outside both my and the surrounding businesses is and how are all reliant on it to conduct our businesses, the loss of these two instances hugely reinforced and made us all appreciate more the importance of the parking and the dire consequences of losing it. We are this day still recovering from the loss of custom and turnover because of these interruptions as some frustrated customers have not returned - possible because other businesses provide easier parking. On any given day if one were to walk through Woolston Village and Ferry Road and observe the use of current parking spaces it would be obvious and clear that full use is being made of all this parking by people visiting the village. The area from St Johns st to the pedestrian crossing particularly is always busy and at times observations would indicate that more parking spaces were needed - not less. It is common to see incidences of road rage over parking spaces and illegal parking on yellow lines and across driveways and other odd parking as people want to quickly get in and out after purchases at the relevant businesses - my business and the ones surrounding it are mostly food and convenience type operations e.g. takeaways and bakery whose customers expect to be able to park quickly and conveniently outside, make their purchases quickly and leave - the 30 minute parks around us have a high turnover because of this and would probably be more suited to being 15 or 10 minute parks. I feel that the majority of an important group has been omitted from this proposal - this group being the various business owners and or property owners of the Woolston Village whose input, feedback and interests are lacking in this proposal and very little consideration appears to have been given to them especially with regards to the extreme proposal to remove approx 70% of the on street parking available for their customers - no loss of parking for a shopping area can be beneficial and why would anyone want to park on side streets from their convenient front of shop parks especially so if they are handicapped, elderly or have small children of which our businesses have many - this is more so in winter when off street parking can be quite daunting in extreme rainy and cold weather for car users visiting the area. There is also the safety and security issue of parking on side streets and behind businesses - many of my elderly customers who also visit the surrounding businesses in one go use cars and rely on them for their freedom to get them to the area independently. Many of my customers were unaware of this proposal until they were informed by me and other business owners - the majority of business owners and customers and locals alike strongly oppose the removal of parking in the area and are at a loss to understand the need to remove parking when it is difficult enough to park as it is - I am sure there are plenty more people who frequent the area who are unaware of this proposal and its ramifications especially with regards to the removal of parking - there did not appear to be any media information informing people of the proposal.

I know for a fact a large percentage of people who visit the Village live outside of Woolston and rely on cars for transport - many passing through and stopping on impulse and convenience and thus convenient parking - what would be the incentive for them to stop in Woolston if they had to park far away and walk ? Many locals have have told me they have not received any material regarding this proposal. All the local business owners I have spoken to have said they were never directly asked for input on the proposal even when we really are the ones being directly affected - some owners have said they were never visited by the council with information at all. Many of my business owners have spoken to oppose the removal of parking on Ferry Road. It is interesting and odd to see 60 minute parking being retained on Ferry Rd in front of the ANZ and 24 hour Dairy(Night and day) when these businesses have 35 private parks just next door to them whereas the area from St Johns St to the pedestrian crossing on Ferry Rd will lose 11 parks with most of the businesses here having limited or no private parking. With the loss of the NZ post and Kiwi Bank and the eminent loss of the ANZ Bank the village is facing an uncertain future as two of its largest businesses leave to set up in Ferry Road so which is the newer Ferrymead businesses in newer buildings have provisions for parking at their doorssteps as do businesses at Eastgate mall - a convenience this proposal will take away from Woolston Village and the majority of our customers with it. Woolston Villages fragile retail environment will be put at extreme risk possibly discouraging any future businesses and or developers from investing in the area - note parking consent requirements by council for new businesses starting up and new developments. There does seem to be any provisions being made for delivery orders of stock etc would need to be carried from who knows where - many supply reps and delivery people and customers alike have voiced their concerns over the no stopping or parking proposal as again they already have difficulty finding parking. The map of the concept figure appears misleading as it appears to highlight private "off street car parks" as being available parking for the general public when in fact this parking is privately owned and for customers shopping at the associated businesses e.g 104 New World Supermarket at New World they will enforce this as they do currently. The map highlights street parking and the area past Morcan St and the area past Heathcote St and parking in front of residences out of the parking area when in fact the main business area really only extends between Portman St and Catherine St which currently has approximately 37 parking places on Ferry Rd of which 26 are proposed to be removed or 70% removed from the main shopping area leaving 11 parks really. The proposed alternative parking sites on side streets e.g Portman and St Johns Streets are on observation already full i of I am guessing residents cars and staff from the businesses. Heathcote , Marcanon and Catherine streets are so far away from the main business area that most people would not even bother - many of these streets are so narrow that only a single car can pass through if cars are parked on both sides of them. Once the parking is removed from the front of St Annes school Morcan and Catherine Streets will be chaotic especially so at school pick up and drop off times and riskier for parents and children who will try to cross over during peak traffic times. I pity the residents of the streets that will be affected and are getting increased traffic and the prospect of cars being parked on their streets for 2 hours or more at a time i am certain many people will park over the limits here and on any retained parks on Ferry Road as they do at present - the council simply does not have the resources to enforce the parking limits continually as they are not even enforcing parking limits on Ferry Rd now. Are these streets equipped for the extra traffic? and the question of security and safety also arises eg thefts vandalism assaults etc that can come with parking off street - is the lighting sufficient for those parking at night time ? The proposed speed limit to 30 km and landscaped islands will slow traffic to a crawl and cause congestion on this part of Ferry Rd which has always been a main through road - past road works on Ferry Rd have exhibitied this and high traffic on hot summer days for people heading to summer beach also exhibit major gridlocks - this possible gridlock possibliy on a daily basis will I am sure cause people to avoid the Woolston Village altogether to use alternative routes e.g Linwood Ave. Traffic Islands will make it difficult for many business owners and/or customers to...
turn into their driveways and tree plantings beside driveways will hinder people exiting these driveways and create hazards for pedestrians. An example of this is the proposed tree planting beside the driveway at 701 Ferry Rd and the consented supermarket - this will greatly obstruct the view of both heavy delivery vehicles exiting from the supermarket and vehicles exiting 701 Ferry Rd. Trees that drop their leaves create a mess in the area and making up gutters and downpipes causing increased maintenance costs. No provision appears to be made for much needed public toilets in the proposal. The Twisted Hop Pub can have at full capacity up to 160 patrons yet they only have private parking spaces for approximately 13 cars - the result of this extreme overflow can often be seen with cars parked to capacity up and down Ferry Road for hours on end - this overflow will likely take up all the retained parks on Ferry Rd and side streets should the proposal go ahead. Once the New World supermarket Development and planned Community Center and library are completed this will put extra strain on available parking - has this been considered in the proposal? - Page 18 of the parking survey itself states * CAUTION if applying this surveyed parking demand to future development of the shopping area and non developed sites of the Woolston Shopping area need to be considered * With regards to the minutes of the meeting with Foodstuffs/ New World and the council on 17th May 2016 - they have made some interesting points in that they feel they won't have the necessary parking for their new development and that they will be relying on the side streets namely Glenny and St Johns streets to accommodate the overflow as well as their query on retaining the consented Island on Ferry Road including the left turn - the fact that they were given consents by the council is concerning especially the later regarding the Island so that they can accommodate their entry/exit on such a busy road and on a corner that is already very busy and hard to negotiate to accommodate this "Private Island some public street parking will no doubt be removed - without consultation of the public or nearby businesses this was given prior consent and stamped for the benefit of Foodstuffs who already have entry/exit entrances from two additional streets being Glenny and St Johns streets for their New World Supermarket. In summary I believe that the proposal for the Woolston Village and Ferry Road has relied too much on the mentioned parking and shopper surveys which I believe to be greatly flawed in that they are not complete or carried out properly or the results communicated correctly - the survey itself urges caution on its own use and mentions "Gaps" in data. There doesn't appear to be any information or statistics showing this section of Ferry Road is more unsafe than any other part of Ferry Rd or Christchurch for that matter. The Village has a perfectly good controlled pedestrian crossing and existing cycle lanes but the speed could be reduced to 40km rather than 30km as proposed - even though I can recall any traffic fatalities in the immediate area in my time here. Having seen parking and shopper patterns myself for approximately 28 years and communicated with many people who frequent the area on a regular basis and who actually live and work in the community and wider area I can confidently say that the planners of this project have got it very wrong and that the proposal especially the removal of parking on Ferry Road will not attract people to the area but rather scare them away along with those that already use it. The nature of the individual businesses and how they interact have not been taken into account and the assumptions of this proposal made by its planners are extreme and dangerous and put many businesses owners and their employee's livelihoods at risk. No loss of parking in a shopping area can be beneficial especially if it has been worked on perfectly fine for all this time - why try to fix something that isn't broken. - I appreciate the council efforts to improve the area - but not this way - please leave all the parking on Ferry Road as it is. - Thank you.

161 Y wishes to express strong support for the proposed changes to Woolston Village and the movement and streetscape improvements, as expressed in the Woolston Village proposed changes documentation. We believe these plans will make Christchurch a truly more accessible city, Woolston Village will become a thriving and attractive pedestrian-focused environment not only for the local residents but also visitors. The proposed changes will encourage the use of active transport (cycling and walking) down Ferry Road supports the installation of cycle lanes, advanced cycle stop boxes at traffic lights, and extra cycle parking. By also making the footpaths wider and introducing more crossing points and pedestrian islands, the proposed design will make the area more safe and pleasant for the pedestrians using this public space.

also in full support of introducing a 30km/h speed limit zone, reducing car parks on Ferry Road, and directing motorist to alternative parking on the side streets, as this will make the village safer for all road users. By encouraging more active transport down around the Woolston Village, the proposed changes will have economic, health and environmental benefits. The health and economic benefits of cycling [1, 2] and walking [3, 4] are well documented in peer-reviewed literature. These benefits include decreased risk of disease, obesity and associated illnesses; improvements to quality of life; and higher life expectancy. The decreased healthcare costs of the above improvements are a direct economic benefit. Additionally, increased cycling and walkability reduces infrastructure maintenance costs, congestion, parking requirements, noise and emissions. The only perceived drawback from the proposed changes will be the decrease in the number of car parks by about 70%. However this perception is not based on available peer reviewed evidence, which suggests that "enough evidence exists to challenge the orthodoxy that exists amongst decision-makers that parking restraint will discourage economic development." [5] Given this, opposition to these proposals based on parking reduction will only serve to stifle economic opportunity and future prosperity of Woolston Village. The proposal is based on sound research, and the benefits far outweigh the costs. This will lead to Woolston Village becoming a citizen-friendly area, with thriving economic activity. As a result, Christchurch will take a further step towards modernisation where residents and visitors alike can enjoy a healthy, liveable, and resilient city. As outlined above, supports the general idea behind the proposal, however we do have some specific concerns. These are mainly regarding cyclist safety, which must not be compromised if the aim is to see more people take up cycling who would otherwise not feel safe enough to do so. Our suggested improvements are: For safety reasons, as well as future-proofing the suggested improvements, all cycle lanes should be 2 metres in width and segregated from the car lanes. Sensors for the proposed advanced cycle stop boxes need to be located at an appropriate distance from the traffic lights corresponding to the average cycling speed. The current system installed on Tuam Street outside the bus exchange is proving ineffective. References: [1] Deanjah, G., & Caulfield, B. (2014). Estimating the health economic benefits of cycling. Journal of Transport & Health, 1(2), 141-149. [2] Rojas-Rueda, D., de Nazelle, A., Tainio, M., & Nieuwenhuijsen, M. J. (2013). The health risks and benefits of cycling in urban environments compared with car use: health impact assessment study. Bmj, 343, d4521 [3] Lilman, Todd. "Economic value of walkability." Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board 1828 (2003): 3-11. [4] Giles-Corti, B., Foster, S., Shilton, T., & Falconer, R. (2010). The co-benefits for health of investing in active transportation. New South Wales public health bulletin, 21(6), 122-127. [5] Marsden, Greg. "The evidence base for parking policies - a review." Transport policy 13.6 (2006): 447-457. [6] Hass-Klau, Carmen. "A review of the evidence from Germany and the UK." Transport Policy 1.1 (1993): 21-31. [7] Topp, Hartmut, and Pharoah. "Car-free city centres." Transportation 21.3 (1994): 231-247.
N 162 I oppose the removal of the parking at the Woolston Village on Ferry Road.

N 163 As the owner of the property at Ferry Rd in the name of, we are not in favour of the proposed tree planting and removal of car parking in front of our building. The new proposed island in the centre of the road will restrict traffic making the road more dangerous. All of these issues will frustrate business/sales in the area for retailers not enhance it.

N 164 I strongly oppose the proposed removal of parking on Ferry Road and Woolston Village as it is not beneficial for the area and will have a negative impact on the area and its retailers - convenient parking is hard to find here as it is at present and its removal will deter me and others from visiting the Village should the parking proposal go ahead.

Y 165 I am in strong support of the proposed changes to Woolston Village and the movement and streetscape improvements, as expressed in the Woolston Village proposed changes documentation. This is a very visionary effort for the future of Christchurch and I would like to commend the Council on this proposal. I often cycle down this area of Ferry Road on my road bike and find the experience quite unsafe with parked cars obstructing the view of cars moving out into Ferry Road. The proposed changes encourage cycling and walking down this area of Ferry Road and the design features seek to enhance a more valued village atmosphere in this area. I support the installation of cycle lanes, extra cycle parking and advanced cycle stop boxes at traffic lights. However, to ensure the safety of cyclists, the cycle lanes need to be segregated from the road and span 2 m wide. I also recommend the sensors for the proposed advanced cycle stop boxes be located an appropriate distance from the traffic lights corresponding to the average cycling speed, as I am currently frustrated by the ineffective system currently installed on Tuam Street outside the bus exchange. Introducing a 30km/h speed limit zone, reducing carparks on Ferry Road, and directing motorist alternating parking on the side streets, will make the village safer for all road users. By also making the footpaths wider and introducing more crossing points and pedestrian islands, the proposed design will make the area more safe and pleasant for the pedestrians using this public space. The current opposition to this proposal based on parking reduction will ultimately only serve to stifle economic growth of the Woolston Village. This opposed perception is unfounded, as case studies in other cities have shown that increasing other modes of access to streets and cities, particularly walkability and cycling access, led to businesses doing better long term. In turn, this shift toward active transport will result in numerous health and economic benefits, which have been well researched and documented in peer-reviewed literature. This will lead to Woolston Village becoming a citizen-friendly area, with thriving economic activity. As a result, Christchurch will take a further step towards modernisation where residents and visitors alike can enjoy a healthy, liveable, and resilient city. The proposed changes to the Woolston Village will transform the area into a thriving and attractive pedestrian-focused not only for the local residents but also visitors.

N 166 See end of document for PDF of full submission.

N 167 See end of document for PDF of supporting information to #166.

N 168 See end of document for PDF of supporting information to #166.

Y 169 We think it will be a move in the right direction provided there is plenty of parking! As there is an older population to think of.

N 170 The loss of any parking spaces on Ferry Rd or the adjoining side streets would cause the St Anne’s Catholic Church many problems. People would end up parking dangerously to be within walking distance of the Church. Church services Saturday evening and Sunday morning take 1 hour, so 30 minute parking would be restrictive. Weekday services take 30 mins +.

N 171 Hi,

They strongly oppose the removal of 6 carparks from outside of their property. It seems from looking at the plans that the Council have decided that car parks supplied on landowners property will suffice instead of having street parking. The removal of street parking from outside of the building will be a large blow for this tenant.

We support enhancing the area, but I have seen at other sites the inclusion of the median strip / mid street planting at the sacrifice of street carparking achieves nothing for the tenants or property owners.

We request that street parking be left on the side of the street outside of this property.

Sorry for being late with the feedback we trust it will be accepted.

N 172 I apologise for not getting any response to the formal consultation process. We have simply been snowed under in work. I have taken your assurances about the envelope provided on face value and if that is what has been provided of as part of this design, then it is difficult to dispute otherwise - but I have to say just looking at the plans, there does appear to be plenty of obstacles to try to wind your way through with and overdimensioning load. And that is what the substance of my concern is. When members viewed the plans they were immediately looking for any possible alternative routes to try to avoid this area - suffice to say that they were not very successful.

So in detail working from the northern end (and travelling south-east):

- The future gateway artwork needs to be 11.5m apart.
- The pedestrian islands before you get to Heathcote Street are central on the road and ideally we would like them deleted. Alternatively they need to be properly mountable – no more than 100mm high with 30 degree angles on the blocks. No handrails.
- The trees adjacent to number 651 on each side of the road would appear to make it tight for an overdimension load.
- The next set of islands before Portman Street, ideally we would like them deleted. Alternatively they need to be properly mountable – no more than 100mm high with 30 degree angles on the blocks if they need to be mounted (given they have planting I assume not), so if possible then to have 7.5m of clear space to one or both sides of the islands to any trees, lightpole or sign. No handrails.
- The next set of islands just after Portman Street also have trees adjacent to them. This is a 30km/h environment – do the islands have to be there? It make a proper pedestrian crossing and then the islands are not required. Else the islands need to be properly mountable – no more than 100mm high with 30 degree angles on the blocks. No handrails.
- The planted medians from #683 to approx. #699 needs to have 7.5m of clear space to one or both sides of the islands to any trees, lightpole or sign, to allow an OD load to travel one side or the other, and hang over the median. Ideally delete this as a 30 km/h speed area.
- Is that a signalised crossing at #620? If so then the position of any signal poles is crucial. Have to be 7.5 away from the median.
- The planted median from #636 to approx. #640 needs to have 7.5m of clear space to one or both sides of the islands to any trees, lightpole or sign, to allow an OD load to travel one side or the other. Ideally delete this as a 30 k/h speed area.
- The pedestrian islands at approx. #650 are central on the road and ideally we would like them deleted. Alternatively they need to be properly mountable – no more than 100mm high with 30 degree angles on the blocks. No handrails.
- The future gateway artwork at approx. #670 needs to be 11.5m apart while the pedestrian islands there are central on the road and ideally we would like them deleted. Alternatively they need to be properly mountable – no more than 100mm high with 30 degree angles on the blocks. No handrails.

The concern I have is that the cumulative effect of having to run over at least 4 sets of pedestrian islands, removing signage and possibly hand rails on each one, a the same time are carefully negotiating through the rest of the obstacles will mean that transport operators will want to avoid this area. It will simply take a lot of time, will hold up other road traffic, and becomes a safety hazard as the load moves slowly down the road, and the traffic piles up in each direction.

It is really disappointing to see such a congested road is proposed for an OD route. To be honest I don’t recall any such similar examples anywhere around the country.

I think that we definitely need to talk more about what is being proposed here. Cheers

175 Y  
My address is [redacted]. I would very much like to have, Firms Vans and Trucks, not to be parked overnight and all weekends, either side of my drive way, as trying to make a right hand turn out of my drive way, is very dangerous. One has to pull out much to far, and sit to be able to see the way clear. Same thing happens across the road, either side of the School St Annes. I’m very concerned so one will loose there life, out there, as Ferry Road is a very busy road, at all times of the day and night, and speed is an issue.

Thank you for your time in reading this.

174 Y  
After reviewing the proposal I cannot see to many issues for heavy vehicles that fit the standard heavy vehicle dimensions and mass regulations. However I do concur with the feedback provided by the Heavy haulage and I think that this will also happen with the future proposal as it is presently planned. Ferry Road is an important freight corridor, and needs to be considered in light of this as part of the overall network of freight corridors around the greater Christchurch area. Once the alternative route for over dimension and hazardous goods ex the Lyttelton Port over Evans Pass / Summer Road is re-opened the volume of heavy vehicle traffic using Ferry Road will increase. If the use of Ferry Road by over dimension vehicles is going to be restricted, then I think it is important that an easily accessible and viable alternative route that does not push these vehicles down surrounding residential streets needs to be considered.

175 Y  
Details of submission (see full submission for General comments) Dr Alastair Humphreys Public Health Physician CDB
8 The CDHB is supportive of the plans to enhance the Woolston Village by making this section of Ferry road safer for road users as this reduces the burden of injury on the health sector. We are also supportive of creating more inviting public spaces as these will have a positive effect on people’s mental health and wellbeing.
9 The CDHB was involved in the Inquiry by Design process for the Ferry Road Master Plan. The objectives and actions of the original Ferry Road Master Plan can be clearly seen in this proposed concept plan.
10 The CDHB supports the proposal and has some recommendations for consideration which will further improve health outcomes for the community.
Specific comments:
11 The CDHB supports the creation of a pedestrian –focused environment with wider footpaths that have additional crossing points. This will make Woolston a more walkable community and enable people to easily access daily services including general practitioners. Additional crossing points also will allow bus patrons to have easy access to the shopping precinct.
12 The placement of bus stops looks well considered so people can access different sections of the village as needed. The CDHB recommends that consideration is given to the type of landscaping and low plantings that adjoin bus stops. It is important that road users, especially cyclists, have good visibility when approaching bus stops.
13 The CDHB is pleased to see that there is a mobility car park outside of the medical centre at 887 Ferry Road.
14 The CDHB supports the introduction of a 30 k/h speed zone. This was one of the CDHB’s original submission points on the Ferry Road master plan and it will reduce the likelihood of accidents in the village.
15 The CDHB supports the introduction of cycle lanes, advanced cycle stop boxes and cycle parking. Active transport contributes to significant health benefits to individuals and communities through increased physical activity opportunities, improved air quality through reduced vehicle emissions and corresponding reduction in associated respiratory illness and an overall reduction of the burden of disease associated with obesity, cardiovascular disease and respiratory illnesses.
16 The CDHB is pleased to see that street lighting will be improved as this will potentially lead to a reduction of accidents and injury, as well as crime.
17 It is noted that there is a future library and community centre planned for the area. The CDHB encourages the Council to consider accessibility and universal design when it is constructing community facilities and infrastructure. It is important that the built environment be as accessible as possible to people of all ages and abilities.
18 Thank you for the opportunity to submit on Woolston Village Concept Plan.

176 Y  
I'm writing regarding the Proposed concept for Ferry Road at Woolston Village. I think the plan looks good, just wondered why the road had such a curve in it near St Johns Street?

I think consistency in the surface finishes would be an improvement if that's possible? Continuing the cycle lane marking through the town centre (rather than stop start markings) and paving the entire footpath or road (rather than strips at crossings) I think would look better. I gather that would come at additional cost and thought would have to be given to identification of crossings for the sight impaired, but I think it would look less confused and busy for the majority of users.

One final thought, there are four established street trees either side of a pedestrian crossing near Portman Street. The existing road has cycle lanes either side and a central island to aid pedestrian crossing. It looks like the proposal is to remove the trees, replace them with new trees and form a new crossing in a similar location. Can you let us know why the existing trees are not being retained and the line of the road adjusted slightly to accommodate them? It looks like the road curves and proposed street trees protrude into the cycle lanes elsewhere, so surely there is scope to accommodate the existing trees?
17. Redcliffs Transport Project - Redcliffs School Transport Safety Requirements

Reference: 19/14647
Presenter(s): Mark Gregory – Transport Network Planner, Isabelle Gensburger – Project Manager, Tara King – Senior Engagement Advisor

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to approve the proposed changes to the road network, associated with ensuring a safe environment for the proposed Redcliffs School development (Refer Attachment A).

Origin of Report
1.2 This report is staff generated as part of the 2018/19 funding round process.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of medium significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by using the engagement and significance matrix. Staff have considered the significance of the decision to be made by the Community Board and Council. Their assessment is that the matter is of medium significance for the following reasons:

2.1.2 There is a strong interest within the local community in relation to any work that is associated with the new Redcliffs School.

2.1.3 The new Redcliffs School cannot operate without a full safety audit that includes specific consideration of access to the school and speed in the area. This transport plan works to address this requirement.

2.1.4 There are strong safety benefits in the implementation of the transport plan, as it will ensure that children and parents accessing the school can do this safely and traffic is managed appropriately.

2.1.5 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect this assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approve the preferred Option, consisting of the following (in accordance with Attachment A)
   a. Establish a turning restriction, banning the right turn movement from Main Road (from the east) to Beachville Road (to the north/east).
   b. Extend the traffic island at the intersection of Main Road / Beachville Road intersection, as per Attachment A.
   c. Disestablish the bus stop on the south side of Main Road, including the indented bay, (located approximately 70 metres east of McCormacks Bay Road).
d. Resolve no stopping markings in place of the bus stop (entirely) on the south side of Main Road (approximately 70 metres east of McCormacks Bay Road).

e. Establish a zebra crossing, to operate as a School patrol crossing, outside of 25-27 Main Road, including kerb build outs.

f. Remove the zebra crossing opposite the proposed Redcliffs Park (the ‘old School site’).

g. Construct a refuge island and kerb build outs in place of the zebra crossing, opposite the proposed Redcliffs Park.

h. Establish a kerb extension and pedestrian crossing refuge island, at the intersection of Beachville Road / Celia Street.

i. Establish a footpath on Celia Street, between 53 Celia Street and Beachville Road (a distance of approximately 93 metres).

2. That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board recommend to the Council to approve:

a. A new variable speed limit of 40km/h (School Zone), as per Attachment A:

i. On Main Road, commencing approximately 42 metres west of the McCormacks Bay Road centre line, for a distance of approximately 480 metres.

ii. On Beachville Road, from Main Road (at Main Road / Beachville Road/McCormacks Bay Road intersection), to outside 107 Beachville Road; a distance of approximately 320 metres.

iii. On Celia Street, outside 47 Celia Street to the intersection of Beachville Road/Celia Street; a distance of approximately 140 metres.

iv. On McCormacks Bay Road for a section of approximately 20m south of Main Road.

b. Cycle lanes on approaches to proposed zebra crossing and refuge island, in accordance with Attachment A.

4. Key Points

4.1 This report supports the Council's Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

4.1.1 Activity: Traffic Safety and Efficiency

- Level of Service: 10.0.6.1 Reduce the number of casualties on the road network - =129 (reduce by 5 or more per year)

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 – Approve the Redcliffs Transport Plan as per attachment A (preferred).

- Option 2 – Do not approve the Redcliffs Transport Plan and request staff to consider alternative designs and re-consult with the community.

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- Meets objectives relating to safety and the design is safety audited. The outcome of Audit finds no outstanding safety matters.

- Ensures that effects on the function of the Arterial Road network, including the strategic freight corridor, are limited.

- Minimum impact on surrounding communities (e.g. no reduction in availability of on street car parking).
- Achieves financial and legal requirements (outlined below, section 6.32).
- Designed to be appropriately scaled to meet anticipated needs and demands.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
- It has not been possible to include a crossing point on Main Road in immediate vicinity of site pedestrian access.

4.4 Option Summary – Advantages and Disadvantages (Option 2)

4.4.1 The advantages of this option include:
- There are no identified advantages at this stage.

4.4.2 The disadvantages of this Option
- Uncertain that safety objectives would be achieved, and need for revised planning, design and safety auditing.
- Uncertain that outcome would achieve financial and legal objectives.
- Uncertain that outcome would be appropriately scaled to meet anticipated needs and demands.

5. Context/Background

5.1 The Ministry of Education (MoE) are planning to operate a school, initially for approximately 300 pupils (potentially increasing to 400 over time). The MoE have acquired the former Redcliffs Park site for this purpose, and have been granted resource consent for the project. Following the preferences of Council (7 September 2017), conditions have been included in both the Land Sale Agreement and Resource Consent, that suitable safety remediation works be undertaken in order to ensure safe pedestrian access to the proposed school, with particular focus on Main Road. Substantial funding has been sought from the MoE, and the design has been undertaken in partnership with the MoE.

5.2 The objectives of the scheme are to enable safe pedestrian access to the proposed school, without compromising the function of the network, including preserving the ‘alternative freight route’ function of Main Road. The design has been safety audited (with a ‘post implementation audit’ to follow) and no outstanding safety concerns are identified. Whilst achieving the objectives, the preferred option is also suitably scaled (in terms of cost and likely effects) to the size of the proposed school, and requires no additional funding from Council over and above pre-existing proposals.

5.3 Several alternative design options have been considered, including a crossing closer to the proposed building access. However, it has not been possible to achieve a crossing which would comply with necessary safe design standards without compromising the Arterial and freight function of Main Road.

5.4 The preferred option achieves the provision of safe walking routes, (integrated with the location of pick up – drop off points) including carefully aligned crossings. Pedestrians will not be required to walk ‘out of their way’ to access a safe crossing, meaning that all pedestrian crossing activity of Main Road are expected to be managed, and within a reduced speed environment.

5.5 Safety works will continue after implementation of the scheme, to ensure that access to the school operates as intended. A School Travel Plan is to be prepared in partnership between the MoE/Board of Trustees and the Council’s Travel Demand Management Officer, and ensure ongoing dialogue in this space. A post implementation Safety Audit will also be undertaken, and monitoring by Council’s transport team.
Community Consultation

5.6 Community Consultation on the Redcliffs Transport Project was undertaken from 19 November 2018 to 17 December 2018. The submission form asked submitters to indicate whether: Yes, they supported the traffic changes; or no they did not support the traffic changes. There was also the opportunity to provide any further comments on the transport plan. (Refer to Attachment B and C for the public information leaflet and submission form).

5.7 A public drop in session was held on Tuesday 27 November from 4 pm to 6 pm at the Redcliffs Mt Pleasant Bowling Club in Redcliffs. There were 15 residents who attended the drop in session over the two hour period, to find out more information on the project and to drop off their feedback forms. Generally those who attended supported the transport plan but had some concerns about the increase in traffic on Celia Street and the removal of the bus stop.

5.8 Approximately 150 consultation leaflets were hand delivered to properties surrounding the new Redcliffs School location, including 68 absentee land owners. A link to the consultation page on ‘Have Your Say’ was also emailed out to 798 key stakeholders (those who participated in the consultation on the new Redcliffs School land swap) and printed copies of the consultation leaflet were made available at the Linwood Service Centre, Civic Offices, Matuku Takotako: Sumner Centre, Redcliffs Village Library, Redcliffs School and Beckenham Service Centre.

5.9 A Newsline article was also published on the 19 November 2018 and included a link to where online submissions could be made https://ccc.govt.nz/news-and-events/newsline/show/3178

5.10 At the close of consultation 48 submissions were received with 27 (56%) in support of the transport plan, 17 (36%) not in support and 4 (8%) who did not indicate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes - support</th>
<th>No – do not support</th>
<th>Did not indicate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 (56%)</td>
<td>17 (36%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.11 All submissions have been provided to the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board and are publicly available on the Council ‘Have Your Say’ page electronically https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/consultations-and-submissions/haveyoursay/show/207
6. **Option 1 – Redcliffs Transport plan as per attachment A (preferred)**

**Option Description**

6.1 A package of measures intended to facilitate safe pedestrian and cyclist access to the proposed Redcliffs School site.

**Significance**

6.2 The level of significance of this option is medium consistent with section 2 of this report.

6.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are consistent with the level of significance for this project. These activities are included in section 5.2 to 5.5 of this report.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

6.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

6.5 Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited (MKT) have been provided with all the information on this project. The project team had not received specific feedback from MKT at the time of writing this report.

**Community Views and Preferences**

6.6 Local residents surrounding the new Redcliffs School location and those who use the school are specifically affected by this option due to their proximity to the new school and their use of the school. Their views have been collected as part of the consultation process.

6.7 At the close of consultation 48 submissions were received with 27 (56%) in support of the transport plan.

6.8 The Redcliffs School Board of Trustees support the transport plan, but would prefer the speed limit to reduce to 30 km/h instead of 40 km/h.

6.9 The Ministry of Education also support the transport plan.

6.10 Environment Canterbury support the transport plan, however they do have concerns about the space left between bus stops, in particular with the removal of the bus stop on the corner of Main Road and McCormacks Bay Road.

6.11 The location of other submissions and whether they support the transport plan is available on a map (refer to Attachments D and E).

**Themes relating to those who support the Redcliffs Transport Plan**

6.12 For those submitters who supported the transport plan, the common reasons were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for supporting the plan</th>
<th>Submitter ID #</th>
<th>No. of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good safety improvements</td>
<td>20615, 20598, 20583, 20513, 20205</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed reductions good</td>
<td>20603, 20583, 20573, 20513, 20361</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy with the pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>20603, 20598, 20205, 20195, 20167</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.13 For those who did support the transport plan there were also further requests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Submitter ID #</th>
<th>No. of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move zebra crossing closer to the school</td>
<td>20598, 20583, 20513, 20540</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the 40 km/h school speed limit to 30 km/h (extend to Celia Street and Beachville Road)</td>
<td>20598, 20583, 20513</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do not ban the right turn onto Beachville Road from Main Road (Causeway end)

Install traffic lights at the Beachville Road and Main Road intersection (Causeway end).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Submitter ID #</th>
<th>No. of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not ban the right turn onto Beachville Road from Main Road (Causeway end)</td>
<td>20287, 20222</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install traffic lights at the Beachville Road and Main Road intersection (Causeway end)</td>
<td>20183</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.14 Project team comments in relation to these are as follows (where relevant):

**Moving of the zebra crossing**

6.15 There were four comments from those who support the transport plan, requesting that the zebra crossing is moved closer to the school.

“We would like to ask that the new zebra crossing is places as close as possible to the school. Closer than planned would be very much appreciated”. Submitter ID #20598.

Due to other technical challenges, there isn’t room to locate the crossing directly outside the school gate. We have instead located is as close as possible, and have also ensured that the location of the crossing suits all users.

**School speed zone reduced from 40 km/h to 30 km/h**

6.16 There were three comments from those who support the transport plan, requesting that the 40 km/h speed limit is reduced further to 30 km/h and includes all of Celia Street. There were also two separate comments requesting that the entire length of Celia Street was included in the speed reduction area.

“We would prefer a 30kph rather than 40kph speed limit around the school, including all of Beachville and Celia as these streets will have children crossing to the school all along their lengths. The evidence is definitive on how much safer for pedestrians 30kph is than 40kph”. Submitter ID #20583.

The proposed 40km/h limit is cognisant with standard school speed zone treatments around the City; however, the project team will monitor the performance of the school speed zone post implementation, and recommend proposed changes if necessary (noting that these will require special approval from the New Zealand Transport Authority).

Celia Street already has traffic calming measures in place with the narrowing of the road and installation of the islands. It is considered as an existing low speed environment.

**Do not ban the right turn into Beachville Road**

6.17 There were three comments from those who support the transport plan, requesting that the right turn into Beachville Road from Main Road (at the Causeway end) is not banned.

“The proposal to prohibit a right turn into Beachville Road for cars coming from Sumner should be rejected. It will just increase traffic along Beachville Road and past the school, and is entirely unnecessary”. Submitter ID #20287.

The main purpose of this plan is to ensure it is safe and the design has been safety audited. The current space available for right turning traffic will not be enough, and the result will be increased delays on Main Road, as the right turn queue ‘over spills’. Furthermore, the presence of a right turn queue will obstruct pedestrian sight distance at the crossing. Therefore, if the right turn is in place it will create congestion issues on the Arterial Road network and visibility issues for pedestrians using the pedestrian refuge island.
**Installation of traffic lights at the Beachville Road and Main Road intersection**

6.18 There was one comment from a submitter who supports the transport plan, suggesting a set of signalised traffic lights is installed at the Beachville Road and Main Road intersection (Causeway end).

“I do wonder whether with the extra traffic, whether lights should be installed at this intersection, with pedestrian crossing for school children”. Submitter ID #20183

Signalised traffic lights were considered for this intersection, but the proposal did not meet the test in relation to demand, cost and network impacts. The size of the school is not large enough to generate enough traffic to justify the significant cost for signalised lights. In order for the lights to work appropriately the McCormacks Bay Road and Main Road intersection (opposite Beachville Road) would also require traffic lights, which would also increase the cost and put it well outside the available budget.

**Themes relating to those who do not support the Redcliffs Transport Plan**

6.19 For those submitters who did not support the transport plan, the common reasons were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for not supporting the plan</th>
<th>Submitter ID #</th>
<th>No. of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern over increased congestion and traffic issues</td>
<td>20422, 20356, 20297, 20158</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mention of cyclists in the transport plan</td>
<td>20641, 20605, 20599,</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support right turn ban from Main Road onto Beachville Road (Causeway end).</td>
<td>20400, 20398</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to see the 40 km/h speed limit reduced to 30 km/h</td>
<td>20605, 20599</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for roundabout installation at Beachville Road and Main Road intersection (Causeway end)</td>
<td>20207</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for traffic lights to be installed at Beachville Road and Main Road intersection</td>
<td>20338</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.20 Project team comments in relation to these are as follows (where relevant).

**Concern over increased congestion and traffic issues**

6.21 There were four comments from submitters who did not support the transport plan, in relation to the school traffic creating further issues in the area.

“Very concerned about the impact of significant increased traffic on homes and community in narrow Celia and Beachville Roads, congestion, parking and traffic speed. Neither road was ever intended as a main traffic thoroughfare to and from a school. Submitter ID #20422.

The transport plan provides three opportunities for accessing the school with either Main Road, Beachville Road or Celia Street, which should split up traffic numbers. The school is also working on a school travel plan as part of the conditions of the resource consent, this plan will work to actively encourage students to walk or cycle to school instead.

The Redcliffs Transport Plan will be an improvement to what is currently in place. The site will also be monitored to ensure that it is working appropriately.

**No mention of cyclists in the transport plan**

6.22 There were three comments from submitters who did not support the transport plan, as the plan made no mention of cyclists.

“I am concerned about the lack of cycling facilities in this plan. Main Road and Beachville Road are important cycling connections between Sumner to the east and the rest of Christchurch to
the west, and these works would be an excellent opportunity to make safer and more attractive”. Submitter ID #20605.

Cycle lanes will continue to operate along Main Road as they have done previously. The Coastal Pathway is also available for some pupils to use. There is not enough road space to separate the cycleway with separator posts and this route is not a major cycleway route. We also need to accommodate heavy vehicle trucks, as they will use Main Road again once Sumner Road is reopened.

Do not support right turn ban from Main Road onto Beachville Road

6.23 There were two comments from submitters who did not support the transport plan, as they do not support the right turn ban from Main Road onto Beachville Road (Causeway end).

“I support everything except the no right turn onto Beachville Road from Main Road – while I think it is a good idea to reduce potential congestion around the new pedestrian crossing, I am worried that it would funnel a significant amount of school traffic down Celia Street. Celia Street is narrow and not suited to heavy traffic volumes”. Submitter ID #20400

Please refer to project team comments in section 6.17 of this report.

Speed zone reduced from 40 km/h to 30 km/h

6.24 There were two comments from submitters who did not support the transport plan, as they would like to request the speed zone is changed to 30 km/h.

“I would also support lowering a speed limit to 30 km/h in a school zone rather than 40 km/h. A lower speed limit will not significantly increase travel time, as it does not affect average speed as much as it affects top speeds, but the security gain for cyclists, particularly children cycling to school, will be worth it”. Submitter ID #20605

Please refer to project team comments in section 6.16 of this report.

Request for roundabout installation at the Beachville Road and Main Road intersection

6.25 There was one submitter who did not support the transport plan, who suggested that a roundabout would work better at the Beachville Road and Main Road intersection (Causeway end).

“A safer option would be to realign McCormacks Bay Road slightly so that it lines up more closely with Beachville Road and install a mini roundabout”. Submitter ID #20207.

There would be a significant cost to install a roundabout at this intersection, as additional land would be required. Given the relatively low turning traffic volumes, compared to non-turning, the level of service for the side roads would not be improved by a roundabout, meaning that the sought after improvements would not be achieved by a roundabout.

Request for traffic lights to be installed at Beachville Road and Main Road intersection

6.26 There was one submitter who did not support the transport plan, who suggested that a set of signalised traffic lights would work better at the Beachville Road and Main Road intersection (Causeway end).

“For the McCormacks Bay/Beachville/Main Road intersections, install lights after the intersection (on the Causeway) to enable pedestrians/cyclist to join the coastal pathway”. Submitter ID #20338.

Please refer to project team comments in section 6.18 of this report.

Comments from those who did not indicate

6.27 There were four submitters who did not indicate on their submission form whether yes they support the plan or no they do not support the transport plan. The main comments related to
retaining the right turn, increased traffic and congestions concerns and request to reduce the speed limit proposed from 40 km/h to 30 km/h.

The project team comments in relation to these concerns are responded to in section 6.17, 6.21 and 6.16 of this report.

6.28 In summary, the main themes from all submissions relate to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No. of comments</th>
<th>Project team comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the 40 km/h school speed limit to 30 km/h (extend to Celia Street and Beachville Road).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>To be monitored, but a reduction would require NZTA approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move zebra crossing closer to the school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crossing is as close as we can technically get it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not ban the right turn onto Beachville Road from Main Road (Causeway end)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>For safety reasons the right turn is being banned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over increased congestion and traffic issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>We are not expecting this to be an issue with what is in place, but we will monitor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mention of cyclists in the transport plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The final plan to be approved now specifically marks out the cycle lanes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

6.29 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies, including the Land Sale Sub Committee’s recommendations adopted by Council on 7 September 2017.

Financial Implications

6.30 Cost of Implementation: $396,841

6.31 The following funding streams:

6.31.1 $183,000 received from the Ministry of Education

6.31.2 $213,841 programmed through the Master Plan ‘Main Road M3 Beachville Road Streetscape enhancements’

Legal Implications

6.32 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.

6.33 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

6.34 The legal consideration is that the proposal:

6.34.1 Enables conditions of Resource Consent to be enacted, agreed within the framework of resource Management Act s176, namely that:

“The school shall not commence operation at the new site until a full safety audit is undertaken in accordance with “Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects: Guidelines”, NZTA May 2013, with particular consideration given to:

Pedestrian crossing location and design for school pupils crossing Main Road to the school; and

The design of the Main Road/Beachville intersection; and

Vehicle Speeds in the vicinity of the school”.

"The school shall not commence operation at the new site until a full safety audit is undertaken in accordance with “Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects: Guidelines”, NZTA May 2013, with particular consideration given to:

Pedestrian crossing location and design for school pupils crossing Main Road to the school; and

The design of the Main Road/Beachville intersection; and

Vehicle Speeds in the vicinity of the school”.

"The school shall not commence operation at the new site until a full safety audit is undertaken in accordance with “Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects: Guidelines”, NZTA May 2013, with particular consideration given to:

Pedestrian crossing location and design for school pupils crossing Main Road to the school; and

The design of the Main Road/Beachville intersection; and

Vehicle Speeds in the vicinity of the school”.

"The school shall not commence operation at the new site until a full safety audit is undertaken in accordance with “Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects: Guidelines”, NZTA May 2013, with particular consideration given to:

Pedestrian crossing location and design for school pupils crossing Main Road to the school; and

The design of the Main Road/Beachville intersection; and

Vehicle Speeds in the vicinity of the school”.

"The school shall not commence operation at the new site until a full safety audit is undertaken in accordance with “Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects: Guidelines”, NZTA May 2013, with particular consideration given to:

Pedestrian crossing location and design for school pupils crossing Main Road to the school; and

The design of the Main Road/Beachville intersection; and

Vehicle Speeds in the vicinity of the school”.

"The school shall not commence operation at the new site until a full safety audit is undertaken in accordance with “Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects: Guidelines”, NZTA May 2013, with particular consideration given to:

Pedestrian crossing location and design for school pupils crossing Main Road to the school; and

The design of the Main Road/Beachville intersection; and

Vehicle Speeds in the vicinity of the school”.

"The school shall not commence operation at the new site until a full safety audit is undertaken in accordance with “Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects: Guidelines”, NZTA May 2013, with particular consideration given to:

Pedestrian crossing location and design for school pupils crossing Main Road to the school; and

The design of the Main Road/Beachville intersection; and

Vehicle Speeds in the vicinity of the school”.

"The school shall not commence operation at the new site until a full safety audit is undertaken in accordance with “Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects: Guidelines”, NZTA May 2013, with particular consideration given to:

Pedestrian crossing location and design for school pupils crossing Main Road to the school; and

The design of the Main Road/Beachville intersection; and

Vehicle Speeds in the vicinity of the school”.

"The school shall not commence operation at the new site until a full safety audit is undertaken in accordance with “Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects: Guidelines”, NZTA May 2013, with particular consideration given to:

Pedestrian crossing location and design for school pupils crossing Main Road to the school; and

The design of the Main Road/Beachville intersection; and

Vehicle Speeds in the vicinity of the school”.
6.34.2 The design safety audit has been completed, and a post-implementation safety audit will also be completed.

6.34.3 Meets the Conditions of Land Sale, with regards to the delivery of road safety measures and financial contributions towards the Project paid by the Ministry of Education:

"The Crown agrees to pay to the Council a minimum of $183,000 towards new traffic management and pedestrian safety systems, such sum to be paid on the Settlement Date."

**Risks and Mitigations**

6.35 There is a risk to the Ministry of Education’s project in the event that the proposed Part C matters are not resolved.

**Implementation and dependencies**

6.36 Approval of Part A matters by Council, including Cycle lanes, and inclusion of the temporary (School zone) speed limit.

6.37 Implementation of the temporary (school zone) speed limit must proceed in accordance with section 2.5 and 2.6 of the ‘Land Transport Rule Setting of Speed Limits (2017)’. Consultation with the Community Board and Community meets the requirements of the rule. Subject to Community Board approval, formal approval will be sought from the additional parties identified in the rule, including NZTA and Police. The proposed scheme meets the technical requirements for a school speed zone.

6.38 Option 1 would be constructed from mid-2019, in time for the proposed School opening currently scheduled for January 2020.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**

6.39 The advantages of this option include:

- Meets objectives relating to safety; and design is safety audited. Outcome of Audit finds no outstanding safety matters.
- Ensures that effects on the function of the Arterial Road network, including the strategic freight corridor, are limited.
- Minimum impact on surrounding communities (e.g. no reduction in availability of on street car parking).
- Achieves financial and legal requirements (outlined below, section 6.32).
- Designed to be appropriately scaled to meet anticipated needs and demands.
- Developed in partnership with the NZTA and Traffic Engineering Consultants, and considered the ‘best’ option, optimising costs and impacts, in light of an array of other design options.

6.40 The disadvantages of this option include:

- It has not been possible to include a crossing on Main Road in the immediate vicinity of the school entrance.

7. **Option 2 – Do not approve the Redcliffs Transport Plan and request staff to consider alternative designs and re-consult with the community.**

**Option Description**

7.1 Do not adopt the preferred option; adopt alternative designs.

**Significance**

7.2 The level of significance of this option could be high due to the Legal Implications (see paragraph 7.12).
7.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are to Consult (as defined within the Significance and Engagement Policy).

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

7.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**

7.5 Local residents surrounding the new Redcliffs School location and those who use the school are specifically affected by this option due to their proximity to the new school and their use of the school. Their views would need to be collected and considered again if a completely new traffic design was created.

7.6 At the close of consultation 48 submissions were received with 17 (36%) not in support. However, there were no submitters who indicated that a transport plan was not required at all and that staff should do nothing. Those who did not support the plan did acknowledge that changes need to be made to accommodate the new Redcliffs School location.

7.7 Alignment with Council Plans and Policies.

7.8 This option is likely to be inconsistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

7.8.1 Inconsistency – Does not respond to the Hearing Panel’s recommendations made to Council (7th September 2017) for a school speed zone ‘pedestrian safety systems that may be required’.

7.8.2 Amendment necessary – an alternative scheme could possibly meet requirements approved by Council.

**Financial Implications**

7.9 Cost of Implementation - Unknown

7.10 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Unknown

7.11 Funding source – Unknown

**Legal Implications**

7.12 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.

7.13 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

7.14 The legal consideration is that under Option 2:

7.14.1 The Ministry of Education cannot enact Conditions of Resource Consent, and henceforth would be unable to operate a school without being in breach of conditions.

**Risks and Mitigations**

7.15 Given uncertainty of Option 2, there is a risk that technical, financial and legal requirements would not be met. The ability of the Ministry of Education to deliver the proposed school, within the purview of its Conditions of Consent, would be uncertain.

**Implementation**

7.16 Implementation dependencies – unknown.

7.17 Implementation timeframe – unknown.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**

7.18 The advantages of this option include:

- No known advantages at this stage.
7.19 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Legal risks: The MoE would be unable to proceed with the proposed school, until such time that an alternative design was found to meet requirements of Conditions of Consent.

- Financial: There are no known sources of funding for alternative designs at this stage, especially those pertaining to more expensive options.

It is unlikely that options of greater expense (for example, traffic signals at Main Road/Beachville Road/McCormacks Bay Road) would be appropriately scaled to demand, forecast growth and unlikely to achieve value for money against any of the funding criteria.

**Attachments**

<table>
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**Confirmation of Statutory Compliance**

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

(i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and

(ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.
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</tr>
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</table>
Changes to Main Road and Beachville Road intersection

In order to improve safety and to avoid congestion at this intersection, the plan includes the removal of the right turn lane from Main Road into Beachville Road.

This will then permit those turning right from Main Road into Beachville Road, from blocking vehicles wanting to travel straight ahead towards the causeway, and then congestion on the road. This congested traffic could then also be an issue for pedestrians’ visibility when waiting to cross Main Road at the pedestrian refuge island. However, road users will still be able to turn right out of Beachville Road onto Main Road towards the causeway, as this movement will not create a safety issue.

The pedestrian island near this intersection on Main Road will also be extended to create space for more pedestrians to wait safely before they continue to cross the road.

Changes to pedestrian crossing on Main Road

With the new school coming, changes are needed on Main Road to make sure that children and their families can cross safely. A new zebra crossing (opposite 20 Main Road), operating with a school patrol (much like how Redcliffs School operated in the past) will be relocated, but closer to the school gate.

As there isn’t room to locate the crossing directly outside the school gate, we have instead located it as close as possible, and have also ensured that the location of the crossing suits all users.

Space has been left to the east of the proposed crossing for parents to drop off their children, and there is the opportunity to use the ‘old’ Redcliffs School car park, for parents to park and walk their children in. There is also plenty of parking available on Beachville Road, outside the school frontage. We’ve also listened to the Community concerns about on street parking, and the current proposal will ensure that there is no loss of on street parking.

Removal of the bus stop opposite 5 Main Road

The existing indented bus stop at this location requires removal for safety reasons. There is concern that parents will pull in here to drop off their children and then children would also cross from here, which could be dangerous. The kerb will instead be realigned and the indented bus space removed and no stopping lines will be re-marked along here instead.

Timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 November 2018</td>
<td>Consultation opened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 December 2018</td>
<td>Consultation closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>Decision meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>Project start (subject to approval)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To comment on the plan and find out more:

1. Go online ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay or complete the enclosed freepost form and return to:
   Christchurch City Council,
   PO Box 73016, Christchurch 8154

Consultation is open until 5pm Monday 17 December 2018

The next closest bus stop would then be 225m east (towards Redcliffs Village) of this one, which is approximately a 2-3 minute walk away.

Changes to the Beachville Road and Celia Street Intersection

For safety reasons, we are looking at squaring up the current layout and include an improved crossing facility. A new footpath along Celia Street will be built, where there is currently a section missing (along the new school frontage). These changes will make it easier and safer for children to cross the road and walk into the School. The street lighting along this section will also be reviewed and upgraded as necessary.

Installation of a new school speed zone

A new school speed zone has been included in this plan. This zone includes a 40km/h speed restriction on school days. This zone starts near the end of the causeway and covers a portion of Beachville Road, Celia Street and a small section of McCormacks Bay Road.

Have your say

Redcliffs Transport Project
Main Road, Beachville Road, Celia Street and McCormacks Bay Road

Closes Monday 17 December 2018

ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay

Purpose of this project

We are proposing changes to parts of Main Road, Beachville Road, Celia Street and McCormacks Bay Road in Redcliffs. We are working closely with the Ministry of Education with the aim of making it safer and easier for parents and children to access the new Redcliffs School, which is due to open in January 2020.

As part of preparing for the location of the new school we have had to consider:

- How and where children can cross Main Road safely.
- The safest locations for pick up and drop offs.
- How to make sure that drivers and crossing children can see each other.
- The best way to manage vehicle speeds.

What is included on the plan?

The plan includes these changes:

- Main Road and Beachville Road intersection - removal of the right turn into Beachville Road from Main Road. Road users will still be able to turn right out of Beachville Road onto Main Road.
- Installation of a new school speed zone with a 40 km/h speed limit - starting near the end of the causeway and covering a portion of Beachville Road, Celia Street, Main Road and a small section of McCormacks Bay Road.
- Main Road - removal of the zebra crossing opposite 45 Main Road and replacement with a pedestrian refuge.
- Main Road - Installation of a new school patrol zebra crossing opposite 25 Main Road, with a street lighting upgrade.
- Main Road (near Beachville Road) - repair of the safety barrier on the Beachville Road side and extension of the pedestrian island.

On street parking

The location of the new transport facilities such as signage, zebra crossing points or pedestrian refuge will not require the removal of any on street car parking. These have been placed in areas where parking is already unavailable.

Main Road - removal of the bus stop bay opposite 5 Main Road and kerb realignment to remove the indentation.
- Beachville Road and Celia Street intersection - installation of a new pedestrian refuge.
- Beachville Road and Celia Street intersection - installation of a new footpath and street lighting upgrade from SH3 Celia Street up to Beachville Road (where there is a small gap in the footpath network).

Talk to the team

Tuesday 27 November 2018, 4 pm to 6 pm (drop in at any time), Redcliffs Mt Pleasant Bowling Club, 9 James Street, Redcliffs.
HAVE YOUR SAY

Redcliffs Transport Project
Main Road, Beachville Road, Celia Street and McCormacks Bay Road
Closes Monday 17 December 2018

Save time and do it online ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay

Do you support the proposed traffic changes?
☐ Yes    ☐ No

Do you have any comments on the Redcliffs Transport Plan?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Please note:

We require your contact details as part of your submission - it also means we can keep you updated throughout the project.

Your submission, name and address are given to decision-makers (Community Board / Committee /Council) to help them make their decision.

Submissions, with names only, go online when the decision meeting agenda is available on our website.

If requested, submissions, names and contact details are made available to the public, as required by the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

If there are good reasons why your details and/or submission should be kept confidential, please contact our Engagement Manager on (03) 941 8999 or 0800 860 169 (Banks Peninsula).

Please fold with the reply paid portion on the outside, seal and return by 5pm, 17 December 2018

If you wish to attach extra paper, please ensure the folded posted item is no thicker than 6mm. Alternatively, you can send your submission in an envelope of any size and address it using “Freepost Authority No. 178”

Attention: Tara King
Senior Engagement Advisor
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 73016
Christchurch Mail Centre
Christchurch 8154
18. Christchurch Northern Corridor Downstream Effects Mitigation Plan (Draft)

Reference: 19/88719
Presenter(s): Andy Richards, Project Manager

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is to request the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board recommend to Council the endorsement of the Draft Downstream Effects Management Plan and for staff to undertake consultation on the recommendations contained within the plan.

Origin of Report
1.2 This report is staff generated following initial engagement with the community and completion of a draft plan suitable for consultation.
1.3 This report was presented to the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board on 25 January 2019 and they resolved:

“That the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board:


That the Council:

2. Receives the Draft Downstream Effects Management Plan for staff to commence engagement with the community on the recommendations contained within the plan.”

2. Significance

2.1 The decision in this report is of high significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the number of people affected, both directly and indirectly, and the high level of community interest. This preparation of the Downstream Effects Management Plan is also a condition of an Environment Court ruling in 2016.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board recommend to Council to:

1. Endorse the Draft Downstream Effects Management Plan for staff to commence engagement with the community on the recommendations contained within the draft plan.

4. Key Points

4.1 Under the conditions for the relevant Consent Order, Christchurch City Council is required to:
4.1.1 Address the downstream effects relating to traffic arising from the operation of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.
4.1.2 Engage an Independent Traffic Expert to recommend appropriate traffic mitigation measures in the form of a Management Plan
4.1.3 Engage with affected owners and occupiers (as identified in the Plan) and specified persons/groups regarding the Independents Expert’s recommendations
4.1.4 Carry out ongoing monitoring and identify the anticipated future increase in traffic as a result of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.

4.1.5 Carry out any recommended traffic mitigation measures if traffic volumes are anticipated to increase by over 30% on any street. Council will need to implement mitigation measures as soon as reasonably practicable and in accordance with the timeframes required by the Consent.

4.2 At the request of the Independent Traffic Expert Council staff have completed a first phase of community engagement to understand community concerns about expected increased traffic growth and potential traffic mitigation measures. The findings from this engagement have fed into the attached draft Downstream Effects Mitigation Plan that has been prepared by the Independent Traffic Expert.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Access to Commercial Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Access to Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Access to Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNC</td>
<td>Christchurch Northern Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPTED</td>
<td>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Cranford Street Upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTSP</td>
<td>Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMP</td>
<td>Downstream Effects Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECan</td>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>High Occupancy Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LILO</td>
<td>Left-In and Left-Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>Multi Criteria Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Major Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAE</td>
<td>Northern Arterial Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoR</td>
<td>Notice of Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONRC</td>
<td>One Network Road Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEll</td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth II Drive [State Highway 74]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANF</td>
<td>Safety Audit and Network Functionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Safer Cycling routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSCA</td>
<td>Safe Speed Community Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>Volume over road Capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

Introduction

This Plan recommends a programme of work to reduce the downstream effects of the Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC). It has been compiled to comply with the Notice of Requirement (NoR) ruling for the CNC for an independent traffic expert to develop a Downstream Effects Management Plan (the Plan). Where possible, it has been formulated to be consistent with national, regional, and local transport policy and to address transport concerns raised by stakeholders and the public during consultation. To minimise the impact of improvements on private land, the Plan has focused as far as possible on remedial treatments that can occur within the existing road reserve.

The Plan supports further travel demand management initiatives in northern Christchurch and beyond, to reduce the volume of vehicles with single occupants entering the urban road network. However, the focus of the Plan, as specified in the NoR decision, is to mitigate the impacts of the additional traffic that will enter the local network at Cranford Street. Even if travel demand management measures reduce future traffic volumes it is expected that most of the additional traffic as estimated from the transport models will still impact on this network and require various interventions.

Issue Identification

As specified in the NoR, the key focus of the Plan is to identify the preferred vehicle access routes for the additional traffic from the CNC, including trucks, that will occur on the downstream road network. To manage this traffic so that it uses the preferred routes and mitigate where possible adverse effects of the additional traffic, especially on local streets. A transport model has been used to assess the routes drivers are likely to take travelling from the CNC into the city centre in 2021 (opening year) and 2031 (design year). This modelling indicates that the preferred traffic routes, the arterials and collector streets, do not have adequate capacity to accommodate all the additional traffic (including trucks) and, without intervention, there would be a lot of rat-running traffic in local streets. The NoR specifies that when the rat-running traffic volumes on these local streets are 30% or greater than what would have been expected had the CNC not been built, then intervention is required to avoid, remedy, or mitigate these effects. The modelling shows that many local streets trigger this 30% increase, especially in 2031, if there is no intervention.

Whether on the main roads or local streets, the additional traffic from the CNC will adversely impact other road users, and specifically pedestrians and cyclists that use the roads affected. Of particular concern is how this traffic will impact on safety and access of less able pedestrians, such as school children, elderly, and those with a disability. The additional traffic will in some cases impact on local residents’ ability to safely access various community facilities (e.g. schools, parks, and commercial centres) and their own properties by walking, cycling, and driving/parking. The Plan has considered how these impacts might be avoided, remedied, or mitigated. In most cases localised studies have been recommended to look at these matters and develop suitable interventions.

Option Development

Based on an understanding of the likely transport impacts of the additional CNC traffic, two option development stages were undertaken. The first stage of the option development focused on options that would encourage the additional vehicles from the CNC to primarily use arterial and collector routes, and not use local streets. The second stage then considers how the increased safety and access requirements of different road users can be improved on streets with additional traffic flows.

Stage 1: Major Route and Traffic Calming Upgrades

During the first stage of option development both arterial/collector upgrades and traffic calming options were developed to keep the extra traffic from the CNC on the main routes. In the first assessment we considered arterial/collector and traffic calming measures on their own. We then considered several options that looked at a combination of arterial upgrades and traffic calming measures. The arterial/collector road improvements were developed to address capacity constraints that were identified along these routes; both midblock and at intersections, using local experience and the transport modelling. The traffic calming measures were developed for local streets that are expected to have a significant amount of rat-running traffic (defined as greater than 30% increase in traffic) with or without arterial/collector upgrades. The full list of major upgrades considered are presented below.
• Do Nothing – this results in rat-running on a lot of local streets
• Option 1. Traffic Calming Only
• Option 2. Arterial Upgrades Only. This included three-laning of Barbadoes Street and Madras (Forfar) Street, Cranford Street Clearaways and Berwick Street / Warrington Street capacity improvements
• Option 3 (a). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades. Arterial upgrades as per Option 2 except clearways on Barbadoes Street and Madras (Forfar) Street instead of permanent three-laning
• Option 3 (b). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades. Arterial upgrades as per Option 2, so permanent three-laning of Barbadoes and Madras (Forfar) Streets
• Option 3 (c). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades. Arterial upgrades as per Option 2 except extension of Barbadoes / Madras one-ways to Warrington Street.
• Option 4 (a). Traffic Calming and Clearaways on Cranford / Sherborne Streets from Innes Road to Bealey Avenue
• Option 4 (b) Traffic Calming and permanent four-laning on Cranford / Sherborne Street (option included to allow comparison of options with a more major upgrade of arterial roads)
• Option 5. Traffic Calming plus combined Arterial Options (Options 3(a) and 4(a))

The analysis of these options was undertaken using the CAST (Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic) transport model. This model indicated how successful the options were in keeping traffic on the main routes and discouraging rat-running in local streets.

A multi-criteria analysis (MCA) workshop was then undertaken of each option to determine the best performing options. This involved a number of transport specialists and an urban designer. The MCA looked at a number of factors, including impact on safety of different road users, whether the options met the objectives of the NoR, journey time benefits, timeframe to implement, construction costs, impacts on local businesses, social and amenity impacts, and environment impacts. The workshop participants, including the independent traffic expert, agreed the criterion and the weighting of each criterion and discussed and assessed the various options. The highest weighting went on community impacts (the last three criteria above). Journey time benefits only had a 10% weighting. The best performing options in order were 3 (c), 4(a) and 3 (a).

All three options have very similar upgrades on Cranford Street north of Berwick Street and along Berwick Street and Warrington Streets. They differ in the improvements south of Berwick Street on Cranford/Sherborne Streets, Forfar/Madras Streets and Barbadoes Street. Hence the Plan recommends that the improvements along Berwick and Warrington Streets and Cranford Street north are progressed to scheme design and the three options south of Berwick Street are further investigated and presented to the community for input before deciding on a preferred southern option (see Table 1 below). In addition to infrastructure changes, education, and enforcement aspects of the improvements, especially the peak period clearways, needs to be investigated and implemented.

A list of routes that are expected to require traffic calming has also been developed, based on the transport modelling. Careful monitoring of traffic volumes on local streets is required between 2020 and 2031 to assess the benefits of traffic calming measures and any streets that are adversely impacted by rat-running traffic as a result of drivers selecting alternative rat-running routes. Nine safe speed community areas are also proposed in the wider St Albans network to discourage rat-running.

Stage 2: Safe Access to Community Facilities

During the second option development phase, the impacts the additional traffic would have on all road users was considered, specifically those who live in or near the impacted road network and their ability to safely access various destinations within the local road network. The project has been split up into:

1. Safe access to School
2. Safer Cycling
3. Access to Parks
4. Access to Commercial Centres
Most of the issues raised by the public and stakeholders fit into one of these categories. One specific matter that does not is safe access into properties on arterial and collector roads with peak period clearways, like Cranford Street. The identification of issues with access and possible solutions to improve access will need to be assessed as part of the implementation of the clearways.

The key issues in terms of safe access to schools is access across Cranford Street for children walking to and from St Albans School. The children primarily use the Cranford Street /Westminster Street signalised intersection to access the school, but some also use the Berwick Street/Cranford Street signalised intersection. Due to several close (crash) misses, the school currently employs a cross warden at the Cranford Street /Westminster Street intersection to help children cross the road. With the proposed upgrades of this intersection (also Berwick Street /Cranford Street) the potential for a crash will increase if no safety improvements are made. As an interim measure it is proposed to lower the speed limit to 40km/h from north of Westminster Street to south of Berwick Street during school start and finish times, install a textured surface at the Westminster Street intersection and look at changes to the signals before the CNC opens. Further improvements need to be investigated and implemented within 3 years of the CNC opening.

The introduction of peak period clearways along Cranford Street down to Berwick Street and possibly other clearways further south makes such routes less safe for cycling, especially during the peak periods. It is not possible to rectify this without widening the road designation and purchasing additional land. Hence the recommended option is to direct cyclists onto other routes. The general increase in traffic across the network will also make it less safe to cycle on a number of other roads (e.g. Edgeware Road) without improved cycle facilities. To encourage local people to cycle and to direct them to use the Papanui Parallel cycleway (a separated north-south cycle path) on Ruitland Street, Trafalgar Street, and Colombo street, it is proposed to develop three east-west secondary cycle routes (along McCafferson Road, Westminster / Courtenay Streets and Edgeware Road). These will be feeder routes to the Papanui Parallel and will be a combination of on-road cycle lanes and off-road paths. It is also proposed that a secondary north-south cycle route be provided on the eastern side of Cranford Street to link cyclists that have origins and destinations on the eastern side of the main route to the city centre and St Albans Park.

The additional traffic generated by the CNC will also increase traffic volumes around St Albans Park, and to a lesser degree around Malvern Park. The three main roads around St Albans Park; Barbadoes Street, Farfar Street and Warrington Street, will have increased traffic flows making it more difficult to access the Park. The proposed traffic signals at Farfar Street /Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street /Warrington Street and the proposed new north-south cycleway to the east of Cranford Street will improve access to the north of the park. However, there are still challenges for pedestrians wanting to cross Farfar Street and Barbadoes Street further south. There have been a number of vulnerable road user crashes at the northern end of Barbadoes Street and the additional traffic from the CNC will exacerbate existing access issues. Hence, a study is proposed to look at access and safety issues for St Albans Park (and Malvern Park) and develop options to make access safer.

Local residents also need to have safe access to their local (shopping and eating) commercial centres. Christchurch City Council are keen to see local centres become more vibrant and for locals to walk and cycle to these centres. Access to these centres by vehicle, along with parking, is also required for some trips, especially those made by less able-bodied residents. A neighbourhood improvement plan has already been developed for the Edgeware Village and so a new plan for that centre is not proposed, although improvement options for cycling and walking along Edgeware Road will need to be integrated into that plan. It is recommended that transport studies are undertaken for the four local activity centres impacted by the CNC traffic: the Westminster Street/Cranford Street, Warrington Street/Barbadoes Street, Edgeware Street/Barbadoes Street and Rutland Street activity centres. Corridor assessments, along Edgeware Road and Westminster/Courtenay Streets are also required to look at enhancing access and amenity for pedestrians of all abilities. The improvements that are recommended in these studies should be implemented to offset the access and safety consequences of the additional traffic.

The key outcomes that are desired from all the proposed studies and improvements is a network of roads that are safer and ‘healthier’, even with the increased traffic volumes. Hence it is important that all designs go through a road safety and healthy streets review in order to maximise the benefits of such improvements. With respect to safety, in addition to traditional safety audits, it is recommended that all designs are assessed using the Austroads safe system assessment framework which targets crash risk that could lead to serious injury and fatal crashes. To achieve healthier streets, it is recommended that all street upgrades are assessed using the Healthy Streets framework that has been developed by Transport for London.
The Downstream Effects Management Plan

Table 1 shows a summary of the studies and improvement options that are proposed to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the impacts of the CNC. This is based on analysis and review of the transport issues using modelling and experience. A key element of the Plan is the ongoing monitoring of the transport flows (including pedestrian and cycle volumes), vehicles speeds, and environmental impacts (vehicle emissions, noise and vibration). Of particular importance will be how traffic flows through the downstream road network in the years following the opening of the CNC. While arterial and collector upgrades and traffic calming measures will be introduced to encourage drivers to use the major roads, it is highly likely that some drivers will choose to use local streets as rat-runs, and that they may behave in ways not predicted by the transport models. Hence the monitoring will identify issues that may require other changes to the road network such as traffic calming of additional streets and upgrades of signalised intersections. The monitoring is expected to have the greatest impact on the composition of the Stage 3 projects.

While ideally some of the Stage 2 projects are undertaken before the CNC opens, there is limited time to make all the changes and hence the most crucial changes to prevent excessive congestion and rat-running have been prioritised in Stage 1 (to be in place ideally before CNC opens), with other projects delayed. The impact of this may be adverse transport effects in the short-term. Hence it is important that Council act quickly to address the worst of any adverse transport effects (e.g. high levels of rat-running) once the CNC opens. We would recommend rapid implementation of projects, where this is practical, and other temporary measures to address the effects that are identified in the monitoring.

Table 1 – Lists of improvement projects and studies categorised by Stage (note some projects appear in two or more stages as they consist of more detailed studies and the implementation of improvements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 – Projects and studies to be undertaken before the CNC opens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Road (MR) Upgrades:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR1 (Cranford Street Clearways) – Peak Period Clearways along Cranford Street from Innes Road to Berwick Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR2 (Westminster/Cranford Intersection) – Upgrades to Westminster Street/Cranford Street Intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR3 (Berwick/Warrington Upgrades) – Upgrading of Berwick Street/Cranford Street signalised intersection and signalisation of the Forfar Street/Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street Intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR4 (South Berwick Upgrades) – Downstream of Berwick Street arterial upgrade option that comes out of the scoping study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR5 (HOV lanes on Cranford-Sherborne) – Investigate extending the southern HOV (high occupancy vehicle) lanes on the CNC through to Bealey Avenue and installing a northbound HOV lane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safe System Community Areas (SSCA):**

SSCA 1 to 9 – Introduce nine 30km/h (or 40km/h) reduced speed limit areas through the downstream local road network

Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:

Introduce traffic calming on TC1 – Mersey Street (Innes to Forfar), TC2 – Knowles Street, TC 3 – Weston Street, TC 4 – McFaddens Road, TC7 – Malvern Street (LILO) and TC8 – Dee Street (LILO)

**Safe Access to Schools (AS):**

AS1 – Safe Access Across Cranford Street – This study will look at a range of options, including a new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance.

AS2 – Interim Improvements on Cranford Street – As an interim measure it is suggested that as part of MR1 (Cranford Clearways) and MR2 (Westminster Street/Cranford Street Intersection) a 40km/h speed limit be introduced during school arrival and departure time on Cranford Street from approximately 50m north of Westminster Street to 50m south of Berwick Street, a coloured surfacing be installed at the Westminster Street/Cranford Street Intersection, and left turning red arrows be used as protection for crossing pedestrians.
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### Safe Cycling Routes (SC):

**SC1 (Cycle Wayfinding Signage)** – Development of and implementation of a wayfinding signage plan that directs cyclists at the northern end of Cranford Street (at McFaddens Road) and southern end of Cranford Street to safer cycling routes.

**SC2 (McFaddens Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Undertake a route study of a cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road.

**SC3 (Westminster/Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Undertake a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

**SC4 (Edgeware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Undertake a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

**SC5 (North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Undertake a route study of an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street.

### Stage 2 – Projects and Studies that need to be undertaken within three years of CNC opening

#### Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:

Introduce traffic calming on TC9 – Roosevelt Street, TC12 – Caledonian Street, TC13 - Edgeware Road (Village), TC14 – Manchester Street and TC15 – Westminster Street /Courtenay Street, where expected increases in traffic volumes are validated by the monitoring data.

#### Safe Access to Schools (AS):

**AS1 – Safe Access Across Cranford Street** – Implement any options identified in this study such as a new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance.

#### Safe Cycling Routes (SC):

**SC2 (McFaddens Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Construct a secondary cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road.

**SC3 (Westminster/Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Construct a secondary cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

**SC4 (Edgeware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Construct a secondary cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

#### Access to Parks (AP):

**AP1 (St Albans Park Access Plan)** – Development of a plan that will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists.

**AP2 (Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan)** – Development of a plan that will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists.

#### Access to Commercial Centres (AC):

**AC1 – Westminster/Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study.** Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

**AC2 – Barbadoes/Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study.** Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

**AC3 – Barbadoes/Edgeware Local Activity Centre Transport Study.** Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

**AC4 – Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study.** Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

**AC5 – Westminster/Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar)** – Undertake this study which will focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users.

**AC6 – Edgeware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes)** – Undertake this study which will focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users.

### Stage 3 – Projects that could be undertaken any time between the opening of the CNC and 2031
Monitoring

Ongoing monitoring of traffic, pedestrians, and cycle volumes, crashes and vehicles speeds, emissions, noise, and vibration on major roads and some local streets is to occur annually, or when required more often, after the CNC opens to validate the plans and projects already identified in this document, and through the various studies that are specified.

It is expected that additional interventions will be required to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the effects of the additional CNC traffic, including the impact of trucks, that is identified in this monitoring. In terms of local streets, intervention is required if the traffic volumes increase by 30% above what might have been expected on the route if the CNC had not been built. In terms of other interventions (e.g. arterial upgrades) this will be the result of congestion or safety concerns with respect to all road users. Some improvement may also not be required (e.g. if local road traffic does not increase by 30%, as predicted by the modelling). Consultation on all proposed changes will be undertaken.

An indication of Stage 3 improvement projects is provided below. This list will need to be reviewed and where necessary revised once the actual impacts of the CNC traffic is known from the monitoring.

Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:

Introduce traffic calming only where monitoring indicates high levels of rat-running are occurring (may include additional streets): TC – 5 McFadden Road, Knowles Street, Weston Street (east Cranford), TC6 – Jamieson Street, TC10 – Forfar Street, TC11 – Flackton Street, TC16 – Severn Street, TC17 – Thames Street, TC 18 – Ayleford Street, TC19 – Kensington Avenue, TC 20 – Philipotts Road and TC 21- Francis Street.

Safe Cycling Routes (SC):

SC5 (North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Construct an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street.

Access to Parks (AP):

AP1 (St Albans Park Access Plan) – Implementation of the access plan as required to address access issues.

AP2 (Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan) – Implementation of the access plan as required to address access issues.

Access to Commercial Centres (AC):

AC1 – Westminster/Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study – Implement study recommendations

AC2 – Barbadoes/Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study – Implement study recommendations

AC3 – Barbadoes/Edgware Local Activity Centre Transport Study – Implement study recommendations

AC3 – Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study – Implement study recommendations

AC4 – Westminster/Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar) – Implement study recommendations

AC5 – Edgware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes) – Implement study recommendations
1. Introduction and Background

Planning for a new arterial route from the Christchurch CBD (Four Avenues) to the northern suburbs of Christchurch and beyond has been ongoing for many decades. Over the last decade a preferred route has been identified and designed for the northern section of this route. This preferred route is called the Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC) which, at the time of this report, is under construction with a planned completion date of mid-2020. The CNC will increase traffic volumes on the urban road network south of the project.\(^1\) The Downstream Effects Management Plan (the Plan) considers the impact of this additional traffic and what changes are required to the network to minimise the impact of this additional traffic travelling from the CNC through to the CBD. The Plan has been compiled to satisfy the requirements of the Notice of Requirement (NoR) ruling for the CNC (Appendix A). The rest of this introduction provides background and history of the CNC (decades of transport planning on a northern route), that helps set the context of the Plan.

1.1 Christchurch Northern Corridor and Requirement for a Downstream Effects Management Plan

The Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC) project is an alliance project currently being undertaken by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZ Transport Agency), and Christchurch City Council\(^2\). As part of this project a new four-lane motorway will connect SH1 from just south of the Waimakariri Bridge with Cranford Street about 500m north of the McFaddens Road / Cranford Street intersection (see Figure 1-1). The project also includes new pedestrian and cycle facilities\(^3\).

![Figure 1-1: Christchurch Northern Corridor](Source: https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/projects/christchurch-northern-corridor/CNC-Map-Poster.pdf)

A section of Cranford Street (the southern end of the CNC) will also increase from a two-lane road to four-lanes with a median. As part of the project the Innes Road / Cranford Street intersection will also be subject to works to enlarge its capacity. A representation of these changes, including active mode provisions, are shown in Appendix B.

In July 2015 Independent Hearings Commissioners heard the designation case for the CNC. The designation was approved subject to a number of conditions. A major concern raised by submitters was the downstream effects of the CNC, especially on local roads within St Albans and adjoining suburbs. To address this concern a condition was added that required Christchurch City Council to engage a suitably qualified independent traffic expert who would produce a Downstream Effects Management Plan. Dr Shane Turner of StanTeC was appointed to this role.

The Plan is the outcome of investigations on likely downstream effects of the CNC and recommends works that could be undertaken to address those effects. Given the uncertainty around the effects, which are

\(^1\) Refer to Section 4.1.2.1

\(^2\) Information on this project can be found at [https://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/christchurch-motorways/christchurch-northern-corridor/](https://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/christchurch-motorways/christchurch-northern-corridor/)


\(^4\) Downstream as defined by the Notice of Requirement means south of the Innes Road / Cranford Street intersection. For the purposes of the DEMP, ‘south’ of the CNC has been interpreted as including local and collector roads between Innes and McFaddens due to the interconnectivity of the local road network.
based on land use estimates and expected driver behaviour, a key aspect of the Plan is the monitoring of transport effects once the CNC opens, and comparing these with conditions prior to the CNC (minus expected network growth without the CNC). However, given the increase in traffic volume from day 1 some improvements do need to be in place before the CNC is opened (expected to be in 2020).

1.2 History of the Christchurch Northern Arterial (now CNC)

Various traffic corridor plans have been conceived in planning for Christchurch since the 1950s. In 1962 the Christchurch Regional Planning Authority proposed the Northern Arterial Concept Route; roughly following the path of the current Northern Arterial however extending further south through St Albans. During the 2nd review of the plans the corridor was changed so that new arterial would extend to Bealey Avenue where it would connect with the one-way pair: Barbadoes and Madras Street. In 1989 the Northern Arterial Designation was narrowed in width at the Redwood/Belfast portion. Later, the St Albans portion of the designation was removed from the Christchurch City District Scheme. The following excerpt is taken from Christchurch City Centre – 40 years of Change, and it explains some of the reasons why the network has been developed the way it has in Northern Christchurch:

"During the 1980s...the Christchurch City Council made successive reductions to the proposed road network in suburban areas. These changes were in response to a combination of other factors including: slower population growth, economic downturn – less central employment, limited funding based on benefit/cost ratios, community acceptance of greater congestion, increasing opposition from affected residents, councillor opposition in the 70s and 80s. Subsequently in the agreed 1989 regional plan the road network and hierarchy of roads were generally retained but the motorways were deferred still further on the assumption that the arterial "at-grade" road network would suffice. This policy, together with the reliance on benefit/cost for national funding, supported the ongoing construction of more arterial all-purpose roads in the suburbs." (Christchurch City Centre – 40 Years of Change, Traffic, Planning – 1959-1999, Malcom Douglass, Christchurch City Council, 2000 [p1]).

Clearly, there has been much discussion and investigation on the north–south transport connections in Northern Christchurch for at least the last 50 – 60 years. During that time larger motorway connections (passing through urban Christchurch) have been considered, planned, and eventually withdrawn. The history of these decisions has been important in the preparation of the Plan as it is not intended to re-litigate or reconsider past discarded options, or options of a similar nature and scale, which have shown to be out of favour,

Given the history and strong views of the local community, the Plan is focused on using existing roads to carry the additional traffic associated with the CNC. It also seeks to minimise the impact of any upgrades on private property and especially building structures within the urban area. Hence wherever possible the focus is on remaining within current road reserves.

An important part of the Plan is understanding the impact that the additional CNC traffic could have on the local community, and how this can be avoided, remedied or mitigated. This includes minimising the impact of the additional CNC traffic on safe access to parks, schools, businesses and housing. It is also important that the future transport network supports transport choice, and in particular walking, cycling, and public transport. A legacy of the Plan should also be improvements in amenity and urban design to streets within the community.

---

5 https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/projects/northern-arterial/docs/nart_project-timeline.pdf
6 Christchurch City Centre – 40 Years of Change, Traffic, Planning – 1959-1999, Malcom Douglass CCC, 2000 (p11)
2. Report Structure

The report begins (Section 3) by summarising the various national, regional, and local transport planning strategies that have been agreed and outlines the current road network and operating conditions for different road users, including any existing road safety issues.

The report then outlines the purpose and objectives of the study and the methodology that has been adopted to undertake the transport assessment (Section 4). It also specifies the ‘balanced’ transport planning approach that we have attempted to undertake that looks to minimise the impact of the additional traffic on local streets, but also provide for, and encourages, greater use of other transport modes, or at the very least, higher occupancy rates in motor vehicles.

Section 5 discusses the transport modelling that has been undertaken to understand the likely impacts of the additional traffic from CNC (currently expected to open in mid-2020) on the downstream road network in 2021 (represents opening year) and 2031 (design year) if no changes are made. The modelling assesses the impacts of the CNC against what is expected in terms of traffic growth on the wider network if the CNC was not built.

The consultation undertaken with stakeholders and the public is summarised in Section 6. Wherever possible the concerns raised by the public and various organisations have been addressed in the option development. However, not all issues raised can be addressed, as many fall outside the scope of this assessment, or are in conflict with other issues and options raised.

The option development phase is presented in Section 7. The first iteration of the option development focused on the local streets that had greater than a 30% increase in traffic and also capacity constraints on the urban arterial/collector network. The focus at this level being to minimise the number of local streets impacted by a combination of arterial/collector road upgrades (the carrot) and local road traffic calming and speed limit reductions (the stick). The second iteration of the option development looks at options to minimise the impact of the additional traffic on safe access to schools, safe cycling through the network, access to parks, and access to local and neighbourhood activity/community centres.

Section 8 and 9 present the recommended downstream improvement plan. It highlights improvements that need to be undertaken before the opening of the CNC to address impacts associated with the sudden increase in traffic as a result of the CNC opening. It then outlines improvements that should be undertaken shortly after the opening and through to approximately ten years after the opening (up to design year 2031). The Plan has a strong monitoring focus to assess the impact of traffic growth between opening and 2031. The timing of upgrades beyond the opening will be tied to the impacts observed in the monitoring. Some upgrade projects may be delayed, and other projects brought forward depending on the monitoring outcomes, and new projects may be identified based on traffic effects not predicted in the modelling (e.g. local street rat-running).
3. Background Review

This section outlines briefly the key national, regional, and local transport strategies that have been agreed by various organisations for transport planning activities within Christchurch. It then provides an overview of the existing transport network and how this operates. This includes bus and cycling routes, and road safety issues. There are a number of existing transport issues on the current road network but only some of these issues will be impacted by the CNC traffic, and need to be addressed in the Plan. More information on these issues is presented in Section 6.

3.1 National, Regional, and Local Strategies

Various national, regional, and local strategies exist which have guided the direction of the Plan. Their respective relevance to the Plan is that the options need to be conscious of, and aim to satisfy (where possible), the relevant objectives contained in these strategies.

3.1.1 National

The latest Government Policy Statement has four strategic directions: Safety, Access, Environment, and Value for Money. These strategic directions were considered during option conception and in the application of the multi-criteria analysis.

The Safer Journeys Strategy (2010-2020) guides how safety concerns will be addressed in New Zealand over the period 2010-2020. It outlines the Safe System approach which recognises the vulnerability of road users, and the four pillars of safe roads and road sides, safe speeds, safe vehicles, and safe road use, under which safety is to be addressed. In urban areas the safety of pedestrians (especially vulnerable pedestrians; young, and elderly) and cyclists needs to be considered alongside vehicle safety.

3.1.2 Regional

The Regional Land Transport Plan (2015-2025) outlines five regional objectives; 1) A land transport network that addresses current and future transport demand, 2) A land transport system that is increasingly free from death and serious injury, 3) The Canterbury earthquakes recovery is supported, 4) The land transport network is resilient and supports long-term sustainability, and 5) Investment in land transport infrastructure and services is efficient.

In addressing the downstream effects, the formation of the Plan has been particularly conscious of regional objectives 1, 2, and 5, as well as long-term sustainability mentioned in objective 4. Resilience was considered less of a priority due to the various routes available in Christchurch should, for example, Cranford Street becomes temporarily unavailable. It should be noted, however, that any implementation of works must also be conscious of earthquake recovery projects when they occur.

3.1.3 Local

The Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan (CTSP) has four goals: 1) Improve access and choice, 2) Create safe, healthy, and liveable communities, 3) Support economic vitality, and 4) Create opportunities for environmental enhancements. The Plan seeks to align with the CTSP; namely to use the existing road network more efficiently. Therefore, the Plan has concentrated on low impact, at grade, treatments.

The Long-Term Plan (LTP) sets out Christchurch City Council’s funding priorities for transport over the next 10 years (2018-2028). Their commitment to the CNC is outlined there, along with other key projects such as Accessible City Major Cycle Routes, a local cycle network (connecting to major cycle routes), pedestrian improvements plan, and Public Transport Infrastructure. Achieving mode shift (including better mode choices) is one of the level of service targets for the active transport in the LTP. Indicative funding has also been allocated in the LTP for Downstream Effects Management Plan projects in the period 2018/19 to 2023/24.

---

7 http://www.saferjourneys.govt.nz/
3.2 Local Network Conditions & Description

This section of the report provides an overview of the existing down-streams urban transport network south of the CNC.

3.2.1 Route and Road User Hierarchy

Routes vary significantly in function. Some are used only for through movements (for example a motorway), while others are mainly used for access (a cul-de-sac). In response to this, the road network is categorised into hierarchy which enables planning and decisions to be made, some of which have wide effects. The route hierarchy in the vicinity of Cranford Street (which is relevant here) is presented in Figure 3-1 from Christchurch City Council's District Plan. A similar hierarchy is given in the CISP.

![Figure 3-1: Road Hierarchy (Source: http://www.prepredistrictplan.ccc.govt.nz/images/DistrictPlanImages/Chapter%207%20Transport/Operative/OperativeFig7_17a.jpg (note: some street names added))]  
A key objective of the Plan is to keep the majority of vehicles on principal routes (arterials, distributors, and collectors).

Cranford Street from the connection of the CNC to Innes Road is a major arterial, south from there it becomes a minor arterial primarily as it moves through community centres like Westminster Street / Cranford Street, and Edgeware Village, Innes Road and Berwick Street / Warrington Street are also classified as minor arterials. Collector roads in the vicinity of Cranford Street include McFaddens Road, Rutland Street, Westminster Street / Courtenay Street / St Albans Street, Madras Street, and Barbadoes Street.

Based on this hierarchy, the bulk of the north-south traffic from the CNC should be accommodated on Cranford, Berwick, Warrington, Madras, Barbadoes, and Sherborne Streets. While Rutland Street and Springfield Road are also collectors, Rutland Street now forms part of a major cycle route and hence it is desirable to keep traffic volumes on Rutland Street at lower levels.

NZ Transport Agency’s One Network Road Classification (ONRC) system also classifies Christchurch’s urban roads. This system shows Madras Street and Barbadoes Street on an equivalent hierarchy to

---

9 Definitions of the respective road hierarchies can be found in the Council’s District Plan
Cranford Street and Sherborne Street (arterials\textsuperscript{11}), and also highlights the importance of Forfar Street, which is classified as a primary collector under the ONRC. Based on ONRC categories the study has assessed using Madras and Barbadoes for carrying additional north—south traffic and Forfar Street carrying more traffic than the majority of local streets in the area.

### 3.2.2 Active Modes and Public Transport

Christchurch City Council have been active in promoting active and public transport modes in the northern suburbs of Christchurch, by identifying and installing infrastructure to support these travel options. Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury (ECan) are planning to do more upgrades, and promotion, to support greater use of these modes. We support further initiatives to move people out of cars and into other transport modes.

Christchurch City Council are currently investing in the development of separated cycleways\textsuperscript{12} as part of their Major Cycle Route (MCR) project, which will eventually deliver 13 major cycleways. The Papanui Parallel Cycleway was one of the first to be constructed, and its alignment through the subject area can be seen in Figure 3-2. Further cycleways are planned in the wider area including; the Northern Line, and the cycle trail along the CNC, as well as a network of secondary cycle routes connecting to the major cycleway network\textsuperscript{13}. The CNC cycle trail will eventually allow cyclists to travel from the Waimakariri District to the Papanui Parallel and into the city. The CNC also includes a cycle track to the east along GEIl Drive. Limited work has been undertaken to date around key secondary cycle route linkages to the Papanui Parallel. We do see the development of such routes being important as traffic volumes grow in this network.

Christchurch City Council have a project to create a link between the CNC and the Papanui Parallel, called the Grassmere Link. Council have allocated funding for this project in the 2020 to 2024 financial years. This project will be delivered as part of the CNC.

\textsuperscript{11} ONRC divides New Zealand’s roads into categories based on how busy they are, whether they connect to important destinations, or are the only route available. Within this arterial is broadly defined as ‘link regionally significant places and industries’ (Source: https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/Road-Efficiency-Group/docs/ONRCP/generalguid.pdf)

\textsuperscript{12} https://ccc.govt.nz/transport/cycling/major-cycle-routes/about-cycle-routes/

Bus routes in the vicinity of Cranford Street are shown in (Figure 3-3). The Orange Line bus route is located on Cranford Street, From the Christchurch Northern Corridor connection, the Orange Line continues down Cranford Street as far as Edgeware Road where it moves across to Colombo Street. Other nearby bus routes include ‘44 Shirley’, ‘100 Wigram/The Palms’, the Orbiter which turns right from Innes Road (east) onto Cranford Street under the new route, and the Blue Line which connects Rangiora to Christchurch City Centre via Papanui Road.

ECAn have plans to increase the frequency of bus services (on the Orange Line) on Cranford Street. Further bus priority measures are currently being investigated on Main North Road leading into Papanui Road 14. One benefit of the CNC is that it is expected to reduce traffic volumes on Main North Road and Papanui Road allowing better bus priority on this corridor.

ECAn (and NZ Transport Agency) have also previously investigated Park N Ride facilities in northern Christchurch. Any facility needs to be located so that it benefits from the bus priority improvements on Main North Road and Papanui Road.

We support citywide initiatives that encourage more trips by bike, public transport, or walking. We also support initiatives to encourage car-pooling, including HOV lanes.

### 3.2.3 Existing Traffic Conditions and Crash Analysis

Historical crash data is available for the network south of the CNC but there are limited traffic counts available for the existing road network. The traffic counts that are available are shown in Appendix C. As part of the monitoring a lot more (baseline) traffic counts are being collected before the CNC opens.

The crash history shows that generally the majority of crashes (in the period 2012-2016) in the downstream network have occurred on higher volume roads such as Cranford Street, Innes Road, and Hills Road. In general, the data aligns with what would be expected relative to a typical network hierarchy: high volumes on arterials and collectors, and a relationship between traffic flow and crash incidence.

Of the death and serious injuries that have occurred during the 2012-2016 timespan, the majority have involved turning or crossing traffic mainly at intersections. Hence particular attention needs to be given to the design of intersections as traffic volumes increase.

Pedestrian crashes have occurred east of Cranford Street on Innes Road (near school crossing), and also around Edgeware Village and near St Albans Park. In total there were 11 pedestrian (including one mobility) crashes that occurred in the study area in the period of 2012-2016. Of these, two pedestrians were minors, and three were older than 65. The crashes resulted in two Deaths or Serious Injuries [DSI] (only 8% of the DSI) which is lower than the national average 15 for 2016 (10%).

There were three recorded bicyclist DSI in the study area (12.5% of the DSI), which is higher than the national average of 6.2% for 2016, but fairly typical of Christchurch where cycle numbers are higher. Cyclist crashes have generally occurred south of Westminster Street. Cranford Street has experienced a higher amount of motorcycle crashes than most other nearby streets.

Speed has also been a factor. Cranford Street performed relatively well compared with other major roads, except around the Westminster Street / Cranford Street intersection, and immediately south of the Berwick Street / Cranford Street intersection. Locations where speeds were a bigger factor include Barbadoes Street between Edgeware Road and Warrington Street, and Flockton Street. This may be a result of the current wide lanes on these roads and the unsignalised Barbadoes/ Warrington intersection.

More detail on current crash patterns is provided in Appendix C. The pre-CNC crash data will form an important baseline for monitoring the crash impacts on the network following the opening of the CNC.

---

4. Purpose of the Plan

4.1 CNC Notice of Requirement (NoR)

The primary purpose of the Plan, as specified in the NOR, is to identify downstream effects (from the southern end of the NAE/CSU18) of the CNC and develop a plan that addresses these effects. This requires identifying what needs to happen before the CNC has opened and what level of monitoring and interventions are required to mitigate adverse effects between 2020 (opening year) and 2031 (design year).

4.1.1 NoR Objectives

The objectives of the investigation, as stated in the Notice of Requirement (NoR), into the downstream effects are:

(a) To identify preferred vehicle access routes, particularly for trucks, between the end of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and the Central City (that is between the end of the NAE/CSU and the City centre); and

(b) To identify strategies to keep vehicles on preferred vehicle access routes; and

(c) To discourage vehicles away from public transport routes and walking or cycling routes such as Main North Road / Papanui Road and Ruland Street corridors respectively.

These objectives are limited in scope and are motor vehicle centric. While objective 3 may consider other modes, it does not cover improved infrastructure over the network for other modes to offset the additional traffic volumes. To be consistent with the various national, regional, and local transport strategies it is important that the Plan developed considers a number of other transport planning matters (e.g. safe access to schools), and especially the impacts of the additional CNC traffic on walking, cycling, and public transport on the downstream road network. Hence the Plan includes improvements that extend beyond these objectives.

4.1.2 NoR Effects Management

The NoR also states that: This Management Plan is to ensure downstream effects are appropriately managed and to:

(a) Assess the existence, nature, and extent of any increased traffic on streets adjacent to, or adjoining Cranford Street attributable to the NAE/CSU that might cause or contribute to a loss of service to any of these streets for up to 10 years after the opening date of the NAE/CSU;

(b) Implement measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate such effects, where these are more than minor, in a timely and cost-effective manner and where appropriate and practicable; and

(c) Monitor the efficacy of the measures for an appropriate period and implement further remedial action, if this is necessary and appropriate.

Here we have taken a broader view on the measures that need to be undertaken to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the traffic effects. It is not just being a matter of keeping the traffic on main roads and discouraging them from using local streets and routes currently prioritised for public transport (Main North Road) and cycling (Ruland Street), but also mitigating the effects on other modes of the increased traffic. For example, the large increase in traffic on Cranford Street will impact 1) on safety of school children crossing the corridor to access St Albans School, 2) cyclists who use Cranford Street and 3) pedestrians and drivers who want to access the Westminster/Cranford local activity centre. Measures to mitigate these three risks have been considered in the Plan.

4.1.2.1 30% Traffic Growth Threshold

It was stipulated in the NoR that in order to be considered for treatment a street must have experienced in excess of 30% increase on the traffic volume that preceded the CNC. Additionally, underlying traffic growth was not to be included. It was also made clear that in the event of a street exceeding the threshold that works did not necessarily need to be undertaken to reduce the traffic volume.

---

18 NAE refers to “Northern Arterial Extension” (the connection between SH74 and Cranford Street), CSU refers to “Cranford Street Upgrade”. Both form part of the greater Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC) project.
This requirement is significantly more complex than it appears. Initially, when the CNC is completed and connected to the existing network, it will be relatively simple to deduce where a 30% increase has occurred exclusive of non-CNC related growth. The complexity of accurately making this calculation will concen- trate the longer time frame passes from 2021.

While this threshold seems relevant for local streets, which carry modest volumes, the same cannot be said of arterial roads and some collector streets. Many of the arterials, and especially some of the intersections, would experience congestion well before they get a 30% increase in traffic, if changes are not made to the arterials to remove severe congestion, then it will be difficult to mitigate the 30% growth in traffic on some local streets. Hence our approach with arterials has been to look at where congestion is expected to occur and look at options to reduce congestion where this does reduce the number of local streets impacted by more than 30% additional traffic.

### 4.1.2.2 Monitoring the Threshold

The streets that are expected to get a 30% increase in traffic by 2031 or may get an increase (based on local knowledge) will be monitored from 2020 through to 2031. Baseline data from these streets is being collected in 2018. There are some challenges in monitoring local streets as the additional growth threshold is the additional growth that has occurred beyond what might have been expected from natural traffic growth without the CNC.

There are many societal events which affect the number of trips undertaken on a network, land use changes, economic changes, and political changes to name a few. Given time, changes will occur, and these will need to be updated in a base model. There are also many specific changes that will occur on the network which will also need to be updated within the base model. These changes are relatively simple to take care of in a model. However, a much more difficult undertaking is to uncouple changes made to the downstream network in response to the CNC; changes which affect the traffic volume on various streets (increases and decreases) which may not have been undertaken had the CNC not been constructed, or at least not within the set timespan outlined in the NoR. Over time it will become increasingly difficult to separate the impact of these downstream treatments and the CNC itself in terms of their consequence to the network’s performance. Section 8.1 discusses the monitoring method that we suggest being used to monitor traffic volume increases.

It is also proposed to monitor the vehicle emission, noise, and vibration impacts of the additional traffic on arterials and collector routes. This monitoring is in response to concerns raised by the community.

### 4.2 Methodology

The NoR set out the framework for the appointment and methodology of the Plan. Prior to the operating of the CNC, Christchurch City Council were to appoint a suitably qualified independent traffic engineering expert to investigate and design an appropriate methodology. To avoid doubt the NoR stated what was expected to be included in the methodology. The following headings outline the methodology we have adopted to respond to the various elements expected by the NoR.

#### 4.2.1 Identify Affected Streets, specifically those by CNC

Streets affected by the CNC were primarily identified using the CAST Saturn Model. The model outputs highlighted midblock locations that exceeded the 30% growth requirement of the NoR in the Am Peak, PM Peak and all day. A model was used as the network size is too great to attempt to conceptualise the impact only through the experience of individuals. Notwithstanding, models are limited in their ability to reflect dynamic human choices, due to the many variables, and varying importance of variables, that can influence trip distribution. Therefore, the streets identified in the model were subjected to community consultation, expert knowledge of the network (and network management in general), and with other experts during the workshop.

The monitoring of streets between 2020 and 2031 will identify the actual streets impacted by the CNC by more than 30%, which may or may not align with that shown in the modelling. The local streets affected by the CNC (from modelling and local knowledge) if no arterial upgrades occur are shown in Section 7.2.4. The local streets expected to be impacted under the two arterial upgrade options are shown in Section 7.2.4.

#### 4.2.2 Assess Current Vehicle Usage and Service

Various sources were available to assess the baseline traffic volumes for the Plan. The primary source is the CAST transport model (flow estimates are included in Appendix D1) and a small number of manual counts (Appendix C). Before the CNC is opened, traffic counts will be collected at over 50 locations in the road network to establish baseline traffic volumes which will be used as part of the ongoing monitoring of each
street in relation to the impact of the CNC. Monitoring screens have been developed and are presented in Appendix E. We are recommending ongoing annual or biannual monitoring of the streets that are expected to carry most of the additional traffic, while other streets only need to be monitored if adverse effects are reported (e.g., increase in rat-running or speeding). These counts will include the proportion of heavy vehicles. Separate baseline intersection counts will also collect pedestrian and bicycle traffic volumes.

4.2.3 Consideration of the Effects of Increased Traffic Flows

The effects on all transport modes as a result of the increased CNC traffic flows have been assessed based on community issues raised during consultation, expert knowledge of the network, and advice from transport engineers and an urban designer during three issue and option development workshops. These methods are limited in that they require a reliance on the predicted affected streets from the CAST model. The monitoring program is therefore required to help ascertain and confirm exactly where and to what level the transport effects actually manifest. This may identify that streets not shown in the transport modelling are impacted.

4.2.4 Recommendation of Appropriate Mitigation Measures

At this stage a workshop process was undertaken with other experts. The feedback from the community consultation was used extensively during this phase to help identify potential problems on the network and also as a gauge on community response to options. This information was then used to identify a range of options that best addressed the issues. A multi-criteria analysis framework was developed and agreed upon, and the options were rated against different pre-agreed outcome measurements. The results were triangulated against local expert knowledge.

Once the type and scope of the arterial upgrades were settled upon a second iteration of mitigation measures took place which concentrated on measures that could mitigate the effects on access to schools, parks, commercial centres, and cycling in light of the arterial upgrades.

This process identified issues and options that need to be addressed before the CNC opens and depending on monitoring outcomes following the CNC opening, up to 2031.

4.2.5 Recommendation of Further Remedial Steps

While the Plan outlines the issues and upgrade options that may need to be actioned in the few years following the opening of the CNC and through to 2031, what needs to be done will depend on the outcome of transport monitoring. It is possible that new issues arise as a result of the CNC that are not reflected in the transport modelling undertaken or in the traffic history. The routes expected to be affected may be affected as predicted and thus not need to be upgraded. Through the ten years following the CNC opening, Christchurch City Council will need to regularly monitor traffic flows, crash records, and environmental impacts (emissions, noise, and vibration) and intervene to address such issues, to mitigate the ongoing effects of the CNC.

4.3 Balanced Transport Planning Approach

Wherever possible, we have taken a balanced transport planning approach to the development of the Plan that looks to mitigate the impact of the additional traffic on arterial roads and local streets and other transport modes with minimal impact on private property.

As cities grow they are faced with growth in land transport trips. It is not suitable to accommodate all such trips in single occupancy vehicles. NZ Transport Agency and Christchurch City Council have actively looked to provide transport options for these trips in Northern Christchurch. This includes the provision and promotion of bus, cycle, and car-pooling initiatives, along with infrastructure upgrades to ease congestion and reduce the proportion of people in single occupancy vehicles. We are supportive of more investment and promotion in this area, but are conscious that such initiatives, particularly in the short term, will have limited impact on the number of vehicles that will enter Cranford Street when the CNC opens.

To achieve a balanced transport planning outcome, which encourages use of other transport options, we have not considered options that provide an expressway (e.g., permanent four-lane route) through St Albans to the City Centre via widening the road reserve of current arterials or on a new arterial alignment. Only a small number of people who participated in the consultation favoured such an approach. The support for a balanced approach to transport planning and the promotion of alternative transport modes

and car-pooling was promoted by many stakeholders and the general public in the consultation. This is consistent with the findings of a number of consultation processes managed by Christchurch City Council citywide (e.g. Share an Idea campaign) in northern Christchurch. Hence, in our view highly car-centric options south of the CNC would not be acceptable to the majority of the local community and therefore are not being promoted.

However, the CNC is currently being constructed, and it is clear from the transport modelling that this will significantly increase vehicle flows on Cranford Street (south of Innes) in 2020 and through to 2031. While one option is to do nothing and allow congestion to occur, there are consequences of severe congestion that are undesirable to the community in terms of pollution and road safety. Hence to address severe congestion and discourage use of local streets by commuter traffic, a measured plan of arterial upgrades and traffic calming of local and collector roads is proposed. Wherever possible the upgrades are being achieved within the current road reserve. Given this constraint, there will still be congestion on the arterial/collector roads, especially at the Berwick Street /Cranford Street and Westminster Street /Cranford Street intersections as traffic volumes grow towards 2031.

The Plan also includes a number of transport improvements that are expected to encourage more walking and cycling in the community. Where possible this includes mitigating the adverse impacts of the additional CNC traffic. While this is not possible on all routes, this is to a degree offset with other transport improvements in the local road network e.g. improved bicycle routes running parallel with and crossing Cranford Street.

The Plan gives limited attention to travel demand management measures to move people out of cars, other than improving transport facilities to support use of other transport modes (e.g. walking and cycling). Travel demand management is typically an intervention considered strategically for a wide area such as the Greater Christchurch urban area or the northern part of Christchurch and Wakamarama District. Any demand management interventions specific to this project would shift or create issues across the network if not coordinated with other projects. Therefore, the Plan does not closely look at hard18 mode shift interventions or other wider demand management strategies for treating rises in traffic volumes. We do strongly support Christchurch City Council’s investigations and plans to introduce more travel demand management measures in Northern Christchurch that focus on reducing congestion and travel in single occupancy vehicles on the Northern Corridor19. Such measures include improvements to bus services, possibly HOV lanes on Cranford and Sheerborne Streets, schemes that promote carpooling, and implementing park and ride (and park and bike) facilities.

Another key aspect of the project scope is that only problems that arise directly and significantly as a result of the CNC are being addressed as part of this project. All other network issues are to be addressed via other funding arms of the relevant transport authority. The NoR outlined that a 30% increase of vehicle movements on top of those expected to have occurred if the CNC had not been constructed are to be addressed in the Plan. Hence transport impacts created by general traffic growth in Northern Christchurch, and not by the CNC, will not necessarily be addressed by the Plan.

18 Measures such as price tolling, or land zoning changes.
5. Transport Modelling

Transport modelling forms an important part of the analysis that informs problem identification and option analysis. Modelling has been used as the effects of the project are yet to be experienced, and in many instances will be significant enough to warrant treatment prior to the opening of the CNC. For example, this is likely to be the case on arterial routes and at busy intersections where a sudden influx of traffic will make upgrades after the CNC more disruptive.

The important outputs required from the modelling were to estimate which local roads were likely to experience a 30% increase of traffic volume (either during the morning or evening peak, or daily) on top of what would have been expected at the same point of time in a scenario where the CNC was not constructed.

Therefore, the transport modellers were requested to model:

- The downstream network in 2021 and 2031 without the CNC
- The downstream network in 2021 and 2031 with the CNC
- The downstream network in 2021 and 2031 with the CNC and various downstream treatment packages (as outlined below)

These were to be modelled during the weekday AM Peak and PM Peak, and all (week) day.

No modelling of weekend traffic flows was undertaken as there is no current CAST weekend model. Weekend traffic volume peaks can be relatively high but are not tidal like weekday peaks, so do not generally cause the same level of congestion. It will be important to monitor traffic volumes after CNC opens in the weekends to identify any capacity issues during the weekends.

The 2021 model represents the open year of the CNC (currently expected to open in September 2020). The 2031 model represents the design year. The expected effects beyond 2031 have not been assessed in this report as per the requirements of the NoR.

Modelling was undertaken for this study by Jacobs (a modelling consultant). This modelling included the road changes associated with the Papanui Parallel cycleway that makes Rutland Street and Trafalgar Street less attractive for through traffic. The model also assumed the latest version on the CNC design, including a third motorway lane southbound on the Waimakariri River and southbound HOV lanes south of this extending to north of the QEII Drive interchange. The most recent land-use forecasts (at the time the modelling commenced) for Northern Christchurch and the Waimakariri District were used in the modelling.

A summary of the modelling undertaken by Jacobs has been prepared for Christchurch City Council.

5.1 Limitations of Modelling

Modelling a network requires a series of assumptions to estimate trip patterns. These include assumptions relating to land use, population, and the propensity of people to choose particular modes given the attraction of trip generators. All of these (and others not mentioned here) have varying degrees of certainty. The assumptions can become erroneous following events such as policy changes, land developments, and economic changes. They can also be erroneous in how they predict the movements of vehicles which are controlled by individual humans who can (and do) employ dynamic decision making, rather than decisions made with rigid logic.

Models, like CAST, do not highlight the effects of intersection delay well. In this instance, given the amount and complexity of the network with many intersections (varying significantly in delay), intersection delay will be a factor in where drivers decide to make their trips in reality.

Christchurch has a grid-like network (owing primarily to its topography), where drivers have many route choices. In such circumstances larger models (as is the case here) may struggle to replicate actual behaviour due to "all or nothing assignment" by the modelling algorithms. These issues become more pronounced when assessing the effects on local streets. It is fair (at least relatively) to assume drivers will use direct arterial routes if the level of service is acceptable to the driver. When the arterial becomes less desirable, exactly which local streets, and to what magnitude, will be affected is more difficult to estimate using transport modelling.

More details available in Appendix D
Underlying assumptions, such as traffic growth, will also likely change in response to changes in land-use and different levels of land-use growth. Indeed land-use projections regularly change in response to market forces and planning rules.

As such, as discussed in Sections 4.1.2.1, and 4.1.2.2, the model will be more accurate in 2021 than in 2031, therefore monitoring to track growth following 2021 is critical to validating the model findings.

Nonetheless, even with the limitations, modelling is the best tool we have to estimate what may occur in the future.

5.2 Expected Transport Impacts Caused by CNC Traffic

In order to understand impacts caused by the CNC, it is important to first understand what level of growth on roads in Northern Christchurch would have occurred if the CNC had not been built. The pattern of travel would be impacted by the ability of the transport network to accommodate additional traffic. The modelling then considers how the CNC will concentrate traffic where it links to the arterial network at QEII Drive and Cranford Street. The pattern of travel is then influenced by the future road networks ability to accommodate this traffic. Upgrades to roads will influence which roads the traffic will use. This includes both capacity upgrades on arterials/collectors and at intersections and discouraging traffic through using traffic calming. Even small changes will impact on the routes drivers take to travel through Northern Christchurch.

5.2.1 Expected Traffic Growth Without CNC

Initial modelling has been undertaken (using CAST (Saturn) model) to identify the level and location of expected network traffic growth and traffic congestion if CNC had not been built, refer to Figure 5-1. Note that 'V/C' stands for volume over road capacity.

Areas of the network in excess of 80% experience congestion, as traffic volumes approach capacity (V/C = 1) and unstable flow conditions occur. This results in slower moving vehicles and smaller, and less frequent, gaps for vehicles to enter traffic flow from side streets. This in turn results in queuing on side streets, and risk taking when selecting gaps to enter.

Marshland Road and Main North Road are two important arterial routes in Northern Christchurch, and without the CNC additional congestion would have occurred on these routes by 2021 and be worse in 2031 due to growth in traffic flows from Northern Christchurch suburbs and Waimakariri District (dark red and red sections). But, as the maps shows, there are other congestion areas further south on Cranford Street and Hills Road, Barbadoes Street, especially closer to the intersection with Bealey Avenue, is also affected. All of these areas have been circled on the maps.
Figure 5.1: Expected Underlying Growth 2031 (Without CNC) (Left AM, right PM)

5.2.2 Additional Traffic Growth Across Local Network as a Result Of CNC

Modelling has been undertaken to assess the growth of traffic in the network overall and around the southern end of the CNC following the completion of the CNC (less the underlying expected growth if CNC had not been built). Streets (arterials, collectors, and local streets) that are likely to have an increase of 30% more traffic in peak periods by 2031 compared to 2021 without the CNC have been highlighted in the following figures. Figure 5.2 shows the larger picture and how traffic will divert from Marshland Road, Main North Road and Johns Road (blue lines) to the CNC and downstream routes (red lines).
Figure 5-2: Major changes in traffic volumes as a result of CNC (compared with no CNC) in 2031

At a more localised level the impact of CNC on traffic volumes in the AM Peak, PM Peak, and all day in 2021 and 2031 are shown in Figure 5-3 to 5-8. Those streets which are expected to have a greater than 30% increase in traffic are shown in black (arterials) and orange (local roads).
These figures show a significant number of local streets are expected to have at least a 30% increase in traffic volumes due to rat-running traffic. The effect is more pronounced in 2031, although the majority of streets are also impacted in 2020/21. If no arterial/collector upgrades progress, then a lot of streets need to be traffic calmed before the CNC opens. However, with the level of congestion expected on Cranford Street it will be challenging to design and construct traffic calming that deters rat-runners.

5.3 Modelling of Improvement Options

The initial modelling excluded any change to downstream routes and intersections. This was done subsequent to options being developed and is presented in the following sections, and Appendix D.

5.4 Impacts of Additional Traffic

The main impacts of the additional traffic are road safety, access to shops, parks, school and housing, air pollution, pavement deterioration, and amenity (urban design).

There is a known relationship between traffic volume and crash risk. This means streets with an increase in traffic volume (particularly if not treated) tend to experience more crashes if not treated. Deterring vehicles, especially heavy vehicles away from local streets (for example by traffic calming) and onto better designed arterial routes will reduce the safety impact of the CNC traffic. Lower operating speeds (<40km/h, or even 30km/h) on local roads will also reduce both the number and severity of crashes. On arterial and some collector (distributor) streets where traffic volumes will increase significantly, a combination of route upgrades and temporary speed limit reductions (for example school zones) can be used to address crash risk. As traffic volumes increase, the headway between vehicles decreases and consequently the ability for drivers to enter and exit the traffic flow (via access, or intersections) reduces.

Road pavement tends to wear out faster with higher traffic volumes; however, this is more dependent on the relative volume of heavy vehicles, rather than necessarily the total traffic volume.

The Plan looks to address as many of these impacts of the CNC traffic as possible, acknowledging that some issues cannot be easily addressed. The intention of the Plan being to minimise rather than fully eliminate the effects of the additional traffic volumes as a result of the CNC.
6. Community and Stakeholder Concerns

6.1 Purpose and Outcomes of Early Community Engagement

Consultation with the public and key stakeholders has and will continue to be an important part of the development and advancement of the Plan. The St Albans community, in particular, have been very active in expressing their views on the various northern arterial scenarios that have been presented by Christchurch City Council and the Crown over the last 50 plus years, including the Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC). The major concern expressed during consultation on the CNC, is how the additional traffic from the arterial will impact on the St Albans and surrounding communities, and how this can be mitigated. Concerns that were expressed at the CNC NoR hearing led to the requirement to produce a DEMP (the Plan).

In order to involve the public and key stakeholder in the process as required by the NoR and Christchurch City Council’s own internal processes, a consultation strategy was developed by Christchurch City Council. The first step of the strategy focused on capturing all the issues and concerns of the general public, key stakeholders, and politicians (community board and Christchurch City Council), in order to achieve an independent perspective (from Christchurch City Council) on the issues and concerns, the independent expert participated in the majority of the consultation meetings.

Subsequent phases will involve consultation on the Plan and each of the improvement projects within the Plan. The NoR has some specific requirements around consultation which are stated below. Most of these matters apply to consultation on the options that are developed in the Plan.

4.5. Where traffic calming work is recommended, Christchurch City Council will consult with:

4.5.1. Residents of the streets where traffic calming measures are proposed to be taken;

4.5.2. Canterbury District Health Board;

4.5.3. Maiohau Primary School, Our Lady of Fatima School21, Paparoa Street Primary School, St Albans Catholic Primary School, and St Albans School;

4.5.4. St Albans Residents Association and Maiohau Community Trust; and

4.5.5. Cyclists through Spokes;

4.6. Consultation shall include the distribution of a newsletter including feedback form prior to the review.

Section 5 of the NoR also provided guidance on the process for consultation prior to implementation of the Plan.

5.2 Owners and occupiers of properties on streets identified by the independent traffic expert as requiring mitigation measures shall be:

5.2.1 Advised of the recommendations of the independent traffic expert under clause 3, including proposed mitigation measures, within 30 working days following the provision of the recommendation to Christchurch City Council;

5.2.2 Provided a period of 20 working days to comment on the proposed mitigation measures; and

5.2.3 Advised by Christchurch City Council of the final mitigation measures to be implemented, at least 20 working days prior to commencement of any works.

The initial phase of stakeholder and public consultation was focused on identifying all the existing and potential future transport issues associated with the CNC traffic on the downstream transport network. To

---

21 Now known as St Francis of Assisi School
help the public in assessing the potential effects of the CNC, transport modelling outputs of the likely impacts of the CNC were provided. More specifically, this identified the streets that are expected to have more than 30% additional (rat-running) traffic in 2031. In order for the public to consider how changes to the arterial and collector roads may reduce the amount of traffic using local streets, the benefits of a potential arterial upgrade options were provided. This preliminary option included clearways on Cranford Street, upgrades to three intersections on Berwick and Warrington Street and three-laning of Madras/Forfar and Barbadoes Streets from Bealey Avenue to Warrington Street in the higher flow direction.

The initial consultation process consisted of the following steps:

1. One-on-one meetings with 20 key stakeholders, which included the parties specified in the NoR (e.g. the local schools) and other stakeholders such as shop owners expected to be impacted.
2. Four public open days attended by 123 members of the community at which plans were presented of the impacted area and a potential arterial upgrade option.
3. Distribution of a newsletter to approximately 12,000 households and businesses in the affected road network (Appendix F). This included a submission form. Over 400 submissions were received from the community.
4. Several meetings with the Paparangi community board and Initial Teacher Education (ITE) Council committee to discuss the process being used in consultation and the issues identified in the transport modelling.
5. A half day consultation hearing of submissions from stakeholder and the public that was chaired by the community board.

The feedback from the public and stakeholders was compiled into common themes for consideration at future stages of the project. The key topics raised from consultation are as follows22 (Christchurch City Council have prepared a report that provides more detail on each submission):

**Clearway comments (mostly Cranford Street, but also in general)**

- Take the clearway through to Bealey Avenue
- Pedestrian safety – upgrades required and design concerns
- Access to English Park
- Impact on side streets
- Ongoing monitoring/policing
- Improved facilities for public transport/park and ride
- Impact on Cranford Street properties
- Impact on driveway safety
- Loss of parking
- Provision of safe cycling facilities
- Impact on businesses
- Consider HOV lanes

**Intersection changes comments**

- Parking concerns
- Forfar Street roundabout doesn’t need to change, and safety concerns
- Cycling safety – both concern for increasing cyclist risk and also support for changes
- Impact on businesses
- Impact on St Albans Park
- Barbadoes/Warrington needs lights
- Leave as is and monitor traffic impact first
- Pedestrian safety – both concern for increasing pedestrian risk and also support for changes
- Berwick Street – pinpoint and congestion

### Three laneing – Madras Street and Barbadoes Street

| Traffic light phasing | Two new sets of lights could cause short cutting through side streets | Flockton Street issue – will vehicle and bus manoeuvres be possible due to proximity to traffic signals |

### Cranford / Westminster, Cranford / Berwick, Madras / Edgeware, and Barbadoes / Edgeware

| Safety – driver behaviour and vehicle speed concerns, pedestrian safety (especially children), and also desire to leave as is. | Turning arrows or separate turning lanes | Lower the speed |
| Leave intersection[s] as is | Have red light camera at intersection | Pedestrian and cycle focus |
| Parking – provision for shops/businesses and increase P15 to P30. | Impact on businesses and residents | Widen road – do not narrow |

The feedback from consultation provided good insight into the community’s thoughts and concerns on the project. The results were considered during the issue and options workshops which led into option development, and the multi-criteria analysis of different options. Refer to Section 7.2.4 and 7.4 for discussion on how the consultation outputs informed option analysis.

Many of the issues with the options can be mitigated, or possibly resolved, during the later design phases of this project, however others may be more challenging. On-going dialogue and consultation will therefore be crucial to try to achieve the best upgrade options for the community.

As per the requirements of Section 5.2 of the NoR, and Christchurch City Council’s own processes, further consultation will occur on the Plan and each of the projects that are recommended in the Plan. This phase of consultation will inherently be more detail specific on the individual treatment selection (say speed platform vs carriageway narrowing); however, it is important that the resultant decisions remain holistic to the network. A treatment decision on one street may result in a significant impact on another; perhaps even acting as a catalyst for another street exceeding the 30% threshold. Consequently, decisions cannot be made in isolation, or without consideration of their wider impact. The monitoring regime will be an important part of monitoring the impacts of various interventions and identifying any knock-on effects of such changes to other parts of the transport network.

### 6.2 Changes in Transport Modelling

Since the initial transport modelling was undertaken, that informed the consultation material, further modelling has been undertaken of the downstream effects. The latest transport modelling has changed some of the streets that are expected to be impacted by greater than 30% traffic in 2031 and also looked...
at the impacts in 2021. One major change to the modelling that impacts on routes impacted downstream is the proposed layout of the Innes Road/Cranford Street intersection, which is being upgraded as part of the CNC project. Other changes that have been made include restricting a number of side-roads on major routes to left-in and left-out (LLO). For example, Malvern Street and Dee street intersections on Cranford Street. These network changes have impacted on traffic flows on Mersey Street (which now carries more traffic) and Malvern Street (which carries less traffic).

6.3 Changes to the Plan following second round of Engagement

"Intentionally left blank until report is FINALISED"
7. Issues and Option Development

This section of the report outlines the expected transport issues that will result from the CNC, along with associated improvement options (as identified during the stakeholder and public consultation), transport modelling, and review of the network by the independent expert. The Plan presents various options that have been developed to avoid, remedy or mitigate the expected transport issues and fulfill the objectives stated in the NoR conditions. In many cases it also recommends further studies to look at option development. As with any area-wide transport plan, it is also important that the options are as consistent as possible with the objectives of local, regional, and national strategies. As outlined in the CTSP and the national Government Policy Statement (GPS) on transport, road safety, and access for all road users is a high priority.

Section 7.1 outlines the issue and option development process that has been adopted for the Plan. Given the focus on keeping upgrades within the existing road reserve wherever possible (e.g. not looking at any new arterials or major arterial upgrades), there are a limited number of options available for increasing road capacity and mitigating the impact of the additional traffic on various road users (e.g. cyclists and pedestrians) and the local community.

7.1 Issues and Option Development Process

The first step in developing options was to clearly set out all of the issues that may be experienced on the network following the opening of the CNC. These included existing issues that may be exacerbated, and new issues. Compiling the issues was done by using the data available on the network (such as crash data), outputs from the model (such as where congestion might occur), feedback from the public, and expert knowledge of the network. A knowledge of the issues (or at least likely issues) was important so that the subsequent options considered would be focused on addressing these issues.

The option development has been separated into two development stages. Stage One involved developing options to encourage the additional traffic that will come down the CNC, when it opens and through to 2031, to stay primarily on the arterials and collector routes and off the local streets. This can be achieved by using a combined ‘carrot’ and ‘stick’ approach. The carrot being to upgrade some of the arterial and collector routes. The stick being to traffic calm a number of local streets to push traffic back onto the arterial and collector routes. In addition to the traffic calming, up to 9 ‘safe speed community areas (SSCA)’ are proposed in the study area to deter rat-running traffic on local streets and to reduce the risk of serious and fatal crashes from any traffic.

We acknowledge that the community wants to also see travel demand management measures that reduce the volume of vehicles coming down the CNC and into the St Albans road network. We have suggested that Christchurch City Council and NZ Transport Agency investigate measures that encourage alternative modes and more car-pooling. While such measures would reduce traffic volumes, the impact on traffic volumes coming off the CNC, at least initially, is likely to be relatively small (effective measures might result in up to 10% reduction in traffic volumes) and so the focus of this study has been dealing with a significant increase in traffic through the network when the CNC opens and out to 2031.

The second development stage focuses on improvements that need to be made on several roads to mitigate the impact of the additional traffic from the CNC on all road users and the community. Of particular importance is a network of roads that supports and promotes use of transport options other than the single occupancy motor vehicle; which retains or improves access to key community facilities (parks, schools, and shops) and, where possible, addresses the safety impacts of the additional traffic. The second stage of option development includes projects in the following four categories:

- Safe Access to Schools
- Safe Cycling Routes
- Access to Parks
- Access to Commercial Centres

Two over-arching principles are promoted in the development of the options; delivering healthier streets and a safer (transport) system. With the growing understanding that streets have a vital role to play in developing vibrant and healthy communities, the Plan includes a requirement to develop street improvements that lead to healthier streets wherever possible. We propose doing baseline (before treatment) and design assessments of each impacted route using the Healthy Streets framework developed by Transport for London (see Guide to the Healthy Streets Indicators). The ten key healthy street indicators are shown in Figure 7-1 below. Preference should be given to options that lead to more healthy
streets or, where this is not possible due to increasing traffic volumes, that minimise the impact on the health of a street.

![Image of Healthy Streets Check scores diagram](image)

**Figure 7-1: Healthy Street Framework**

In terms of improving road safety and moving towards a safer transport system the Austroads safe system assessment framework should be used, in addition to safety auditing, to evaluate all infrastructure improvement options. The safe system framework breaks the risk of fatal and serious injury crashes into three components: exposure, likelihood, and severity. The exposure is typically the volume of transport users (pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists) on the street. With the increase in traffic volumes on many routes in the network as a result of the CNC, the crash risk will increase if no improvements are made. To compensate for this increase in crash risk we propose that both the ‘likelihood’ and ‘severity’ of crashes must go down. To achieve a reduction in ‘likelihood’ the facilities for road users, especially pedestrians and cyclists, in urban areas must improve. For example, the introduction of traffic signals, the greater use of pedestrians crossing aids (islands) and shorter crossing distances, and introduction of cycle lanes and paths. Crash severity is influenced by operating speeds which are related to speed limits and road design. Hence improvements that reduce operating speeds and lower speed limits reduces crash severity. In this network this will be achieved on local roads through introduction of the safe speed areas.

The Plan does not include many changes to support public transport, although it does support further investigation of improvement options that benefits public transport (i.e., HOV lanes). While this may be the case, one of the key outcomes of the CNC is to reduce traffic on Main North Road and Papanui Road which is the key public transport corridor for Northern Christchurch. In terms of the study area, the needs of public transport should be considered in the more detailed designs, including location of bus stops, bus shelters, and reducing delays on routes, especially at traffic signals.

The next five sections talk in more detail about the issues and options in the Plan.
7.2 Arterial/Collector Capacity Issues

7.2.1 Context

One of the main issues identified for the arterial and collector roads was that they would be under greater strain (in terms of vehicle flows) than before the CNC during peak periods. When a road becomes severely congested vehicle movements slow and gap selection becomes more difficult and dangerous leading to greater queuing on local streets. It also becomes more dangerous to cross the road; especially before vehicle speeds drop due to congestion. To a degree, arterial/collector congestion is to be expected, especially during peak hours. However, the modelling outputs indicate that congestion will rise (especially during weekday peak hours) to a point where drivers will be more likely to choose to use local roads impacting on safety and amenity in primarily residential areas. Therefore, the issue identified was that the key arterial roads will likely be unable to cater for the increased vehicle demands, resulting in a redistribution of movements to local roads. The key arterial and collector capacity constraints have been identified for the current network in the transport modelling (during weekday peak periods) and are as follows (noting that an extensive number of plots have been used to identify these issues):

1. The merge south of the Cranford Street / Innes Road intersection when the CNC opens. Two through lanes north and through the intersection become one lane southbound. The modelling in the AM Peak indicates that the V/C (expected volume to road capacity) ratio in 2021 would be 0.97 and in 2031 would be 0.98 (noting that anything over 0.8 is poor and will lead to disruptive traffic flows. Modelling indicates a lot of rat-running, especially onto Mersey Street if this matter is not addressed.

2. The through lane capacity at the Westminster Street / Cranford Street Intersection. The current intersection has a shared through and right lane and through and left lane with a short merge lane, especially northbound (due to parking for the shops). With right turning demand there is effectively only a single through lane at the intersection, which severely constrains the capacity of intersection in both north and southbound directions. Queues already form heading northbound in PM Peak period.

3. Northbound and southbound through lane capacity at the Berwick Street / Cranford Street intersection. Currently only one through lane and a short right turn lane is provided heading north through the intersection. With CNC flows, the northbound through movement has a V/C of 0.85 in 2021. There is currently one through and one short left turn lane heading southbound. With CNC flows and the clearaways on Cranford to Berwick the V/C is 0.91 in 2021. Both constraints would cause peak period delays.

4. Right turn capacity turning right from Berwick Street into Cranford Street. The single right turn lane is a major capacity constraint for traffic heading north on Madras Street / Forfar Street wishing to turn into Cranford Street. The impact of this constraint in isolation is difficult to assess given upstream capacity constraints. Option modelling has shown that with a double right turn in 2021, this route will have a V/C 0.74. From this we can imply that a single right turn will have a much poorer V/C.

5. The single-lane Forfar Street / Warrington Street roundabout is also a capacity constraint. In 2021 the Northbound Forfar Street approach will be 0.81 in the PM Peak and this deteriorates further in 2031. The impact of this has again been assessed using the option modelling because of upstream capacity constraints. The option modelling includes traffic signals with a double left turn from Forfar Street into Berwick Street. This movement has a V/C of 0.62 in the PM Peak. A single left, as provided with the roundabout, would have a V/C well over 0.8. In the AM Peak the single through lane V/C from Berwick Street into Warrington Street at a signalised intersection would be 0.87. This indicates that two through lanes (or both a through and through and right turn lane) are required which can-not be accommodated at the current roundabout. In addition, roundabouts often experience safety problems when they operate near capacity due to risk taking as drivers pick smaller gaps. We expect crash numbers to increase if roundabout is not upgraded.

6. Capacity constraints at Barbadoes Street / Warrington Street priority T-intersection. Right turn movements out of Barbadoes Street will become increasingly difficult due to increased traffic volumes during peak periods. At the priority intersection the V/C for the right turn out of Barbadoes Street is 0.82 in the evening peak in 2021. We have already observed considerable delays for this movement in the evening peak, in the absence of CNC traffic.

7. Edgeware Road intersections at Cranford Street / Sherborne Street, Madras Street, and Barbadoes Street can only effectively accommodate a single through lane, like Westminster Street / Cranford Street, due to right turns sharing the lane with through vehicles, and short shared left and through lanes.
8. Southbound capacity constraint at Barbadoes Street / Bealey Street intersection. The single lane through movement on the mid-block approach to the intersection (there are two through lanes at the intersection itself) already causes congestion in the AM Peak, which the models predict to increase going forward, especially if more traffic from the CNC is pushed down this route.

9. Northbound capacity constraint at Madras Street / Bealey Street intersection. In the PM Peak the two through lanes have to merge quickly on the exit of the intersection due to a short merge to accommodate kerbside parking. This creates safety issues for motor vehicles and especially cyclists as the motor vehicles are often travelling at higher speeds having come off the one-way system with traffic signal coordination.

10. Southbound capacity constraint at the Sherborne Street / Bealey Avenue intersection. The single lane right-turn at this intersection into Bealey Avenue and single through lane approach up Sherborne Street causes queuing especially in the AM Peak, mainly to right turners but also to left turners stuck in the queue. The modelling of clearways down Sherborne Street indicates V/C of 0.91 in 2021 and 0.95 in 2031 for right turn into Bealey Avenue if this intersection is not upgraded.

11. While the Innes Road / Cranford Street intersection is being upgraded as part of the CNC we are aware that the left turn from the west into Cranford Street has only a short lane and hence drivers travelling north on Rutland Street may choose to travel through on Rutland Street and use Knowles Street, Weston Street, or McKaddens Road to access Cranford Street instead of Innes.

12. The installation of traffic signals at St Albans Street / Rutland Street intersection and limited right turn phase time from Rutland Street into Innes Road at the St Albans Street / Rutland Street intersection as part of the cycleway upgrade has reduced the traffic volumes on this route (a good outcome given cycle safety considerations), and also the influenced how drivers heading north access Cranford Street, as in 11.

Arterial upgrades typically involve increasing the capacity of transport corridors to attract trips from local roads to arterials and collectors during peak flow periods. The idea is that if arterials/collector routes have adequate capacity then drivers are less inclined to use local roads which tend to be designed more for accessing adjacent residential land uses rather than for movement of vehicles.

There is a range of ways in which the capacity of a road can be increased, such as physically creating more capacity (more lanes) at intersections and mid-blocks. Time controlled additional capacity is another treatment such as 'clearways' where part of the carriageway can be used as an additional lane during heavier traffic flows but returns to parking at other times of the day, so it can be used for other purposes i.e., parking. Applying right turning bans at intersections can also increase road capacity.

Other treatments are also possible which increase the productivity of a corridor (number of people carried in each lane). Improvements of this kind can be in the form of high occupancy vehicle lanes (HOV) and bus lanes. HOV lanes require vehicles using these lanes to have a minimum number of people (typically two or three per vehicle) which over time allows more people to pass through the existing corridor. Buses can use HOV lanes, as can electric vehicles and bicycles. Bus-only lanes tend to be used on high frequency bus routes. HOV lanes are an option for clearways in the study area while bus-only lanes are not recommended due to the relatively low frequency of buses. A study would be required to confirm that HOV lanes can operate along the proposed clearways.

Bealey Avenue, as a key arterial, forms a southern boundary of this project. Bealey Avenue runs approximately west to east and provides connections with the one-way pair box, and four avenues. There are several arterials and collectors located south of the CNC and north of Bealey Avenue that will carry additional traffic from the CNC. The key ones being Cranford Street, Sherborne Street, Berwick/Warrington Street, Barbadoes Street, Madras Street and the Innes, Rutland/Springfield corridor. The extent to which each street will carry the extra traffic depends on the capacity that is added to these streets at intersections and to midblock. Early on in the study, modelling was undertaken to assess whether improvements to the Q Eli Drive/Innes roundabout, Innes Road, and Hills Road might move some of the traffic expected down Cranford Street onto Hills Road. The modelling indicated that even with higher cost improvements along this route very few drivers would divert to the Hills Road route.

As with all capacity improvement projects, there is a risk that adding capacity can simply shift the location of congestion; for example, by relieving pressure at one location traffic will flow freely until encountering the next constriction. However, if there is too much congestion on arterial roads then drivers will be more inclined to 'rat-run' using local roads. Hence the Plan, therefore balances these issues by providing some additional arterial capacity, while calming local streets. While capacity is being added to arterial and collector roads there will still be some peak period congestion. The actual traffic effects after CNC is opened will be monitored to see whether more arterial capacity, and or local road traffic calming is required.
7.2.2 North of Berwick Street Issues and Options

North of Berwick Street there are only two existing arterial and collector route options available to drivers coming down from the CNC. One option is the Rutland Street /Springfield Street corridor. As discussed previously, with the improvement made to the corridor as part of the Papapiu Parallel separated cycleway (on Rutland Street), and being less direct, this corridor is less attractive than the main route option of Cranford Street.

The split of extra traffic between the routes is approximately 550vpd (vehicles per day) on Rutland Street and 4,100vpd on Cranford Street south of Innes Road when the CNC opens in 2020 (without any improvements). This increases to around 900vpd on Rutland Street and 5,000vpd on Cranford Street by 2031. While there is an increase in traffic on Rutland Street, it is minimal given the total increase in traffic from CNC and will have minimal adverse effects on the Papapiu Parallel cycleway. Further details on traffic volumes on various routes are provided in Appendix D2.

As identified earlier, the main issues on this route are the capacity constraints as traffic heads south in the morning and north in the evening, via one single through lane south of Innes Road. The other constraint is right turning vehicles blocking the through lane at side roads and at the English Park carpark. While this will occur at other accessways along the route, the intersections and the carpark are the major traffic generators of right turning movements. Other issues, such as the safety of school children crossing Cranford Street, are covered in later sections.

While no changes are proposed to Rutland Street, additional capacity is required on Cranford Street from Innes Road to Berwick Street to accommodate the increase in traffic from the CNC. The two main options that can be accommodated in the current road reserve are four-laning and peak period clearways. The latter is preferred because it allows parking on Cranford Street near the Westminster Street /Cranford Street local commercial centre outside peak periods. Changes are also proposed at the Westminster Street /Cranford Street intersection (see Figure 7.2). Right turn bans will apply at this intersection during peak periods, to provide two through lanes. Given the increased traffic volumes through the intersection, to accommodate cyclists (via cycle lane) and to address safety concerns with drivers hitting the signal pole (westbound) along Westminster Street, widening of the western approach is proposed (more on this later). Right turn bans will be installed permanently at the Dee Street and Malvern Street approaches on both sides of Cranford Street using throat islands. We also propose that the English Park carpark access be redesigned and right turns in and out of this carpark be banned.
7.2.3 South of Berwick Street Issues and Options

South of Berwick Street there are three routes that can carry the additional traffic from the CNC through to Bealey Avenue, being Cranford Street, Sherborne Street, Farfar Street, Madras Street, and Barbadoes. The extent to which each route carries this additional traffic depends on the capacity improvements undertaken to address the constraints listed above. The key capacity issues are at the nine intersections in the network that are on these routes intersecting with Berwick Street, Warrington Street, Edgeware Road, and Bealey Avenue. The key intersection constraints are along Berwick and Warrington streets. The issues being lack of right turn capacity (from a single right turn lane) from Berwick into Cranford, and the capacity and safety of the Farfar Street/Warrington Street roundabout and Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street priority-controlled intersection with the increase in traffic volumes. The other six intersections capacity issues can be addressed by banning right turn and/or adding approach lane capacity.

In terms of a continuous route connecting Cranford Street [clearway] and Bealey Avenue, there are two main options with several sub-options for one of the options proposed. Both options involve upgrading the Cranford Street/Berwick Street, Farfar Street/Warrington Street, and Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street intersections along with some capacity improvements to Berwick and Warrington Streets to provide approach-lane capacity. Option A involves adding clearways to Cranford and Sherborne Streets and Option B involves upgrading the capacity of Barbadoes and Madras/Farfar Streets (two sub-options being clearways or extending one-ways). In addition, there are a number of intersection upgrades required. More on each of these options and analysis is given later on in this report.
7.2.4 Local Streets Affected by Traffic following Arterials Improvements

Transport modelling was undertaken to assess how effective the arterial upgrades would be in reducing the number of local streets that have a greater than 30% increase in traffic in 2021 and 2031. This analysis effectively repeated that undertaken early on in the study for no network changes (as presented in section 5.4) but this time including the two arterial upgrade options. Both options looked at the clearway from Innes Road to Berwick Street, improvements to the Cranford Street / Westminster Street intersections and upgrades to capacity along Berwick and Warrington Streets. The two options south of Berwick were A (Cranford/Sherborne clearways) and B (Madras Street /Forfar Street and Barbadoes Street clearways) as shown in Figure 7-3.

Figures 7-4 to 7-9 shows the local streets that will trigger the 30% increase in AM Peak, PM Peak and all-day in 2021 and 2031 for Option A. Figures 7-10 to 7-15 show the same plots but for Option B. These figures were produced using the change flow maps from the transport modelling, as presented in Appendix D4. These figures show the streets that are expected to trigger a 30% increase in traffic compared with what might have occurred if the CNC had not been built.
Figure 7-4: Streets expected to be affected by more than 30% in AM Peak, 2021, Option A

Figure 7-5: Streets expected to be affected by more than 30% in AM Peak, 2031, Option A

Figure 7-6: Streets expected to be affected by more than 30% in PM Peak, 2021, Option A

Figure 7-7: Streets expected to be affected by more than 30% in PM Peak, 2031, Option A

Figure 7-8: Streets expected to be affected by more than 30% all day, 2021, Option A

Figure 7-9: Streets expected to be affected by more than 30% all day, 2031, Option A
Care needs to be taken in interpreting these plots as there is considerable uncertainty in how much these streets will be impacted by the CNC traffic, due to the limitation in transport modelling. What it does indicate is streets that need to be treated before the opening of the CNC or shortly after. For the other streets (those not impacted by additional traffic in 2021), the traffic monitoring will identify the actual increase and determine whether traffic calming changes are required to these streets.

The outcome of this analysis informs the streets that are likely to need traffic calming when the CNC is opened or shortly after (e.g., Mersey Street). These are streets that are shown to be impacted in most scenarios, and those that can be monitored and treated at a later date (e.g. – Forfar Street). Figures 7-4 to 7-9 show the additional rat-running streets south of Berwick Street, including Edgeware Road, Manchester Street, and Caledonian Road (the last two are wide local streets) that are impacted by Option A, extending clearways down Sherborne Street. A detailed list of streets that need to be (or may need to be) treated are provided in Chapter 8. Details on the types of traffic calming that should be provided, along with supporting speed limit restrictions, are provided in Section 7.5. Specific traffic calming treatments need to be developed and discussed with affected parties and the public for each street.

### 7.3 Options Considered to Address Issues

During the first stage (iteration) of option development, the study team looked at project options that used a combination of traffic calming of local streets and capacity upgrades of arterial and collector routes to attract the extra vehicles from the CNC to the arterial and collector routes. The intention of each of the options is to encourage the additional CNC traffic to use the preferred arterial and collector roads and reduce rat-running on local roads. The Stage 1 options were compiled following consultation with stakeholders and the public. The consultation feedback was used at this stage to ensure the options considered were fairly representative.

As already discussed, additional options were developed as comments from the public and stakeholders were received. This included greater use of clearways, rather than permanent three-laning, the option of extending the Barbadoes Street / Madras Street one-way system north to Warrington Street, and using clearways down the Cranford Street / Sherborne Street corridor south of Berwick Street. The full list of options was discussed and evaluated during several issue and option workshops and meetings.

The main options considered in Stage 1 are summarised as follows (see Appendix G for option diagrams):

- **Do Nothing** – this results in rat-running in a lot of local streets.

- **Option 1. Traffic Calming Only**.

- **Option 2. Arterial Upgrades Only**. The option used was three-laning of Barbadoes Street and Madras (Forfar) Street, Cranford Street Clearways and Berwick Street / Warrington Street capacity improvements.

- **Option 3 (a). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades**. Arterial upgrades as in Option 2 except clearways on Barbadoes Street and Madras (Forfar) Street instead of permanent three-laning.

- **Option 3 (b). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades**. Arterial upgrades as in Option 2, so permanent three-laning of Barbadoes and Madras (Forfar) Streets.

- **Option 3 (c). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades**. Arterial upgrades as in Option 2 except extension of Barbadoes Street / Madras Street one-ways to Warrington Street.

- **Option 4 (a). Traffic Calming and Clearways on Cranford Street / Sherborne Street from Innes Road to Bealey Avenue plus Berwick Street and Warrington Street Improvements**.

- **Option 4 (b) Traffic Calming and permanent four-laning on Cranford Street / Sherborne Street** (option included to allow comparison of options with a more major upgrade of arterial roads)

- **Option 5. Traffic Calming plus combined Arterial Options of all three routes (Options 3(a) and 4(a)).**

Most of the options include right turn bans at intersections, including traffic signals (e.g. Cranford Street / Westminster Street). The traffic signal right turn bans only operate when the clearways are operating.

Some of the stakeholders have also suggested use of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) clearway lanes. These lanes encourage people to car-pool and/or use the bus. Currently HOV lanes are proposed on part of the CNC; in southbound direction but ending before the QEII interchange. This project has not looked at HOV lanes in detail as such lanes need to be considered over the full corridor, including the CNC. We would support Christchurch City Council and NZ Transport Agency undertaking an HOV lane study of the northern corridor (Waimakariri Bridge to Bealey Avenue) and looking at whether the clearways on
Cranford Street and other routes can be HOV lanes, as such an option should reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles coming from the north, which is consistent with a number of transport strategies, including the CTSP.

7.4 Multi-Criteria Analysis of Options

Before commencing the MCA assessment, an MCA facilitator developed a number of criteria for evaluating the options based on previous assessments of this type he had undertaken and based on the strategic transport documents that were relevant for this study area. During the first issues and options workshop the criterion and weightings for each criterion were discussed and agreed. The attendees at the workshops were selected by the Independent Expert to cover various transport and other relevant disciplines, including urban design. The attendees intentionally wanted limited weighting placed on journey time and more on community impacts to reflect the outcomes from the consultation, which wanted a focus on community impacts.

During the second and third workshops, participants gave ratings to the various options listed above. This involved robust discussion over each of the ratings. Feedback from the consultation process was used during discussion (such as exactly where safety or environmental concerns were) which allowed for more specific rating analysis. The ratings of each option (considering the positive and negative consequences) are compared with the transport network in 2020 immediately before the CNC becomes operational; the baseline option. Hence, the sum of rankings for all options do have a negative value as they include CNC traffic, while the baseline option does not. To provide a relative score between the options each option has been compared with the do-nothing option and, in this case, most of the options have a positive score. The results of the MCA are presented in Table 7.1.
### Table 7-1: Multi-Criteria Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3a</th>
<th>Option 3b</th>
<th>Option 3c</th>
<th>Option 4a</th>
<th>Option 4b</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for vulnerable</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>users</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for cyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for motorbikes</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Context</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep vehicles on preferred vehicle access routes</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage mode change</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with local and regional transport strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey Time (End to End)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay for motorists on arterial routes</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce or improve PT travel times and reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Considerations</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to local businesses and economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and amenity impact</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementability</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and on-going costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MCA indicates that option 3(c), which involves extending the one-way pair of Madras (Fortar) Street and Barbadoes Street, along with clearaways on Crawford Street to Berwick and capacity upgrades including new signals on Warrington Street and traffic calming of local streets has the best overall (score) ranking.

However, two other options also rank relatively well being option 3(a) which is similar to option 3(c) but has clearaways on Madras (Fortar) Street and Barbadoes Street rather than converting them to one-way streets. The other high ranked option is 4(a) which includes clearaways on Crawford Street / Sherborne Street through to Bealey Avenue, with traffic signals at Fortar Street / Warrington and Barbadoes Street / Warrington Street. While option 3(b) also has a similar scoring overall it did score more poorly in terms of "main considerations", with permanent three-laning impacting more on business and residential kerb-side car parking. Given that additional capacity is only required in peak periods, the peak period clearway option (3a) is preferable as a two-way configuration, and so it has not been carried forward.

Option 5 provides both sets of upgrades, it is unlikely by 2031 that both upgrade Options (3(a) and 4(a)) will be required. Indeed, capacity constraints on Crawford Street north of Berwick Street will limit need for all upgrades. Hence this option is not preferred.

### 7.4.1 Preferred Option Discussion

Option 3(a) includes upgrades to Berwick Street and Warrington Street, as does Option 3(c). However, instead of extending the one-way streets it proposes peak period clearways on Madras (Fortar) Street and...
Barbadoes Streets south of Warrington Street. A key reason this option is not scoring as well as the one-way extension is the additional lane during peak periods would impact on the following: 1) Kerbside parking (for business and residents), 2) Difficulty accommodating cycle facilities (due to clearway), and 3) Much wider crossing distance across Farfor Street and Barbadoes Street to St Albans Park. The main negatives with the one-way extension is extra travel distance for some trips to Madras Street and Barbadoes Street businesses and residents (this is minimal in this case due to the grid network of roads), and a potential increase in speeds if road does not get suitable narrowing.

Option 4(a) includes extending clearways further south on Cranford Street and along Sherborne Street. This option has slightly better travel time savings compared to Options 3(a) and 3(c). But, as can be seen in the MCA analysis, travel time has a relatively low weighting overall (at 10%) compared to many other matters assessed. Negative impacts include poor provision for cyclists when clearway is in operation, right turn ban at Berwick Street (from Cranford Street), additional traffic through Edgeware Village, and removal of parking on Sherborne Street from Bealey Avenue to Purchase Street permanently as part of upgrading the Bealey Avenue/Sherborne Street intersection. The main advantage of this option is that change will not need to be made to most of Madras (Farfor) Street and Barbadoes Street. However, this is also a negative as these routes, especially Madras (Farfor) Street, will experience traffic growth which will impact on safe access to St Albans Park as there will be additional traffic that pedestrians have to give-way to.

### 7.4.2 Development of a Preferred Option

All three options would provide the additional traffic capacity required to minimise rat-running on local streets. All three include peak period clearways on Cranford Street to Berwick Street and improvements to the Westminster Street/Cranford Street and Berwick Street/Farfor Street intersections. The modelling indicates that Madras Street would have significant additional traffic using it with all three options and that the Warrington Street/Farfor Street intersection needs to be signalised, along with associated upgrades to Berwick and Warrington Streets. We would also highly recommend upgrading the Barbadoes Street Warrington Street intersection, which already experiences considerable delays and has safety concerns, especially for crossing pedestrians and buses.

For the three highest ranking options, the capacity upgrades required on Berwick Street/Warrington Street and north of Berwick Street (Cranford clearways) are very similar and hence these elements of the options are included as part of the proposed Plan (some differences in intersection layouts at new traffic signals). However, south of Berwick Street there are three options, with one, Sherborne Street clearways, appearing to be quite different to the other two that utilised Barbadoes Street and Madras Street to carry the additional CNC traffic. However, all three routes, Sherborne Street/Cranford Street, Madras Street/Farfor Street, and Barbadoes Street already have a role in distributing traffic from Cranford North to Bealey Avenue and further south, and vice versa. Drivers tend to choose the route that best positions them to use Bealey Avenue and access sets of one-way pairs (Madras Street/Farfor Street and Durham Street/Montreal Street), depending on their destination (or origin). Drivers will still have both choices following the opening of the CNC but will distribute themselves depending on the level of congestion on each route.

Modelling to date on this study has been undertaken with the CAST model. This model is useful for looking at preferred route choice at a network level. In our view it is not sensitive enough to assess the more detailed operation of the road network at an intersection and individual road link level. We are also conscious that the stakeholders and the public are keen to see more detail on what each upgrade option would look like, and the detailed effects. These effects include removal of parking outside residences and business, rat-running through several local routes, such as Edgeware Road through the village. Hence the Plan suggests all three options are progressing to a scoping study. This scoping study would look in more detail at the design of each route and the nine main intersections from Warrington Street to Bealey Avenue, involve more detailed modelling of each option to look at how the options might be staged (e.g. where are clearways required in 2020, compared with 2031), and seek further community and stakeholder input on the proposed upgrades. It is possible that the preferred option may involve some upgrades to all three routes.

In all three cases the upgrades would connect into the Berwick Street/Warrington Street capacity improvements which we suggest progresses to detail design and construction ideally ahead of the CNC opening.
7.5 Traffic Calming and Safe Speed Community Areas

7.5.1 Development of Traffic Calming Measures

Local streets have a primary function of providing access to adjoining land-use and lack some of the safe design features of arterial road. To a lesser degree, collector routes. While many of the streets in the St Albans area are narrow or have been narrowed to reduce vehicle speeds, there are a number of local streets in the study area that are very wide and may attract fast moving rat-running traffic, including larger trucks. Speeding issues if not treated, can increase the risk of crashes involving serious injuries and deaths. A range of treatments exist which can limit, dissuade, or mitigate vehicle movements through parts of the transport network where these movements are less desired, or unexpected. Most of these treatments are categorised as ‘traffic calming’ and should also reduce vehicle speeds and discourage access by larger vehicles (except on bus routes). Treatments typically include:

- **Vertical deflection** – wattle profile speed humps, raised platforms (mid-block and intersection), raised pavements, and wombat crossings (raised pedestrian crossings).
- **Horizontal deflection** – lane narrowing/kerb extensions, slow points, centre blister islands, driveway links, median treatments, and roundabouts.
- **Diversion devices** – full road closure, half road closure, diagonal road closure, modified intersection, left-in/left out islands.
- **Signs, line marking, and other treatments** – speed limit signs and indication devices, prohibited traffic movement signs, one-way street signs, give-way signs, stop signs, shared zones, school zones, threshold treatments, tactile surface treatments, bicycle facilties, and bus facilities.

The traffic calming measures range in severity. Some completely close off available movements, such as converting a street that had multiple vehicle entries to a cul-de-sac. A treatment such as this would remove all through movements from the street. Other treatments are less severe, allowing for full access but reducing vehicle speeds and making the street less comfortable to negotiate. In the Plan we have generally selected less severe traffic calming measures to start, as these are typically more acceptable to the public prior to high levels of rat-running being observed on streets.

If traffic monitoring indicates this is not effective, more severe traffic calming, such as banning movements or partially, or fully closing streets, may be necessary. While there is a focus on the less severe traffic calming to start, there are some obvious more severe traffic calming measures (e.g. restricting arms of intersections to entry or exit only) that could be made for relatively low cost, compared to traffic calming an entire street. Such options should be discussed with local residents and it supported progressed.

Another beneficial side effect of traffic calming streets is that it can improve the level of service for cyclists and pedestrians. This can be achieved by treatments such as kerb protrusions that reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians, or by reducing speeds so cyclists feel more comfortable cycling in the traffic lane.

The Plan identifies the streets that are expected to have a greater than 30% increase in traffic volumes as a result of the CNC in the AM or PM peak periods (in some cases in both) or all day by 2031. The modellings indicates some of these streets may need to be treated before or shortly after the CNC opens. The monitoring programme will pick up changes in traffic volumes and speeds and indicate which streets need to traffic calmed later on; between 2021 and 2031.

7.5.2 Safe Speed Community Areas (SSCA)

In addition to physical changes to streets it is proposed to create up to 9 safe speed (community) areas either side of Cranford and Sherborne Streets as shown in Figure 7-16.

In addition to reducing travel speeds on local streets and reducing crash risk, the SSCA also signal to drivers that they are entering lower volume and lower speed streets where they should be more alert as children and elderly people may be on or crossing the road; hence the reason for including ‘safe’ in the signage. Ideally SSCA should have a 30km/h speed limit, as that is the ‘safe speed’ where collisions with pedestrians and cyclists have a very low likelihood of causing fatal or severe injuries.

We recommend that all traffic calmed local streets be designed to operate at around 30km/h. However, some of the streets within these areas will remain untreated and so a 40km/h speed limit may be more appropriate until such time as all the streets in an area are treated and have operating speeds between
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30 and 40km/h. The 40km/h speed limit is also more consistent with what has already been applied to other residential streets in the city. In either case, a drop in the speed limit and the associated signage is expected to reduce the number of crashes and the severity of any crashes which do occur.

Note that it is not essential to lower the speeds in area 2B, as these are not through routes, although as part of the changes we would strongly recommend these routes have lower speed limits.

![Figure 7-16: Safe Speed (Community) Areas](image)

### 7.6 2nd Stage of Option Development

The additional CNC traffic coming into Cranford Street causes a number of transport, social, and environment effects on the downstream (primarily St Albans) community. The proposed arterial/collector street upgrades (and associated traffic calming and speed management) address some of these effects, but do not address others, and in some cases create new traffic effects. The Stage 2 option development needs to consider these other effects. We have divided these other issues and associated improvement options into five categories:

1) Safe access to schools,
2) Safer cycle facilities,
3) Access to parks,
4) Access to commercial activity centres, and
5) Other effects.

The other effects include issues like access to properties along the arterial routes.

Few infrastructure improvement options are proposed at this stage. Instead a number of studies are proposed to look at the specific impacts of the additional traffic on each focus area and how these impacts can be mitigated. These studies are included in the Plan. An outcome of these studies will be a number of improvement options, some of which need to be implemented soon after the CNC is opened.
and others which can be made later in ten-year monitoring period (known as the commissioning period). The ongoing monitoring may also indicate that additional improvement options are required in these categories to address specific issues. As mentioned earlier, the healthy streets and the safe system framework methods are proposed, alongside traditional safety auditing, to maximise the safety and amenity benefits of route and intersection upgrades.

The next few sections outline some of the issues that need to be addressed by these improvement options.

### 7.6.1 Safe Access to Schools

Increased traffic volumes in the area will impact on safe access to key destinations in the local area, and specifically schools, parks, and commercial activity centres, and especially for those walking to these locations. Of particular concern is access to these locations by the young (e.g. school children), elderly (which there are increasing numbers of), and those with disabilities, such as those with a mobility or visual impairment. Increased risk of crashes is a direct result of the additional traffic from the CNC, especially on arterial and collector roads. Hence improvements need to be made including infrastructure improvements and speed limit changes.

There are a number of primary schools in the study area and consideration needs to be given to how the additional traffic from the CNC may impact on the safety of school children that are walking around the network and especially crossing the road. Typically, it is older primary school children (year 5 and 6) that are walking unaccompanied by adults. There may also be a small number of primary school pupils that cycle to school. While there are also a number of preschools in the area, children of this age will in almost all cases be accompanied by an adult.

The main school impacted by the CNC downstream traffic is St Albans Primary School. Some of the school children need to cross Cranford Street to walk to the school. Children also cross Westminster Street (west of Cranford) and Courtenay Street. While signalised intersection crossings are provided at the Westminster Street and Berwick Street intersections, there have been a number of near misses, particularly at the former, between crossing children and turning traffic (typically turning when the signal has gone red, often due to traffic congestion and no turning arrows). St Albans School currently employs a cross-guard at this intersection before and after school to guide pupils across the road. Traffic calming has already been introduced on Westminster Street both sides of Courtenay Street, including a pedestrian refuge and road narrowing, to slow down traffic and aid crossing of the route by school children.

The additional traffic on Cranford Street, as a result of the CNC, will increase the risk of crashes involving pedestrians, including school children, if no changes are made. There are several improvements that can be made on Cranford Street to address this safety risk including a temporary speed limit before and after the school north of Westminster to south of Berwick, putting the Westminster Street / Cranford Street intersection on a platform or using a textured surface, and introducing smarter signals phasing as part of widening the western approach of the intersection. The latter being part of a proposed upgrade of Westminster Street and Courtenay Street to improve amenity and accommodate cycling infrastructure. Banning of right turns into Westminster Street in the AM peak (and PM commuter peak) will also reducing the risk of turning crashes involving pedestrians crossing Westminster Street. Additional enforcement be if a red-light running camera, or increased police presence, is also recommended.

Another option that should be considered is a mid-block crossing outside the English (ASB) Park carpark, approximately mid-way between the two intersections (Berwick and Westminster). An at-grade mid-block crossing would have the advantage of no turning movements. As raised by submitters, a grade separated crossing (sub-way or overbridge) would remove the conflict with vehicles altogether. However, there are a number of issues with such an option, with the key issue being the lack of room to accommodate the overbridge within the current road reserve. It would be difficult based on the number of daily users to justify the cost of such a structure and there are major visual impacts associated with installing an overbridge in this location.

The banning of right turn vehicles from Cranford Street into Westminster Street in the morning peak will also help reduce this risk.

Another safety issue identified during the consultation was the school crossings on Innes Road outside Mairehau Primary School and Our Lady of Fatima School. While there are zebra crossings outside each school, many drivers are not stopping, especially at the Mairehau Primary School, crossings. A signalised crossing would be more effective, perhaps located at the Mairehau school crossing. Although the traffic volumes on Innes Road are not expected to increase significantly (and not above 30%) when the CNC is
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opened we would strongly recommend Christchurch City Council signalise one of the crossings as part of its safer routes to school programme.

There are also incidents on Rutland Street outside St Albans Catholic School between school children and cyclists on the cycleway. Christchurch City Council have been looking into these issues as part of the major cycleway programme and hence the Plan does not consider this matter further. other than raising it as an issue that needs to be monitored going forward. It is possible that the increased traffic flows on Rutland Street as a result of the CNC may impact on the safety of crossing school children. Options to address any concerns may need to be considered as a Stage 3 project.

It is important that through the ‘safe routes to school programme’ that there is additional education of pupils, teachers, and parents, especially associated with safe crossing behaviour in and around each school, leading up to the opening of the CNC.

7.6.2 Safer Cycle Facilities

A key impact of the additional CNC traffic and the need for peak period clearways on Cranford Street and other routes is a deterioration in the facilities provided for cyclists on these routes. Not only is there additional traffic on the clearway routes, there is not adequate room to provide cycle lanes or adequate room for cyclists when clearways are in use. The 3.7m wide kerbside lane is not adequate for a truck or bus to safely pass a cyclist. When parking is occurring in the clearway lanes then cyclists have some space between the parked car and main traffic lane. Such a facility is only suitable for confident cyclists and not the new cyclists that Christchurch City Council want to encourage into cycling. It is also a poorer option than the cycle paths that are provided down the CNC and on Cranford Street down to McFaddens Road. The option of a shared path on the berm is not considered suitable due to safety concerns associated with backing vehicles from residential properties. Because of issues associated with visibility from backing vehicles, narrowing the berm and widening the carriageway to accommodate cycle lanes is also not considered a safe option.

With the Papamoa Parallel nearby and with the provision of additional infrastructure and suitable wayfinding (at each end of clearway sections), the majority of cyclists can be accommodated on alternative routes. Some cyclists will choose to cycle on Cranford Street anyway, mostly the confident cyclists that will use the space when available or cycle in the traffic lane. Others with origins or destinations on routes like Cranford Street will most likely ride on the footpath or cycle in the traffic. If the Government do pass a law allowing footpath cycling like some Australian States and other countries, then we would recommend that Christchurch City Council consider applying this to these routes. With footpath riding, speeds are tempered by the width of the footpath (as compared with allowing a footpath cyclist on this route as a shared path) and the users who are typically less confident or younger riders.

To provide suitable facilities for cyclists coming from the north (to and from the city) and the local community we are recommending investigation of one further north-south cycleway and at least three east-west cycle links to the Papamoa Parallel and the new north-south cycleway, which needs to be on the eastern side of Cranford Street. The need for the new north-south route, especially north of Westminster Street, is that the deviation to the Papamoa Parallel will be too great for some cyclist’s trips, especially from cyclists that originate from Matareha. Which is to the east of Cranford Street. Wayfinding needs to be provided at the McFaddens Road/Cranford Street intersection to the north. In the south, cyclists heading north from the city should be encouraged to use the Colombo Street cycleway or the Manchester Street cycle lanes.

The new north-south link should start on the eastern side of Cranford Street at the McFaddens Road / Cranford Street intersection. The preferred route needs to go through a routes selection process and Safety Audit and Network Functionality (SANF) assessment (see Appendix H for details). One potential route that utilises streets that need to be traffic calmed, is shown in Figure 7-17. The route follows McFaddens Road, Jamieson Street, Severn Street, Forfar Street, then alongside Madras Street and through St Albans Park, Allard Street, Packe Street, Purchas Street, and then onto Manchester Street. The route would be a combination of quiet streets and shared paths. Suitable crossings would need to be provided across Innes Road, Westminster Street, and Edgeware Road.

The key east-west links are McFaddens Street, Westminster/Courtenay Street and Edgeware Road. The McFaddens Road cycle connection would be considered as part of the traffic calming of this route on both sides of Cranford Street. The Westminster Street/Courtenay Street and Edgeware Road cycle facilities would be included in two corridor studies that are recommended for these routes, with the extent of these studies shown in Purple in Figure 7-17. This will be a combination of on-road cycle lanes and shared facilities. Extension of the Manchester Street cycle lanes from Bealey Avenue to Edgeware Road is also recommended.
7.6.3 Safe Access to Parks

The additional traffic from the CNC will potentially impact on traffic flows around at least two of the parks, St Albans Park and the lesser degree Malvern/Rugby Park. Given St Albans Park is surrounded by three main routes that are likely to have an increased traffic volume, being Warrington Street, Barbadoes Street, and Forfar (Madras) Street, it is the most affected by additional traffic. Current pedestrian (and cycle) access to the park is not ideal with the wide carriageway on Forfar Street and Barbadoes Street, and a roundabout and only pedestrian crossing aids at Forfar/ Warrington and Barbadoes Street /Warrington Street respectively. Cycle access to the north is provided by these main roads. With the relatively lower traffic volumes the impact on access and safety has been limited. With the increased traffic it will be difficult in peak periods to access the Park.

The installation of traffic signals at Forfar Street /Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street /Warrington Street as part of the major road improvement (MR3) will improve access and safety considerably to pedestrians and cyclists even with the increasing traffic volumes. The new north-south cycle facility (SC5) in conjunction with east-west links (SC3 and SC4) will also improve cycle access to the park. The remaining issues are mid-block crossings across Forfar Street /Madras Street and Barbadoes Street. The new design of these routes needs to consider how both routes can be narrowed alongside the park so that pedestrians have shorter crossing distance and speeds are managed to lower levels. This is particularly an issue for the mobility impaired and also caregivers with prams.

In terms of Malvern Park, rat-running traffic on Roosevelt and Malvern Streets would impact on access to the park. Traffic calming measures will be required to manage traffic volumes and speeds around the park. Access across Innes Road to Malvern Park will also become more difficult due increasing traffic volumes, There is an alleyway provided between Innes Road and Knowles Street /Weston Street which includes a refuge island on Innes Road. With increased traffic flows on Innes Road, the mid-block crossing will be more difficult.
7.6.4 Safe Access to Commercial Centres

There are a number of commercial centres that are likely to be impacted by the downstream traffic generated from the CNC. This includes the Edgeware Village Neighbourhood Centre and four local commercial centres, being Westminster/Cranford shops, Barbadoes/Warrington shops, Barbadoes/Edgeware shops, and the Rutland Street shops.

Recent changes on Rutland Street have provided improved access to these shops by bicycle (Papanui Parallel) and pedestrians (crossing aids). Parking has also been considered in the new design. However, there are concerns from businesses that there is not enough short-term parking nearby. This is a matter that needs to be monitored by Christchurch City Council and addressed as needed.

The Edgeware Village has been the subject of several recent studies, including the Edgeware Village masterplan. This has resulted in improved north-south cycle facilities (Papanui Parallel) and a signalised pedestrian crossing of Edgeware Road. Modelling indicates that traffic volumes may increase on Edgeware Road, both to west (and east) of Cranford Street and on Cranford Street/Sherborne Street. This is likely to impact on cycle access to the village and the Papanui Parallel, especially from the east. The corridor plan recommended for Edgeware Road (in Figure 7-17) should consider how cyclists can move through the Village east to west and vice-versa. Any option development through the village needs to be developed in conjunction with refinement of the Edgeware Village masterplan.

The centre most impacted by the extra CNC traffic is the Cranford Street/Westminster Street local centre. Since the earthquakes this centre has become more vibrant with several new businesses setting up in this area. The current pedestrian and cycle connections around the centre are not good, although there is a signalised intersection to get across Cranford Street. With Christchurch City Council wanting to promote walking and cycling, and encourage people to use these local centres, in addition to the increasing traffic through the centre we recommend that a plan be prepared for the centre in conjunction with the corridor study of Westminster (and Courtenay) Streets. The plan should look at cycle and pedestrian linkages to the centre. This will require widening of the western approach to the traffic signals and new footpaths. The plan should also consider parking requirements and options to provide additional parking, especially off-road parking.

The Warrington Street/Barbadoes Street local centre also has relatively poor pedestrian and cycle facilities. Access to the north will be improved with the proposed traffic signals. A plan should also be prepared that looks at opportunities to improve pedestrian facilities, especially to the park/west side of Barbadoes Street. The study should also look at parking requirements, as parking demand is high from residents and the café customers who are not able to use the off-road car-park, with the clearway option impacting on parking availability. Special consideration needs to be given to the Audiology business on west side of Barbadoes Street (sensitive to noise, including construction) and also the location of the bus stop outside the café (can this be moved to allow short stay parking for the café).

The Barbadoes Street/Edgeware Street local centre has poor cycle facilities but reasonable pedestrian access via the traffic signals. Again, a plan should be prepared for this centre. Cycle facilities should be provided on Edgeware Road as part of the Edgeware corridor study. Parking requirements should be considered given the potential for the clearway to limit parking in the morning peak period.
8. Recommendations (Management Plan)

The overall downstream effects plan will be implemented over approximately a 10-year period. Some network changes need to be in place before the CNC is opened in mid-2020 due to the expected jump in traffic volumes on Cranford Street from traffic diverting from other routes. While the focus is on routes that are expected to be impacted by traffic growth of 30% or more by 2031 as result of the CNC, the timing of upgrades is dependent on a number of factors, such as increased crash risk, overall increase in rat-running, level of congestion on arterial roads and impacts of construction after CNC opens.

The following sections outline the recommended improvements and further studies that are proposed to avoid, remedy and mitigate the traffic impacts of the CNC on the downstream road network. This builds on the option development process discussed above. First, we discuss the staging of the upgrades and monitoring requirements before presenting the options across the seven option (and study) categories.

8.1 Monitoring and Project Staging

8.1.1 Introduction

The Plan presented in this report is based on traffic modelling, which is based on land-use projections and drivers’ behaviours. There is no certainty of how much traffic will use the CNC and downstream roads, especially by 2031. However, there is an expectation that there will be an initial increase in traffic due to drivers diverting to the CNC from Marshlands Road and Main North Road, and hence the Plan looks to address the impact of this increase and then monitoring will be used to confirm transport impacts between 2021 and 2031 and what needs to be addressed.

Some parts of the network may be initially more sensitive to the impact of the CNC than others, and once drivers become more accustomed to the new layout, driving behaviours will become more obvious. We are particularly conscious that drivers’ rat-running behaviours are difficult to predict using a transport model and so we expect some behaviour to be different to what has been modelled.

The capacity interventions, particularly on Cranford Street and Berwick Street, appear more pressing than others, and do need to be in place before the CNC becomes operational. There were some suggestions during consultation that no works should be undertaken prior to the CNC opening, and to see how the network performs. This approach has merit on parts of the network, however if universally adopted it is likely to result in major traffic impacts on a large number of (rat-running) routes after the CNC is opened and severe congestion on arterial roads. Making changes following the opening of the CNC may also be very disruptive on commuters and the community once the network is already heavily congested.

8.1.2 Proposed Monitoring

As previously stated, the Plan is focused on parts of the network that experience a 30% increase in vehicles (minus underlying traffic growth). In order to ascertain whether a part of the network has exceeded the 30% threshold, the simplest approach would be to compare between the growth expected between 2021 and 2031 with the volume recording at any given time. However, there are a number of limitations in using this approach as outlined below.

There are many societal events which affect the number of trips undertaken on a network: land-use changes, economic changes, and political changes to name a few. Given time, changes will occur, and these will need to be updated in a base model. There are also many specific changes that will occur on the network which will also need to be updated within the base model. These changes are relatively simple to take care of in a model. However, a much more difficult undertaking is to un-couple changes made to the downstream network in response to the CNC: changes which affect the traffic volume on various streets (increases and decreases) which may not have been undertaken had the CNC not been constructed, or at least not within the set timespan outlined in the NAP. One example of this is the provision of additional capacity on (any) arterial corridor in order to relieve traffic from local streets. Any expansion of capacity on the network will likely illicit a redistribution of vehicle movements, but the net effect may on balance be the most desirable. Consequently, there may be scenarios where Christchurch City Council are best to increase the traffic flow on some arterial or collector roads (perhaps even in excess of the 30% threshold). Over time it will become increasingly difficult to separate the impact of these downstream treatments and the CNC itself in terms of their consequence to the network’s performance.

The easiest method, therefore, is to gather baseline data from the monitoring sites, and apply an assumed base growth rate on the network to these streets as representing growth that would have occurred if the CNC was not build. Then traffic volumes can be monitored and, when a site increases beyond a 30% growth above this standard level of growth, the next step of investigation can begin. In our view, a 30%
downstream wide blanket threshold is a relatively blunt approach to network management of this magnitude. It fails to acknowledge fundamental network differences, and the interrelationship between hierarchy elements. Networks vary in where it can, and cannot, accommodate growth, or indeed what exactly might be considered acceptable or unacceptable growth. The relationship between effects of traffic, and volume of traffic, is also not strictly linear. Some effects respond differently to the volume of traffic, and effects also vary depending by road environment.

A time unit for the traffic volume increase was not stipulated in the NoR (for example 30% increase on the number of vehicles per day). The tidal nature of the commuter flow in Northern Christchurch means that the greatest effects is usually experienced during the morning peak, and to a lesser extent the evening peak. Therefore, for the purposes of the Plan, the assumed time unit for the 30% threshold includes the daily count, AM peak count, or the PM peak count.

A decision tree conceptualisation of the process outlined in the NoR is shown below:

![Decision Tree for NoR Monitoring of Traffic Volumes](image)

**Figure B-1: Decision Tree for NoR Monitoring of Traffic Volumes**

The monitoring programme will involve the collection of daily traffic volumes and vehicle speeds (over a minimum of three 24-hour days – normally seven days). The baseline data (pre-CNC) is being collected in 2018 at over 50 sites/streets in the downstream road network. The locations of the counts are shown on the screen lines in Appendix E. Following the opening of the CNC, Christchurch City Council will typically collect counts annually or biennially on the routes that are most likely to impacted by rat-running traffic, as indicated by the transport modelling. A number of the streets included in the baseline counts are not expected to be impacted, but counts are being collected in case rat-running does occur so there can be a comparison made of traffic conditions before the CNC opened. For these streets, and also the regularly monitored streets out of sequence, special counts may be collected if rat-running does appear to be an issue. It may also be necessary to monitor adjoining streets after traffic calming is applied if traffic just diverts across to these other streets.

It is also proposed to monitor the vehicle emission, noise, and vibration impacts of the additional traffic on the main roads (arterials and collector routes). This monitoring is in response to concerns raised by the community. Baseline data will be collected along with annual or biennial measurements through to 2031. The arterial sites being monitored include:

- Cranford Street north of McFaddens Street
- Cranford Street north of Berwick Street
- Berwick Street immediately east of Cranford Street
- Madras Street north of Edgeware Road
- Barbadoes Street north of Edgeware Road

The intention being to collect air pollution levels using detectors installed at each of these locations, so data can be extracted whenever required through to at least the end of 2031. Christchurch City Council will investigate suitable technology for this monitoring.

Noise and vibration measurements will also be collected at sites along these routes. The monitoring will consider those most affected by vibration and noise (houses and businesses close to the vibration and noise source), and the typical impact on houses and businesses along each section of road. The source of noise and vibration will be identified using video (CCTV) cameras. Based on the monitoring, Christchurch City Council will consider whether there are suitable options to address any adverse effects found by this monitoring.

### 8.1.3 Staging of Improvements

The proposed improvements and associated studies have been grouped into three time periods. Stage 1 upgrades are those upgrades that need to be in place before the CNC is opened, to address severe traffic congestion and excessive rat-running in local streets. Stage 2 upgrades are those improvements that will reduce other traffic effects of the CNC opening traffic flows, including additional traffic calming schemes, safe cycling, and safe access to schools, parks, and commercial areas. These improvements should be implemented within three years of the opening of the CNC. It is recommended that the studies into the issues and options for these upgrades commence before the CNC opens. While these improvements should ideally also be in place before the CNC opens, it is acknowledged that it will take time to develop and implement these options. Stage 3 upgrades are those improvements that the modelling indicates will be required between 2021 and 2031. This includes traffic calming and some additional safe cycling improvements. The timing of these upgrades will depend on the outcomes from the monitoring.

### 8.2 Proposed Improvement Options

This section outlines the various improvement options and associated studies that are recommended to address the expected impacts of the CNC traffic that will flow into the downstream road network. The options have been split into Stage 1, 2, and 3 depending on when the upgrades should be implemented. The improvements options have been grouped into the following categories:

1. Major Roads (MR Options)
2. Traffic Calming (TC Options) and Safe Speed Community Areas (SSCA Options)
3. Safe Access to Schools (AS Options)
4. Safe Cycling Routes (SC Options)
5. Access to Parks (AP Options)
6. Access to Commercial Centres (AC Options)

Each of the options are presented in the following sections and have been developed in-line with the processes outlined previously.

#### 8.2.1 Major Roads (MR Options)

All of the major road upgrade options need to be in place before the CNC opens. So, all options are in Stage 1.

The major road options have been separated into those north and south of Berwick Street, and on Berwick Street / Warrington Street. The options proposed north of Berwick Street include the following:

**MR1 Cranford Clearways** – Peak Period Clearways along Cranford Street – to extend from Innes Road through to Berwick Street. To include right turn restrictions at Dee Street and Malvern Street and at English Park Carpark. This option will also include a study of the accesses along the route and how drivers will be able to manoeuvre in and out of each driveway (the same to be applied to other clearway options further south). A plan will also need to be produced on how to enforce the clearways.
MR2 (Westminster/Cranford Intersection) – Upgrades to Westminster Street /Cranford Street Intersection. This is to include banning right turns into Westminster Street in peak period, widening of the western approach and include cycle lanes on Westminster Street. It should also include other changes to improve safety for crossing school children as discussed later on.

Along Berwick Street and Warrington Street the following option is proposed. This should be undertaken as a single option given the close proximity of the intersections and associated road widening between each.

MR3 (Berwick/Warrington Upgrades) – Upgrading of Berwick Street /Cranford Street intersection to include double right turn into Cranford Street and signalisation of the Forfar Street /Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street Warrington Street Intersections, plus any road widening between these intersections. Simulation modelling will be required to assess what extra lanes are required.

South of Berwick Street there are several upgrade options possible on the three arterial/collector routes (as specified earlier, i.e. options 3(a), 3(c) or 4(a)) and a scoping study needs to be undertaken, using a simulation model to develop these options further and determine what needs to be in place by 2021 and then through to 2031. Consideration needs to be given to high kerbside parking demands on Madras Street and Barbadoes Street due to medium density developments in this area in the development of options. A parking survey needs to be undertaken as part of the scoping study. The access requirements of the proposed St Albans Shopping Centre on Madras Street also need to be considered in option development. It is suggested up to three options should then go to the public for feedback before finalising the option. This may delay the project construction until after the CNC opens, but, ideally these changes are made before the CNC opens. The MR 1, 2, and 3 options above are the more critical projects that need to be in place when the CNC opens.

MR4 (South Berwick Upgrades) – Preferred downstream of Berwick Street arterial upgrade option that comes out of the scoping study of Options 3(a), 3(c) and 4(a) and any sub-options of these.

We also strongly recommend that Christchurch City Council work with NZ Transport Agency to do a study extending the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on the CNC in the southbound direction from north of QEII down through the arterial road network and along Cranford and Sherborne Streets. In addition, an HOV lane could be provided northbound from Bealey Avenue though to the CNC roundabout on Cranford Street. The use of HOV lanes would promote car-pooling and bus-use, and reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles, which is a desirable travel demand management outcome. The HOV lanes would utilise the extra lane created by the peak period clearways. This study is specified below as MR5 and the HOV lanes, if suitable, should ideally be implemented as a Stage 1 improvement, but could also be implemented as a Stage 2 improvement.

MR5 (HOV lanes on Cranford Sherborne) – Investigate with the NZ Transport Agency extending the southern HOV lanes on the CNC through to Bealey Avenue and installing a northbound HOV lane.

No other major road upgrade options are proposed.

8.2.2 Local Roads: Traffic Calming of Local Streets (TC Options) and Safe Speed Community Areas (SSCA Options)

As mentioned in Section 7.5, it is proposed that nine safe speed community areas (SSCA 1 to 9) are introduced in the downstream road network making up most of the local streets. A speed limit of 30km/h is recommended, but a 40km/h speed limit is also an option. The location of these areas on each side of Cranford Street and Sherborne Street are shown in Figure 8-1 and listed below.

- SSCA1 – Ranger Street
- SSCA2 – Knowles Street
- SSCA3 – Thames Street
- SSCA4 – Roosevelt Street
- SSCA5 – Flockton Street
- SSCA6 – Trafalgar Street
- SSCA7 – Oxley Ave
- SSCA8 – Caledonian Road
- SSCA9 – Bishop Street
It is recommended that the SSCA areas all be in place before the opening of the CNC, as a deterrent for rat-running. It is recommended over time that all the streets in these areas are traffic calmed so that the reduced speed limit is self-explaining on each street.

The modelling has identified the streets that are likely to require traffic calming through to 2031. As specified previously, some of these streets need to be traffic calmed in Stage 1 or 2, while others can wait until the CNC opens and following monitoring (Stage 3 options). It is also possible the monitoring will identify rat-running streets not identified in the transport modelling. Table 8-1 shows the streets that are expected to have an increase in traffic volumes through to 2031 even with the arterial upgrades and the proposed staging of these options, based on the expected timing of rat-running on these routes. Potential rat-running routes west of Rutland Street have been excluded from assessment (Christchurch City Council will monitor and treat these routes if required separate from the Plan).

Table 8-1: Traffic Calming Routes and Their Staging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Start and Finish</th>
<th>Staging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC1 - Mersey Street</td>
<td>Innes Road to Berwick Street</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC2 - Knowles Street</td>
<td>Rutland Street to Cranford Street</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC3 - Weston Street</td>
<td>Rutland Street to Cranford Street</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC4 – McFaddens Street</td>
<td>Rutland Street to Cranford Street</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC5 – McFaddens Street</td>
<td>Cranford Street to Ranger Street</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC6 – Jamieson Street</td>
<td>McFaddens Street to Innes Road</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC7 – Malvern Street</td>
<td>Rutland Street to Cranford Street</td>
<td>Stage 1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC8 – Dee Street</td>
<td>Roosevelt Street to Cranford Street</td>
<td>Stage 1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC9 – Roosevelt Street</td>
<td>Innes Road to Westminster Street</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC10 – Forfar Street</td>
<td>Westminster Street to Warrington Street</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC11 – Flockton Street</td>
<td>Westminster Street to Warrington Street</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC12 – Caledonian Road</td>
<td>Bealey Avenue to Edgeware Road</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC13 – Edgeware Road</td>
<td>Caledonian Road to Manchester Street</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 14 – Manchester Street</td>
<td>Bealey Avenue to Edgeware Road</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As part of the Cranford Street Clearways Project (MR1) these streets will become left-in and left-out only which effectively works as traffic calming.

8.2.3 Safe Access to Schools (AS)

The main school impacted by the CNC downstream traffic is St Albans Primary School. Some of the school children need to cross Cranford Street to walk to the school. Given the range of options that are possible to address this risk it is recommended that a study be undertaken to identify the preferred option(s). This study is to be undertaken as part of the Stage 1 improvements and implemented as a Stage 2 improvement.

AS1 – Safe Access across Cranford Street – This study will look at a range of options, including a new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance.

AS2 – Interim Improvements on Cranford Street – As an interim measure it is suggested that, as part of MR1 (Cranford Clearways) and MR2 (Westminster/Cranford Intersection), a 40km/h speed limit be introduced during school arrival and departure time on Cranford Street from north of Westminster Street, a coloured surfacing be installed at the Westminster Street /Cranford Street Intersection, and left turning red arrows be
used as protection for crossing pedestrians. As with MR1 and MR2 these changes should be undertaken as a Stage 1 improvement.

8.2.4 Safer Cycling Routes (SC Options)

One of the new transport effects of the CNC, is that there will be poor facilities for cyclists on Cranford Street, especially when the clearway is in operation. Given the future traffic volumes down Cranford Street, this is not ideal. A number of options to provide better cyclist facilities on Cranford Street were investigated (e.g. shared pedestrian and cyclist path) and none are suitable within the current road reserve. Widening the road reserve would be expensive and very intrusive for those who live on the street. Hence the preferred option is to accommodate cyclists on alternative routes. While the Papanui Parallel does provide an alternative route, this is not considered sufficient on its own to redirect cyclists and accommodate all diverted and local area cyclists and hence other network changes are proposed. Hence, we propose a number of studies to identify suitable secondary cycle routes and look at wayfinding signage.

We would strongly recommend that Christchurch City Council use the SANF process to refine the options (as specified in Appendix H), the preferred eastern north-south route should also be selected using a multi-criteria analysis of different potential routes (as also specified in Appendix H).

The proposed five cycle facility upgrades are as follows:

SC1 (Cycle Wayfinding Signage) – Development of a wayfinding signage plan that directs cyclists at the northern end of Cranford Street (at McFaddens Road) and southern end of Cranford Street to safer cycling routes. This should be a Stage 1 improvement and coincide with introduction of the peak period clearways.

SC2 (McFaddens Road Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Development of a safe cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road of ideally slow streets or off-road routes. Route study to occur in Stage 1 and be implemented in Stage 2.

SC3 (Westminster/Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Development of a safe cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street. May consist of on-road and off-road cycling facilities, or just on-road facilities. Route study to occur in Stage 1 and be implemented in Stage 2.

SC4 (Edgeware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Development of a safe cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street. To consist of mainly on-road cycling facilities. Route study to occur in Stage 1 and be implemented in Stage 2.

SC5 (North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Development of an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street. To consist of bicycle greenways and off-road routes. A key cycle linkage to St Albans Park from the north and south. Route study to occur in Stage 1 and be implemented in Stage 2.

These Westminster Street /Courtenay Street and Edgeware Road corridors are also key accesses routes for pedestrians to the Westminster Street /Cranford Street local activity centre and the Edgeware Village, as specified in section 8.2.6.

8.2.5 Access to Parks (AP Options)

Two studies are proposed to look at safe access to these parks and what improvements could be made to improve safety around the parks.

AP1 (St Albans Park Access Plan) – This plan will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists. It will consider carparking requirements, given the proposed upgrades to Forfar Street and Barbados Street, and parking requirements of cyclists. The study should occur during Stage 2 and any recommendations be implemented during Stage 3.

AP2 (Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan) – This plan will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists. It will consider carparking requirements of Malvern Park and also what traffic calming may be required to reduce traffic speeds on Malvern Street and Roosevelt Street to create safer crossing places. The study should occur during Stage 2 and any recommendations be implemented during Stage 3.

8.2.6 Access to Commercial (Activity) Centres (AC options)

It is recommended that four activity centre transport studies and two corridor studies be undertaken during Stage 2 and implemented during Stage 3 of the process, as outlined below. With a development plan having already been prepared for the Edgeware Village it not proposed to do a further study of that...
centre. There are some overlaps between these studies and the safer cycling route studies, so this will need careful coordination to get the best outcomes.

**AC1 – Westminster/Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study.** This study will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. It will consider amenity improvements that can be made to the centre. A key focus will be on improving access along Westminster Street and Courtenay Street in the associated corridor study and across the intersection as part of MR2.

**AC2 – Barbadoes/Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study.** This study will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. It will consider amenity improvements that can be made to the centre. A key change at this location will be the installation of traffic signals at the Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street intersection to improve walking access to the north. High kerbside parking demands and the noise sensitive audiology centre are key matters that need to be considered.

**AC3 – Barbadoes/Edgeware Local Activity Centre Transport Study.** This study will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. It will consider amenity improvements that can be made to the centre.

**AC3 – Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study.** This study will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. It will consider amenity improvements that can be made to the centre. Given that there have been several changes outside these shops with the new cycleways, major changes are not likely to be required at this activity centre.

**AC4 – Westminster/Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar) –** This study will be a companion study to the cycle corridor study (SC3) but focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route, especially for vulnerable road users.

**AC5 – Edgeware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes) –** This study will be a companion study to the cycle corridor study (SC4) but focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users.
9. Summary

Table 9-1 summarises the improvements and studies that are proposed before the CNC opens (Stage 1 improvements and studies) and those options that should be implemented within three years of the opening (Stage 2 - less critical but expected to be actioned early in the ten-year monitoring period). Given the big increase in traffic volumes on Crawford Street expected when the CNC opens some work needs to be undertaken before it opens to avoid excessive congestion and rail-running in the down-streams network.

While some of the Stage 2 projects should ideally be in place before the CNC opens there is limited time to progress all the studies and projects identified before it opens and hence more crucial projects have been prioritised in Stage 1 and the rest moved to Stage 2. Some of the Stage 2 projects, especially some of the traffic calming, may also not be required, depending on the monitoring results. The impact of delaying some projects to Stage 2 (up to three years after the CNC opens) is that there may be adverse transport effects in the short term. Council will need to prioritise the worst of these transport effects, as identified in the monitoring, for early intervention, including rapid implementation projects where practical.

Other projects, those in Stage 3, can be implemented after the CNC opens. The traffic monitoring will show the actual transport impacts of the CNC and allow the projects developed in Stage 3 (and studies and projects in Stage 2) to be refined and changes made to the streets treated and options monitored in response to the observed traffic volumes, and other outcomes (e.g. increase in crash risk).

Table 9-1: Lists of improvement projects and studies categorised by Stage (note some projects appear in two or more stages consisting of the studies and the implementation of improvements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 – Projects and studies to be undertaken before the CNC opens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Road (MR) Upgrades:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR1 (Crawford Street Clearways) – Peak Period Clearways along Crawford Street from Innes Road to Berwick Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR2 (Westminster/Crawford Intersection) – Upgrades to Westminster Street /Crawford Street Intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR3 (Berwick/Warrington Upgrades) – Upgrading of Berwick Street /Crawford Street signalised intersection and signalisation of the Forfar Street /Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street Intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR4 (South Berwick Upgrades) –Downstream of Berwick Street arterial upgrade option that comes out of the scoping study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR5 (HOV lanes on Crawford-Sherborne) – Investigate extending the southern HOV (high occupancy vehicle) lanes on the CNC through to Bealey Avenue and installing a northbound HOV lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe System Community Areas (SSCA):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSCA 1 to 9 – Introduce nine 30km/h (or 40km/h) reduced speed limit areas through the downstream local road network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce traffic calming on TC1 – Mersey Street (Innes Road to Forfar Street), TC2 – Knowles Street, TC 3 – Weston Street, TC 4 – McFaddens Road, TC7 – Malvern Street (LILO) and TC8 – Dee Street (LILO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Access to Schools (AS):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS1 – Safe Access Across Crawford Street – This study will look at a range of options, including a new mid-block signalised crossing across Crawford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS2 – Interim Improvements on Crawford Street – As an interim measure it is suggested that as part of MR1 (Crawford Clearways) and MR2 (Westminster/Crawford Intersection) a 40km/h speed limit be introduced during school arrival and departure time on Crawford Street from approximately 50m north of Westminster Street to 50m south of Berwick Street, a coloured surfacing be installed at the Westminster/Crawford Intersection, and left turning red arrows be used as protection for crossing pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Safe Cycling Routes (SC):**

**SC1 (Cycle Wayfinding Signage)** – Development of and implementation of a wayfinding signage plan that directs cyclists at the northern end of Cranford Street (at McFaddens Road) and southern end of Cranford Street to safer cycling routes.

**SC2 (McFaddens Street Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Undertake a route study of a cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road.

**SC3 (Westminster/Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Undertake a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

**SC4 (Edgware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Undertake a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

**SC5 (North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Undertake a route study of an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street.

**Stage 2 – Projects and Studies that need to be undertaken within three years of CNC opening**

**Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:**

Introduce traffic calming on TC9 – Roosevelt Street, TC12 - Caledonian Street, TC13 - Edgware Road (Village), TC14 – Manchester Street and TC15 - Westminster Street / Courtenay Street, where expected increases in traffic volumes are validated by the monitoring data.

**Safe Access to Schools (AS):**

**AS1 – Safe Access Across Cranford Street** – Implement any options identified in this study such as a new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance.

**Safe Cycling Routes (SC):**

**SC2 (McFaddens Street Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Construct a secondary cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road.

**SC3 (Westminster/Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Construct a secondary cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

**SC4 (Edgware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Construct a secondary cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

**Access to Parks (AP):**

**AP1 (St Albans Park Access Plan)** – Development of a plan that will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists.

**AP2 (Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan)** – Development of a plan that will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists.

**Access to Commercial Centres (AC):**

**AC1 – Westminster/Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study** – Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

**AC2 – Barbadoes/Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study** – Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

**AC3 – Barbadoes/Edgware Local Activity Centre Transport Study** – Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

**AC3 – Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study** – Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

**AC4 – Westminster/Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar)** – Undertake this study which will focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users.

**AC5 – Edgware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes)** – Undertake this study which will focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users.

**Stage 3 – Projects that could be undertaken any time between the opening of the CNC and 2031**
Monitoring

Ongoing monitoring of traffic, pedestrians and cycle volumes, crashes and vehicles speeds, emissions, noise and vibration on major roads and some local streets is to occur annually, or when required more often, after the CNC opens to validate the plans and projects already identified in this document, and through the various studies that are specified.

It is expected that additional interventions will be required to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of the additional CNC traffic, including the impact of trucks, that is identified in this monitoring. In terms of local streets, intervention is required if the traffic volumes increase by 30% above what might have been expected on the route if the CNC had not been built. In terms of other interventions (e.g. arterial upgrades) this will be the result of congestion or safety concerns with respect to all road users. Some improvement may also not be required (e.g. if local road traffic does not increase by 30%, as predicted by the modelling). Consultation on all proposed changes will be undertaken.

An indication of Stage 3 improvement projects is provided below. This list will need to be reviewed and where necessary revised once the actual impacts of the CNC traffic is known from the monitoring.

Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:

Introduce traffic calming only where monitoring indicates high levels of rat-running are occurring (may include additional streets): TC – 5 McFadden, Knowles, Weston (east Cranford), TC6 – Jamieson, TC10 – Forfar Street, TC11 – Flockton Street, TC16 – Severn Street, TC17 – Thames Street, TC 18 – Aylesford Street, TC19 – Kensington Avenue, TC 20 – Philpotts Road and TC 21- Francis Street.

Safe Cycling Routes (SC):

SC5 (North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Construct an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street.

Access to Parks (AP):

AP1 (St Albans Park Access Plan) – Implementation of the access plan as required to address access issues.

AP2 (Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan) – Implementation of the access plan as required to address access issues.

Access to Commercial Centres (AC):

AC1 – Westminster/Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations
AC2 – Barbadoes/Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations.
AC3 – Barbadoes/Edgeware Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations
AC3 – Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations
AC4 – Westminster/Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar) – Implement study recommendations.
AC5 – Edgeware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes) – Implement study recommendations
Appendix A  Downstream Effects and Property Traffic Management Plan

1. Introduction and Purpose

1.1. Christchurch City Council (Council) lodged an application for a Notice of Requirement (NoR) for the Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade (NAE/CSU) in October 2013. As part of that application, on 3 November 2014, the Council lodged a report: Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA).

1.2. The TAA reported on the Christchurch Northern Corridor and included an assessment that, at the city end of that corridor, more traffic is expected to use Cranford Street than would be the case without the Project. The principal reason for this anticipated increase in use is re-routing traffic within the Christchurch Northern Corridor to benefit from the improved travel conditions provided by the NZ Transport Agency’s Northern Arterial and the Council’s NAE/CSU.

1.3. While the project, and the full Christchurch Northern Corridor is considered by the Council to be necessary to deliver a wide range of outcomes for the urban form, shape and growth for northern Christchurch and Waikari/Heathcote District, additional traffic may have potential adverse effects on residences and businesses in the immediate area around the southern end of the NAE/CSU (referred to as “downstream effects” in this Management Plan). In particular, more vehicles may travel on adjacent or nearby roads which were not the subject of any improvement or upgrading as part of the NoR application.

1.4. The modelling used for the NoR predicts what will happen at 2031 so long as the modelled assumptions are borne out. The TAA recommends continued investigation of the downstream effects of the Christchurch Northern Corridor (i.e., NAE/CSU) with the following objectives:

(a) To identify preferred vehicle access routes, particularly for trucks, between the end of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and the Central City (that is between the end of the NAE/CSU and the City centre); and
(b) To identify strategies to keep vehicles on preferred vehicle access routes; and
(c) To discourage vehicles away from public transport routes and walking or cycling routes such as the Main North Road / Papanui Road and Rutland Street corridors respectively.

1.5. This Management Plan is to ensure downstream effects are appropriately managed and to:

(a) Assess the existence, nature and extent of any increased traffic on streets adjacent to, or adjoining Cranford Street attributable to the NAE/CSU that might cause or contribute to a loss of service to any of these streets for up to 10 years after the opening date of the NAE/CSU;
(b) Implement measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate such effects, where these are more than minor, in a timely and cost-effective manner and where appropriate and practicable; and
(c) Monitor the efficacy of the measures for an appropriate period and implement further remedial action, if this is necessary and appropriate.

1.6. Some traffic increase can be expected if development to the north of Christchurch continues to grow or exceeds present expectations, whether or not the NAE/CSU project proceeds. For the avoidance of doubt, this Management Plan is to identify any adverse traffic effects that arise between the commissioning date of the NAE/CSU (expected to be approximately 2021) and up to ten years after that opening date (referred to in this Management Plan as the “Commissioning Period”). If any adverse effects are identified, a response to appropriately-manage these adverse effects, within this Commissioning Period will be considered and implemented.

1.7. The precise areas to be covered under this Management Plan will be established as part of the methodology referred to below. The methodology will assess the existence, nature and extent of any increased traffic attributable to the NAE/CSU on a number of streets at the southern end of the NAE/CSU including, but not limited to Mersey Street, Malvern Street, Roosevelt Street, Severn Street, Dee Street, Weston Road, Knowles Street and McFaddens Road [potentially adversely affected streets].
1.8 For the avoidance of doubt, while these listed streets are described as potentially adversely affected streets, this Management Plan is not confined to those streets, nor does it mean all of these listed streets will be adversely affected.

2. Appointment and Methodology

2.1 Prior to operating the NAE/CSU the Council will appoint an independent expert who is a suitably qualified traffic engineer to investigate and design an appropriate methodology to identify the potential impacts (if any) on those streets at the end of the Christchurch Northern Corridor which may be potentially affected as a result of the operation of the NAE/CSU.

2.2 That methodology is to apply commonly accepted professional standards to assess traffic-related effects and, for the avoidance of doubt, will include procedures to:

(a) Identify and confirm all streets adjacent to or adjoining Cranford Street affected by the operation of the NAE/CSU;

(b) Assess the current level of vehicle usage and service of each of the potentially adversely affected streets in proximity to the southern end of the NAE/CSU;

(c) Include modelling where appropriate to identify the anticipated future increase in the use of potentially affected streets that may be caused by, or attributable to, the operation of the NAE/CSU;

(d) Consider the extent of and effects (if any) arising from such growth in traffic flows, on those potentially affected streets that are reasonably attributable to the operation of the NAE/CSU;

(e) Recommend appropriate mitigation measures (where an increase in traffic-related effects within potentially adversely affected streets, is caused by or contributed to by the NAE/CSU) to Council and, where required, the local community board (if the community board holds the requisite delegation for Council for any of the traffic calming works required) as soon as practicable, and institute monitoring procedures to verify the outcome of the mitigation measures; and

(f) Recommend further remedial steps to Council and, where required, the local community board (if the community board holds the requisite delegation for Council for any of the traffic calming works required) (under 3.1 below) if monitoring confirms a continued increase in adverse traffic-related effects on the affected streets that is more than minor.

2.3 Any appropriate mitigation measures may be delivered on an iterative basis that is by first assessing the efficacy of an initial stage of mitigation measures before undertaking a further stage or stages of mitigation measures.

2.4 Where monitoring is required that monitoring must be completed within six months from the completion of the mitigation works.

2.6 The independent expert will support and where necessary, assist Council with consultation and/or the communication required as part of this management Plan.
3. Recommendation to Council

3.1. The independent traffic expert recommendation to Council must include appropriate remedial steps to be taken to avoid, remedy or mitigate any increase in adverse traffic-related effects where such effects are more than minor, identified under the methodology as being caused by or attributable to the operation of the NAE/CSU. This may include but is not limited to:

(a) Measures to improve the operation of Cranford Street and Sherborne Street, including capacity measures such as peak hour clearways;
(b) The introduction of speed restrictions in some or all affected streets;
(c) The introduction of chicanes in some or all affected streets;
(d) The introduction of speed bumps in some or all affected streets;
(e) Any other suitable traffic calming mechanisms, including those identified within the Council's Infrastructure Design Standard.

3.2 The remedial steps may include a programmed series of measures to be delivered over time, with the intention that any recommended remedial steps must be taken as soon as reasonably practicable after that recommendation is made. All remedial steps must be completed within the Commissioning Period.

4. Work to be Carried Out by Council

4.1. If the independent traffic expert determines that the increase in traffic to be experienced prior to the expiry of the Commissioning Period that is caused by or attributable to the operation of the NAE/CSU, is likely to raise or has raised the level of vehicle movements on any of the potentially affected streets by more than 30 per cent above the traffic level that would have occurred without the operation of the NAE/CSU then measures to improve the operation of Cranford Street and Sherborne Street and/or calming work will be undertaken by the Council as recommended.

4.2. Any calming work may be undertaken iteratively, (that is by first assessing the efficacy of an initial stage of calming work before undertaking a further stage or stages of calming work). In such a situation the monitoring previously undertaken must be repeated within six months of each stage of calming work being completed. This further monitoring is to assess whether further or other calming work is needed.

4.3. For the avoidance of doubt no calming work will need to be investigated or carried out unless the NAE/CSU has raised the level of vehicle movements by more than 30 per cent above the traffic level that would have occurred without the operation of the NAE/CSU. Further, the purpose of any calming work undertaken is to mitigate (effects from) any increased traffic movement to an acceptable level but does not mean a requirement to reduce traffic movements or their effects to the levels occurring prior to the opening date of the NAE/CSU.

4.4. The desired outcome of this Management Plan is to, within the Commissioning Period, avoid, remedy or mitigate downstream traffic effects, such that they are no more than minor. The Council shall take all practicable steps to ensure any works reasonably-necessary to achieve this outcome are completed within that time.

4.5. Where traffic calming work is recommended Council will consult with:

4.5.1. Residents of the streets where traffic calming measures are proposed to be taken;
4.5.2. Canterbury District Health Board;
4.5.3. Mairehau Primary School, Our Lady of Fatima School, Paparoa Street Primary School, St Albans Catholic Primary School and St Albans School;
4.5.4. St Albans Residents Association and Mairehau Community Trust; and
4.5.5. Cyclists through Spokes;
4.6. Consultation shall include the distribution of a newsletter including feedback form prior to the review.
5. Communication with Residents

5.1. Prior to operating the NAE/CSU, the Council shall prepare and implement a Communication Plan that sets out procedures detailing how the public and stakeholders will be communicated with throughout the Commissioning Period. As a minimum, the Communication Plan shall include:

5.1.1. Details of a public liaison person including contact details;

5.1.2. Methods to inform and to communicate details to property owners and occupiers within potentially affected streets of the recommendations from the independent traffic expert and any proposed mitigation measures to be carried out by Council;

5.1.3. Methods to deal with any concerns raised by property owners or occupiers; and

5.1.4. Monitoring and review procedures for the Communication Plan.

5.2 Owners and occupiers of properties on streets identified by the independent traffic expert as requiring mitigation measures shall be:

5.2.1 Advised of the recommendations of the independent traffic expert under clause 3, including proposed mitigation measures, within 30 working days following the provision of the recommendation to the Council;

5.2.2 Provided a period of 20 working days to comment on the proposed mitigation measures; and

5.2.3 Advised by Council of the final mitigation measures to be implemented, at least 20 working days prior to commencement of any works.
Appendix B
Details

Cranford Street (north of Innes Road)
Figure 8-1: Cranford Street Changes (Source: https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/projects/christchurch-northern-corridor/CNC-Project-Update-Cranford-Street-August-2017.pdf)
Appendix C  Existing Traffic Flow and Crash Record

There is currently in excess of 20,000 vehicles per day on Cranford Street north of Berwick Street (2017), Warrington Street (2013) and Berwick Street (2014) have traffic counts of 10,790 and 12,326 vehicles per day respectively. Madras Street and Barbadoes Street have traffic counts of 8,274, and 8,191 vehicles per day (in 2016). The counts presented here are reasonably recent. Older counts are also available however become less useful over time.

Crash Record

Given the large area impacted by traffic from the CNC we have referred to aggregated crash maps from Urban KiwiRAP [New Zealand Road Assessment Programme]. Urban KiwiRAP uses estimate death and serious injury equivalents along with distance (risk per kilometre for collective risk), it is a useful tool to examine safety risks comparative to the rest of the transport network, including other cities in New Zealand. Sections with high and medium-high risk are the key areas of focus.

An interrogation of Urban KiwiRAP data highlighted corridors that currently experience high numbers of crashes; either by kilometre (collective risk), or by number of vehicles (personal risk) in the study area.

![Figure C-1: Collector Risk Map (Source: https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/maps/collective-risk#Canterbury)](https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/maps/collective-risk#Canterbury)

![Figure C-2: Death and Serious Injury by Movement Type (2013-2017)](https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/maps/collective-risk#Canterbury)

The Collective Crash Risk\(^{25}\) in the vicinity of Cranford Street for 2012-2016 is shown in Figure C-2 [note the maps have been filtered so that only the High and Medium-High risk corridors are shown]. The streets with the highest risk\(^{26}\) that relate most directly to the potential downstream effects are Cranford Street (to Edgeware Road), Innes Road, and Madras Street. It is typical that the highest volume routes have the greatest concentration of crashes, and so this is to be expected.

For the period 2012-2016 there are few routes in the study area with a high Personal Risk (this is the risk per vehicle going down each street). The only routes that have medium-high crash risks are Malvern Street, Westminster Street [west of Cranford] and Edgeware Road through and either side of the Edgeware village. Improvements to these routes should consider local safety risks.

---

\(^{25}\) The highest collective risks are often located on streets with the higher traffic volumes

\(^{26}\) Note that the maps present a risk that aggregates the crash history over the length of the road section selected, and that these sections have not been created to only constitute streets directly affected by CNC. For example, the Madras Street section length extends from Warrington Road to Gloucester Street.
Figure C-2 shows the existing incidence of crashes and DSI within the project area. The majority of DSI crashes involved turning or crossing traffic mainly at intersections. Hence particular attention needs to be given to the design of intersections.

Crash heat maps for the period of 2012-2016 period are shown in Figures C-3 to C-6.

In terms of vulnerable users Cranford Street has experienced a higher amount of motorcycle crashes than most other nearby streets.

Pedestrian crashes have occurred east of Cranford Street on Innes Road (near school crossing), and also around Edgeware Village and near St Albans Park. In total there were 11 pedestrian (including one mobility) crashes that occurred in the study area in the period of 2013-2017. Of these 2 were minors, and 3 were older than 65. The crashes resulted in 2 DSI (8% of the DSI) which is lower than the national average\textsuperscript{27} for 2016 (10%).

\textsuperscript{27} National data for pedestrians and cyclists obtained from: https://www.transport.govt.nz/resources/road-safety-resources/roadcrashstatistics/motorvehiclecrashestrinewzealand/motor-vehicle-crashes-in-new-zealand-2016/
There were 3 recorded cyclist DSIs in the study area (12.5% of the DSIs), which is higher than the national average of 6.2% for 2016. Cyclist crashes have generally occurred south of Westminster Street.

Figure shows crashes that had speed as a main factor. Cranford Street performed relatively well compared with other major roads, except around the Westminster Street / Cranford Street intersection, and immediately south of the Berwick Street / Cranford Street intersection. Locations were speeds was a bigger factor include Barbadoes Street between Edgeware Road and Warrington Street, and Flockton Street. This may be a result of the current wide lanes on these roads and the unsignalised Barbadoes/Warrington intersection.

The pre-CNC crash data will form an important part of monitoring the crash effects of the CNC.

Table C-1: Selection of Existing Vehicle Counts (Source: http://ccc.interpret.co.nz/trafficcount/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>AADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berwick Street (East of Cranford)</td>
<td>12,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford Street (North of Berwick)</td>
<td>20,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Street (East of Forfar)</td>
<td>10,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay Street (NE Trafalgar)</td>
<td>2,632 (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbadoes (North of Bealey)</td>
<td>8,191 (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras (North of Bealey)</td>
<td>8,274 (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherborne (South of Canon)</td>
<td>12,974 (2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D  Jacobs Modelling (D1 to D4)

The figures in this appendix are to be viewed with the understanding that traffic modelling has certain limitations. In particular, the predicted changes to low volume roads have more ambiguity due to there being a multitude of route choices.

Further, there are streets that appear in these modelling plots as affected that we do not necessarily believe that effects will occur. This is resultant from a limitation of the modelling tools that they show effects well away from the major network changes. We have made this judgement based on expert knowledge of the network, and monitoring will pick-up any wider effects that are significant.
D.1  Do Nothing Change Flow Plots
Legend
AM Change
- Between 0% to 20% increase
- Between 20% to 30% increase
- Between 30% to 40% increase
- More than 40% increase

Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC
CNC03 vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC03 vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Daily Traffic Volume Difference - with/without CNC
CNC03 vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 500 vpd are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC 
CNC03 vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC03 vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
D.2  Traffic Volumes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screenline Location</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>ADOT</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>DM with CNC</th>
<th>Clearway with CNC (Inches to Bealey &amp; signal)</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ne/CN/D3</td>
<td>CN/D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFaddens Road</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,488</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston Road</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>730</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowles St</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes Road</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>5,947</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>6,426</td>
<td>6,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>6,967</td>
<td>8,282</td>
<td>8,332</td>
<td>8,544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,014</td>
<td>15,782</td>
<td>14,758</td>
<td>14,964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>3,247</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>2,492</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>4,611</td>
<td>4,265</td>
<td>4,673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>5,943</td>
<td>6,274</td>
<td>8,094</td>
<td>7,335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>4,523</td>
<td>4,775</td>
<td>8,043</td>
<td>5,952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,466</td>
<td>11,049</td>
<td>16,550</td>
<td>12,687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeley Avenue</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not in model)</td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>2,677</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Street*</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgware Road</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>4,329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>2,687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,931</td>
<td>4,369</td>
<td>3,885</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchas Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>3,987</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>3,991</td>
<td>3,235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,701</td>
<td>6,554</td>
<td>6,996</td>
<td>5,417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFaddens Road*</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>3,621</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,804</td>
<td>6,196</td>
<td>6,144</td>
<td>5,867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton Road*</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>661</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowles St*</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes Road</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>6,381</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>5,797</td>
<td>5,797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>7,222</td>
<td>5,518</td>
<td>5,243</td>
<td>9,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,603</td>
<td>11,291</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td>15,026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,859</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>3,196</td>
<td>3,617</td>
<td>3,522</td>
<td>3,732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,269</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,906</td>
<td>8,886</td>
<td>8,222</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgware Road</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>3,037</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>2,698</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>3,689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>3,177</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,566</td>
<td>5,356</td>
<td>4,311</td>
<td>3,122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchas Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>5,806</td>
<td>5,470</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>4,841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,154</td>
<td>7,624</td>
<td>8,504</td>
<td>6,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Street</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>4,096</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>6,510</td>
<td>6,314</td>
<td>6,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td>Item No.: 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Item No.</th>
<th>Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board</th>
<th>04 February 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crandon Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>10,381</td>
<td>16,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>10,513</td>
<td>20,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,894</td>
<td>37,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jameson Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>2,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>3,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nancy Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philpotts Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td>2,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Papanui Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>9,280</td>
<td>9,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>8,016</td>
<td>8,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,296</td>
<td>17,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brown Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>1,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,211</td>
<td>2,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somme Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,321</td>
<td>2,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rutland Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>3,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>3,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,749</td>
<td>5,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gossel Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(not in model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carrington Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jacob Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(not in model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roosevelt Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>3,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>3,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crandon Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>9,382</td>
<td>13,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>8,459</td>
<td>10,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,841</td>
<td>24,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mervin Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>3,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seventh Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>1,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cranford Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Francis Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kensington Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>2,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>3,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mahars Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuka Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hills Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>5,633</td>
<td>4,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>5,831</td>
<td>5,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,464</td>
<td>9,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bristol Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>2,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gordon Avenue</strong></td>
<td>(not in model)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abberley Crescent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Albany Street</strong></td>
<td>(not in model)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Springfield Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>5,969</td>
<td>5,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td>8,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,642</td>
<td>13,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trafalgar Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crandon Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>10,784</td>
<td>11,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>10,147</td>
<td>12,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersey Street*</td>
<td>8,930</td>
<td>23,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forfar Street*</td>
<td>5,203</td>
<td>2,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield Avenue</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Avenue*</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flockton Street*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford Street</td>
<td>10,953</td>
<td>16,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forfar Street</td>
<td>5,414</td>
<td>5,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbersides Street</td>
<td>9,277</td>
<td>5,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine Street*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Street</td>
<td>8,770</td>
<td>8,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodville Street</td>
<td>8,961</td>
<td>8,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills Road</td>
<td>17,793</td>
<td>17,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North North 1</td>
<td>[Start of Counting Point - Innes Street]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFaddens Road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>1,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston Road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowles St</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes Road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>6,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>6,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>3,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>5,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>4,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odeby Avenue (not in model)</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>1,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Street*</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgware Road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>1,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchas Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>4,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFaddens Road*</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>3,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston Road*</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowles St*</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes Road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>6,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>7,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>3,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgware Road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>1,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchas Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>5,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Street</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East West 1 (North to South)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford Street</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>6,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jameson Avenue</td>
<td>21,580</td>
<td>21,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Avenue</td>
<td>4,451</td>
<td>4,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philpotts Road</td>
<td>9,458</td>
<td>9,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papanui Road</td>
<td>18,582</td>
<td>18,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browns Road</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>3,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somme Street*</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Street</td>
<td>5,095</td>
<td>5,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossel Street (not in model)</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrington Street</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs Street (not in model)</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Avenue</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford Street</td>
<td>10,013</td>
<td>12,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersey Street*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severn Street</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Street</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Avenue</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Avenue</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahars Road</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuka Street*</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>2,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills Road</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Street</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Avenue (not in model)</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>2,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abberley Crescent</td>
<td>11,876</td>
<td>10,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Street (not in model)</td>
<td>6,216</td>
<td>6,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Road</td>
<td>6,216</td>
<td>6,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafalgar Street*</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,599</td>
<td>3,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford Street</td>
<td>10,483</td>
<td>12,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,894</td>
<td>24,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersey Street*</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>2,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>3,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forfar Street*</td>
<td>3,831</td>
<td>2,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,195</td>
<td>2,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield Avenue</td>
<td>5,526</td>
<td>4,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not in model)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Avenue</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flockton Street*</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>1,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford Street</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>3,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>3,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Monk 4</td>
<td>5,987</td>
<td>9,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(South of Monk Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford Street</td>
<td>6,102</td>
<td>6,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,502</td>
<td>13,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forfar Street</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>2,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,632</td>
<td>11,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados Street</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>5,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,542</td>
<td>8,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine Street*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Street</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodville Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills Road</td>
<td>9,060</td>
<td>8,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,228</td>
<td>17,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Item No.: 18**

**Attachment A**
D.3 V/C Ratios and Delay for Key Intersections
Year 2021: Volume/Capacity Ratio - Option CNC03
(V/C less than 60% are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Volume/Capacity Ratio - Option CNC03
(V/C less than 60% are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Volume/Capacity Ratio - Option CNC03
(V/C less than 60% are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Volume/Capacity Ratio - Option CNC03
(V/C less than 60% are not shown on the plot)
Figure 1: Barbadoes / Warrington Intersection, 2021 PM peak CNC03

Figure 2: Barbadoes / Warrington Intersection, 2031 PM peak CNC03
Figure 3: Bealey / Sherborne Intersection, 2021 AM peak CNC03

Figure 4: Bealey / Sherborne Intersection, 2031 AM peak CNC03
Figure 5: Berwick / Cranford Intersection, 2021 AM peak CNC04e

Figure 6: Berwick / Cranford Intersection, 2021 PM peak CNC04e
Figure 7: Forfar / Warrington Intersection, 2021 AM peak CNC04e

Figure 8: Forfar / Warrington Intersection, 2031 AM peak CNC04e
D.4 Change Flow Plots with Arterial Upgrades
Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Daily Traffic Volume Difference - with/without CNC
CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 500 vpd are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Legend
PM Change
- Between 0% to 20% increase
- Between 20% to 30% increase
- Between 30% to 40% increase
- More than 40% increase

Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Daily Traffic Volume Difference - with/without CNC
CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 500 vpd are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04g vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04g vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Legend
Daily Change
- Between 0% to 20% increase
- Between 20% to 30% increase
- Between 30% to 40% increase
- More than 40% increase

Year 2021: Daily Traffic Volume Difference - with/without CNC
CNC04g vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 500 vpd are not shown on the plot)
Item No.: 18

Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04g vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC
CNC04g vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Daily Traffic Volume Difference - with/without CNC
CNC04g vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 500 vpd are not shown on the plot)
Appendix E  Monitoring Screens
Appendix F  Consultation Leaflet
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04 February 2019
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Item 18

HAVE YOUR SAY

Proposed changes to Cranford Street and the surrounding area

Open until Monday 4 June 2018
ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay

Why we need to make changes

We’re proposing changes to Cranford Street and the surrounding roads to coincide with the completion of the Cranford Northern Corridor. We’ve had community thoughts on how to make the road work for communities and local road users.

Why we need to make changes

We’re proposing changes to Cranford Street and the surrounding roads to coincide with the completion of the Cranford Northern Corridor. We’ve had community thoughts on how to make the road work for communities and local road users.
Attachment A
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Options for your feedback

Proposed Cranford Street clearway and one-way connections

A clearway on part of Cranford Street and three-lane sections of Madras/Fort Street and Barabbies Street would help to improve the traffic flow in the area and increase short cuts through local streets.

The clearway on Cranford Street would operate from 6am-9am and 4pm-6pm.

The clearway on Madras/Fort Street would operate from 6am-9am and 4pm-6pm.

The clearway on Barabbies Street would operate from 6am-9am and 4pm-6pm.

There would be no parking during the hours that the clearway operates.

Proposal to reduce traffic on side streets

Our investigations show that if the Cranford Street clearway and improved links to the one-way streets are implemented there will be less short cuts through side streets.

These improvements will reduce the number of streets that are required for traffic calming as shown on the maps.

To discourage short cuts through side streets and improve safety there are a number of options:

- Automated control
- Removing sections of the road
- Chicanes, bends and landscaping
- Mid-block raised platforms
- Parking restrictions

Raised intersection with improved pedestrian crossing facility

Mid-block raised platform with road narrowing

Raised intersections
Appendix G  Options Diagrams
Do Nothing (yellow streets & arterials affected) + Option 1 - traffic calming only (all yellow streets)
Appendix H  Cycle Route MCA and Safety and Network Functionality Assessments

Multi Criteria Analysis – SANF Application to Cycle Route Identification

Identification, evaluation and selection of a preferred cycle route requires an objective transparent process that can withstand peer review, public scrutiny and permit informed decisions by elected members. This is achieved through a Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) tool and Safety Audit and Network Functionality (SANF) process.

The purpose of an analysis is to select a preferred route from a number of identified on and off-road route options using a Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) tool. The MCA assessment process is presented in the July 2016 version of Council’s “Cycle Design Guidelines Part B: Design Principles Best Practice Guide”.

Route Identification and MCA Assessment

The assessment process involves a site and desktop review of streets within the Route Corridor (an area connecting the start and end points) with streets being linked to form possible routes. Possible facility types are identified, based on cross sectional width, traffic volumes and constraints and are presented on a plan overlaying the land use types.

A shortlist of Route Options is identified from the possible routes, based on logical links to key connections/attractors and available roads within the corridor.

The Route Options are scored in an MCA assessment by a diverse team of people. This assessment scores each option against the following criteria: Safety, Directness, Coherence, Attractiveness, Comfort, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), Business Impact (i.e. change in access and loss of on-street parking), Residence impact (i.e. reduction in on-street parking), operational and network impacts (i.e. changes to the street layout, reduced road width, potential delay to other road users, additional signalised intersections), ease of construction and costs, land purchase/easements and consents. The results are reviewed using sensitivity testing (applying 70% weighting to the broad categories of cyclist criteria, impacts and costs) to confirm the best route option.

SANF Assessment

A SANF assessment involves an independent team of diverse people undertaking a holistic review of the route identification and MCA assessment outcomes to determine whether sufficient analysis has been completed to reach the conclusions and recommendations. A supportive SANF assessment provides transparency and confidence to decision makers that the analysis and impacts on affected parties has been adequately considered. A SANF demonstrates to the public that independent peer reviews have been undertaken.
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Christchurch
Hazeldean Business Park, 6 Hazeldean Road
Addington, Christchurch 8024
PO Box 13-052, Armagh
Christchurch 8141
Tel +64 3 366 7449
Fax +64 3 366 7780

Please visit www.stantec.com to learn more about how Stantec design with community in mind.

**Reference:** 18/1217103

**Presenter(s):** Diana Saxton, Community Recreation Adviser; Bruce Coleman, Community Development Adviser.

### 1. Purpose and Origin of Report

#### Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to consider an application for funding from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund from the organisation listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Request Number</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00058699</td>
<td>Bamford School</td>
<td>Rock Band Equipment</td>
<td>$3,078</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00058706</td>
<td>Delta Community Support Trust</td>
<td>Community Advocacy</td>
<td>$7,152</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00058658</td>
<td>Richmond Residents and Business Association</td>
<td>Establishment and Projects</td>
<td>$9,965</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 There is currently a balance of $69,605 remaining in the fund.

#### Origin of Report

1.3 This report is staff generated as a result of an application being received.

### 2. Significance

2.1 The decision(s) in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the number of people affected and/or with an interest.

2.1.2 Due to the assessment of low significance, no further community engagement and consultation is required.

### 3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approves a grant of $1,000 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Bamford School towards Rock Band Equipment.

2. Approves a grant of $3,000 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Delta Community Support Trust towards Advocacy services.

3. Approves a grant of $4,000 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Richmond Residents and Business Association towards set-up and projects.
4. Key Points

4.1 At the time of writing, the balance of the 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund is as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Budget 2017/18</th>
<th>Granted To Date</th>
<th>Available for allocation</th>
<th>Balance If Staff Recommendation adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$152,199</td>
<td>$61,350</td>
<td>$69,605</td>
<td>$61,605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Based on the current Discretionary Response Fund criteria, the application listed above is eligible for funding.

4.3 The attached Decision Matrix provides detailed information for the application. This includes organisational details, project details, financial information and a staff assessment.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Decision Matrix - Bamford School</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Decision Matrix - Delta Community Support Trust</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Decision Matrix - Richmond Residents' and Business Association</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Coleman - Community Development Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Saxton - Community Recreation Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arohanui Grace - Manager Community Governance, Linwood-Central-Heathcote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2018/19 DRF LINWOOD-CENTRAL-HEATHCOTE DECISION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Name</th>
<th>Name and Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Contribution Sought Towards</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bamford Primary School</td>
<td><strong>Rock Band Equipment</strong> To provide an inclusive, extra-curricular music programme for children of all abilities to learn to play in a rock band.</td>
<td>$3,078</td>
<td>Cymbals - $594.15 Bass guitar &amp; bass amp - $1,103.33 Stratocaster - $296.65 Guitar amp - $339.15 Keyboard &amp; stand - $466.61 Microphone &amp; stand - $278.80 Total - $3,078</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisation Details**
- Service Base: 10 Gould Crescent, Woolston
- Legal Status: School
- Established: 
- Target Groups: Children/ Youth
- Annual Volunteer Hours: 40
- Participants: 50

**Alignment with Council Strategies**
- Children's Policy
- Youth Policy
- Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy

**Other Sources of Funding**
- Donations of equipment - pending

**Staff Assessment**
Children at Bamford School have expressed interest in developing their musical interests by being able to play in a rock band. This is being supported by the school through organising an extra-curricular music programme that will run once a week. The programme will be led by a volunteer tutor from within the school community. A teacher aide will also support children with various disabilities to take part in the programme. Bamford is a low income area within the Linwood Ward. The programme will provide a supportive environment and remove the financial barriers (tuition and equipment) that may prevent children from participating in a rock band.
2018/19 DRF LINWOOD-CENTRAL-HEATHCOTE DECISION MATRIX

Priority Rating
- High
- Medium
- Low

Organisation Name
Delta Community Support Trust

Name and Description
Community Advocacy (Split L-C-H 45%% - 55%%)
This is split application 45% Linwood-Central-Healthcote 50% Paparangi-Innes Community Boards
Delta Community Support Trust delivers community based services including budget advice, community meals, community garden, programmes for the disadvantaged and marginalised and those people who experience mental health issues and or a disability.
Funding is sought to increase the hours of their community development worker due to the demand for community advocacy and support.

Funding History
- 2018/19 - $35,000 (Operational Costs) SCF
- 2018/19 - $25,000 (Evergreen Club and Friendship Link) CBF
- 2017/18 - $25,000 (Evergreen Club and Friendship Link) CBF
- 2017/18 - $22,500 (Community Development) SCF
- 2016/17 - $3,000 (Refugee and Migrant Work) SCF SP
- 2016/17 - $3,000 (Community Garden) SCF SP
- 2016/17 - $35,000 (Operations) SCF

Other Sources of Funding

Request Budget
- Total Cost: $9,152
- Requested Amount: $7,152
- 78% percentage requested

Contribution Sought Towards:
- Salaries and wages: $5,720
- Tragedy/Handicap: $500
- Telephone/Internet: $51
- Rent/House/Hire: $114
- Administration: $767

Staff Recommendation
$3,000
That the Linwood-Central-Healthcote resolves to approve the making of a grant of $3000 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to Delta Community Support Trust towards salary for their Community Development Worker.

Alignment with Council Strategies and Board Objectives
- Strengthening Communities Strategy
- Alignment with Council Funding Outcomes
- Support, develop and promote capacity
- Community participation and awareness
- Increase community engagement
- Enhance community and neighbourhood safety
- Provide community based programmes
- Reduce or overcome barriers
- Foster collaborative responses

How Much Will The Project Do? (Measures)
Will provide advocacy for 100+ people.
Will provide 240 hours of service.

How Will Participants Be Better Off?
The 100 people who engage in this service will gain access to services they would not otherwise have been able to including: appropriate Work and Income payments, appropriate levels of housing quality, access to health, education and immigration services, and connection with groups who can help upon exiting prison.

Staff Assessment
Delta Community Support Trust (Delta) delivers a range of community based services, including budget advice, community meals, community garden, empowerment courses, counselling and life skills courses, cultural support and a food bank.
Delta provides programmes that break down social isolation, promote social inclusion and provide a feeling of ownership, place and community for all people. The membership is predominantly benefit recipient renters, social housing tenants, the elderly living alone and those who experience an intellectual and/or mental health diagnosis.
Delta is a meeting place for the most vulnerable.
Delta's Community Development programme provides an extensive range of services including: low cost community meals, drop-in café, budget advice, personal advocacy and support, counselling and life skills courses, food bank, budget advice, a community garden and gardening tutoring, cultural work (ESOL and international playgroup), and wider community development work through the Richmond Community Action Network and other collaborations.
Over the last three years Delta reports seeing a rising demand for community advocacy. This is accessing assistance for people struggling to engage with private landlords and government agencies (Work and Income New Zealand, Housing New Zealand) and also the health, education, corrections and immigration enabling clients to get the services they need. Although there are people in these agencies focused on making the system accessible, Delta often find the people they work with are simply not engaging.
Delta establishes and builds ongoing relationships, connections and trust with people, this enables them to be able to help and support people using their services to engaged with agencies they need to.
To address the increase in demand Delta employed a staff member three extra hours a week to work specific on community advocacy. Delta is seeking funding for an additional two hours a week for their community advocacy work.

Paparangi-Innes staff recommendation is: $3,000.
### 2018/19 DRF LINWOOD-CENTRAL-HEATHCOTE DECISION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rating</th>
<th>Organisation Name</th>
<th>Name and Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Contribution Sought Towards</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Richmond Residents and Business Association</td>
<td><strong>Association establishment and first year activity</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Richmond Residents and Business Association (RR &amp; BA) was established in May 2018 to provide a voice for the residents of the Richmond area. Funding is sought towards establishment and running costs.&lt;br&gt;Split LCH 60% / PI 40%</td>
<td><strong>$10,465</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Requested</strong>&lt;br&gt;$9,965 (95% requested)</td>
<td>Establishment and initial running costs including setting up and running the Association's website for the first year, establishing a membership list, communicating with members and running monthly and special meetings</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Sources of Funding**<br>Donations from members and other fund raising. The RR & BA does not intend to charge a membership fee initially in order to build up a solid membership base and establish its credibility.

**Staff Assessment**<br>This request is recommended as Priority One due to its close alignment with both Council and Community Board strategic priorities, the Association's demonstrated effectiveness in the first few months of its existence and the need for strong community voice in this area.

The RR & BA was formed in May 2018 because of widespread concern about road issues related to earthquake repairs and flood mitigation works and concerns about the state of the Richmond Village commercial area. The Association has proved very effective in voicing community concerns, bringing people together and working towards achievable solutions.

The Association has also been involved in practical responses to improving the Richmond Village commercial area, exploring ways in which the Council's Enliven Places funding might be applied in the area, investigating the feasibility of a city to sea heritage trail and gathering and responding to residents concerns about some residential developments in the area.

In a relatively short period of time the Association has proved to be highly competent in a number of areas including conducting and analyzing community surveys, promoting and hosting public meetings, working with a range of Council staff, initiating and assisting with the planning of new initiatives, cooperating with other community organisations in the area and establishing themselves as an incorporated society.

The Association has applied to become an incorporated society Papanui-Innes Staff recommendation-$3,000.

Reference: 18/1053032

Presenter(s): Diana Saxton, Community Recreation Advisor;

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to consider an application for funding from its 2018-2019 Discretionary Response Fund from the organisation(s) listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Request Number</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00058636</td>
<td>Friends of Edmonds Factory Garden Incorporated.</td>
<td>Sunrise Seats</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 At the time of writing this report the current balance of this fund is $86,355.

Origin of Report

1.3 This report is staff generated as a result of an application being received.

2. Significance

2.1 The decision(s) in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the number of people affected and/or with an interest.

2.1.2 Due to the assessment of low significance, no further community engagement and consultation is required.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approves a grant of $16,000 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to the Friends of Edmonds Factory Garden Incorporated towards the cost of four Sunrise Seats.

4. Key Points

4.1 At the time of writing, the balance of the 2018-2019 Discretionary Response Fund is as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Budget 2018/19</th>
<th>Granted To Date</th>
<th>Available for allocation</th>
<th>Balance If Staff Recommendation adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$146,336</td>
<td>$54,981</td>
<td>$86,355</td>
<td>$70,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Based on the current Discretionary Response Fund criteria, the application listed above is eligible for funding.

4.3 The attached Decision Matrix provides detailed information for the application. This includes organisational details, project details, financial information and a staff assessment.
Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Diana Saxton - Community Recreation Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Arohanui Grace - Manager Community Governance, Linwood-Central-Heathcote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board
04 February 2019

2018/19 DRF LINWOOD-CENTRAL-HEATHCOTE DECISION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rating</th>
<th>Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes significantly to Funding Outcomes and Priorities. Highly recommended for funding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities. Recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities but to a lesser extent than Priority 2 applications. Not recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Meets all eligibility criteria and has minimum contribution to Funding Outcomes and Priorities. Insufficient information provided by applicant (in application and after request from Advisor) / Other funding sources more appropriate. Not recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**00058636**

**Organisation Name:** Friends of Edmonds Factory Garden Incorporated

**Name and Description:** Sunseats

We Association wishes to complete the change of park benches for Sunrise seats.

There are 4 basic park seats which have not been changed for the heritage style sunrise seats now installed in the rest of the garden.

**Funding History:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$150 (Music at Edmonds) DRF (L-C-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>$750 (Music at Edmonds) SCF (L-C-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>$7,950 (Sunrise Seats) DRF (L-C-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>$250 (Memorial Plaque) Light Bulb Matters Fund (H-F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>$1,000 (Community Events) DRF (H-F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>$250 (Annual Garden Party) Light Bulb Moments Fund (H-F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>$4,255 (Sunrise Seats) DRF (H-F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Sources of Funding:**

$500 - Funds on hand.

**Request Budget:**

- **Total Cost:** $16,600
- **Requested Amount:** $10,100
- **97% percentage requested**

**Contribution Sought Towards:**

- Purchase of four Sunrise seats

**Staff Recommendation:**

$16,000

That the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board makes a grant of $16,000 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Friends of Edmonds Factory Garden Incorporated towards replacement of heritage seating in Edmonds Factory Garden.

**Alignment with Council Strategies and Board Objectives:**

- Strengthening Communities Strategy
- Older Persons’ Policy
- Heritage Conservation Policy
- Heritage Values, Vision and Mission Statement Policy
- Community Board Plan 2017-19

**Alignment with Council Funding Outcomes:**

- Support, develop and promote capacity
- Increase community engagement
- Enhance community and neighbourhood safety
- Provide community based programmes
- Reduce or overcome barriers
- Foster collective responses

How Much Will The Project Do? (Measures)

A group of volunteers work in the Garden for about 3 hours each Saturday volunteer permitting, part of the work we do is to clean the seats and remove any graffiti that is possible, we also recolour the woodwork when needed.

How Will Participants Be Better Off?

Improved seating will add to their experience of visiting the Garden.

**Staff Assessment:**

Edmonds Factory Garden on Ferry Road has been owned by the Council since 1991. The garden is well supported by the community and used for special occasions such as weddings. A dedicated group of volunteers known as Friends of the Edmonds Factory Garden work with the Council to care for the garden and to promote, protect and enhance its heritage values. This includes fundraising for different projects such as seating, garden parties and community and music events for the community to enjoy.

Historically since 1994, the Friends of the Edmonds Factory Garden have been working to systematically replace the old park benches with ‘Sunrise seats’.

The Bluebird Oval Garden was formed in 1994 and the original first three sunrise seats were installed by the Friends of Edmonds in keeping with the heritage status of the garden and other sunrise seats in the garden including one in the Scented Garden and three in the Rose Gardens.

The Hagley/Ferrymead Board had previously granted $4,255 from its 13/14 Discretionary Response Fund towards the replacement of two Sunrise seats and the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has previously made a grant of $7,950 from its 2017/18 Discretionary Response Fund to Friends of Edmonds Factory Garden Incorporated towards replacement of three heritage seats in the Edmonds Factory Garden.

With seven Sunrise seats already completed, there remains the two park seats in the front garden, one park seat on the eastern side of the rosebush area and one park bench in the back lawn area to be upgraded.

Replacing the current park benches with the heritage style Sunrise seats now installed in the rest of the Garden will complete the suite of 11 Sunrise seats, thus completing this phase of restoration. The proposed Sunrise seats are locally made and they will enhance the garden for rest and social recreation and add to the heritage values of the park.

Reference: 19/51292
Presenter(s): Diana Saxton, Community Recreation Adviser

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to consider an application(s) received for funding from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund.
1.2 There is currently a balance of $2,300 remaining in this fund.

Origin of Report
1.3 This report is to assist the Board to consider an application of funding from Team Lhotshampa, a Bhutanese refugee youth soccer team from Christchurch.

2. Significance

2.1 The decision(s) in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the number of people affected and/or with an interest.
2.1.2 Due to the assessment of low significance, no further community engagement and consultation is required.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board resolve to:

1. Approve a grant of $150 each (total of $450) from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to Team Lhotshampa members Bishwas K C, Biswa Nishan, and Pranesh Regmi towards participating in the Tenzing Hillary Cup in Auckland from 2 to 3 February 2019.

4. Applicant - Team Lhotshampa

4.1 Bishwas K C aged 23 of Bromley, Biswa Nishan aged 17 of Central Christchurch, and Pranesh Regmi aged 24 of Linwood are members of Team Lhotshampa, a Bhutanese refugee youth soccer team who compete in the Canterbury Sunday Soccer League. They also compete in other various soccer tournaments organised by other communities.

4.2 Team Lhotshampa provides a positive platform for the youth and young adults of the Bhutanese community to connect with other members of the community and provide them with a sense of belonging. The team environment is a safe option for their youth to recreate, establish friendships and lead healthy lifestyles through sport.

4.3 Team Lhotshampa are participating in the Tenzing Hillary Cup which is an Inter-Nepalese Football Tournament to be held in Auckland from 2 to 3 February 2019 and is hosted by the local Nepalese community.

4.4 Team Lhotshampa are defending champions and are aiming to become back to back champions. They also see this tournament as a platform for their talented players to showcase their skills.
4.5 Fundraising for the trip includes setting up a crowd fundraising page on gofundme plus personal savings.

4.5 The following is the cost for the trip per person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Fee</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$335</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 The applicants have not applied for funding previously from the Community Board.

Attachments
There are no attachments to this report.

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Diana Saxton - Community Recreation Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Arohanui Grace - Manager Community Governance, Linwood-Central-Heathcote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Area Report - February 2019

Reference: 19/16066
Presenter(s): Arohanui Grace, Community Governance Manager

1. Purpose of Report
This report provides information on initiatives and issues current within the Community Board area, to provide the Board with a strategic overview and inform sound decision making.

2. Staff Recommendations
That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

2. Nominate Board members to join the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Edible Garden Awards judging panel.
3. Nominate one Board member to attend the Brougham Street/Moorhouse Avenue Area Project Stakeholders workshop to be held on 27 February 2019.
4. Consider items for inclusion for the Board Report to the Council’s 14 February 2018 meeting.

3. Community Board Activities and Forward Planning

3.1 Memos/Information/Advice to the Board

3.1.1 Community Boards Conference 2019 - The 2019, bi-annual, Community Boards Conference, run by the New Zealand Community Boards Executive Committee as part of Local Government New Zealand, will take place from 11 – 13 April 2019 in New Plymouth.

- The theme of the Conference is “Community Boards in a time of change.”
- The Board has operational funding to draw upon for attendance and a formal report will be prepared seeking approval for those who are interested in attending.
- The Board has operational funding to draw upon for attendance and a formal report will be prepared seeking approval for those who are interested in attending.
- In the meantime, members are asked to note the dates and the attached draft programme, and to indicate any interest in attending.

3.1.2 Community Board Best Practice Awards 2019 - As part of the Community Boards Conference 2019, noted above, Boards are able to submit Best Practice Excellence Awards applications that demonstrate what Boards have achieved over the last two-year period.

- Noting that entries must be lodged by 5.00pm Friday 8 March 2019.
- There are three categories for submitting an entry:
  - Community Leadership.
  - Enhancing Communities.
  - Engaging Communities.

Subject to members indicating interest in attending, the Board is invited to consider if there is a suitable project that could be submitted for an award.
3.1.3 The Brougham-Moorhouse Area Project team is organising another workshop for key stakeholders on Wednesday 27 February and are seeking one Board representative to attend.

Staff from the NZ Transport Agency, Christchurch City Council and Beca are working together to develop a 30 year strategy, with the aim of making it easier and safer to get around one of Christchurch’s busiest areas. Feedback from the first round of community engagement is currently being analysed.

The purpose of the 27 February workshop, to be held in the Function Room at the Civic Offices, is:

- To outline the list of possible treatments (individual measures and specific interventions) for the Brougham-Moorhouse Single Stage Business Case
- To discuss the possible options, based on key themes e.g. a package of treatments that give priority to north south movements
- The information required and assumptions to be made in defining each option e.g. evidence required to assess the treatments/options

3.2 Board area Consultations/Engagement/Submission opportunities

3.2.1 As of 18 January 2019 there were no consultations are open to the community within the Community Board Area.

3.3 Annual Plan and Long Term Plan matters

3.3.1 In early December 2018 the Board held a workshop on Annual Plan 2019 priorities and presented them to a Council workshop.

3.3.2 The following link outlines the recommendations that were adopted in the Long Term Plan 2018-2028:
http://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2018/06/CLTP_20180622_MIN_2843_AT.PDF

3.4 Board Reporting

3.4.1 Members are invited to suggest items for inclusion in the Board Report to the Council.

4. Community Board Plan – Update against Outcomes

4.1 The Board held a workshop on Monday 28 January which included discussion on the Community Board Plan.

5. Significant Council Projects in the Board Area

5.1 Infrastructure projects underway

Linwood Pool

5.1.1 On Saturday 8 December from 1 pm to 4 pm at Linwood Park, the community were invited to view the layout of the new Linwood Pool and to comment on some future changes to improve Linwood Park.

5.1.2 The plans were also available online for comment for those who were unable to attend the community day https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/consultations-and-submissions/haveyoursay/show/203

5.1.3 A Newsline Story was also available on 10 December 2018 and provided further information on the draft layout https://ccc.govt.nz/news-and-events/newsline/show/3247

5.1.4 There were around 300 people who came along to the community day, this included a lot of local families and some of the local sporting groups.
5.1.5 A specific area was set up at the event for people to come along and view large plans along the fenced area of the tennis courts and this also included draft plans of improvements to the rest of Linwood Park. The design team were also present at the community day, so it provided a good opportunity for them to get some direct community feedback and to explain each design element. (Attachment C)

5.1.6 Feedback from those who attended the community day was very positive and people were really happy with the sketches. The less positive comments related to requests for items such as a gym, wave pool and hydro slide which were well outside the project budget for this facility and could be provided for more appropriately at other Council facilities. Council also received 17 online submissions. (Attachment D)

5.1.7 The development plans for Linwood Park have a limited amount of funding, so these will need to be worked on in more detail before they are ready to go out for more formal consultation. The timings for the pool and park will not quite run together now, but it was helpful to get some initial feedback on the park at the community day. This information will be incorporated in the landscape plan when it is ready to go out.

5.1.8 The project team are continuing to engage directly with some of the key stakeholders on this project.

5.1.9 The gifting of Te Reo name for the facility has been requested via Council’s Ngai Tahu partnership team, the name will feed into the cultural design input that Matapopore have been engaged to provide.

5.1.10 Geotechnical investigations and analysis has been completed and while results were variable they have confirmed ground improvement will be required. Given the potential significance of this aspect, further investigations will be undertaken to gather additional data to inform the design.

5.1.11 The next steps for this project will involve commencing and completing the concept design. Community feedback on the draft layout will be incorporated into the concept design as it progresses, where appropriate. This plan will then be presented to the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board for approval sometime in May 2019. Construction is then due to commence in 2020.

5.1.12 A process for ongoing communication with the community is being developed.

5.2 Ōpāwa Library – Staff presented to a Board workshop held on 3 December 2018 regarding the selection of the construction contractor for the rebuild Ōpāwa Library.

6. Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area

6.1 Community Board Edible Garden Awards 2019 - The inaugural Linwood-Central-Heathcote Edible Garden Awards applications are closing on 8 February 2019. The award ceremony is to be held on Thursday 7 March at the Woolston Club. The gardens will be assessed on the
week of 18 February 2019. The Horticultural Society is seeking Board members to join the judging panel.

7. **Parks, Sports and Recreation Update (bi-monthly)**
   7.1 The next update will be in March 2019.

8. **Community Board Funding Update**
   As at 3 December 2018 the:
   8.1 Discretionary Response Fund unallocated balance for 2018/19 is $86,355.00.
   8.2 Youth Development Fund unallocated balance for 2018/19 is $2,300.00.
   8.3 Light Bulb Moments Fund unallocated balance for 2018/19 is $2,270.00.
   8.4 The 2018/19 Discretionary Response Funding Spreadsheet is attached. *(Attachment B).*
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New Zealand Community Boards Conference 2019

Community Boards in a Time of Change
11 - 13 April 2019, the Devon Hotel, New Plymouth

Programme

Subject to change. Updated 17 December

- Thursday 11 April
- Friday 12 April
- Saturday 13 April

Thursday 11 April

1.00pm  Optional tour / activity
4.00pm
5.00pm  Registration open
5.45pm  Coaches depart The Devon Hotel
6.00pm  Welcome Function at Len Lye Centre
         (Coach transfers, canapes and beverages included in full and partner registration fee)
7.30pm  Coaches return to The Devon Hotel
         Free evening

Friday 12 April

8.00am  Registration desk open | tea and coffee available
8.30am  Conference Opening
9.00am  New Plymouth Mayor
         Neil Holdom
9.15am  Looking Forward, encouraging Youth and Talent
         Darren Pratley
10.00am Engaging with the Maori Community
         Puna Wano-Bryant and Wharehoka Wano
8.00am  Registration desk open | tea and coffee available

10.45am  Morning tea

11.15am  Taranaki Mouna Project - eradicating all predators off the Mount
         Sean Zeitljes

12.00pm  Youth Engagement
         Sarah Colcord

12.45pm  Lunch

1.45pm  Address by Minister for Local Government
         Nanaia Mahuta

2.30pm  Award participant presentations

3.15pm  Afternoon tea

3.45pm  Concurrent Workshops:
         Are we People
         Friendly
         enough?
         Lance Girling-
         Butcher

         Building strong Te
         Ao
         Maori relationships
         Puna Wano-Bryant
         & Wharehoka Wano

         Towards Predator-
         Free
         Taranaki
         Toby Shanley

         Age Friendly
         Communities
         Diane Turner

5.15pm  Close

7.00pm  Conference Dinner and Best Practice Awards at The Devon Hotel
         (Dinner, beverages, entertainment included in full and partner registration fee.)

Saturday 13 April

8.00am  Registration desk open | tea and coffee available

8.30am  Chair of NZ Community Boards
         Mick Lester

8.45am  LGNZ Update
         Dave Cull, President of Local Government NZ

9.15am  LGNZ Localism Project
         Malcolm Alexander, CEO of Local Government NZ

9.45am  Topic TBC
         Shay Wright

10.30am  Morning tea
8.00am  Registration desk open | tea and coffee available

11.00am Concurrent workshops

   The important role of Youth Voice Groups locally and regionally
   Shay Wright and Sarah Colcord

   Rural Connectivity Group – RBI2 and Mobile Black Spots Programme
   Caitlin Metz

   Community Emergency Planning
   Ben Ingram

12.30pm Lunch

1.30pm Active Aging
   Natalie Jackson

2.15pm Thinking about Education to Employment
   Warwick Foy.

3.00pm Conference wind up

5.30pm Post conference BBQ at The Devon Hotel
   (Dinner included in full and partner registration fee. Cash bar.)
Linwood Pool

Feedback from the event on Saturday 8 December 2018.

Positives:
- Like the children’s pools are beside each other (good for supervision)
- Like the multi-sports courts
- Like the hot spa (x2 comments)
- Keeping the courts
- Hold birthday parties at the pool, area covered for this
- Lane swimming
- I like that the kids can walk here.

Negatives:
- Like more toys
- Missing a gym
- Want a steam/sauna room (x2 comments)
- Missing a leisure pool (leisure area in lane pool too cold for babies and toddlers)
- Suggest incorporating BBQ facilities for space

Things to consider in the design:
- Need to be able to sit up to your neck in the water in the spa like at Graham Condon
- More parking
- More family change rooms
- Need a glass wall between children’s area and the bigger pool – sound
- Temperature – needs to be just right (swimming and walk ins)
- Need to attract teens to pool seem more for under 5’s and adults
- Lots of family changing rooms with showers, not like QE2 which only has a few and then huge, but not useful change rooms without showers
- Want large changing rooms (2 comments)
- Hydro rehab pool
- Yoga?
- Area for green prescription including gym
- A wave pool to cater to teenagers
- Cycleway access from Linwood Ave
- Make sure dry areas aren’t slippery (x2 comments)
- Would have liked indoor court for basketball, gym space – perhaps for tumble times
- How is the te reo/Maori input reflected in the design? The names/signage?
- Separate area for women (Muslim) for cultural reasons, on public men swimming at same time.
- Disabled parking needs to be closer to the pool. Not ideal in wet weather to have it too far away as it takes time to pack up vehicle.
- Spa is too shallow at QEII – Graham Condon is perfect.
- Need somewhere to put shampoo, not too close to the floor for disabled.
- Seats too low in changing rooms at QEII for disabled. Need dry area seat, to help those who are unsteady on their feet. Make sure these seats are always available and not taken away.
- Picnic area needs shaded areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Town / City</th>
<th>1. What do you like about the layout of the new Linwood pool?</th>
<th>2. What don't you like about the layout of the new Linwood pool?</th>
<th>3. Do you have any other comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>20604</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Woolston</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
<td>It caters for all needs, levels and ages.</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>Love the outdoor tennis and basketball courts. Think this will be very valuable to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>20596</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Where it sits and how it is connected with other recreation facilities</td>
<td>See below - consideration of 'seniors' and those post op with disabilities.</td>
<td>I am a Linwood resident, working in Shirley and I am 64 yrs old. When the pool complex opens I would like to use it to contribute to maintaining my own health, fitness and flexibility. This morning before work I went to Jelle Park Pool. Two lanes in the indoor 'Sports pool are set aside for 'casual' aqua-jogging and at 8am at least 10 older people were in the pool. When I got out of the pool I noticed that there were up to 50 'seniors' enjoying an aqua-size class in one of the adjoining pools. When I do retire (when the pool is going to be ready in 2021?) I would like to be able to bike to the pool and join others in the pool for exercise and recreation. I did not see in the layout that aqua-jogging featured - it is a popular, non-weight bearing, in doors, any weather, any session physical activity for many seniors and Linwood would be no exception I expect. In the privately owned pool Aqua Gym they manage this need by always having one lane available for anyone who wants to exercise in the water even if they are not swimming. The pool is deep enough to accommodate this and there is a ladder to enable senior people/people with injuries/postop to get in and out of the pool more easily without having to use the inner concrete step holds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>20566</td>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
<td>I like that fact there is a separate learning pool, as my son found this useful to be where kids are aren't playing to gain confidence.</td>
<td>That there is no gym. I was excited to hear there would be a council pool facility so close to home but no gym. It doesn't need to be a huge room, but I think if a gym was added - it would improve numbers. As we would choose to go to Taiaroa or Pioneer. Inconvenient but then all facilities are there for our whole family. Graham Condons isn't big but such a great addition.</td>
<td>Are the community rooms going to be used for classes? Like yoga?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>20552</td>
<td>Lindy</td>
<td>Woolston</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grateful and impressed by pools in Christchurch and I am looking forward to having one built close to my home so I can continue to do lane swimming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spa is spot on at Graham Condon - good temperature and water depth. The spa at QEII is not good. Please keep the spa exactly the same as Graham Condon otherwise I won't visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>20551</td>
<td>Lyn</td>
<td>Primary Sports Canterbury</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seems to be some room around the pool.</td>
<td>I cannot see how much seating there is for both children and adults when they want to watch others competing.</td>
<td>On behalf of all of the primary schools in Christchurch, we desperately need this pool to accommodate spectators as well as the swimmers. There are many school and zone events which require, and have spectators who want to see their children swim against other primary school children from other schools. The QEII pool is not suitable for this - which still means that schools are unable to have any swimming competitions. A thing that they all actually want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>20547</td>
<td>Jannaone</td>
<td>To Waka Uwua School</td>
<td>Woolston</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>The family friendly nature of the facilities. Family spa, toddler area, lane</td>
<td>For schools taking large groups for swimming lessons there are two areas that are challenging for our health &amp; safety and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 20543</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Pegasus Health Charitable Ltd</td>
<td>Opawa, Christchurch</td>
<td>Like the options of 4 different water spaces, unsure as to the ability to create a private swim space for women and boys under 5 years - this is extremely important as there are many people living in the Linwood and surrounding areas from refugee/migrant backgrounds who for religious/cultural reasons need a level of privacy when swimming. I strongly recommend that there be a way to partition off the lane to swim pool and possibly also the spa and toddler pool for women to be able to use this space privately and regularly at certain times of the day/week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 20542</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Woolston</td>
<td>Woolston</td>
<td>The whole concept looks great. However, I don't feel like it's suitable for all ages. My daughter who is 7, doesn't seem to have anywhere to play swimming. It's great to have a baby/toddler pool and fantastic for a learn to swim pool. Lane pool, great for adults and teenagers perhaps. But where do the kids 6-12 year old kids get to just play swim? I see you have the lane pool also equipped for bombing and inflatable play. However, I don't know how well that would work. And it seems to be quite deep? Just doesn't seem big enough for both?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 20538</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Waimari Beach</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>It needs another large pool for schools, lessons, clubs and general swimming all to be catered for. Learn from QE2 which is way too small.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 20537</td>
<td>Hu</td>
<td>Woolston, Woodston</td>
<td></td>
<td>I like the indoor community space, however, there are plenty of community spaces around the pool site such as the Linwood Resource Centre, the Union. It doesn't have a sauna. Please have a sauna!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>20536</td>
<td>HanH</td>
<td>Woolston</td>
<td>Good size changing rooms, spa</td>
<td>Not enough facilities - there should be a hydrotherapy pool, leisure pool and fitness centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>20530</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>Love the variety of pools to suit different ages/good to see family spa included in the proposal</td>
<td>It would be really nice to see some more development around the toddlers area - great having so close to everything else, but toddlers can be very quick to get away from a carer - so would be good to see some natural - maybe low level barriers preventing the toddlers from being able to quickly escape to the large pool. Also would be really nice to see more developed permanent play structures - maybe taking inspiration from the old QE2 or even hammer springs kids play area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>20529</td>
<td>Skey</td>
<td>Woolston</td>
<td>This is a much-needed asset for schools in the local area and I'm very happy that Council has the time and funds to do this. It's been a missing facility for too many years now and it's fantastic to see it being built :)</td>
<td>Including two community rooms in a sports facility is pretty pointless, especially when there are tons all around the area: one in Eastgate, the community boardroom across the road on Smith Street, the Woolston community library, etc. I'd have thought you'd go for a small gym or at the very least a room that could be used for sports like a school gym with a wooden floor, so people can use it for yoga, martial arts and other physical exercise types of activities. The bike park looks a bit small and it doesn't look covered, just exposed to the elements and in the middle of the car park area. As there is no mention of CCTV in the pictures, this is not great for security. If the weather's crap and you want to swim for an hour do you just leave your bike locked but unattended in heavy rain in Woolston? Having cycle parks is a great step forward too, as there are usually too few or none at all. Given that this is surrounded by cycle lanes on three sides, it makes sense to include cycle parks here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If we were able to get a few viable CCTV cameras around the facility I think it would not only protect the facility but also the park (constantly tagged), the Council facilities across the road (community gardens and Bindery) and prevent the courts from being vandalised again and again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It's a really great initiative overall and I'm really looking forward to having it in the area. I'll be great to have and even better for the schools that this will serve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good on you Council!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
traffic for quite a while. I might be wrong about the scale though it’s a bit hard to tell.

My recommendations:
1. Replace the large community room with a sports hall to encourage a variety of additional sporting activities in the one room.
2. With the small community room either:
   a. Replace it with the kitchen and extend the large community room where the kitchen was moved from to make it bigger, or
   b. Replace it with a covered bike park and make sure there’s a CCTV camera there, freeing up the proposed bike area for a bus or two to fit into, or at least more car park spaces.
3. A few extra outdoor tables would be needed if you are serious about having farmer or craft markets. The more people you can fit in the more people will come.
4. CCTV would be nice, as the area is consistently getting vandalised and tagged. Exposing a new facility with freshly painted walls to the public will make it a graffiti magnet for taggers and vandals. Check out the newly painted Community Gardens fence right across the street - vandals have been kicked through it in several areas shortly after it was painted. Unfortunately there is a tiny but very noticeable minority in the area that just like to, well, be assesoles.

14. 20524 Jenny Woollaston Christchurch

I like that it answers the most important reason for having a pool in this part of the city - teaching people how to swim. I also like that there is a decent amount of cycling parking proposed, although perhaps not enough in comparison to the huge car parking area. Considering that this facility is on a major cycle route and right beside an open space that already attracts a lot of families who arrive by bike (to use sports fields, playgrounds, and skate park) and have nowhere to park them.

It’s great to see the unused land in this area being properly developed and the tatty old courts being replaced with new ones.

I’m disappointed that there is no sauna or steam room shown on the plans, and that the spa is a “family” one – there’s no child-free place for adults to relax and enjoy the facilities. I was very excited to have a pool complex being built very close to home, but I’m not at all excited about sharing water with children for hygiene and noise reasons. It would be great if you could incorporate some adult-only facilities in the design, and I’d be happy to sacrifice the community hall space for that. I don’t see a community hall as a good fit for a pool complex and am surprised that it has been included here in the first place since there is already a community room in Eastgate as well as the community boardroom across the road on Smith Street.

Is there any coach parking for school buses as part of the public parking area? This As already noted, I am concerned that there is only a small amount of bicycle parking provided in comparison to the space dedicated to car parking despite this being on a major cycle route. I’m also a bit concerned about the vehicle entry/exit that is closest to the cycleway running alongside Linwood Drain. This is right beside a courtesy crossing that gets a lot of use by cyclists, pedestrians, children, dogs on leads etc., and it can already be difficult to cross here with drivers who don’t feel obliged to stop. Can this be changed to an official pedestrian/cyclist crossing to enforce stopping by drivers coming out of the pool car park?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20523</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20522</td>
<td>Justine</td>
<td>Aranui</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20521</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Wainoni</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Attachment D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Linwood-Central-Heathcote Discretionary Response Fund Allocation 2018/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Allocation 2018/19</th>
<th>Board Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Discretionary Response Fund Carry Forward</td>
<td>$5,427.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund Allocation</td>
<td>$135,909.00</td>
<td>03/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund</td>
<td>$141,336.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Westland Kindergarten Association (Kidsfirst) - Linwood - Contribution to New Oven</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>03/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST from CCTV Cameras Credit</td>
<td>-$5,863.00</td>
<td>09/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachville Reserve - Rebuild of Pedestrian Steps to Estuary</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>15/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley and Waltham Parks - Installation of drinking fountains</td>
<td>$13,244.00</td>
<td>19/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opawaho Trust - towards youth work in Waltham and Opawo</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>01/10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipstown Community Centre Charitable Trust - Production of a book 'A Bread Companion/Festa 2018'</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>01/10/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discretionary Response Fund Balance - 2018/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Balance 2018/19</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development Fund - (Allocated from 2017/18 Discretionary Response Fund)</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>20/06/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria Yamaguchi Elin - World Kendo Championships South Korea</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>03/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Maria College (Monica Fahey &amp; Maddison Fortune) - New Zealand Choral Federation Big Sing Wellington</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>03/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haeta Community Campus (Antonio Lemalu) - National Secondary Schools Rugby League Auckland</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>03/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Washbourn - Global Round of the World Scholars Cup Melbourne</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>03/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikayla Jade Cooper - House of Champs Hip Hop Competition Brisbane</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>03/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Richardson - House of Champs Hip Hop Dance Competition, Brisbane 26 October 2018</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>02/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milly Musset - Attending International Guide Jamboree, Sydney 30 September 2018</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>02/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Wilson - Arizona Fall Classic Showcase Competition 8 October 2018</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>02/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Geord Pirker - Shirley Boys' High School Raratonga Trip 29 September 2018</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>02/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrymead Bays Football Club Torpedoes 11 Grade - Competing in the 2018 South Island Football Tournament</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>19/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrymead Bays Football Club 15 Grade - Competing in the 2018 South Island Football Tournament</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>19/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Thomas Pohio - Retracing the Migration of our Tūpuna</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>19/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarlett Girvan - Representing Canterbury at the Gymsports NZ Nationals competition in rhythmic gymnastics</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>17/10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Richelle Lister - Competing in the Touch Nationals in Rotorua in February 2019</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>03/12/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brayden Peter - Competing in the 2018/19 rowing regatta season</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>03/12/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Youth Development Fund Balance - Available for allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Bulb Moments Fund - (Allocated from 2017/18 Discretionary Response Fund)</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>20/06/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50’s Up Brass Band inc - Community Christmas Concert</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>17/04/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Pleasant Memorial Community Centre and Residents; Association - towards producing a stall</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>03/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Punjabi Social and Cultural Group - Canterbury Turban Day</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>06/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainoni Avonside Community Services Trust - Volunteers Acknowledgement Lunch</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>11/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood Avenue Community Centre Trust - 20 Year Celebration</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>11/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Zealand Prostitutes Collective - Red Umbrella Day BBQ</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>26/09/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Anne’s Catholic School - Renewed Gardens</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>25/10/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Light Bulb Moments Fund Balance - Available for allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Bulb Moments Fund Balance - Available for allocation</td>
<td>$2,270.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shape Your Place Toolkit Fund - 2017/18 Carry Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shape Your Place Toolkit Fund - 2017/18 Carry Forward</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Shape Your Place Allocation</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2018/19 Shape Your Place Toolkit</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shape Your Place Toolkit Fund Balance - Available for allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shape Your Place Toolkit Fund Balance - Available for allocation</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Elected Members’ Information Exchange

This item provides an opportunity for Board Members to update each other on recent events and/or issues of relevance and interest to the Board.