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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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whiria ngā whenu o ngā papa Honoa ki te maurua tāukiuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overarching Principle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Principles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability, Affordability, Agility, Equity, Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration, Prudent Financial Management, Stewardship, Wellbeing and resilience, Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Outcomes**

What we want to achieve together as our city evolves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong sense of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation in civic life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and healthy communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration of our identity through arts, culture, heritage and sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing the voices of children and young people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liveable city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant and thriving central city, suburban and rural centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A well connected and accessible city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient supply of, and access to, a range of housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st century garden city we are proud to live in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthy environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique landscapes and indigenous biodiversity are valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable use of resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prosperous economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great place for people, business and investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An inclusive, equitable economy with broad-based prosperity for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A productive, adaptive and resilient economic base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern and robust city infrastructure and community facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Priorities**

Our focus for improvement over the next three years and beyond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enabling active citizenship and connected communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable 21st century city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate change leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed and proactive approaches to natural hazard risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing active, public and shared transport opportunities and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and sustainable water supply and improved waterways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mihi

Greetings to all who have gathered
within our (communal) house
to speak and to listen to the
topics/conversations of your community
Welcome, welcome
Therefore, again I greet all present
**Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board**  
22 March 2019

**Part A**  Matters Requiring a Council Decision  
**Part B**  Reports for Information  
**Part C**  Decisions Under Delegation

---
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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 Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board meeting held on Friday, 8 March 2019 be confirmed (refer page 7).

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.

   4.1 Positive Youth Development Report Back – Kate Davies
Kate Davies will attend to report back to the Board on her participation at the competitions and training camps for the Athletics New Zealand Jumps Future Squad from November 2018 to February 2019.

   4.2 Positive Youth Development Report Back – Taiko Torepe-Ormsby
Taiko Torepe-Ormsby will attend to report back to the Board on representing New Zealand at the State Teams Age Short Course Swimming Championships in Canberra, Australia from 3-5 October 2018.

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 Innes Road Bus Stops – Paul and Christian Kellar
Paul and Christian Kellar will speak to the Board regarding the Innes Road Bus Stops proposals.

   5.2 Innes Road Bus Stops – Chris and Gemma Greenshield
Chris and Gemma Greenshield will speak to the Board regarding the Innes Road Bus Stops proposal.

   5.3 Innes Road Bus Stops – Peter and Victoria Maddock
Peter and Victoria Maddock will speak to the Board regarding the Innes Road Bus Stops proposal.
5.4 Innes Road Bus Stops – Edward Wright, Environment Canterbury

Edward Wright, Manager Public Transport Strategy, Planning and Marketing – Environment Canterbury will speak to the Board regarding the Innes Road Bus Stops proposal.

6. Presentation of Petitions

There were no petitions received at the time the agenda was prepared.
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The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**  
   Part C  
   **Community Board Resolved PICB/2019/00019**  
   **Community Board Decision**  
   That the apology for absence received from John Stringer, be accepted.  
   Emma Norrish/Jo Byrne  
   **Carried**

2. **Declarations of Interest**  
   Part B  
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**  
   Part C  
   **Community Board Resolved PICB/2019/00020**  
   That the minutes of the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board meeting held on Friday, 22 February 2019, be confirmed.  
   Mike Davidson/Pauline Cotter  
   **Carried**

4. **Public Forum**  
   Part B  
   **Positive Youth Development Report Back – Rosa Vesty**  
   Rosa Vesty reported back to the Board on her attendance at the Australian Volleyball Schools Cup held in Melbourne from 9 to 14 December 2018.  
   After questions from members, the Chairperson thanked Rosa for her presentation.
4.2 **Speeds on Factory Road, Belfast – Brett Shaw**

Brett Shaw presented his concerns regarding the speed of traffic on Factory Road, Belfast to the Board.

Mr Shaw informed the Board that the speed limit on Factory Road was 60 kilometres per hour, which he felt was too fast for safety in what is primarily a residential area. He also advised that motorists were speeding, sometimes as much as 20 kilometres per hour above the current speed limit, and asked that the Board look at options to deter this behaviour.

Mr Shaw was very concerned about the safety aspects of motorists exceeding the speed limit as there are residences with children and pets on Factory road.

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

The Board decided to request that staff:

a) review the speed limit currently in operation on Factory Road and the nearby side streets in Belfast to determine whether the 60 kilometres per hour was still appropriate given the growth of residential housing in this formerly rural area

b) conduct speed and traffic counts on Factory Road to ascertain speeding issues and traffic volumes, and

c) review signage

and that the information be provided in a report to the Board detailing the findings and providing options for remediation.

The Board also requested that staff contact the New Zealand Police to provide a presence on Factory Road for enforcement purposes.

5. **Deputations by Appointment**

**Part B**

There were no deputations by appointment.

6. **Presentation of Petitions**

**Part B**

There was no presentation of petitions.

7. **Correspondence**

**Staff Recommendations**

**Part B**

That the Papanui-Innes Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the correspondence report dated 08 March 2019.
7.1 Portion of unmade road adjacent to 110 Sawyers Arms Road

Community Board Resolved PICB/2019/00021

The Board received a memorandum from staff regarding the portion of unmade road adjacent to 110 Sawyers Arms Road and thanked staff for the comprehensive information provided, noting that a report is due to come to the Board in April 2019.

Jo Byrne/Pauline Cotter

7.2 Modular Pump Track - 10 Shirley Road site

Community Board Resolved PICB/2019/00022

The Board received the tabled correspondence from Joanna Gould regarding the Modular Pump Track proposed for the 10 Shirley Road site.

Following discussion the Board decided to request that staff provide information on the process regarding a permanent versus a temporary structure and whether there would be a need for consultation pending the result of the funding application.

Ali Jones/Jo Byrne

8. Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board Area Report - February 2019

Community Board Resolved PICB/2019/00023 (Staff Recommendation accepted without change)

That the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board:

1. Receive the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board Area Report for February 2019.

Mike Davidson/Emma Norrish

9. Elected Members’ Information Exchange

Part B

Board members exchanged information on matters of interest including the following:

9.1 Notification of Works

Board members noted that they are no longer receiving Works Notices for road and infrastructure repairs in the Papanui-Innes wards in a consistent manner. It was also noted that the website is not as efficient for Board members when dealing with public queries.

The Board asked for information on why the system regarding the issuing of Works Notices to Community Board members has changed.
9.2 **River Road and Courtenay Street**

The Board requested an update from staff on what is happening with River Road and Courtenay Street.

Meeting concluded at 10.04am.

CONFIRMED THIS 22ND DAY OF MARCH 2019

ALI JONES
CHAIRPERSON
7. Correspondence

Reference: 19/271654
Presenter(s): Elizabeth Hovell, Community Board Advisor

1. Purpose of Report
Correspondence has been received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy Waugh</td>
<td>Momorangi Reserve Children’s Playground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Staff Recommendations
That the Papanui-Innes Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the correspondence report dated 22 March 2019.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Momorangi Reserve Children's Playground - Andy Waugh</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: andy waugh  
Sent: Wednesday, 13 March 2019 12:34 a.m. 
To: Hovell, Elizabeth  
Subject: Correspondence for next meeting

Thanks Elizabeth for your email of 7 March 2019 detailing how to submit a question to the Board. Please find below my question for inclusion at the next meeting. I would appreciate a copy of the minutes detailing any response from Board members.

Thank you

Dear Board members

I was born 50 years ago in 1968. I was raised in Momorangi Crescent and have resided away from Christchurch for the majority of my adult life.

Recently as a birthday gift my son asked me to write an autobiography. This allowed me to revisit my childhood both in terms of memories and now thanks to tools such as Google Street View, the physical location.

Half a century ago, the park at the corner of 'the crescent' contained one bench seat, one slide, two see-saws and two swings.

Looking on Street View (as recorded in August 2018) I can see that there is currently one bench seat, one slide, two see-saws and two swings.

My memory will not stretch as far to recollect if these are the exact same items merely with a rigorous maintenance schedule. However in 50 years there has been zero investment in this park. This is woeful on your and your colleagues behalf who have come before you.

I would like to alert you to the 'Liveable City' outcomes in the current Community Board Plan, one of which states that, 'Children are provided with safe, fun playgrounds.'

At this point I would like to offer the opinion that a 1960's playground present in 2019 is definitely not fun.

On behalf of generations of children raised in Momorangi Crescent, it is significantly past time to invest in new play equipment.

Regards

Andy Waugh

TRIM: 19/271574
8. Access to public transport - Innes Road bus stops

Reference: 19/195396

Presenter(s): Brenda O’Donoghue, Passenger Transport Engineer

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board to consider options to provide access to public transport on Innes Road, between Philpotts Road and Cranford Street.

2. Executive Summary

2.1 This report is staff generated in response to a change in the route of the Orbiter, which is an outcome of recent changes to the intersection of Philpotts Road and QEII Drive as part of the Christchurch Northern Corridor project.

2.2 Due to the new route of the Orbiter, there is a need for bus stops on Innes Road, between Philpotts Road and Cranford Street in order to provide access to public transport for the surrounding residential area.

2.3 The overview of the preferred bus stop locations is shown on Figure 1.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board resolve to approve Option 1:

1. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as A1 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001A Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment A of the report from the agenda).

2. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as A1, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001A Issue...
1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment A of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.

3. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as A2 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001A Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment A of the report from the agenda).

4. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as A2, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001A Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment A of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.

5. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as B1 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001B Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment B of the report from the agenda).

6. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as B1, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001B Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment B of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.

7. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as B2 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001B Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment B of the report from the agenda).

8. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as B2, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001B Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment B of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.

9. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as C1 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001C Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment C of the report from the agenda).

10. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as C1, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001C Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment C of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.

11. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as C2 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001C Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment C of the report from the agenda).

12. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as C2, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001C Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment C of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.

That should the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board decline to approve Option 1 that the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board resolve to approve Option 2:

9. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as C1 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001C Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment C of the report from the agenda).

10. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as C1, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001C Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment C of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.
That should the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board decline to approve all or part of the proposed bus stops and no stopping restrictions associated with Option 1 or Option 2, and that the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board resolve to approve from the alternative bus stop locations associated with Option 3:

13. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as D1 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001D Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment D of the report from the agenda).

14. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as D1, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001D Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment D of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.

15. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as D2 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001D Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment D of the report from the agenda).

16. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as D2, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001D Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment D of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.

17. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as E1 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001E Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment E of the report from the agenda).

18. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as E1, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001E Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment E of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.

19. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as E2 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001E Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment E of the report from the agenda).

20. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as E2, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001E Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment E of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.

21. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the part of Innes Road referred to as F1 and as shown by broken yellow lines, identified as ‘no stopping’ on the attached drawing TG134001F Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment F of the report from the agenda).

22. Under clause 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the part of Innes Road referred to as F1, identified as ‘bus stop’ on the attached drawing TG134001F Issue 1, dated 26/02/2019 (refer to Attachment F of the report from the agenda), is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of buses at all times.

23. 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.
24. 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 Service Plan for Public Transport Infrastructure in the Councils Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028).

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 – Preferred bus stop locations. Install a set of bus stops on Innes Road near Thames Street and install a set of bus stops on Innes Road near Nancy Avenue. (Refer to Attachments A and B)
- Option 2 – Install a set of bus stops on Innes Road near Ethne Street. (Refer to Attachment C)
- Option 3 – Install bus stops on Innes Road between Philpotts Road and Cranford at alternative bus stop locations not included as part of Option 1 or Option 2. (Refer to Attachments E, D and F)
- Option 4 – Do nothing

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- Good catchment potential for residents living along Innes Road, as well as the streets that connect to Innes Road, enabling better mode choice through shorter walking distances to access public transport.
- All bus stops are located close to a pedestrian crossing facility, which can encourage pedestrians to choose safer locations to cross the road, and make the journey to and from the bus stop accessible.
- The bus stops beside 229 Innes Road, 280 Innes Road and 360 Innes Road have no objects located within close proximity of the kerb. This means that buses can pull up close to the kerb, thereby reducing the step gap for customers, and removes the potential for a bus to hit a fixed obstacle, such as a utility post, when manoeuvring into and out of the bus stop.
- All of the bus stops have an appropriate kerb height which makes for a more accessible step height between the platform and the bus.
- All locations are suitable for a bus passenger shelter, should the Council wish to pursue this in the future. The proposed bus stops include a seat as minimum.
- The properties located beside the proposed bus stops have privacy screening, such as fences, hedges and garages.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- The bus stop beside 271 Innes Road is located alongside a utility post. This increases the risk of possible damage to the bus, should the bus pull up close to the footpath. In practice the bus driver is likely to increase the gap between the bus and the platform to mitigate the risk. The location of the utility post is unlikely to impact the safe entry and exit of the bus, due to the location of the post relative to its forward location along the bus box.
One of the bus stops is located across a driveway. This is a temporary obstruction, lasting for a matter of seconds when the bus is stopped to allow passengers to board or alight the bus, which is why such configurations are common practice locally and nationally.

- Reallocates on-street parking presently available for residents and visitors to those who travel by public transport. There is sufficient on-street parking capacity in the general area for other motorists to continue to park on-street.

5. Context/Background

Issue

5.1 Recent changes to the intersection of Philpotts Road and QEII Drive as part of the Christchurch Northern Corridor project has resulted in the route of the Orbiter changing to Cranford Street, as indicated in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Orbiter route via Cranford Street](image)

5.2 The route change results in an approximately one kilometre section of road where permanent bus stops are needed to allow access to public transport.

5.3 To ensure access is available to the new route, which commenced Monday 7 January 2019, a set of interim bus stops were installed on Innes Road, near Ethne Street. Interim bus stops are used when a quick fix is needed.

5.4 The interim bus stops were installed in accordance with the provisions set out in Part 9 of the Councils Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, which allows for temporary discontinuance of a parking place for the stopping or standing provisions for specified vehicles at that parking place. However, any sign or traffic control installed under this clause must be removed after a period of three months from installation unless the Council, by resolution, has approved continued use.

5.5 Compliance with Part 9 of the Councils Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 means that the interim bus stops can be used until Sunday 7 April 2019, after which time the stops will either have to be removed, or by resolution the permanent bus stops are approved by the Papanui-Innes Community Board.
Strategic Alignment

5.6 Council’s strategic framework is a key consideration in guiding the recommendations in this report. The provision of bus stops allows our communities access to public transport which in turn allows the Council to achieve:

- Strong communities,
- Liveable city,
- Healthy environment, and
- Prosperous economy.

5.7 The recommendations in this report will help to achieve the desired community outcome of a well-connected and accessible city through improved opportunities to access and use public transport.

5.8 All recommendations in this report, except for “Option 4 – Do nothing” are consistent with the anticipated outcomes of the Service Plan for Public Transport Infrastructure in the Councils Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028).

5.9 All recommendations in this report, except for “Option 4 – Do nothing” align with the Christchurch Suburban Parking Policy (2019), which provides a framework to address parking related issues and the management of competing demands for public space within the cities suburban areas. As indicated in Table 1, policy one of the Suburban Parking Policy prioritises the provision of bus stops ahead of residential, short stay and commuter parking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Commercial Areas</th>
<th>Residential Areas</th>
<th>Other Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Movement and amenity</td>
<td>Movement and amenity</td>
<td>Movement and amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Mobility parking</td>
<td>Mobility parking</td>
<td>Mobility parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>Bus stops</strong>/ cycle parks/ bike corrals/ shared parking (bike share or car share)/ micromobility (e.g. scooters)</td>
<td><strong>Bus stops</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bus stops</strong> / cycle parks/ bike corrals/ shared parking (bike share or car share)/ micromobility (e.g. scooters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Taxi ranks (special passenger vehicle stands)</td>
<td>Residents parking</td>
<td>Short stay parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Loading zones</td>
<td>Cycle parks/ bike corrals/ shared parking (bike share or car share)/ micromobility (e.g. scooters)</td>
<td>Residents parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Short stay parking</td>
<td>Short stay parking</td>
<td>Commuter parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Residents parking</td>
<td>Commuter parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commuter parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Policy 1, Suburban Parking Policy, prioritisation of road space
Decision Making Authority

5.10 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.

5.11 The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.

5.12 The installation of any signs and/or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

Assessment of Significance and Engagement

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

5.14 The level of significance was determined by assessing the impact of the project against the criteria set out in the Significance and Engagement assessment, and assessment of the number of properties affected by the proposed options.

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

Context – public transport

5.16 The length of Innes Road that staff are assessing for bus stops is about 950 metres in the north to east direction travel (Orbiter clockwise), and 1,100 metres on the east to north direction of travel (Orbiter anti-clockwise). The separation distance means that at minimum one set of bus stops is needed. However, providing one set of bus stops to bridge the separation gap, will make the walk to the bus stop longer for some residents who live on streets that connect with Innes. Provision of two sets of bus stops will mean more people are located within a shorter walk from a bus stop.

5.17 The new bus stops provide access to the Orbiter bus line. The Orbiter is a core public transport route, providing access to a number of city’s suburban hubs, schools and the University of Canterbury. The Orbiter is a high frequency route, predominantly running every 10 minutes, Monday to Saturday. The service runs every 15 minutes during the off-peak hours of service, including Sundays.

5.18 Patronage numbers have been assessed from passenger boarding data associated with the interim bus stops located on Innes Road near Ethne Street. The patronage analysis covers the period 11 February 2019 to 3 March 2019. It is noted that the interim bus stops have been in operation for a limited time, and the passenger boarding data may not yet be a true reflection of passenger demand, where the bus stop has had a longer period to become established with the surrounding community. The passenger boarding numbers for both bus stops are indicated in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim bus stops on Innes Road near Ethne Street</th>
<th>Daily weekday average passenger boardings</th>
<th>Daily weekend average passenger boardings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North side (Orbiter, clockwise)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South side (Orbiter, anti-clockwise)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Passenger boarding numbers

5.19 The passenger boarding numbers for the bus stop located on the south side of the road is indicating a strong suburban passenger demand to use the Orbiter (anti-clockwise, towards Northlands Shopping Centre).
5.20 Typical with bus stops, one bus stop tends to be busier, facilitating customers that are traveling towards a key travel destination, and the second bus stop facilitates the customers return trip. Bus stops that facilitate the return trip tend to have lower boarding numbers, which is the case with the north side bus stop (Orbiter, clockwise).

Context – traffic and parking

5.21 Innes Road is classified in the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan as a minor arterial route. Minor arterial routes provide for access to key activity centres and connections to district arterials and state highways.

5.22 The average weekday, two-way traffic flow on Innes Road between Hills Road and Cranford Street, recorded between August and September 2018, is about 15,000 vehicles per day. This traffic flow is similar to the traffic flow on other minor arterial roads that are part of the Orbiter route, and much lower than the typical daily traffic flow for the major arterial sections of the Orbiter route.

5.23 A weekday parking occupancy survey was undertaken on Thursday 14 February 2019, along Innes Road between Philpotts Road and Mersey Street. The survey was timed to coincide with the peak parking demand period associated with parents dropping off or collecting students from St Francis of Assisi school. A weekday evening survey was included to assess the residential parking demand. A Sunday morning parking occupancy survey of Innes Road between Philpotts Road and Nancy Avenue was undertaken to assess the on-street parking demand associated St Francis of Assisi church services. The parking occupancy survey results can be found in Attachment J. The following is a summary of the survey results.

5.23.1 The parking occupancy survey indicates the on-street parking capacity on Innes Road between Mersey Street and Nancy Avenue is underutilised. There is sufficient on-street parking capacity for the installation of the bus stop, and for residents and visitors to continue parking on-street.

5.23.2 The demand for parking on Innes Road between Nancy Avenue and Philpotts Road is greater due to the St Francis of Assisi school and church activities. In this section of Innes Road, the peak occupancy of 86 percent was observed to occur at 3:00 p.m. during the Thursday survey. However, the average occupancy for all of the surveyed time periods, including Sunday morning, was less than 75 percent.

Bus stop location planning

5.24 Bus stops provide key access connection points to allow personal mobility, by means of public transport. The importance of bus stops is reflected in the Christchurch Suburban Parking Policy (2019).

5.25 It can be a challenge in an urban-residential environment to achieve a balance in bus stop planning criteria, because of the need to work with the space available on-street, and to be considerate to those who live near the bus stop. However, the effects of bus stops in urban settings are generally not site-specific, they will have similar effects along the street irrespective of which property it is placed by.

5.26 There are multiple considerations in the location planning of bus stops, however the key topics to consider include:

- Catchment areas and proximity to surrounding services and amenities,
- Works well for the wider road network, bus network and bus passengers,
- Accessibility,
- Capacity,
- Impact on the surrounding environment, and
- Information gathered from site visits and feedback from stakeholders.

5.27 Following the multiple considerations in the location planning of bus stops, staff have determined a preference for four new bus stops on Innes Road, between Philpotts Road and Cranford Street.

6. Options Analysis

Options Considered
6.1 The following options were considered and are assessed in this report:
- Option 1 – Preferred bus stop locations. Install a set of bus stops on Innes Road near Thames Street and install a set of bus stops on Innes Road near Nancy Avenue.
- Option 2 – Install a set of bus stops on Innes Road near Ethne Street.
- Option 3 – Install bus stops on Innes Road between Philpotts Road and Cranford at alternative bus stop locations not included as part of Option 1 or Option 2.
- Option 4 – Do nothing

6.2 A summary of all bus stop location options considered, including those that were not advanced to consultation is included in Attachment G.

Options Description
6.1 Option One: Preferred Option: Install a set of bus stops on Innes Road near Thames Street and install a set of bus stops on Innes Road near Nancy Avenue.

6.1.1 Option Description: Install four bus stops in accordance with Attachments A and B. The location overview of the Option 1 bus stop locations is shown on Figure 3.

Figure 3: Overview of Option 1 bus stop locations
6.1.2 The bus stops in Option 1 are located beside 229 Innes Road, 271 Innes Road, 280 Innes Road and 360 Innes Road.

6.1.3 Option Advantages

- Good catchment potential for residents living along Innes Road, as well as the streets that connect to Innes Road, enabling better mode choice through shorter walking distances to access public transport.

- All bus stops are located close to a pedestrian crossing facility, which can encourage pedestrians to choose safer locations to cross the road, and make the journey to and from the bus stop accessible.

- The bus stops beside 229 Innes Road, 280 Innes Road and 360 Innes Road have no objects located within close proximity of the kerb. This means that buses can pull up close to the kerb, thereby reducing the step gap for customers, and removes the potential for a bus to hit a fixed obstacle, such as a utility post, when manoeuvring into and out of the bus stop.

- All of the bus stops have an appropriate kerb height which makes for a more accessible step height between the platform and the bus.

- All locations are suitable for a bus passenger shelter, should the Council wish to pursue this in the future. The proposed bus stops include a seat as minimum.

- The properties located beside the proposed bus stops have privacy screening, such as fences, hedges and garages.

6.1.4 Option Disadvantages

- The bus stop beside 271 Innes Road is located alongside a utility post. This increases the risk of possible damage to the bus, should the bus pull up close to the footpath. In practice the bus driver is likely to increase the gap between the bus and the platform to mitigate the risk, which can impact passenger accessibility.

- The location of the utility post is unlikely to impact the safe entry and exit of the bus, due to the location of the post relative to its forward location along the bus box.

- One of the bus stops is located across a driveway. This is a temporary obstruction, lasting for a matter of seconds when the bus is stopped to allow passengers to board or alight the bus, which is why such configurations are common practice locally and nationally.

- Reallocates on-street parking presently available for residents, visitors and short stay parking, to those who travel by public transport. There is sufficient on-street parking capacity in the general area for other motorists to continue to park on-street.

6.2 Option Two: Install a set of bus stops on Innes Road near Ethne Street

6.2.1 Option Description: Install bus stops in accordance with Attachment C. The location overview of the Option 2 bus stop locations is shown on Figure 4.
Figure 4: Overview of Option 2 bus stop locations

6.2.2 The bus stops in Option 2 are located beside 259 Innes Road and 308 Innes Road.

6.2.3 Option Advantages

- While not to the extent of Option 1, there remains good catchment potential for residents living along Innes Road, as well as the streets that connect to Innes Road. However, for some residents the reduced catchment, in comparison to Option 1, will result in longer walking distances to get to the bus stops, which may impact those with limited mobility.

- All locations are suitable for a bus passenger shelter, should the Council wish to pursue this in the future. The proposed bus stops include a seat as minimum.

- All locations the adjacent properties have privacy screening, such as fences, hedges and garages.

- None of the bus stops are located across a driveway.

6.2.4 Option Disadvantages

- The bus stops are not located in close proximity to pedestrian crossing facilities, which may impede on the safety of pedestrians walking to and from the bus stops, and make it more difficult for those with limited mobility to access public transport.

- All of the bus stops have utility posts located within close proximity of the kerb. The locations of the utility posts, relative to the bus box means there is an increased the risk of damage to the bus, when entering and exiting the bus stop. The location of the utility posts is likely to increase the gap between the bus and the platform, which can impact passenger accessibility.

- It is unlikely that the bus stop will have an appropriate step height from the platform. This is due to the camber of the road and the depth of the drainage channel. Further investigation will determine if bridge blocks are needed to improve the comfort for customers boarding or alighting a bus. Reduced step height can impact passenger accessibility.

- Reallocates on-street parking presently available for residents and visitors to those who travel by public transport. There is sufficient on-street parking capacity in the general area for other motorists to continue to park on-street.
6.3 **Option Three:** Install bus stops on Innes Road between Philpotts Road and Cranford at alternative bus stop locations not included as part of Option 1 or Option 2,

6.3.1 **Option Description:** The alternative bus stop locations are as follows

- 241 Innes Road, in accordance with Attachment D for the part of Innes Road referred to as D1. For example, this location would be suited as an alternative for the bus stop beside 229 Innes Road in **Option One**, or in conjunction with the bus stop location beside 308 Innes Road in **Option Two**, or in conjunction with the bus stop location beside 302 referred to below.

- 302 Innes Road, in accordance with Attachment D for the part of Innes Road referred to as D2. For example, this location would be suited as an alternative for the bus stop beside 280 Innes Road in **Option One** or in conjunction with the bus stop location beside 257 Innes Road in **Option Two**, or in conjunction with the bus stop location referred to above, beside 241 Innes Road.

- 279 Innes Road, in accordance with Attachment E for the part of Innes Road referred to as E1. For example, this location would be suited as an alternative for the bus stop beside 271 Innes Road in **Option One**, or in conjunction with the bus stop location beside 382 Innes Road, referred to below.

- 382 Innes Road, in accordance with Attachment E for the part of Innes Road referred to as E2. For example, this location would be suited as an alternative for the bus stop beside 360 Innes Road in **Option One** or in conjunction with the bus stop location referred to above, beside 279 Innes Road.

- 257 Innes Road, in accordance with Attachment F for the part of Innes Road referred to as F1. For example, this location would be suited as an alternative for the bus stop beside 259 Innes Road in **Option Two**.

6.3.2 The bus stop beside 27 Ethne Street (bus stop on Innes Road), which is currently one of the interim bus stops, has not been included in this report for further consideration as staff do not consider it a suitable or appropriate location for a permanent bus stop. This is due to the minimum legal distance it is offset from the intersection with Ethne Street.

6.3.3 Option Advantages

- The advantages to the alternative options will be similar to the advantages previously outlined in **Option One** and **Option Two**.

6.3.4 Option Disadvantages

- The disadvantages to the alternative options will be similar to the advantage previously outlined in **Option One** and **Option Two**.

- The proposed bus stop beside 279 Innes Road would reallocate two time restricted (P5, 8:15 a.m. to 9:15 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m., Monday to Friday). The P5 parking is associated with the drop-off and collection of students attending St Francis of Assisi School. Should the proposed bus stop beside 279 Innes Road become the authorised bus stop, a second consultation would occur to establish where the two P5 parking spaces would be relocated to.

6.4 **Option Four:** Do nothing.

6.4.1 **Option Description:** Do nothing, interim bus stops are removed and no permanent bus stops are installed.

6.4.2 Option Advantages
• Does not reallocate on-street parking.

6.4.3 Option Disadvantages

• The interim bus stops are permitted to be operational for three months under the Councils Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017. Should the Community Board proceed with the ‘Do nothing’ option or decide to leave the approval of the permanent bus stops to a later date, the three-month allowance for the interim bus stops will have expired. Should this happen, the interim bus stops will have to be removed, resulting in a very long gap between the nearest bus stops, disadvantaging to those who currently use the bus stops to travel by public transport.

• Restricts the freedom of movement for those who have limited choices in how they access education, employment and social activities.

• Restricts the increase in the number of trips made by public transport,

• Restricts mode choice for people have who live along or near Innes Road.

• The potential negative impact it could have on the Council to carry out its role and functions.

Analysis Criteria

6.5 All new bus stops are planned in accordance with the Christchurch Bus Stop Guidelines (2009).

6.6 The bus stop planning criteria as outlined in Section 5. The criteria is used to assess all bus stop location options considered. A copy of the bus stop location assessment, including those that were not advanced to consultation, is provided in Attachment G.

6.7 A parking occupancy survey was undertaken to analyse the parking demand within the area of interest.

Options Considerations

6.8 Options 1 to 3 are consistent with the Council’s approved Service Plan for Public Transport Infrastructure (2018-2028)

6.9 The “Do Nothing” option is inconsistent with the Council’s approved Service Plan for Public Transport Infrastructure (2018-2028):

6.9.1 Inconsistency – The “Do Nothing” option has the potential to not contribute to increase number of trips made by public transport.

6.9.2 Reason for inconsistency – No bus stops are provided, restricting access to public transport

6.9.3 Amendment necessary – Install bus stops as per Options 1, 2 or 3 of this report.

7. Community Views and Preferences

7.1 Affected property owners and residents were sent letters on 4 February 2019. The consultation catchment area for the project is indicated in Figure 5. Letters were dropped into letterboxes at properties located within the catchment area and letters were sent to property owners who do not live at the address. Additional copies were given to the St Francis of Assisi school and church. Staff also door knocked residents who live adjacent to the proposed bus stops. The consultation period ran for three weeks from 4 February to 25 February 2019. Refer to Attachment I for the submissions received.
During the consultation we received 35 submissions. 23 were from people who live near the bus stops, 11 were submissions related to the school and church and 1 was from someone outside.

Feedback was received from two stakeholder organisations, Environment Canterbury and Go Bus Transport, which have been assessed and included separately in Section 7.12 to 7.16.

Of those who submitted 13 supported Option 1, 21 supported Option 2 and one person supported neither option.

Of those who supported the recommended option (Option 1), their bus stop location preferences are indicated in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1 (two sets of bus stops)</th>
<th>Bus stop locations near Severn Street</th>
<th>Bus stops locations near Nancy Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North side of Road: 229 Innes Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>North side of Road: 271 Innes Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North side of road: 239/241 Innes Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>North side of road: 279 Innes Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South side of road: 280 Innes Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>South side of road: 360 Innes Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South side of road: 302 Innes Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>South side of road: 382 Innes Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 was preferred, but no location preference provided.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Option 1 was preferred, but no location preference provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Consultation feedback, Option 1 preferred bus stop locations

Where Option 1 was the preferred option, the preferred bus stop locations near Severn Street are beside 229 Innes Road and 280 Innes Road and the preferred bus stop locations near Nancy Avenue are beside 271 Innes Road and 260 Innes Road.
7.7 Of those who supported Option 2, their bus stop location preferences are as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2, one set of bus stop near Ethne Street</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North side of Road: 257 Innes Road</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North side of road: 259 Innes Road</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South side of road: 308 Innes Road</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South side of road: 27 Ethne Street (bus stop on Innes Road)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Option 2 was preferred, but no location preference provided (on the north side of the road) | 2 |
| Option 2 was preferred, but no location preference provided (on the south side of the road) | 3 |

Table 4: Consultation feedback, Option 2 the preferred bus stop locations

7.8 Where Option 2 was the preferred option, the preferred bus stop locations near Ethne Street are beside 259 Innes Road and beside 27 Ethne Street (bus stop on Innes Road).

7.9 The most popular option, Option 2, is reflective of submitters, including those who live outside the consultation catchment area, who are concerned with having a bus stop in close proximity to St Francis of Assisi school or church.

7.10 For residents living within the consultation catchment area, the most popular option is Option 1 (two sets of bus stops).

7.11 There were a number of key themes and issues raised by submitters that were similar for both the Option 1 and Option 2 proposed bus stops. The key themes and issues, along with a staff response, are provided in Tables 5 and 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns raised common to all options proposed</th>
<th>Staff response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of parking</td>
<td>The allocation of kerbside road space for bus stops is reflected in the priorities of the Council's Parking Policy (2019). In all areas, bus stops are prioritised above residential, short stay and commuter parking. While there is some on-street parking reallocation, there is sufficient on-street parking capacity in the general area for other motorist to continue to park on-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop located over a driveway</td>
<td>Buses are legally permitted to stop over driveways for the purpose of picking up and dropping off passengers at a bus stop. Many bus stops in Christchurch and other bus stop locations around New Zealand are located across driveways. At these stops, buses will only be stopping long enough to pick-up and drop-off passengers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard to motorists pulling out of their driveway</td>
<td>When pulling in or out of driveway, drivers must give way to all traffic on the road, including buses. Certain sight lines for movements to and from the driveway will be restricted while the bus is stopped. This is a temporary obstruction, lasting for a matter of seconds when the bus is stopped to allow passengers to board or alight the bus, which is why such configurations are common practice locally and nationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to intersection makes it unsafe and causes visibility issues</td>
<td>The proximity to nearby intersections and pedestrian crossings for all bus stops proposed has been assessed as suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusion of privacy (noise and loitering)</td>
<td>When planning bus stops staff are mindful of the impact they can have on residents. However, the impact of bus stops in urban settings are generally not site-specific, as they will have a similar impact along the street irrespective of placement beside one residential property or that of another. Where possible bus stops are placed beside properties that have fences, mature shrubs or other screens that mitigate the impact that the bus stop may have on the adjacent residents. A bus will only stop at the bus stop if the passenger demand exists. The frequency of which buses stop at suburban bus stops mitigates the impact of privacy intrusion. Irrespective, bus stops are located within a public space, and are there to improve the transport choices for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littering</td>
<td>Rubbish bins are not typically included in the planning of bus stops. If littering at the bus stop was to become an issue in the future, and this is reported to the Council, staff can assess if the installation of a rubbish bin is warranted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will cause traffic problems</td>
<td>The proposal is no different to any bus stop in the city. Public transport is a fundamental measure to support mode shift and reduce traffic related problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Key concerns raised by submitters, common to all options proposed
Option 1 specific issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops will create an unsafe environment for children</td>
<td>Buses are standard part of the traffic composition, and there are bus stops located near to schools around Christchurch, and other cities around New Zealand. Traffic is a potential hazard on all streets, irrespective of the location of bus stops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2 specific issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a safe crossing point</td>
<td>There is no existing nearby pedestrian crossing facility to aid safe pedestrian movements across Innes Road, near Ethne Street. There is no pedestrian crossing facility proposed. It is the recommendation by staff that Option 1 should be considered as the preferred option, as it includes nearby pedestrian crossing facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Key concerns raised by submitters, specific to the options proposed

Consultation feedback – Stakeholder Organisations

7.12 Christchurch City Council provides bus stops to support the Greater Christchurch public transport services provided by Environment Canterbury. Consequently, Environment Canterbury has also been consulted on for all bus stop options proposed.

7.13 Go Bus is the operator of the Orbiter. Go Bus drivers have to stop at the bus stops on request, and ensure where practicable, passengers can safely and accessibly get on and off the bus. For this reason, Go Bus have a strong interest in the bus stops that are provided, as the location and features of the bus stops address how easy or restrictive the bus stop is for their bus drivers to use.

7.14 Feedback received from Environment Canterbury and Go Bus both outlined their preference as being Option 1. The bus stop location preferences are the same as those represented by the community feedback concerning Option 1.

7.15 The reasons provided by Environment Canterbury for the preference of Option 1 are as follows:

- The bus stops are closer to pedestrian crossings
- Widens the catchment, encouraging more customers to utilise public transport and lessening the walk for elderly or disabled patrons in the area.

7.16 The reasons provided by Go Bus for the preference of Option 1 are as follows:

- Safe entry and exit of vehicles into the stops
- Allowing passengers to board and alight safely
- Allow for the continuation of a reliable bus service in the area
- Reduce the possibility of vehicle damage
- Enable access within a reasonable distance for passengers to help enable trip choice and options
- Enable passengers and pedestrians to use an existing crossing, which will hopefully reduce passengers and pedestrians crossings in an unsafe manner.
8. Legal Implications
  8.1 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision
  8.2 This specific report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit however the report has been written using a general approach previously approved of by the Legal Services Unit, and the recommendations are consistent with the policy and legislative framework outlined in Sections 5.6 to 5.9.

9. Next Steps
  9.1 Approval is required by the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board.
  9.2 If approved, the recommendations will be implemented approximately two weeks of the Community Board approval. The short period is due to the time limit that exists on the legal operation of the interim bus stops.
### 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4 (Do Nothing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td>$10,000 for the installation of traffic controls and seating, plus $7,500 for planning, consultation and the preparation of this report</td>
<td>$5,000 for the installation of traffic controls and seating, plus $7,500 for consultation and the preparation of this report</td>
<td>Depending on the outcome of the Community Board’s resolution associated with Option 3, the installation cost would be in the range of $5,000 to $10,000. Plus $7,500 for consultation and the preparation of this report</td>
<td>$7,500 for planning, consultation and the preparation of this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance/Ongoing</strong></td>
<td>Transport and City Streets, Operations Expenditure budget, includes maintenance of bus stop infrastructure, as and when it is needed.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Source</strong></td>
<td>Traffic Operations, Capital Expenditure budget for bus stop installations, plus existing staff budgets</td>
<td>Existing staff budgets</td>
<td>Existing staff budgets</td>
<td>Existing staff budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on Rates</strong></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Bus stops provide access to public transport. Public transport is part of a wider transport package to support mode shift to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce traffic congestion and traffic crashes. This in in turn helps the Council provide a healthy environment and a liveable city (Council’s strategic framework).</td>
<td>Not providing access to public transport, does not support mode shift and the associated benefits to the environment.</td>
<td>Not providing access to public transport, does not support mode shift and the associated benefits to the environment.</td>
<td>Not providing access to public transport, does not support mode shift and the associated benefits to the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social &amp; Community Impacts</strong></td>
<td>This option will help to achieve the desired community outcome of a well-connected and accessible city through improved opportunities to access and use public transport.</td>
<td>This option will help achieve the desired community outcome of a well-connected and accessible city through improved opportunities to access and use public transport, however the impact might be restricted due to the matters listed in the</td>
<td>Dependant on what bus stop(s) are approved, Option 3 would result in a social and community impact similar to that of Option 1 or Option 2.</td>
<td>Option 4 would have a negative impact on social and community impacts, as it restricts the freedom of movement for people who have limited choices in how they access education, employment and social activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility Impacts</strong></td>
<td>following section ‘accessibility impacts’.</td>
<td>Matters associated with this option that may have a negative impact on the accessibility of the bus stop:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) For some this option will result in longer walking distances to get to the bus stop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) The bus stops are not located in close proximity to a pedestrian crossing facility, which may impede access to the bus stops, particularly for those with limited mobility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Obstacles located in close proximity to the kerb in addition to concerns associated with the camber of the road and the depth of the drainage channel, will impact how accessible the step height and step gap is for people moving to or from the platform and the bus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependant on what bus stop(s) are approved, Option 3 would result in an accessibility impact similar to that of Option 1 or Option 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Option 4 would have a negative impact on accessibility, as it restricts the freedom of movement for people who have limited choices in how they access education, employment and social activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4 – Do Nothing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Manua Whenua</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Council Plans &amp; Policies</td>
<td>This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.</td>
<td>This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.</td>
<td>This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.</td>
<td>This option is inconsistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Multi-criteria analysis, Option 5 (two sets of bus stops): bus stop location options on Innes Road near Thomas Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Bus stop catchment</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Separation distance (m)</th>
<th>Name 1 (5 letters)</th>
<th>Name 2 (5 letters)</th>
<th>Accessible horizontal clearance</th>
<th>Appropriate step height at platform</th>
<th>Bus stop located across a driveway</th>
<th>Location at an intersection or pedestrian crossing</th>
<th>Name of block</th>
<th>Score (1-10)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Network utilisation</th>
<th>On-street parking realization</th>
<th>Suitable for a shelter?</th>
<th>Privacy screening to the adjacent property</th>
<th>Score (1-10)</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Advise to consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North side of road (clockwise)</td>
<td>Previous bus stop: 378 Graydon Street</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>221 Innes Road</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>high fence, shrubs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>229 Innes Road</td>
<td>262.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>low fence, shrubs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>231 Innes Road</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>approach to intersection, but does not impact intersection sightlines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>low fence, shrubs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>249 Innes Road</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>approach to intersection, but does not impact intersection sightlines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>high fence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Back up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>241 Innes Road</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>approach to intersection, but does not impact intersection sightlines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>high fence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>243 Innes Road</td>
<td>443.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>top of the &quot;T&quot; Intersection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>high fence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South side of road (clockwise)</td>
<td>Previous bus stop calculation has not been done</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>202 Innes Road</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>departure side of the intersection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>high fence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>200 Innes Road</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>high fence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>276 Innes Road</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>high fence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Back up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ref | Address | Separation distance | Presence of pedestrian crossing facility other than less than 75 metres? | Bus stop and network operation | Adequate horizontal clearance | Appropriate step height at platform | Bus stop located across driveway | Location at an intersection or pedestrian crossing | Menzies | Surrounding Environment | Onset of parking medication | Suitable for a shelter? | Privacy screening to the adjacent property | Score | Advance to consultation?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>268 Innes Road</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no (utility post close to kerb)</td>
<td>yes, but compromised due to horizontal clearance</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>departure side of intersection, close to maximum separation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>medium fence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>back up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>271 Innes Road</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no (utility post close to kerb)</td>
<td>yes, but compromised due to horizontal clearance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>approach to the crossing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no fence, hedge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>275 Innes Road</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Previous bus stop calculation has not been included due to multiple options analysed</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>approach to the crossing, location at the property with slight variances to the crossing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>medium fence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>279 Innes Road</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>Previous bus stop calculation has not been included due to multiple options analysed</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>departure side of the intersection, which is recommended practice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (these are currently 'SF' and time of day restricted)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>high fence, vegetation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>301 Innes Road</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no (utility post close to kerb)</td>
<td>yes, but compromised due to the horizontal clearance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>top of the 'I' intersection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>low fence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>303 Innes Road</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>305 Innes Road</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no (utility post close to kerb)</td>
<td>yes, but compromised due to the horizontal clearance</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>307 Innes Road</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Previous bus stop calculation has not been included due to multiple options analysed</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>It is close to the approach to the crossing. The location is away from the property with slight variances to the crossing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>high fence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>309 Innes Road</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>310 Innes Road</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>departure side of the intersection, which is recommended practice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 (these are 'II' and time of day restricted)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>grassed area of school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>back up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>311 Innes Road</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>approach to intersection and may compromise access to block</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>high fence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board
22 March 2019

#### Item 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Bus stop identification</th>
<th>Distance to nearest bus stop</th>
<th>Bus stop alignment and network operation</th>
<th>Surrounding Environment and pedestrian crossing</th>
<th>Access to/for pedestrians</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North side of road (Kahanui Street)</td>
<td>291 Innes Road</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Innes Road</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Innes Road</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Innes Road</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Innes Road</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Innes Road</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Innes Road</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Innes Road</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Innes Road</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Innes Road</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Innes Road</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| South side of road (Kahanui Street) | 291 Innes Road | 395 | no | yes | no | near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing. | 3 | yes | High fence, 3.13 back up |
| | 291 Innes Road | 463 | no | yes | no | near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing. | 3 | yes | High fence, 3.13 back up |
| | 291 Innes Road | 505 | no | yes | no | near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing. | 3 | yes | High fence, 3.13 back up |
| | 291 Innes Road | 555 | no | yes | no | near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing. | 3 | yes | High fence, 3.13 back up |
| | 291 Innes Road | 605 | no | yes | no | near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing. | 3 | yes | High fence, 3.13 back up |
| | 291 Innes Road | 655 | no | yes | no | near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing. | 3 | yes | High fence, 3.13 back up |
| | 291 Innes Road | 705 | no | yes | no | near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing. | 3 | yes | High fence, 3.13 back up |
| | 291 Innes Road | 755 | no | yes | no | near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing. | 3 | yes | High fence, 3.13 back up |
| | 291 Innes Road | 805 | no | yes | no | near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing. | 3 | yes | High fence, 3.13 back up |
| | 291 Innes Road | 855 | no | yes | no | near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing. | 3 | yes | High fence, 3.13 back up |
| | 291 Innes Road | 905 | no | yes | no | near the intersection, but does not have pedestrian crossing. | 3 | yes | High fence, 3.13 back up |
Innes Road Proposed Bus Stops - Option 2
Proposed bus stops locations near Ethne Street
Consultation Plan
Dr A J Stoop Ltd
Yaldhurst Family Doctors
129 Yaldhurst Road, St Kevins, Christchurch 8012
Phone: (03) 343 4034  Fax: (03) 348 0551

25 Jul 2018

To whom it may concern,

Christchurch City Council,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing in support of the Maddock family, Innes Road, Malerehas. They have recently been informed that a bus stop is to be placed directly outside their house.

This will have significant ramifications for their boys, particularly with regard to sleep. Both have sleep issues and a bus stop, with activity occurring until late at night, is likely to have detrimental effects on their already disturbed sleep. Their bedroom is upstairs and directly facing the street. I am concerned that this could in turn affect their health and learning.

In view of this, I ask that this decision be reconsidered.

Yours sincerely,

Dr A J Stoop
MBChB  FRANZCGP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Option 1-2</th>
<th>Preference Option 1-2: preferred bus stop locations (A/B)</th>
<th>Preference Option 2-3: preferred bus stop locations (A/B)</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Submitter comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BA Rennell</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Option 1: Location B 340 / 336 Innes Road has potential to block traffic travelling east on Innes Road when a car or several cars wait on Innes Road to turn right into Thames Street. Location B is too close to Thames Street &amp; may impact on visibility for traffic on Thames turning right onto Innes Road. Location A: (340) is closer to Innes intersection as cars use Innes to turn right onto Thames &amp; left onto Philpotts. Cars travelling south on Philpotts St turn right onto Innes Road. This is a busy intersection. Option 2: Location B (336) is too close to Innes intersection as cars use Innes to turn right onto Thames &amp; left onto Philpotts. Cars travelling south on Philpotts St turn right onto Innes Road. This is a busy intersection. Option 2: Location A (340) is closer to Innes intersection as cars use Innes to turn right onto Thames &amp; left onto Philpotts. Cars travelling south on Philpotts St turn right onto Innes Road. This is a busy intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rebecca McIvor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Option 1: Location B 340 / 336 Innes Road has potential to block traffic travelling east on Innes Road when a car or several cars wait on Innes Road to turn right into Thames Street. Location B is too close to Thames Street &amp; may impact on visibility for traffic on Thames turning right onto Innes Road. Location A: (340) is closer to Innes intersection as cars use Innes to turn right onto Thames &amp; left onto Philpotts. Cars travelling south on Philpotts St turn right onto Innes Road. This is a busy intersection. Option 2: Location B (336) is too close to Innes intersection as cars use Innes to turn right onto Thames &amp; left onto Philpotts. Cars travelling south on Philpotts St turn right onto Innes Road. This is a busy intersection. Option 2: Location A (340) is closer to Innes intersection as cars use Innes to turn right onto Thames &amp; left onto Philpotts. Cars travelling south on Philpotts St turn right onto Innes Road. This is a busy intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sadgrove Family</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Option 1: Option 1 is by far the best option, as stated in the advantages / disadvantages table, there is a clearer view for the buses, pedestrian crossings near by and shorter walks. Option 2: Option 2 is by far the best option, as stated in the advantages / disadvantages table, there is a clearer view for the buses, pedestrian crossings near by and shorter walks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Will Drewer</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Option 1: Option 1 is by far the best option, as stated in the advantages / disadvantages table, there is a clearer view for the buses, pedestrian crossings near by and shorter walks. Option 2: Option 2 is by far the best option, as stated in the advantages / disadvantages table, there is a clearer view for the buses, pedestrian crossings near by and shorter walks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Janine Tarantelli</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I have supported Option two because I think it is unnecessary to have as many stops on a relatively short section of road. However, I strongly DO NOT support a stop outside 308 Innes Road as the Thames corner / Innes Rd intersection is already very problematic and this will further decrease visibility for turning cars. I have seen many near misses (car / car / car / pedestrian) at that corner over the last five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ross Tarantelli</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I have supported Option two because I think it is unnecessary to have as many stops on a relatively short section of road. However, I strongly DO NOT support a stop outside 308 Innes Road as the Thames corner / Innes Rd intersection is already very problematic and this will further decrease visibility for turning cars. I have seen many near misses (car / car / car / pedestrian) at that corner over the last five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Velicity Midburn</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I do not support any bus stop between Nancy Ave and Philpotts Road as it could limit visibility for cars approaching the pedestrian crossing. This crossing is already dangerous with traffic approaching too quickly. I would support Option 2, with one stop near Thames Street and the other being near the shops, where there is currently a stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dr Leng</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I do not support any bus stop between Nancy Ave and Philpotts Road as it could limit visibility for cars approaching the pedestrian crossing. This crossing is already dangerous with traffic approaching too quickly. I would support Option 2, with one stop near Thames Street and the other being near the shops, where there is currently a stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Louise Macfarlane</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please do not put bus stops so close to St Francis’! Having bus stops so close to a school has a massive impact on safety. Your proposal will mean the school / church issue at least 4 carparks and this will have a massive impact. I cannot imagine a single parent of the school supporting it. I’m almost horrified that it has gotten this far! SAFETY SAFETY SAFETY!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Charlotte Mcgurk</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please do not put bus stops so close to St Francis’! Having bus stops so close to a school has a massive impact on safety. Your proposal will mean the school / church issue at least 4 carparks and this will have a massive impact. I cannot imagine a single parent of the school supporting it. I’m almost horrified that it has gotten this far! SAFETY SAFETY SAFETY!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Irene Tawett</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please do not put bus stops so close to St Francis’! Having bus stops so close to a school has a massive impact on safety. Your proposal will mean the school / church issue at least 4 carparks and this will have a massive impact. I cannot imagine a single parent of the school supporting it. I’m almost horrified that it has gotten this far! SAFETY SAFETY SAFETY!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Amy Wilcox</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please do not put bus stops so close to St Francis’! Having bus stops so close to a school has a massive impact on safety. Your proposal will mean the school / church issue at least 4 carparks and this will have a massive impact. I cannot imagine a single parent of the school supporting it. I’m almost horrified that it has gotten this far! SAFETY SAFETY SAFETY!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Claire Bell</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please do not put bus stops so close to St Francis’! Having bus stops so close to a school has a massive impact on safety. Your proposal will mean the school / church issue at least 4 carparks and this will have a massive impact. I cannot imagine a single parent of the school supporting it. I’m almost horrified that it has gotten this far! SAFETY SAFETY SAFETY!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Laura North</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dangerous putting a bus stop directly outside of a school in a busy area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitters Name</td>
<td>Preference Option 1: preferred bus stop locations (A/B)</td>
<td>Preference Option 2: preferred bus stop locations (A/B)</td>
<td>Submitter comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timo Gutbert</td>
<td>South side, north side</td>
<td>South side, north side</td>
<td>The vicinity around the school is so poor anyone, add a bus stopping and it will be no dangerous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher &amp; Laura Loxton</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>My wife Laura and I are contacting you regarding a letter sent to us and residence of Innes Road regarding the Proposed bus stops on Innes Road. We have carefully considered both proposals and monitored the current temporary bus stop outside our property at Innes Road and we have a number of comments to make. In the new proposal (Option 2) bus stop location A you have the bus stopping right outside our house with a peak for people to site on right outside our fence. I currently work from home and have numerous clients visit my house on a daily basis. The gate to our property is in frequent use during the day and evening due to work commitments and parking on the side of the road for clients is a regular occurrence so having a bus stop here is not practical and will affect my business practices. Just before Christmas, there was a very bad accident just outside Innes Road – friends had come to visit us and a motorist lost control, writing off all 3 cars which highlighted the speed and the dangers along Innes Road without the introduction of a bus stop in this section of the road. The morning commute outside our house is a very busy time and cars coming out of Othine and Thames Street become impatient and a lot of time these roads are used as thoroughfanes to access Crawford Street qv. Visibly is also considerably reduced where the bus stops at the temporary bus stops and cyclists are unable to pass safely as the road does not seem wide enough for the bus to safely pull in and allow the flow of traffic continue – Please see pictures attached. The kerb height and electrical poles outside Innes Road are other 'obstacles' that must be overcome as damage has already occurred. The electrical pole and the kerb is very steep and as yet I have not seen a bus stop where it should at the temporary bus stop which must be due in part to the kerb height. There is no safe crossing in this area and children are having to cross lanes of busy traffic at peak times to access the temporary bus stop. Since the temporary bus stop has been introduced, we have had more litter in the area (there are no bins currently at the temporary bus stops). Some scooters have been abandoned and left outside our house which makes gaining access to the property an issue. Having removed the proposed bus locations at various times throughout the day I find Option 1 - bus stop location A would be the least option for this. As the traffic is already 'dense and slow' heading towards Crawford Street further down Innes Road with an existing pedestrian crossing this would be easier and more convenient for people accessing the doctors surgery / bakery and health clinic. We would also like to be consulted further on any future plans before a decision is made as this email and our returned comments form don't fully cover our concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter Name</th>
<th>Submitter Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Bellows (Organisation: Bus Transport)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above locations have been selected with safety and visibility in mind. We were concerned with the restricted visibility of fellow motorists in the other options which were presented with stop placements being close to intersection where cars will turn behind the bus and essentially be in a blind spot for a period of time. This may create unnecessary conflict and safety issues which would not be ideal, especially when the bus is pulling out of a stop. 

Go Bus is especially supportive of all removal of work and new stops meeting the minimum specifications as outlined in the Christchurch Bus Stop Guidelines (2009). The introduction of shelters and appropriate waiting facilities would also be recommended to be included as the work required to implement Option 1. 

Go Bus is happy to not present the submission in person, so not speaking rights are required. If you require further clarification please do not hesitate to contact me. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter Name</th>
<th>Submitter Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kieran Titter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wish to lodge an objection to the proposed bus stop at 27 Ethel Street (bus stop on Innes Road). I am the owner/occupier of the property situated at Innes Road. As can be seen in the attached photograph 1, the interim bus stop is located on the very edge of the driveway into my property.

The primary ground on which I object to the location of the proposed bus stop at 27 Ethel Street relates to health and safety concerns. The proposed bus is located close to the intersection of Ethel Street and Innes Road. Although the proposed stop may be within the allowable distance from the intersection the location of the proposed bus stop creates a number of hazards. For one, a bus stopped or pulling into the proposed bus stop obscures the clear view of the road for any north bound traffic on Ethel Street endeavouring to make a left hand turn or right hand onto Innes Road. For another, the bus invariably stops over the driveway on Innes Road. White, a bus is permitted to stop over a driveway the driver not only interferes with the enjoyment of the property but also (and more importantly) creates a significant health and safety concern. As a matter of interest, since the interim bus stop has been in place, both my wife and I have had a number of accidents and I have had a pair of shoes stolen from the front door step - nothing of the like of which had occurred before the bus stop was put in place. Hence there is no privacy screening from the road as there is with other options.

The attached photograph 1 shows a man and his dog standing over the driveway with the bus to the driveway. Photograph 2 shows school children waiting for the bus with their backs to the driveway. None of these people will be aware of a vehicle backing out of the driveway. For one, their focus is on the imminent arrival of the bus. For another, many people (school children in particular) are focused on their phones and wearing headphones. It is of course important anyone backing out of the driveway at 310 Innes Road to do so carefully but people will simply not be aware of a vehicle wishing to leave the property. Furthermore, there is a real risk that a person, probably a school child, will run to catch the bus and neither the person nor anyone backing out of the property will see each other. This creates a real risk that the occupier of Innes Road cannot neglect.

As photograph 3 shows, in fact the bus is not stopping over the driveway to allow passengers to get on or off the bus on the driveway. The bus has pulled well forward of the intersection of Ethel Street and Innes Road so as not to impede the intersection. However, the tail of the bus remains over the driveway as a person has alighted as can be seen in the photograph.

The sole advantage of the proposed bus stop is that, as the interim stop has been there for a little while, passengers may have become accustomed to using it. However, the preferred options under Option 1 provides two sets of bus stops that will ensure shorter waiting distances for people to access the bus stops. And, people adapt very quickly to the location of new bus stops. It is generally more desirable for bus stops to be located closer together and near to pedestrian crossings or pedestrian crossing links. |
Furthermore, there is a power pole on the corner of Ethel Street and Innes Road (please photograph 3) that creates an obstacle along the kerb that the bus could strike if we would impact passenger accessibility. Furthermore, the proposed bus stop beside 27 Ethel Street but on the driveway of Innes Road is located beside storm-water drain channels. Even with bridge blocks being installed the lack of kerb height impacts passenger accessibility due to the greater step height between the level of the platform and the level of the bus floor. Indeed, that is why most passengers waiting for the bus will stand on the driveway.

In summary, the disadvantages of Option 1 significantly outweigh the disadvantages of the Option. And, the disadvantages of Option 2 significantly outweigh the advantages of Option 2. Indeed, the only advantage of Option 2 seems to be that some people may have become accustomed to using it. As against, that I am extremely concerned about the risk to road users from Ethel Street and passengers waiting for the bus and standing over the driveway of Innes Road. This risk would not be mitigated by painted lines of the bus stop as the bus will always stop over the driveway and passengers will always stand on the driveway because of the kerb height.

If the bus stop remains at 27 Ethel Street, it is inevitable that there will be a collision with passengers waiting for or getting off the bus no matter how carefully one drives out of the driveway of Innes Road. This is a risk that simply cannot be avoided by adopting Option 1. See [image] for submission and photos.

Furthermore, there is a power pole on the corner of Ethel Street and Innes Road (please photograph 3) that creates an obstacle along the kerb that the bus could strike if we would impact passenger accessibility. Furthermore, the proposed bus stop beside 27 Ethel Street but on the driveway of Innes Road is located beside storm-water drain channels. Even with bridge blocks being installed the lack of kerb height impacts passenger accessibility due to the greater step height between the level of the platform and the level of the bus floor. Indeed, that is why most passengers waiting for the bus will stand on the driveway.

In summary, the disadvantages of Option 1 significantly outweigh the disadvantages of the Option. And, the disadvantages of Option 2 significantly outweigh the advantages of Option 2. Indeed, the only advantage of Option 2 seems to be that some people may have become accustomed to using it. As against, that I am extremely concerned about the risk to road users from Ethel Street and passengers waiting for the bus and standing over the driveway of Innes Road. This risk would not be mitigated by painted lines of the bus stop as the bus will always stop over the driveway and passengers will always stand on the driveway because of the kerb height.

If the bus stop remains at 27 Ethel Street, it is inevitable that there will be a collision with passengers waiting for or getting off the bus no matter how carefully one drives out of the driveway of Innes Road. This is a risk that simply cannot be avoided by adopting Option 1. See [image] for submission and photos.
### Attachment I

#### Item 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter Name</th>
<th>Option 1: Near Sevenoaks Street</th>
<th>Option 1: Between Nancy Ave and Phillips Rd</th>
<th>Option 2: Near Eliza Street</th>
<th>Option 2: Between Sevenoaks and Phillips Rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Chris &amp; Gemma Greenshields</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have received the consultation material for the proposed bus stops on Innes Road for the new Ombler Route.

We oppose Option 1 and prefer Option 2.

We are opposed to option 1 specifically outside 245 Innes Road (location A northside) and 302 Innes Road (location B southside) for the following reasons:

1. High traffic volumes moving between Thames Street and Jansen Avenue makes it unsuitable for bus stops.
2. Increase high traffic volumes from vehicles travelling from Jansen Avenue, left on to Innes Road and then turning right into Thames Street and vice versa. These traffic movements will become more frequent with the proposed changes on Crawford Street. As residents who live in the Crawford/Jansen/Wellington/Noelker and Roder Street area will no longer be able to turn right off Crawford Street when travelling north. We, when travelling north on Crawford Street towards Innes Road, will be more people who will “run” the back streets (from Melworth Street, Deew Street, money Street, Sevenoaks Street) onto Thames Street. They then turn left onto Innes and right onto Jansen Avenue to access their properties avoiding the congested Crawford/Innes intersection and vice versa. This already now and will continue to happen regardless of any traffic measures proposed for these streets.
3. Diverting traffic
   - The one and two peak traffic exacerbate the safety and sightline issues in this area. The peaks see traffic backed up from the Crawford/Innes intersection and traffic backed up from the pedestrian crossing at St Francis of Assisi School past the Thames Street intersection in both directions.
4. Sightlines
   - A bus stop at 302 Innes Road would create major sightline issues and therefore safety issues for traffic turning right onto Innes Road from Thames Street, in an already congested area. As traffic would not be able to see past the bus to view incoming traffic. Resulting in vehicles entering out into the cycle lane or traffic lanes on Innes Road to see past the bus.
5. No use at the bus stop.

We are also opposed to the seat proposed at this bus stop as it will encourage littering and undesirable behaviour and put the safety of our young family at risk. At night there are a number of youth that walk under the influence of alcohol and we do not need a reason for them to hang around our property. A seat would provide that reason.

If Option 1 was to progress - 329 Innes Road (Location A northside) and 380 Innes Road (location A southside) would be better locations as they do not create conflicts around intersections as outlined above, while still meeting your bus stop planning criteria in the information provided.

(Option 1. 272 Innes Road (Location A northside), 279 (Location B northside), 380 Innes Road (Location A southside) and 382 (Location B southside) all look to be ok as they do not create conflicts around intersections as outlined above, while still meeting your bus stop planning criteria in the information provided.

We prefer Option 2 for the following reasons:

- Logical midpoint between existing bus stop.
- Not located away from the intersections of side streets.
- This is where the temporary bus stops are located and seem to be functioning well.
- Formalise existing bus stops that people have become accustomed to using.
- Recent new kerb and channel construction outside 256 (Location B northside).

Have the temporary bus stops been monitored and how many people are boarding and disembarking the bus at this point? If patronage is low then there is no need for 2 bus stops [that option 1 proposed] in between the existing bus stops. One is sufficient.

We look forward to confirmation that you have received our submission and your response.

22. Charnell
   - Y A A
   - A driveway is going on to Innes Road.
   - I think it’s a better plan than add a chair view southeasterly of the road.

23. Sharon Viney
   - Y B B A
   - We are at 4 Innes Road. Since the temporary bus stop has been put outside our house, our 8 year old has been “scared our house will get burgled”, due to people outside our house. She has started sleeping the last again. We have found it the bus stop) very disruptive.

   - Y B A
   - I am concerned about having any bus stops in the same block (either side of the road) at St Francis of Assisi School. I live opposite there and it is extremely busy there - especially before & after school, but also during the week (e.g. funerals & other church services), and on weekends (many church services). With the pedestrian crossing there as well, as well as lots of cars stopping to drop children off, & then move away again, it would be chaotic. With lots of children, this really concerns me. It would be less safer for them going to & from school.

25. Madeleine & Aron Burns
   - Y A A A
   - We are a concern. Are there any bus stops in the same block (either side of the road) at St Francis of Assisi School? I live opposite there and it is extremely busy there - especially before & after school, but also during the week (e.g. funerals & other church services), and on weekends (many church services). With the pedestrian crossing there as well, as well as lots of cars stopping to drop children off, & then move away again, it would be chaotic. With lots of children, this really concerns me. It would be less safer for them going to & from school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter Details</th>
<th>Consultation Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: David Bellamy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I have been retained to act for Stuart and Julia BYRON, the registered proprietors of the property at
   Innes Road, Christchurch.
2. I refer to your letter dated 6 February 2019, which seeks input on the CCC’s proposal to vary an existing
   bus route to incorporate either:
   a) two sets of bus stops on Innes Road near Severn Street or in between Nancy Avenue and Philips Road
      (Option 1); or
   b) one set of bus stops on the Northside or Southside of Innes Road near Ellice Street (Option 2).
4. Mr & Mrs Byron object to the bus proposals generally, however, in the event that it is necessary for a
   bus stop to be placed on Innes Road, their preferred and only option is Option 2. They do not wish to express
   a preference for location A or B (Northside or Southside). They do, however, ask that the concerns they have asked
   us to outline (below) be taken into account in the CCC’s consideration of the proposed locations under Option 2.

Objective to Location B – Innes Road near Severn Street (Option 2):

1. Mr & Mrs Byron are concerned about the implications that the proposed bus stop would have if the proposal is
   carried forward by CCC at location B: 238/242 Innes Road (Northside) and location B: 302 Innes Road (Southside)
   under Option 2. This location is in front of their property and would block their driveway.

2. Chief amongst their concerns is safety, the safety of road users when travelling on Innes Road, Jamieson Avenue
   and Thames Street and the safety of their family.

3. The proposed bus stop at location B: 238/242 Innes Road (Northside) will cause issues with the traffic at the
   intersections between Innes Road, Thames Street and Innes Road / Jamieson Avenue and increase the risk of car
   accidents.

4. The location would see a bus stop placed too close to the Innes Road / Thames Street intersection and without
   sufficient space for buses to pull in for traffic turning right on Innes Road from Jamieson Avenue to have
   unobstructed views down Innes Road to their left.

5. Further, buses stopping at the bus stop will have insufficient space to park causing poor visibility for cars
   exiting Thames Street onto Innes Road and cars travelling down Innes Road. This would create the risk of traffic
   running across the centre line to avoid or pass buses that have stopped or are pulling in and cause blind spots
   for traffic turning right or left out of Thames Street onto Innes Road. Innes Road is one of the busiest streets in
   Christchurch. At the proposed location, the bus stop could cause traffic jams and blockages in peak times given
   the lack of space.

6. The proposed location outside Mr & Mrs Byron’s property poses untenable risk to their family. They have a
   young daughter and intend extending their family.

7. There will be increased foot traffic outside of their home, people lingering, squatting, graffitiing, urinating, leaving
   rubbish and smoking. The potential risk to their young daughter is untenable. It will also lead to an increased
   risk of vandalism, theft and damage to their property.

8. The proposed location would be located directly outside of their family home, and from the plan provided by the
   Council, it appears that the bus stop would block or severely limit their lights of ingress and egress and their
   visibility entering and exiting their driveway.

9. Mr & Mrs Byron are working people, and travel in and out of their home at peak times. The proposed bus stop
   would block their access at key times, and would cause undue delay that will negatively affect other aspects of
   their lives.

10. There is insufficient room for the proposed bus stop at this location and it would reduce the amount of offstreet
    parking available on Innes Road, which is already limited. While not their primary concern, they are nonetheless
    concerned about the impact that this would have on their enjoyment of their property.

11. The location would also negatively impact the value of their family home without any compensation available to
    them. It would cause a large increase in noise outside their home. This noise will emanate from the buses breaking
    to pull over and leaving their risk height for disabled passengers.

12. Further, Mr & Mrs Byron purchased the property with the possibility of subdividing the land. This would involve
    the current driveway being used to service a rear section, and the installation of a new access point to their
    property to the left of their property (if you face the property from Innes Road). The access point would be the
    location of the proposed bus stop. The proposed bus stop would therefore restrict Mr & Mrs Byron’s ability to
    subdivide and fully enjoy their property.

Summary of Position:

13. Mr & Mrs Byron preference is for Option 2. They do not wish to express a
    preference for location A or B (Northside or Southside).

14. They object to the proposed bus stop plan, and more specifically, option 1
    Innes Road near Severn Street at location B (Northside and Southside). They have instructed me to pursue all rights
    available to them at law should the CCC proceed with this option, including advice on their options for
    injunctive relief or otherwise.

15. Please provide a response as soon as possible, addressing how the Council intends to address these concerns if it
    intends continuing to investigate Option 1 Innes Road near Severn Street at Location B (Northside and Southside).

16. I look forward to hearing from you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter Name</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Maddock</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Monks</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Akake</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hennings</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anselm Sari</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Bell</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Bouvier</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Mickan</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lindgren</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Lindgren</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Peter Maddock: We are strongly opposed to the proposed Bus Stop on Innes Road being located outside our home of 137 Innes Road. We believe the location of this bus stop will negatively affect our standard of living including being detrimental to the health of our children. Both our children suffer from sleep issues, including Insomnia, and the location of the bus stop and associated noise from operations will be detrimental to their sleep. It will also affect their health and development. Attached is a letter from our GP supporting this argument. Our children also suffer from Insomnia and find it difficult to maintain sleep with external stimuli, e.g., Noise. As the only income earner, the importance of good sleep is increased in my situation. We have previously lived near to a bus stop and have experienced the negative effects of operations. The nuisance factors of a bus stop in close proximity to our indoor and outdoor living areas and our bedrooms, will negatively impact us directly. Based on experience, we anticipate there will be graffiti on our fence and increased rubbish on our property. The thought of people congregating directly outside our property is also not appealing and we would have to enhance our perimeter fence to maintain our current level of privacy. While recognising the need to re-route this public transport service, our concern is that we will be significantly negatively impacted by having a bus stop directly outside our home.

Support letter: I am writing in support of the Maddock Family, 137 Innes Road, Macraes. They have recently been informed that a bus stop is to be placed directly outside of their house. This will have significant ramifications for their 2 young boys, particularly with regard to sleep. Both have sleep issues and a bus stop, with activity occurring until late at night, is likely to have detrimental effects on their already disturbed sleep. Their bedroom is upstairs and directly facing the street. I am concerned that this could in turn affect their health and learning in view of this. I ask that this decision be reconsidered.

28. Richard Monks
29. Ronald Akake
30. Victoria Hennings
31. Anselm Sari
32. Phil Bell
33. Marie Bouvier
34. Jonathan Mickan
35. David Lindgren
36. Melanie Lindgren

The temporary option 2 site outside our home has increased the traffic noise with buses decelerating and accelerating and idling as passengers embark/disembark. We have concerns about people loitering outside our property and our neighbour’s daughter has significant fears about strangers and the temporary stop outside her house has not helped. Also, there is barely enough room to fit the bus without encroaching on our driveway. The changes to our street frontage with bus fencing and no-gate means the bus is to and froming and loitering passengers have made more of an impact on our feeling of security.

37. Julie Terrington (Organisation: Environment Canterbury)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Innes Rd stops. The staff of Environment Canterbury Public Transport team would like to recommend Option 1. We prefer the stops Innes Rd near Nancy Avenue location B as both directions as these are closer to the pedestrian crossing and the stops Innes Rd near 137 Innes Rd near Innes Street as these provide an easier connection to the 2A service on C Ferrill St.

We feel Option 1 is preferable to Option 2 as it provides 2 sets of stops rather than only one set. This widens the catchment, encouraging more customers to utilise public transport and easing the walk for elderly or disabled patrons in the area.
Additional information: Submitter ID 16 (C & L Luscombe)
HAVE YOUR SAY
Innes Road proposed bus stops

Make sure your feedback gets to us before 5pm on Monday 25 February 2019

Please indicate your preferred option: (select one)

☑ Option 1 (two sets of bus stops)  ☐ Option 2 (one set of bus stops)  ☐ I do not support either option

For your preferred option please answer the following:

Option 1 (two sets of bus stops)
Please indicate your preferred location for each bus stop.

Innes Road near Severn Street:
Bus stops located on the northside of the road
☑ Location A: 229 Innes Road
☐ Location B: 241/239 Innes Road

Bus stops located on the southside of the road
☐ Location A: 280 Innes Road
☑ Location B: 302 Innes Road

Innes Road between Nancy Avenue and Philpotts Road:
Bus stops located on the northside of the road
☑ Location A: 271 Innes Road
☐ Location B: 279 Innes Road

Bus stops located on the southside of the road
☑ Location A: 360 Innes Road
☐ Location B: 302 Innes Road

Option 2 (one set of bus stops)
Please indicate your preferred location for each bus stop.

Innes Road near Ethne Street:
Bus stops located on the northside of the road
☐ Location A: 257 Innes Road
☐ Location B: 259 Innes Road

Bus stops located on the southside of the road
☐ Location A: 308 Innes Road
☐ Location B: 27 Ethne Street (bus stop on Innes Road)

Please provide your feedback and use additional paper if required.

Please see attached feedback and photographs
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 800 169 (Banks Peninsula).

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”

FREEPOST Authority No. 178

Attention: Dane Moir
Engagement Team
Public Information and Participation Unit
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 73016
Christchurch 8154
Objection to bus stop on 27 Ethne Street (bus stop on Innes Road)

I wish to lodge an objection to the proposed bus stop at 27 Ethne Street (bus stop on Innes Road).

I am the owner/occupier of the property situated at Innes Road. As can be seen in the attached photograph 1, the interim bus stop is located on the very edge of the driveway into my property.

The primary ground on which I object to the location of the proposed bus stop at 27 Ethne Street relates to health and safety concerns. The proposed bus stop is located close to the intersection of Ethne Street and Innes Road. Although the proposed stop may just be within the allowable distance from the intersection the location of the proposed bus stop creates a number of hazards. For one, a bus stopped or pulling into the proposed bus stop obscures the clear view of the road for any north bound traffic on Ethne Street endeavouring to make a left hand turn or a right hand into Innes Road. For another, the bus invariably stops over the driveway of Innes Road. Whilst, a bus is permitted to stop over a driveway this not only interferes with the enjoyment of the property but also (and more importantly) creates a significant health and safety concern. As a matter of interest, since the interim bus stop has been in place bottles and cans have been thrown into the driveway and garden and I have had a pair of shoes stolen from the front door step – nothing of the like of which had occurred before the bus stop was put in place. Hence, there is no privacy screening from the road as there is with other options.

The attached photograph 1 shows a man (and his dog) standing over the driveway with his back to the driveway. Photograph 2 shows school children waiting for the bus with their backs to the driveway. None of these people will be aware of a vehicle backing out of the driveway. For one, their focus is on the imminent arrival of the bus. For another, many people (school children in particular) are focussed on their ‘phones and wearing headphones. It is of course incumbent anyone backing out of the driveway at Innes Road to do so carefully but people will simply not be aware of a vehicle wishing to leave the property. Furthermore, there is a real risk that a person, probably a school child, will run to catch the bus and neither the person nor anyone backing out of the property will see each other. This creates a real risk that the occupier of Innes Road cannot mitigate.
As photograph 3 shows, in fact the bus is not stopping over the driveway to allow passengers to get onto or off the bus on the driveway. The bus has pulled well forward of the intersection of Ethne Street and Innes Road so as not to impede the intersection. However, the tail of the bus remains over the driveway as a person has alighted as can be seen in the photograph.

The sole advantage of the proposed bus stop is that, as the interim stop has been there for a little while, passengers may have become accustomed to using it. However, the preferred options under Option 1 provides two sets of bus stops that will ensure shorter walking distances for people to access the bus stops. And, people adapt very quickly to the location of new bus stops. It is generally more desirable for bus stops to be located closer together and near to pedestrian crossings or pedestrian crossing islands.

Furthermore, there is a power pole on the corner of Ethne Street and Innes Road (please see photograph 3) that creates an obstacle along the kerb that the bus could strike or would impact passenger accessibility.

Furthermore, the proposed bus stop beside 27 Ethne Street but on the driveway of Innes Road is located beside storm-water dish channels. Even with bridge blocks being installed the lack of kerb height impacts passenger accessibility due to the greater step height between the level of the platform and the level of the bus floor. Indeed, that is why most passengers waiting for the bus will stand on the driveway.

In summary, the advantages of Option 1 significantly outweigh the disadvantages of that Option. And, the disadvantages of Option 2 significantly outweigh the advantages of Option 2. Indeed, the only advantage of Option 2 seems to be that some people may have become accustomed to using it. As against, that I am extremely concerned about the risk to road users from Ethne Street and passengers waiting for the bus and standing over the driveway to Innes Road. This risk would not be mitigated by painted lines of the bus stop as the bus will always stop over the driveway and passengers will always stand on the driveway because of the kerb height.

If the bus stop remains at 27 Ethne Street, it is inevitable that there will be a collision with passengers waiting for or getting off the bus no matter how carefully one drives out of the driveway of Innes Road. This is a risk that simply can be avoided by adopting Option 1.
Parking Occupancy: Innes Road, between Philpotts Road and Mersey Street

Survey locations and parking occupancy survey periods:
- Location: Innes Road between Philpotts Road and Nancy Avenue
  - Thursday 14.02.19: 8:15 a.m. – 9:30 a.m., 2:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m., 7 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.
  - Sunday 17.02.19: 9 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
- Location: Innes Road between Nancy Avenue and Mersey
  - Thursday 14.02.19: 9:30 a.m., 3:30 p.m., 7 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

Parking occupancy: Innes Road, between Nancy Avenue and Philpotts Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Parking capacity</th>
<th>Average occupancy</th>
<th>Peak occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(number)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>8:15 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.02.19</td>
<td>2:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.02.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking occupancy: Innes Road, between Thames Street and Mersey Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Parking capacity</th>
<th>Average occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(number)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.02.19</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking occupancy: Innes Road, near Ethne Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Parking capacity*</th>
<th>Average occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(number)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.02.19</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = capacity reduced by 4 spaces to account for the interim bus stops
**Parking occupancy graphs: Innes Road between Philpotts Road and Nancy Avenue**

### Parking occupancy: Innes Road between Philpotts Road and Nancy Avenue, Thursday 14.02.19

- **Parking capacity**
- **Parking demand**
- **Average parking occupancy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Parking Demand</th>
<th>Average Parking Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:15 a.m.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 a.m.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 a.m.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking occupancy: Innes Road between Philpotts Road and Nancy Avenue, Thursday 14.02.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Parking Demand</th>
<th>Average Parking Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 p.m.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 p.m.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking occupancy: Innes Road between Philpotts Road and Nancy Avenue, Sunday 17.02.19

- **Capacity**
- **Parking demand**
- **Average occupancy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Parking Demand</th>
<th>Average Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 a.m.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 a.m.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 Right to Drain Water Easement over Janet Stewart Reserve

Reference: 18/493832
Contact: Justin Sims Justin.sims@ccc.govt.nz 941 6424

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board to approve an easement for the right to drain water in gross over part of Janet Stewart Reserve, a Council owned Recreation Reserve (refer to Attachment C).

1.2 Additionally, as part of the intersection improvement works detailed below, Board approval is required to remove a significant tree that is now located on the land Council has compulsorily acquired and which has already been legalised as road as part of the land taking, together with other trees affected by the works.

Origin of Report

1.3 This report is being submitted to the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board as Council is to undertake major intersection improvements at the junction of Hawkins, Lower Styx and Marshland Roads which involves piping stormwater run-off from the road to a swale to be constructed in the adjacent reserve.

1.4 Board approval to grant easements through reserves administered under the Reserves Act is required as there is no staff delegation to cover this.

1.5 Board approval is also required to remove trees on roads under the Control of the Council.

2. Significance

2.1 The decision 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 utilising the significance and engagement assessment worksheet, taking into consideration (amongst other things) the number of people affected and/or with an interest, the level of community interest already apparent for the issue, possible environmental, social and cultural impacts, possible costs/risks to the Council, ratepayers and wider community of carrying out the decision, and whether the impact of the decision can be reversed.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflects the assessment.
3. **Staff Recommendations**

That the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board, acting in the capacity of the administering body, resolve to:

1. Recommend that the Chief Executive acting as the Minister of Conservation’s delegate, consents to the granting of the easement to Christchurch City Council for the right to drain water as outlined in this report.

2. Subject to the consent of the Minister of Conservation, approve the grant of the easement pursuant to Section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977 to:
   a. Christchurch City Council - for the right to drain water over part of Janet Stewart Reserve at 9 Lower Styx Road (Certificate of Title reference 833731) shown on the plan at Attachment C, or such other area if this is only a minor amendment.

3. Authorise the Property Consultancy Manager, should the easement be granted with the consent of the Minister of Conservation, to finalise documentation to implement the easement.

4. Approve the removal of the significant tree (identified in the District Plan as T246) together with any other trees affected by the road intersection improvement works.

4. **Key Points**

   4.1 This report support a project that is in the Council’s Long Term Plan (2015 - 2025):

   4.1.1 Activity: Roads & Footpaths
   - Level of Service: 16.0.3.0 Maintain resident satisfaction with road condition - =38%

   4.2 The design of the intersection and the stormwater arrangement is constrained by the location of the Styx River and the identification of lamprey spawning grounds in one of the existing stormwater drains adjacent to the road.

   4.3 This has resulted in the location of the swale being positioned in Janet Stewart Reserve as there is no practical alternative.

   4.4 There is also no way to avoid the trees that occupy the land required for the new carriageway.

   Option – Grant an easement to Christchurch City Council and approve removal of trees.

   4.5 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

   4.5.1 The advantages of this option include:
   - The easement will protect the infrastructure in perpetuity.
   - The easement will identify the existence of the swale on the Title.
   - The easement is required to fulfil the Reserve Act.
   - The intersection cannot be completed without the removal of the trees which occupy the new road carriageway.

   4.5.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
   - The property will be encumbered with an easement.
5. Context/Background

Background

5.1 As the Board is aware, Council is signalising the intersection of Hawkins, Lower Styx and Marshland Roads and widening the bridge over the Styx River. A location plan and general layout plan can be found at Appendix A and B.

5.2 This is being completed to address current safety deficiencies in the existing intersection and also to fulfil requirements set out in Plan Change 30 of the City Plan.

5.3 Ongoing development in the north of Christchurch and Waimakariri District is also predicted to increase traffic volumes on Marshland Rd highlighting the need to improve the intersection layout.

5.4 The design of the intersection is constrained by the Styx River to the north and the identification of a spawning area for lamprey fish which are a protected species in the drain to the west.

5.5 Council approved the process to acquire the various properties involved at its public excluded meeting of 24th August 2017.

Easement

5.6 Section 48(1) of the Reserves Act 1977 (“the Act”) provides that the administering body (Council), with the consent of the Minister of Conservation, may grant easements for the drainage of any other land not forming part of the reserve.

5.7 Under section 48(2) of the Act, it is necessary for the Council to publicly notify its intention to grant an easement except where the reserve is unlikely to be materially altered or permanently damaged, and the rights of the public in respect of the reserve are unlikely to be permanently affected (section 48(3) of the Act).

5.8 As the swale is to be constructed on a small proportion of the reserve when compared to the whole and a new footpath, board walk and plantings (including endangered species) will be undertaken as part of the works, the rights of the public will not be permanently affected and therefore no public notification is required.

5.9 The easement location is outlined in red on Attachment C.

5.10 For easements, the Council has delegated the role of administering body to Community Boards.

Consent of the Minister of Conservation

5.11 By way of the Instrument of Delegation to Territorial Authorities the Minister of Conservation has delegated the Minister’s consent powers to Council.

5.12 The delegation from the Minister includes an expectation that the role of administering body will be kept separate from the role as Minister’s delegate. Council has addressed this through making community boards the administering body and the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) the Minister’s delegate.

5.13 The Minister’s delegate responsibilities have not been sub-delegated to staff and remain with the CEO.
5.14 In exercising the consent of the Minister of Conservation, the Council should be satisfied that due process has been followed and in this respect it is confirmed that the following matters have been considered:

- The land is held by the Council as a recreation reserve subject to the Reserves Act 1977.
- The easement being applied for, falls within the purposes specified in Section 48(1) of the Act.
- There are sufficient grounds to waive the public notification requirements of Section 48(2) of the Reserves Act as the works comply with Section 48(3).
- Iwi have not been consulted as this site is not a site of significance to Tangata Whenua in the City Plan. However the removal of the significant tree has been consulted and approvals received.

Tree removal

5.15 The proposed intersection layout has been developed to minimise the project effect on the Canal Reserve Drain and lamprey fish habitat therein. The resulting layout requires removal of a number of healthy trees the most notable of which is a cabbage tree identified as significant in the District Plan which sits in the proposed carriageway as indicated on the plan below.

5.16 The option to relocate the tree was investigated but the likelihood of the tree surviving, coupled with the cost of its relocation, have eliminated this as an option.

5.17 MKT have been consulted on the removal of the tree and they accept that it is an unavoidable necessity.

5.18 To minimise the effects of the loss of the significant tree, it is proposed to harvest seeds from the tree and replant these in the most appropriate location within Janet Stewart Reserve in consultation with runanga.

5.19 As part of the intersection project, those areas subject to vegetation removal to facilitate the proposed works and additional areas not previously landscaped are proposed to be reinstated or newly planted with a variety of trees and shrubs. This will include 12 kahikatea trees, 36 totara trees and 22 kowhai trees together with a large variety of flax’s including 600 harakeke flax.

6. Option - Grant an easement over part of Janet Stewart Reserve and remove trees.

Option Description

6.1 That the Council grants an easement for the right to drain water in gross to itself under the Reserves Act 1977.
6.2 Approve the removal of any trees located on the proposed carriageway or that are considered a risk to motorists if they are located within the road corridor.

**Significance**
6.3 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.
6.4 The level of significance was determined by considering the number of properties involved, the effect on the public on the use of the reserve and the precedent effect and potential implications for the Council.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**
6.5 The tree removal was consulted and subsequent approvals received by local IWI via MKT.

**Community Views and Preferences**
6.6 Not applicable.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**
6.7 This option is considered to be consistent with the Council’s Plans and Policies.

**Financial Implications**
6.8 Cost of Implementation – a survey plan needs to be prepared and there are legal costs associated with registering the easement on the Title covered as part of the Council project. There are also costs to remove the trees which are anticipated as part of the project.
6.9 Maintenance/Ongoing Costs - maintenance of the swale is a cost to the Council.
6.10 Funding source – Council project.

**Legal Implications**
6.11 The grant of an easement under section 48(1) of the Reserves Act 1977 would indicate the infrastructure on the titles.

**Risks and Mitigations**
6.12 None.

**Implementation**

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**
6.15 The advantages of this option include:
- The easement will protect the infrastructure in perpetuity.
- The easement will identify the existence of the swale on the Title.
- The easement is required to fulfil the Reserve Act if the swale is constructed in the reserve.
- The intersection cannot be completed without the removal of the trees which occupy the new road carriageway.
6.16 The disadvantages of this option include:
- The title will be encumbered with an easement in perpetuity.
7. **Option 2 - Do Not Grant an Easement over part of Janet Stewart Reserve and do not approve removal of trees**

**Option Description**
7.1 The Council does not approve the grant of an easement to drain water and does not approve the removal of trees from the legal road.

**Significance**
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report. Engagement requirements for this level of significance are not required.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**
7.3 Via MKT this option was consulted on and prior approval received, therefore it is expected that the tree is to be removed.

**Community Views and Preferences**
7.4 Not applicable.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**
7.5 This option is inconsistent with the 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 granting easements would be in contravention of the Reserves Act.

**Risks and Mitigations**
7.10 Not applicable.

**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:

- The existing notable cabbage tree is retained.

7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:

- It would be a breach of the Reserves Act if the swale was created through the Reserve without an easement.
- If Council decided to sell the land in the future an easement would need to be put in place at that time to provide the rights required to protect any infrastructure.
- The intersection improvements cannot be completed without the removal of the trees.
**1.1.1 Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Location Plan</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Intersection Layout</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Easement Scheme Plan</td>
<td>78</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.
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10. MacFarlane Park - Part Changes in Reserve Classification

Reference: 19/112025
Contact: Dan Egerton Dan.egerton@ccc.govt.nz 941 8477

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is to request that the Papanui-Innes Community Board (acting under delegation from the Council) approves the initiation of the Reserves Act processes to:
   a. Reclassify part of MacFarlane Park from Recreation Reserve to Local Purpose (Community Buildings) Reserve; and
   b. Accommodate the proposed new Shirley Community Trust Building (Lions Building), and legalise the occupation of the existing KidsFirst Kindergarten Building.

Origin of Report
1.2 This report is being provided by staff due to the points outlined in paragraph 1.1(b) above due to the inconsistency these have with the current reserve classification, being Recreation Reserve.
1.3 This report provides for the initiation of the processes required by the Reserves Act 1977. The decisions on the proposed changes are made following public notification and the hearing of any objections.

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 assessing potential outcomes from options provided within the Council’s Significance and Engagement assessment worksheet.
2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the above assessment in addition to meeting the statutory (Reserves Act) requirements. The Council is required to publicly notify the intentions to change the classification of the reserve land.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Papanui-Innes Community Board, acting under the delegated authority of the Christchurch City Council, resolves as follows:

1. Under section 24(1)(b) of the Reserves Act 1977, that the process to change the classification from 'recreation reserve' to 'local purpose (community buildings) reserve' in respect of that part of MacFarlane Park being part of Lot 1 & 2 DP 17482 as is shown outlined in red on the plan attached as Attachment A to the staff report from which this resolution emanates ("Affected Part of the Reserve"), be commenced and that the proposed change be publicly notified in accordance with section 24(2) of the Reserves Act 1977.

2. That if no objections are received, the Papanui-Innes Community Board approves the change in classification of the affected Part of the Reserve from recreation reserve to local purpose (community building) reserve and authorises staff to seek the approval of the Minister of Conservation (whose power has been delegated to the Chief Executive) to such change.
4. **Key Points**

4.1 This report supports the [Council’s Long Term Plan (2015 - 2025)](#):

4.1.1 Activity: Community Development and Facilities

- Level of Service: 2.0.1.2 Provide a range of well utilised community facilities, including voluntary libraries - Community Facility Plan adopted

4.2 The following feasible option has been considered:

- Option One - Resolve to commence the process to change of classification of part of the reserve.
- Option Two – Do not resolve to commence the process to change the classification of part of the reserve and remove, or find an alternative use, for the buildings in situ.

4.3 **Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- It enables the Shirley Community Trust building, as gifted by the Lions Foundation (accepted by the Council 2018), to remain on site post April 2021.
- Legalises the use of the KidsFirst Kindergarten.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Part of the Recreation Reserve is removed (albeit changed to Local Purpose (Community Buildings) Reserve).

5. **Context/Background**

**Context**

5.1 The Reserves Act 1977 (“Act”) controls the uses that reserve land may be put by requiring that reserve land is classified in accordance with the Act and granting certain limited leasing powers according to how the reserve is classified.

5.2 MacFarlane Park is currently classified as recreation reserve.

5.3 Following the earthquakes the Government introduced the Canterbury Earthquakes (Reserves Legislation) Order (No 2) 2011 (“Order”) to allow the use of reserves for certain earthquake recovery related purposes that ordinarily wouldn’t have been permitted under the Reserves Act. Pursuant to the Order the Shirley Community Trust building (“Building”) was located on MacFarlane Park.

5.4 However, the Order expires on 30 April 2021, and if the Building is to remain on MacFarlane Park it will need to be authorised using Reserves Act powers.

5.5 As the presence of the Building is inconsistent with the status of MacFarlane Park as a recreation reserve, it is necessary, before 30 April 2021, to change the classification of the reserve to local purpose (community buildings) reserve allow the Building to remain. The alternative would be to require that the building is removed from the reserve.
5.6 If that part of the reserve affected by the Building is reclassified as local purpose (community buildings) reserve, then it will then be possible for the Council to lease the building to an appropriate community group.

Process

5.7 Section 24(1) of the Act specifies the process that must be followed to change the classification of a reserve. Section 24 (2) requires public notification of the proposed change of classification and the right of the public to object within one month after the date of the first publication of the notice.

5.8 If objections are received, which are unable to be satisfied, then a hearing is required. Following this hearing, the Hearing Panel then makes a recommendation back the Community Board for a decision.

5.9 Section 24(2)(b) of the Act requires the Local Authority to consult with Commissioner (Department of Conservation) before any public notification occurs. Staff confirm that the Department of Conservation has been consulted and that it has no concerns with the proposal.

5.10 The approval of the Minister of Conservation is required to any change in the Reserves Act classification. The Minister has delegated this power to the Council, which, in turn, has sub-delegated this power to the Council’s Chief Executive.

5.11 The Staff recommendation includes a recommendation that the proposed change of classification is approved if no objections are received. This has been recommended in the interests of procedural efficiency if no objections are received. However, if objections are received, then the effect of that particular resolution, if adopted, will be void and the objections will then be heard and considered with a new decision on the proposal then being required.

Proposed Partial Change in Reserve Classification

5.12 The proposed change in reserve classification for the part of the Park shown in Attachment A is necessary to permit the current use of the Kindergarten to continue, and the Shirley Community Trust Building to remain past April 2021. The current reserve classification of Recreation Reserve does not provide for such a use.

5.13 The Council has delegated its powers to initiate the Reserves Act reclassification to Community Boards, with the exception of hearing any submissions/objections received (which are considered by a Hearings Panel).

5.14 Public notification is required, whereby the public are able to make written objections to the proposed partial change in reserve classification within one calendar month from the date of notification. The function to consider objections has been delegated to the Council Hearings Panels. The Hearings Panel will then make a recommendation to the Community Board for a final decision on whether or not to proceed with the proposed reclassification of the reserve. If the decision is made to proceed, a formal application will then need to be made to the Council's Chief Executive (acting in her capacity as delegate of the Minister of Conservation) for the Minister’s approval of the proposed reclassification.
6. **Option One - Resolve to commence the process of change of classification of part of the reserve**

**Option Description**

6.1 The Papanui-Innes Community Boards resolves to initiate the Reserves Act process for change of classification over part of MacFarlane Park (as shown in Attachment A) from recreation reserve to local purpose (community buildings) reserve.

**Significance**

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

6.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are necessary via standard Reserves Act notification processes.

**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.

**Community Views and Preferences**

6.5 The views of local residents and the wider public, are to be considered via standard Reserves Act notification requirements.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**

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

**Financial Implications**

6.7 Cost of Implementation – Staff time and consultation costs

6.8 Maintenance/Ongoing Costs – Not applicable

6.9 Funding source – Existing budgets

**Legal Implications**

6.10 The proposed change in classification of part of the reserve are legal processes under the Reserves Act.

**Risks and Mitigations**

6.11 Potential objections from local residents and/or occupiers and users of the Park, who may oppose the part changes to the reserve classification.

6.11.1 Treatment: Applying the due legislative process under the Reserves Act for consultation and consideration of objections/views.

6.11.2 Residual risk rating: the rating of the risk is low.

**Implementation**

6.12 Implementation dependencies - Subject to public notification and statutory processes.

6.13 Implementation timeframe – Approximately three months.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**

6.14 The advantages of this option include:

- It enables the Shirley Community Trust building, as gifted by the Lions Foundation (accepted by the Council 2018), to remain on site post April 2021.
- Legalises the use of the KidsFirst Kindergarten. The disadvantages of this option include:
6.15 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Part of the Recreation Reserve is removed (albeit changed to Local Purpose (Community Buildings) Reserve).
- Loss of some park open space.

7. **Option Two – Do not resolve to commence the process of change of classification of part of the reserve and remove, or find an alternative use, for the buildings in situ.**

**Option Description**

7.1 The Papanui-Innes Community Boards does not resolve to initiate the Reserves Act process for change of classification over part of MacFarlane Park (as shown in Attachment A) from recreation reserve to local purpose (community buildings) reserve.

7.2 This will result in Council having to find an alternative use for the existing buildings, or remove them from the land.

**Significance**

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

7.4 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are not necessary.

**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 The views of local residents and the wider public are not known, however the removal of the facilities from the site are unlikely to be supported.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**

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

**Financial Implications**

7.8 Cost of Implementation – Staff time and consultation costs

7.9 Maintenance/Ongoing Costs – Not applicable

7.10 Funding source – Existing budgets

**Legal Implications**

7.11 None.

**Risks and Mitigations**

7.12 Potential objections from local residents and/or occupiers and users of the Park, who may oppose the removal of the facilities from the reserve.

7.12.1 Treatment: Find alternative uses for the building, and alternative locations for the operations.

7.12.2 Residual risk rating: the rating of the risk is low.
Implementation

7.13 Implementation dependencies – Decision ratified.

7.14 Implementation timeframe – The Shirley Community Trust building is permitted to stay on site until April 2021.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.15 The advantages of this option include:

- None.

7.16 The disadvantages of this option include:

- The operational use of the buildings will have to change, or the buildings will have to be removed.
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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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11. Havana Gardens - Proposed Easement

Reference: 18/1318934
Contact: Dan Egerton Dan.egerton@ccc.govt.nz 941-8477

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board to approve an easement for the right to convey telecommunications over the parts of Havana Gardens Reserve identified in Attachment A.

1.2 The Board is also requested that should it approve the granting of the easement, to recommend to the Chief Executive that she exercise her authority as delegate of the Minister of Conservation to consent to the easement. The Minister has delegated her authority to the Council, who have subsequently delegated the authority to the Chief Executive.

Origin of Report
1.3 This report is being submitted to the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board following a request from Enable Limited to connect a 2-Degrees Mobile Tower to the fibre network.

1.4 An easement is required over Council land but staff do not have a delegation to make a decision in this matter because the land is held as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. The Board has the delegated authority of the Council to make a decision on the granting of this proposed easement whilst the Council has the delegation to grant consent on behalf of the Minister of Conservation.

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.

• The level of significance was determined by a significance and engagement assessment worksheet.

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

• This assessment is based on the fact that there is no impact to the public or users of the reserve and in fact the project in its entirety creates a public benefit.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board resolve to:

1. Recommend that the Chief Executive Officer acting as the Minister of Conservation’s delegate consent to the granting of the easement to Enable Networks Limited for the right to convey telecommunications as outlined in this report.

2. Subject to the consent of the Minister of Conservation, approves the grant of the easement pursuant to section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977 to:
   a. Enable Networks Limited – for the right to convey telecommunications over part of Havana Gardens Reserve at 9 Havana Gardens (Record of Title 128730) shown on the plan at Attachment A, or such other area if this is only a minor amendment.
3. Authorise the Property Consultancy Manager, should the easement be granted with the consent of the Minister of Conservation, to do all things necessary at his soul discretion to finalise the easement.

4. Key Points
   4.1 This report does not support the Council's Long Term Plan (2015 - 2025).
   4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
      - Option 1 - Grant the easement (preferred option)
      - Option 2 - Do not grant the easement

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)
   - The advantages of this option include:
     - The mobile network within Christchurch will be future proofed.
     - Council will derive income from compensation payable for the easement – noting the easement will be valued if approved.
     - The easement will protect the infrastructure in perpetuity.
     - The easement will identify the existence of the pipeline on the title.
     - An easement is required to comply with the Reserves Act 1977.
     - Supports Health and Safety by identifying the location of the facility on the title.
   - The disadvantages of this option include:
     - Minor earthworks and temporary restrictions on the use of the reserve.

5. Context/Background
   Background
   5.1 Enable Networks Limited have received a request from 2-Degrees Limited to connect an existing mobile tower to the fibre network, in order to connect the tower, fibre is required to be installed through the aforementioned reserve.
   5.2 An easement is required to protect the in-ground infrastructure.

   Havana Gardens Reserve
   5.3 The areas of reserve land affected by the proposed easement comprise a:
      - 5,287m² parcel held in title 128730, being Lot 54 Deposited Plan 331269
      - The reserve is held by the Council as Local Purpose (Landscape) reserve which is subject to the Reserves Act 1977.

   Infrastructure
   5.4 The fibre infrastructure will be installed underground, and there will be no material impact on the public and their ability to enjoy the reserve, other than when construction is taking place.
Easement

5.5 Section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977 (the Act) provides that the Council with the consent of the Minister of Conservation, may grant easements for rights-of-way and other services over reserve land. In this case Section 48(1)(a) “any public purpose”.

5.6 Under Section 48(2) of the Act, it is necessary for the Council to publicly notify its intention to grant an easement except where the reserve is unlikely to be materially altered or permanently damaged, and the rights of the public in respect of the reserve are unlikely to be permanently affected (section 48(3) of the Act). Public notification is not required because the public’s ability to enjoy the reserve is not going to be permanently affected.

5.7 The easement area required is shown highlighted on the plan in Attachment A.

5.8 It is the normal policy of the Council that a one-off compensation fee, as determined by an independent valuation, is payable to the Council for the privilege of gaining an encumbrance on the Council’s title. (Council 27 September 2001.)

5.9 If the easement is approved Council staff will instruct an independent valuer to determine the level of compensation payable.

5.10 The works will be undertaken by a suitably qualified contractor who will comply with all Health and Safety regulations in accordance with best practice. This contractor will be appointed by Enable Networks Limited.

Consent of the Minister of Conservation

5.11 In exercising the consent of the Minister of Conservation, the Council should be satisfied that due procedure has been followed and in this respect the Council should have regard to the following matters:

- The land affected by the application is a reserve subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977.
- The easement being applied for falls within the purposes specified in Section 48(1) of the Reserves Act.
- The provisions of Section 48(2) (public notification) have been complied with or that a waiver can be given to this requirement under Section 48(3).
- Section 4 of the Conservation Act 1987 (this Act shall be interpreted and administered as to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi) meaning that in consenting to transactions under the Reserves Act 1977, consideration is to be given to the requirement or otherwise to consult with iwi.

5.12 It is confirmed that the subject land is reserve land, held in title 128730 for Local Purpose (Landscape) Reserve. Section 48(1) of the Act allows the Council to grant rights-of-way and other easements over any part of the reserve for any public purpose (section 48(1) (a)). Public notification of the proposed easement is not required pursuant to Section 48(3) of the Act.

5.13 Specific consultation with iwi is not considered necessary as the site affected does not feature in the City Plan as having any significance to tangata whenua and the proposal is believed to be consistent with the framework of the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (MIMP) as the proposed earthworks activities will be minimal.

6. Option 1 – Grant the easement (preferred)

Option Description

6.1 Grant the easement on the conditions stipulated.
Significance
6.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.
6.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are appropriate.

Impact on Mana Whenua
6.4 This option does 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
6.5 The communities views are not known, and their views are not being sought, as there is no material impact on the communities ability to enjoy the reserve due to the infrastructure being inground.

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

Financial Implications
6.7 Cost of Implementation – nil, or costs borne by the applicant.
6.8 Maintenance/Ongoing Costs – nil, all costs borne by the applicant.
6.9 Funding source – not applicable

Legal Implications
6.10 Section 48(1) of the Reserves Act 1977 enables the Council, with the consent of the Minister of Conservation, to grant easements over public reserves, in this case for the right to convey telecommunications.

Risks and Mitigations
6.11 The proposal is a permitted activity under the City Plan rules, current and proposed.
- Residual risk rating - the rating of the risk is low.

Implementation
6.12 Implementation dependencies – installation of the infrastructure is dependent on granting of the easement
6.13 Implementation timeframe - three to four months. The works are scheduled to commence mid to late 2019, and to be completed within four months.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
6.14 The advantages of this option include:
- The mobile network within Christchurch will be future proofed.
- Council will derive income from compensation payable for the easement – noting the easement will be valued if approved.
- The easement will protect the infrastructure in perpetuity.
- The easement will identify the existence of the pipeline on the title.
- An easement is required to comply with the Reserves Act 1977.
- Supports Health and Safety by identifying the location of the facility on the title.
6.15 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Minor earthworks and temporary restrictions on the use of the reserve.
7. Option 2 – Do not grant the easement

Option Description
7.1 Do not approve the grant of the easement.

Significance
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.
7.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are appropriate.

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 The community’s views and preferences are not known.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
7.6 This option is consistent with the Council’s Plans and Policies

Financial Implications
7.7 Cost of Implementation – zero
7.8 Maintenance/Ongoing Costs – zero
7.9 Funding source – not applicable

Legal Implications
7.10 Not applicable

Risks and Mitigations
- No risks apply.

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:
- There will not be minor earthworks and temporary restrictions to the reserve.
7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:
- The mobile network in Christchurch will suffer from limited lack of future proofing.
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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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12. Waipapa/Papanui-Innes 2018-19 Youth Development Fund - Application - Angus Hammett

Reference: 19/250332
Presenter(s): Trevor Cattermole, Community Development Advisor

1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board to consider an application(s) received for funding from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund.
   1.2 This report is to assist the Board to consider an application(s) of funding from Angus Hammett.
   1.3 There is currently a balance of $4,590 remaining in this fund.

2. Staff Recommendations
   That the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board resolve to:
   1. Approve a grant of $300 from its 2018-19 Youth Development Fund to Angus Hammett towards the costs of attending the AFL New Zealand National combined fitness program to be held in Auckland from April 5 to April 8 2019.

3. Key Points
   Issue or Opportunity
   3.1 As one of the top 36 identified male/female players selected for this combined fitness programme, the AFL provides the applicant with the opportunity to increase his ability, experience and knowledge to further his desire to represent New Zealand in the future in the AFL code.

   Strategic Alignment
   3.2 Investing in our youth to develop leadership, cultural competence and success in their chosen field builds the capacity of our city’s youth, our future adults. In doing so we increase the likelihood of these youths contributing to developing a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable 21st century city; one of the council’s six Strategic Priorities. The recommendations contained in this report are based on this principle.

   Decision Making Authority
   3.3 Determine the allocation of the discretionary Response Fund for each community (including any allocation towards a Youth Development Fund).
   3.4 Allocations must be consistent with any policies, standards or criteria adopted by the Council.
   3.5 The Fund does not cover:
      - Legal challenges or Environment Court challenges against the Council, Council Controlled organisations or Community Board decisions
      - Projects or initiatives that change the scope of a Council project or that will lead to ongoing operational costs to the Council (though Community Boards can recommend to the Council that it consider a grant for this purpose).
Assessment of Significance and Engagement

3.6 The decision(s) in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

3.7 The level of significance was determined by the number of people affected and/or with an interest.

3.8 Due to the assessment of low significance, no further community engagement and consultation is required.

4. Applicant 1 – Angus Hammett

4.1 Age: 15

4.2 School: Saint Bedes

4.3 Activity: AFL

4.4 Event seeking support for: Attendance at the AFL New Zealand National combined fitness program

4.5 Angus is very active in sports which he reports takes up all of his spare time. Angus plays AFL, Rugby and Touch football.

4.6 Angus is also coaches a Junior Rugby team and enjoys giving back to sport because so many people have helped him.

4.7 Angus has his sights on playing for New Zealand and believes this opportunity will hone his skills. Angus realises that this is an experience that not many people will are fortunate to do.

4.8 This is the first time that Angus has applied to this fund.

4.9 The following table provides a breakdown of the costs for Angus Hammett:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost for attendance at the AFLNZ National Combined Fitness Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, accommodation, catering, Playing Kit, off field kit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$740</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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13. Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board Area Report - March 2019

Reference: 19/249166
Presenter(s): Elizabeth Hovell, Community Board Advisor

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 Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board:

3. Community Board Activities and Forward Planning
   3.1 Memos/Information/Advice to the Board
      3.1.1 Information sent to Board:
      - CNC Alliance: Night Work on SH1 and QEII Drive (circulated 5 Mar 2019)
      - Celebrate St Albans Park Reopening Invitation (circulated 6 Mar 2019)
      - CCC Start Work Notice: Sisson Park Footpath (circulated 7 Mar 2019)
      - CNC Alliance: QEII Night Work and Lane Shift Postponed (circulated 11 Mar 2019)
      - SWN – Update Buller’s Stream Stormwater Facility (circulated 11 Mar 2019)
      - SWN – St Bedes Fire Sprinkler Connection to New Water Main (circulated 15 Mar 2019)
      - CNC Alliance: Chaney’s On Ramp Closure March 2019 (circulated 17 Mar 2019)
      - SWN – Papanui Parallel Cycleway Rutland St to Bealey Ave (circulated 18 Mar 2019)

      3.1.2 Heritage Strategy: Our Heritage, Our Taonga
      This strategy is a high-level document that sets out how we intend to work in ongoing partnership with Ngāi Tahu and in collaboration with our communities to identify, protect and celebrate heritage.

      It presents a broadened view of heritage that includes the built and natural environment and tangible and intangible heritage, including stories, memories and traditions, and movable heritage.

      Ngāi Tahu taonga is acknowledged and integrated, and the heritage of the city’s diverse cultures and distinctive communities is respected and provided for. Click on the link below:

      Read Our Heritage, Our Taonga – Heritage Strategy 2019–2029 here. [PDF, 9.6 MB]
3.2 Board area Consultations/Engagement/Submission opportunities

3.2.1 Draft Annual Plan 2019–2020 (Opens 1 March – Closes 1 April 2019)

This draft Annual Plan covers financial year two of the Long Term Plan, from 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020. It contains some changes from the information contained in the Long Term Plan for the 2019/20 year. Click on the links below for more information.

Consultation Document and Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020

3.2.2 Christchurch Northern Corridor Traffic Mitigation (Opens 13 March – Closes 15 April 2019)

The Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC) will help people to travel to and from the north of Christchurch. The CNC extends the Northern Motorway to connect QEII Drive and Cranford Street, through to Innes Road.

The Downstream Effects Management Plan that we are asking you to comment on covers the impacts on all streets in the St Albans, Edgeware and Mairehau area south of McFaddens Road. The recommendations of the Plan can be viewed by clicking on the link below:

Christchurch Northern Corridor Traffic Mitigation - Have Your Say

The Plan (click on the link below) looks at ways to manage additional traffic and to mitigate the impacts of the additional traffic that will enter the local network at Cranford Street.

Christchurch Northern Corridor Downstream Effects Management Plan (DEMP)

Previous feedback (click here to access)

Feedback received from the community helped shape the Management Plan. We listened when you said you wanted safe access for schools, parks and shopping areas and safe areas for all people to walk and cycle.

The requirement for a Downstream Effects Management Plan came from an Environment Court ruling when the Christchurch Northern Corridor was approved. Council must complete the Plan before the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and mitigate the effects additional traffic will have on the local network.

Drop-In Sessions will be held as follows:

10.30am–12.30pm Wednesday 20 March Scottish Society Hall, 136 Caledonian Road, St Albans

5pm–7pm Monday 25 March St Albans School Hall, 17 Sheppard Place, St Albans

3.30pm–5.30pm Tuesday 26 March Scottish Society Hall, 136 Caledonian Road, St Albans

5pm–7pm Thursday 4 April St Albans School Hall, 17 Sheppard Place, St Albans

3.2.3 Paddington Playground Proposed Play Space Renewal (Opens 15 March – Closes 7 April 2019)

This play space project is part of the Council’s programme to make sure your local community has play equipment that is suitable, safe and meets the New Zealand Playground Standards.
The vision for the new play space is to provide a range of play equipment that will cater for a wider range of abilities and age groups. We also plan to install new gardens and four new trees, near the playground, to enhance the play area. For the planting around the playground we will select plant species that are low to the ground to ensure good visibility is maintained.

A concept plan [PDF, 1.9 MB] is presented to show the new layout.

We would like to hear your views prior to the final design. We would appreciate you taking the time to share your feedback with us.

3.3 **Annual Plan and Long Term Plan matters**

3.3.1 A seminar was held on Friday 8 March 2019 to discuss the Board’s approach to the Draft Annual Plan 2019–2020 consultation. A summary of the discussions will be circulated to members for comment.

3.4 **Board Reporting**

3.4.1 The Board are asked to consider topics for inclusion in Newsline, the newsletter and the report to Council.

4. **Community Board Plan – Update against Outcomes**

A final report on progress to date will be included in the 13 September 2019 Papanui-Innes Community Board meeting.

5. **Significant Council Projects in the Board Area**

5.1 **Strengthening Community Fund Projects**

5.1.1 Nil to report.

5.2 **Other partnerships with the community and organisations**

5.2.1 **Papanui Bush – Bridgestone Reserve**

Denis McMurtrie from Papanui Rotary, with permission from the Parks team, has organised a noticeboard to go on Bridgestone Reserve. The noticeboard has been repurposed with City Care refurbishing and installing it at no cost on Tuesday 12 March 2019.
The Papanui Heritage group is working on a map and narrative on the history of Papanui Bush to go into the noticeboard.

Denis and Papanui-Innes community development staff are working with the Head of Department Arts and Arts History and the Student Visual Arts Council at Papanui High School on a mural of native fauna to be attached to the fence running parallel to Langdon Road – this art work is currently in the design phase.

5.3 Community Facilities (updates and future plans)

5.3.1 St Albans Community Facility

The final floor plan has been agreed by a working party consisting of Board members and community representatives from St Albans, including the St Albans Residents Association (SARA) that was set up in 2017 to consider the options for the new facility.

The artist’s impressions of how the final frontages on Colombo Street and Caledonian Road will look are laid out below together with the floor plan for what we hope will become a comprehensive and welcoming community hub for the St Albans residents.
6. **Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area**

6.1  **Ward School Principals Meeting**

The Board held the first term meeting with the Ward School Principals for this year on 15 March 2019. The Principal of Belfast School provided an update to her colleagues and Board members on the preparation and planning of the proposed new educational facility in Belfast. Other topics discussed were the Draft Annual Plan, the current measles outbreak and recommended measures by the Ministry of Education, school zonings and traffic issues.

6.2  **Events Report Back**

6.2.1  **Papanui Neighbourhood Day**

This gathering was cancelled following the unfortunate events that occurred in Christchurch on Friday 15 March 2019.

7.  **Updates from Other Units**

7.1  The next bi-monthly report will be presented in April 2019.

8.  **Community Board Funding Update**

8.1  **Positive Youth Development and Discretionary Response Funds Update**

The 2018/19 financial year’s Positive Youth Development and Discretionary Response Funds Balance Sheet update is attached (refer Attachment A to this report).
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### Papanui-Innes Discretionary Response Fund Project/Service/Description/Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Service/Description/Group</th>
<th>Allocation 2018/19</th>
<th>Board Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance of PYDF/DRF Carried Forward from 2017/18 Funding Year</td>
<td>$ 18,816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Response Fund Budget Allocation 2018/19 (unallocated from SCF)</td>
<td>$ 73,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 91,928</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Amount Transferred to Positive Youth Development Fund 2018/19</td>
<td>$ 7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance for Allocation in Discretionary Response Fund</td>
<td>$ 84,928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND (PYDF): Opening Transfer from DRF**

- Takis Torese-Ormsby (2018 State Teams Age Group Short Course Swimming Championships, Canberra, Australia 2-5 Oct 18) $ 600 14-Sep-18
- Anna Dabkowski (2018 AIMS Games Championships, Tauranga) $ 100 14-Sep-18
- Jorge Mucaughan (2018 NZCAF Shools Aeroba National Championships, Wellington) $ 150 14-Sep-18
- Jennifer Truax (New Zealand Rhythmic Gymnastics Nationals, Tauranga 1-4 Oct 2018) $ 200 28-Sep-18
- Kate Davies (competitions/training camps for Athletics New Zealand Junior Future Squad Nov 18-Feb 19) $ 250 9-Nov-18
- Anna Lee School of Dance for Aleksandra Sow (The Shires On Stage Tour, New York and Orlando, USA Apr 19) $ 450 9-Nov-18
- Roca Vets (Australian Volleyball School Cup, Melbourne 8-14 Dec 18) $ 450 23-Nov-18
- Team Loshchomps. Gurung, Magar and Bhattarai (Tourn Kibara Cup Inter-Nepalese Football Tournament, Auckland 2-3 Feb 19) $ 210 25-Jan-19
- Owen Dabkowski (US6 National Baseball Tournament, Auckland) $ 200 22-Feb-19

**POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND Balance**

- PYDF granted to date $ 4,590
- **DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND (DRF): Initial Amount** $ 84,928

- Villa Maria College for Hannah Warner (NZ Choral Federation Big Sing Competition, Wellington 30 Aug 1- Sep 18) $ 125 10-Aug-18
- Villa Maria College for Laura Warner (NZ Choral Federation Big Sing Competition, Wellington 30 Aug 1- Sep 18) $ 125 10-Aug-18
- Belfast Community Network (Northwest Collective) $ 3,000 24-Aug-18
- Canterbury Cook Islands Sports Assn Inc (Rent costs) $ 4,000 24-Aug-18
- Papanui Softball Club (Replacement of equipment) $ 1,000 24-Aug-18
- St Albans Residents Association - SARA (Towards Rental of Premises) $ 7,500 14-Sep-18
- Neighbourhood Week 2018 (costs of neighbourhood/community celebrations) $ 3,000 14-Sep-18
- Papanui-Innes Community Board’s Edible Garden Awards 2019 $ 3,000 28-Sep-18
- Papanui-Innes Community Board’s Youth Recreation Project $ 7,000 28-Sep-18
- Papanui-Innes Community Board’s Community Pride Garden Awards 2019 $ 3,000 28-Sep-18
- Papanui-Innes Community Board’s Community Service Awards 2019 $ 3,500 28-Sep-18
- St Albans Residents Association - SARA (Fellowship Village Revitalisation Programme) $ 7,000 9-Nov-18
- Shirley Community Trust (Summer holiday programme) $ 4,001 9-Nov-18
- Richmond Residents’ and Business Association (Establishment and running costs) (Laid on Table 7/22/18, 8/2/19 & 22/2/19) $ - 7-Dec-18
- Daka Community Support Trust (Community Advocacy) $ 3,001 7-Dec-18
- Community Focus Trust (Hosting St Albans Community Day and Park celebrations) (Laid on Table 9/21 & 2/21) Declined $ - 7-Dec-18
- The Santa Claus Workshop charitable Trust (towards purchase of a scroll saw) $ 1,395 25-Jan-19
- Papanui-Innes Community Board (Celebrate St Albans Park opening - 31 Mar 19) $ 2,500 8-Feb-19
- Richmond Residents’ and Business Association (Establishment and running costs) (Laid on Table 7/22/18, 8/2/19 & 22/2/19) $ 600 22-Feb-19

**DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND Balance**

- DRF granted to date $ 33,749
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14. 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.