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Strategic Framework

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

Whiria ngā whenu o ngā papa
Honoa ki te maurua ātukiuki
Bind together the strands of each mat
And join together with the seams of respect
and reciprocity.

The partnership with Papatipu Rūnanga
reflects mutual understanding and respect,
and a goal of improving the economic,
cultural, environmental and social
wellbeing for all.

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

Supporting Principles
Accountability
Affordability
Agility
Equity
Innovation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Enabling active citizenship and connected communities
Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant,
prosperous and sustainable 21st century city

Climate change leadership
Informed and proactive approaches to natural
hazard risks
Increasing active, public
and shared transport
opportunities and use
Safe and sustainable
water supply and
improved waterways
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1. Apologies

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

   3.2 Deputations by Appointment
   Deputations may be heard on a matter or matters covered by a report on this agenda and approved by the Chairperson.

   There were no deputations by appointment at the time the agenda was prepared.

4. Presentation of Petitions
   There were no Presentation of Petitions at the time the agenda was prepared.
5. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Report to Council

Reference: 19/512130
Presenter(s): Sally Buck, Chairperson
Arohanui Grace, Community Governance Manager

1. Purpose of Report
The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations
That the Council:


3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation
The Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board held meetings on 6 and 22 May 2019. Decisions made under delegation were:

3.1 The Board approved:
3.1.1 The Linwood Pool Concept Design.
3.1.2 The Scott Park Draft Landscape Plan.
3.1.3 No stopping restrictions in Manchester and Purchas Streets intersection.
3.1.4 The formalising of a road name in Bromley.
3.1.5 Minor amendments to an easement in Olliviers and Settlers Crescent Reserves.

3.2 The approval of contributory funding from the Board’s 2018/19 Youth Development Fund for youth to attend:
3.2.1 The Graduate Jazz Band Trip to Music in the Summer Air – Shanghai Youth Summer Music Camp 2019.
3.2.2 The International Korfball Federation U21 Asia Oceania Championship, May 2019 in Shaoxing, China.
3.2.3 The Australian Youth Climbing Championships.
3.2.4 The Junior World Gymnastics Competition.

3.3 The approval of contributory funding from the Board’s 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund for:
3.3.1 The Risingholme Centre Opening and Open Day celebrations.

4. Part A Recommendations to Council
The following reports presenting Part A recommendations from the Board are included in this agenda for Council consideration:

4.1 Delegation of Sign off of Main Contract for Linwood Pool to the Chief Executive.
5. **Significant Council Projects in the Board Area**

**Linwood Pool**

5.1 The Board approved the concept design of the Linwood Pool and for staff to proceed with procurement and delivery of the Linwood Pool via Design and Build Contract at its 22 May 2019 meeting.

5.1.1 The Board has noted that there are currently no electric car charging units within the Community Board area as shown below. The Board is keen to future proof the pool facility to include infrastructure for electric car charging, so that chargers can be installed at a later time; and also to install infrastructure for future court lighting and barbeques.

5.1.2 The Board wishes to express its appreciation for the Council decision that gave the delegation to the Board to approve the $21 million Linwood Pool development.

6. **Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area**

**Public Forum**

6.1 **Estuary Fest** - Ms Rebekah McCullough, representing the Mt Pleasant Residents’ Association, presented an update to the Board regarding the Estuary Fest 2019, noting it was very successful and acknowledging the Board for its support.

6.2 **Moa Reserve Playground Swing Replacement** - Ms Pat Brooker, resident of Moa Place, highlighted that the swing had been removed from Moa Reserve and said that she had been informed by staff that the swing was not being replaced. Ms Broker was advised to lodge a Customer Service Request through the Council’s Call Centre and the Board requested staff advice on the replacement of the Moa Reserve Playground swing.
6.3 Eastgate Public Transport Passenger Service - Mr Paul McMahon, local resident, spoke to the Board about the possibility of a bus passenger lounge being situated at Eastgate Shopping Mall. He stated a bus lounge would keep residents safe and dry, and encourage more people to use the bus service. It was suggested that the former Postshop/Kiwibank site could be a good space for a bus lounge owing to it having a frontage and access on Aldwins Road.

6.4 Estuary Green Edge Pathway - Ms Judith Millar and Mr Ken Couling, representing Christchurch 360 Trail (Inc) presented to the Board about the group’s concerns about the delays in the implementation of the Estuary Edge project.

6.5 Gracefield Avenue Trees - Dr Marjorie Manthei representing the Victoria Neighbourhood Association, and Murray and Tania Gorton, residents of Gracefield Avenue, presented to the Board requesting the removal of the damaged and dying trees in Gracefield Avenue, as they consider that they are becoming a hazard. The presenters were advised to raise a Customer Service Request through the Council Call Centre and the Board requested staff advice on the condition and renewal of the street trees in Gracefield Avenue in light of any planned developments in the area.

Risingholme Opening

6.6 Risingholme House was reopened by the Mayor on Tuesday 5 June. Councillors Sara Templeton and Tim Scandrett were MCs for the event.

Sale of Alcohol Application Appeal – 375 Ferry Road -

6.7 The Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA) released its decision on the applicants appeal on Monday 27 May 2019. The Authority dismissed the appeal. The decision can be access at: http://www.nzlii.org/nz/cases/NZARLA/2019/.

6.7.1 The Board wishes to acknowledge the assistance that the Council and staff provided to the Community Board for the appeal.

7. Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan

7.1 Ōpāwaho to Ihutai (Ōpāwa to Ferrymead Bridge) and Greening the East

7.1.1 The Board held a seminar on 10 June to discuss the progress of these two cornerstone projects.

7.1.2 The Board has allocated $25,000 of the Board’s Discretionary Response Fund to support the commencement of the Greening the East project, and will consider requests from the Discretionary Response Fund for community projects on Lower Opawaho Heathcote stretch.

7.1.3 A working party is being established to enable the Ōpāwaho to Ihutai project to maintain momentum.

8. Community Board Matters of Interest

8.1 The Christchurch Documentary Project: Woolston 2019 - Christchurch City Libraries in collaboration with the University of Canterbury are creating a photographic portrait of Woolston.

8.1.1 The Christchurch Documentary Project is a contemporary photographic archive produced in collaboration with Christchurch City Libraries and the University of Canterbury, School of Fine Arts. Beginning with Halswell in 2015, the Christchurch Documentary Project set out to create a documentary photographic record of communities across our city. Find out more about this project and past projects at https://my.christchurchcitylibraries.com/the-christchurch-documentary-project/
8.1.2 From March through to September, three photography students, Lucinda Webber, Annabelle Johnston and Victor Wu are photographing the Woolston community. The final collection of images will be available on the Christchurch City libraries website from mid-November and an accompanying exhibition will be displayed at a venue in Woolston from mid-November through December.

8.2 **Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust**

8.2.1 The Board received a deputation from the Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust on the importance of the designation of the Estuary as part of the East Asia/Australasian Flyway. The Board supported the deputation request to support any initiatives that support bird life protection areas within the Avon-Heathcote Estuary.

The Board requested staff advice on how the Community Board can support the Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust with regards to the development of the Christchurch 360 Trail, and the Estuary Green Edge walkway. They also requested an update on the Major Cycleway Route Rapanui –Shag Rock route adjacent to the Estuary Edge.

**Attachments**

There are no attachments to this report.

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Liz Beaven - Community Board Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Arohanui Grace - Manager Community Governance, Linwood-Central-Heathcote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew McLintock - Manager Community Governance Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Filsell - Head of Community Support, Governance and Partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board Report to Council

Reference: 19/578282

Presenter(s): Ali Jones, Chairperson

1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations

That the Council:


3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation

The Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board held meetings on 10 and 24 May 2019 and a joint extraordinary meeting with Linwood-Central-Heathcote on 31 May 2019. Decisions made under delegation were:

- Approved ‘No Stopping’ restrictions on the curve of Willowview Drive close to Coolspring Way in Redwood.
- Approved P10 parking restrictions over the decommissioned bus stop on Langdons Road and P120 parking restrictions on Chapel Street over the decommissioned bus stop.
- Approval of the following grants:
  - $8,000 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to Northcote School towards the ‘Bikes in Schools’ initiative.
  - $2,000 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to the Richmond Community Garden towards the costs of hosting the “Matariki in Zone” event.
  - $450 from its 2018-19 Positive Youth Development Fund to Laura Powley towards the cost of attending the Music in the Summer Air (MISA) Shanghai Youth Summer Music Camp from 7 to 14 July 2019.
  - $450 from its 2018-19 Positive Youth Development Fund to the Canterbury Softball Association Inc. for McKenzie Bailey towards the cost of attending the Asia Pacific Qualifiers in Jakarta, Indonesia in June 2019.
  - $450 from its 2018-19 Positive Youth Development Fund to Rosie Nixon-Smith towards the cost of competing the Asia Pacific Qualifiers in the International Korfball Federation U21 Asia Oceania Championships May 2019 in Shaoxing, China.
  - $350 to Jonel Marais towards the costs associated with attending the 2019 Australian Gymnastics Championship from 28 May to 2 June 2019.
4. Part A Recommendations to Council

The following reports presenting Part A recommendations from the Board are included in this agenda for Council consideration:

4.1 Christchurch Northern Corridor Downstream Effects Management Plan

The report from the joint extraordinary meeting of the Linwood-Central-Heathcote and Papanui-Innes Community Boards held on 31 May 2019 regarding the Christchurch Northern Corridor Downstream Effects Management Plan will be considered by the Council at its meeting on 13 June 2019.

5. Significant Council Projects in the Board Area

5.1 Strengthening Community Fund Projects

Applications for the 2019-2020 Strengthening Community closed on 14 April 2019. A total of 41 applications were received requesting a combined amount of $974,506. The applications are being assessed and processed by staff. A seminar was held with the Board mid-May as a lead-in to the 2019-20 funding process.

5.2 Community Facilities (updates and future plans)

5.2.1 Time Capsule – St Albans Community Facility

The Community Board Advisor has meeting with staff, including the senior architect, to discuss how best to incorporate this into the design.

5.3 Infrastructure projects underway

5.3.1 Stapletons Road and Randall Street Renewal

The Board were advised of this work commencing late May 2019. An information leaflet was distributed by hand to the affected residents.

5.3.2 Belfast Cemetery Extension – Currently out to tender for section of road layout to link the new extension to the entrance.

5.3.3 Paddington Playground Renewal and Basketball Hoop – Consultation results for the community input to the concept plan is being analysed and will be reported to the Community Board to determine appropriate next steps.

5.3.4 St Albans Skate Park Extension – Engagement of designer underway with concepts and consultation aimed for mid-2019.

Events Report Back

5.4 Papanui Library – Sustainable Living Week

The Papanui Library hosted a Sustainable Living Week consisting of a series of free activities, information and interactive sessions from Saturday 27 April to Thursday 2 May 2019. This is part of the Sustainable Living Series two-year programme developed by Christchurch City Libraries to support the Council’s climate change strategy.

Sessions included a Stash Swap, Upcycling Craft, Garden Life Up Close, Love your Rubbish, Building a Tiny House and Community Energy Action services.
5.5 **Papanui and Shirley Inter-Agency Community Network Meetings**

The two-monthly meetings of the Papanui and Shirley Inter-Agency Community Network Meetings took place on 16 and 18 April respectively. There were 20 attendees at the Papanui meeting and 17 at Shirley.

5.6 **ANZAC Day – Papanui**

The ANZAC Day commemoration was attended by about 800-900 people, again a wide range of ages were represented as we see every year. The weather was good which is always appreciated, and the horses this year were a wonderful addition to the event.

It was pleasing to see so many women contributing to the formal presentations, significantly more than in previous years. Much credit goes to the Woolston brass band for getting the Australian national anthem in at the very end of proceedings as it wasn't played after the NZ National anthem as it usually is.

5.7 **ANZAC Day – Belfast**

There was a good turnout at the Belfast service, with higher numbers than previous years. A number of speakers contributed to the event, wreaths were laid by the Rotary Club of Belfast Kaiapoi, the Belfast Bowling Club, Belfast Community Network, the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board and the local Girl Guides. Music included the bagpipes, a violin-soprano duet, and of course The Last Post.
6. Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area

6.1 St James Park

The Kauri tree recently planted in St James Park has had to be removed due to a problem with the roots which caused the tree to fail. The Parks Team have advised that the tree will be replaced with a Japanese maple and they will also be adding some flowering cherry trees along the main path and a few Wollemi pines – a very rare (critically endangered in the wild) and unusual conifer (designated as a living fossil) discovered only 25 years ago in the Blue Mountains (refer photo right).  

6.2 10 Shirley Road

At its meeting on 12 April 2019 the Board queried the name change for the 10 Shirley Road site to Shirley Reserve.

The land is held as a Local Purpose Community Building Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977 and there is no official name for this site as it comprises ten separate parcels of land within the site.

Staff are continuing to work with the Parks Unit around the activation of the space until a decision is made about what will be placed permanently on 10 Shirley Road.

7. Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan

7.1 The Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board Plan can be found at the following link: 
Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board Plan

7.2 The Board's ongoing decisions are being included as measures against the Outcomes and Priorities contained in the 2017–2019 Community Board Plan.

8. Community Board Matters of Interest

8.1 Nil to report.

Attachments

There are no attachments to this report.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Christine Lane - Manager Community Governance, Papanui-Innes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Christine Lane - Manager Community Governance, Papanui-Innes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew McLintock - Manager Community Governance Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Filsell - Head of Community Support, Governance and Partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations

That the Council:


3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation

The Spreydon Cashmere Community Board held meetings on 7 and 17 May 2019. Decisions made under delegation were:

- Approving the landscape plan for Selwyn Reserve.
- Approving a grant of $250 from its 2018/19 Youth Achievement and Development Scheme to Eva Elliott towards participation in the National Senior Adventure Racing Event in Turangi from 29 April to 3 May 2019.
- Approving a grant of $500 from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to Ynys Robbie Bach-Strong towards participation in the Korfball Under 21 Asia and Oceania Competition in China from 19 to 29 May 2019.
- Approving a grant of $500 from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to Billie Hazel Trioka Pine towards participation in the Future Problem Solving International Conference in Massachusetts, USA from 5 to 9 June 2019.
- Approving a grant of $11,466 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Rowley Resource Centre towards Rowley Community Projects.
- Approving a grant of $300 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to St Martins-Ópāwa Friendship Club, towards the Annual Bus Trip project.
- Approving a grant of $1,908 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Project Esther towards equipment for the new Emergency Accommodation project. Approving an allocation of $1,500 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to the 2018/19 Youth Achievement and Development Scheme.
- Approving a grant of $500 from its 2018/19 Youth Achievement and Development Scheme to William Derek Hanlon towards participation in the Under 21 New Zealand Korfball Championships in China from 19 to 29 May 2019.
- Approving a grant of $350 from its 2018/19 Youth achievement and Development Scheme to Indi Marie Beeforth towards participation in the New Zealand Under 14 Basketball Tour in Melbourne, Australia from 6 to 11 June 2019.
4. **Part A Recommendations to Council**

The following reports presenting Part A recommendations from the Board are included in this agenda for Council consideration:

4.1 40 kilometre per hour variable speed zone extension – Hoon Hay Road

4.2 Results of the Request for Proposals for Sign of the Takahe and Lease Agreement (Public Excluded)

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

5.1 Barrington Mall Entrance/Exit

The proposed safety improvements to the Barrington Mall entrance/exit on Barrington Street were scheduled to commence at the beginning of May. Due to delays with the necessary changes to the resource consent for Barrington Mall the work is now unlikely to get underway before June or July 2019.

6. **Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area**

6.1 Mother of All Clean Ups

The annual “Mother of All Clean Ups” to remove litter from the banks of the Ōpāwaho Heathcote River for Mother Earth was this year held on Saturday 11 May, to align with Mother’s Day. More than twelve voluntary groups were supported by the Ōpāwaho Heathcote River Network to take part in the project, covering locations along the river banks between the source springs and the Avon–Heathcote Ihutai Estuary. The rubbish was collected by City Care and properly disposed of.

6.2 West Spreydon School got a head start with a clean-up of the river bank near the school on Friday 10 May 2019. It was also an opportunity for pupils to connect with river life by touching an eel.
6.3 Hoon Hay Lights.

In 2016 a group of local youth who regularly use the basketball facility at Hoon Hay Park, supported by Cross Over Trust and Spreydon Youth Community Trust, attended a Spreydon Heathcote Community Board meeting to express their wish for court lighting. The group members demonstrated their commitment to the project by fundraising to help with the expected cost. The Board asked staff to investigate the proposal and provision for the lights was included in the Long Term Plan 2015 – 2015, Sports Parks Structures (New), for financial year 2018. The group then expressed a desire for further improvements to the park in the vicinity of the court to make it a family friendly space.

The Spreydon Cashmere Community Board contributed funding through its Discretionary Response Funding and advocated for funding for this project via the Annual Plan process. Along with financial support from the Community Board and the Council grants towards the project were made by the RATA Foundation, Rotary Club and Lions Foundation.

New floodlights, a sheltered barbecue area, tiered seating and extra picnic tables and rubbish bins have now been added to the basketball court area at Hoon Hay Park and the court has been painted. The lights are connected to an automatic device ensuring switch-off at 9pm every evening.

An opening was held on 10 May 2019. After a blessing and some speeches the young people cut the ribbon and the basketball began. The event was supported by the Canterbury RAMS who donated a family pass for a prize draw that was won by a young basketballer and Hellers who donated free sausages for the Barbecue.

The 2019 Spreydon-Cashmere Edible Garden Awards event was held on the evening of 6 May 2019 at the Cashmere Club. The awards initiative was piloted in 2018 as a partnership with the Canterbury Horticultural Society, and agreement was made to continue the project due to its success.

This year 29 awards were made to residents and groups whose gardens had been visited and assessed by Society members. As well as certificates, participants received gift items and there was a draw of prizes donated by local businesses. Special awards and prizes were also given for Sustainability, organics, use of rainwater, and outstanding yield.

Approximately 70 people attended the event and were addressed by the Community Board and the Society members.
6.5 Poplar Trees Adjacent to George Manning Lifecare - Paulger Courts Retirement Village

Residents of Paulger Courts Retirement Village that adjoins Spreydon Riverbank Reserve expressed concern about mature Lombardy poplar trees growing on the reserve. The trees are very close to surrounding properties and created a tree debris issue and shading concern. Topping of the trees failed to resolve the problem. Access to the reserve is very limited.

Parks staff worked with management and residents of Paulger Courts to address residents’ concerns. The trees, which were in gradual decline, have been reduced and the root structure left intact to avoid riverbank destabilisation. Residents are happy with the result.

7. Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan

7.1 The latest monitoring report on the Community Board Plan is currently being prepared and will be considered by the Board in June 2019.

7.2 Spreydon Cashmere Age Friendly Action Plan

7.3 The Community Board Plan recognises that the development of an Age Friendly Spreydon-Cashmere Action Plan would contribute to a strong community one of the outcomes identified in the Plan.

An Age-friendly Spreydon-Cashmere Steering Group was formed on 21 August 2018 and tasked with development of a Spreydon Cashmere Age Friendly Action Plan. The Group meets regularly and recently provided an update of its progress to the Board and sought an informal meeting. A workshop involving Board members and representatives of the Steering Group was held on 24 May 2019 where the proposed format and content of the plan was looked at and arrangements for ongoing engagement on the plan were discussed.
8. Community Board Matters of Interest

8.1 Youth Achievement and Development Scheme

The Board has made numerous grants from its Youth Achievement and Development Scheme so far this year for a wide range of academic, sporting, cultural and recreational pursuits. Many of the applicants are achieving and excelling in more than one area.

A number of the grant recipients return to the Board to express their appreciation for the grant and to report on their ventures. In its last report to the Council the Board spoke about the scheme and highlighted the achievements of two grant recipients.

Eva Elliott addressed the Board on her attendance the National Senior Adventure Racing Event in Turangi from 29 April to the 3 May 2019, for which Eva had received a Youth Achievement and Development Scheme grant.

Eva explained that adventure racing requires participants to work in teams to undertake problem solving tasks and endurance events.

8.2 Beckenham Boardroom facilities

The Board has received a number of complaints from residents attending meetings about the quality of sound in the Beckenham Boardroom. Residents in the public seating area at the top of the room in particular have difficulty hearing staff and other people presenting to the Board who have their backs to the public.

The Board has responded by designating the seats against the walls alongside the Board table as “community seats” to be occupied by residents or anyone having difficulty hearing. In addition the Chairperson will, as part of her introduction, advise that anyone in the audience is welcome to indicate when they have missed something and this can be repeated. These measures can only be seen as an interim response pending an awaited upgrade of the Boardroom facilities.

Attachments

There are no attachments to this report.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Faye Collins - Community Board Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Christopher Turner-Bullock - Manager Community Governance, Spreydon-Cashmere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew McIntock - Manager Community Governance Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Filsell - Head of Community Support, Governance and Partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose of Report**

The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. **Community Board Recommendations**

That the Council:


3. **Community Board Decisions Under Delegation**

The Banks Peninsula Community Board held meetings on 6 May and 22 May 2019. Decisions made under delegation were:

- **Pedestrian Improvements at Godley Quay/Voelas Road, Lyttelton**

  The Board received a report with a recommendation to install a pedestrian island at the intersection of Voelas Road and Godley Quay to provide safe, convenient public access to Dampier Bay. Staff also recommended removing on street parking from Voelas Road to Cyrus William Quay to improve safety along a narrow section of road.

  The Board spent considerable time considering alternatives and the final decision was one which it believed balanced safety aspects with community concerns about loss of car parking.

  The Board approved the Godley Quay/Voelas Road pedestrian improvements, which included the pedestrian island and parking restrictions associated with it (plan attached). However the Board did not approve the ‘no stopping lines’ from Voelas Road to Cyrus Williams Quay.

- **Coastal Erosion**

  The Board noted that coastal erosion is a significant and ongoing issue for communities around Banks Peninsula and requested that staff provide an update on any upcoming or current planning regarding this issue.

- **Freedom Camping in Diamond Harbour**

  The Board received correspondence from the Diamond Harbour Community Association regarding community concerns with freedom camping at Stoddart Point in Diamond Harbour.

  The Board referred the correspondence to staff with a request to report back on any steps that can be taken to address the concerns, specifically including changes to the Council literature in regard to freedom camping at the site, regulatory reform, signage and enforcement.
The Board requested that staff report back at its 8 July meeting to allow any necessary changes to be in place by 1 December 2019.

- **Community Funding**
  The Board approved a grant of $2,000 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to Akaroa District Promotions towards security and light and sound for the Lumiere d’Akaroa Event. The Board requested that a letter of acknowledgement be sent congratulating the organisers on this very successful event.

- **Remuneration Authority – Childcare Allowance**
  The Board decided to make a submission in support of the childcare allowance proposed by the Remuneration Authority.

- **Community Board Remuneration**
  The Board requested staff advice as soon as possible on the timing for discussions around the setting of the elected members’ remuneration for the next triennial term and how the Board can have input into those discussions.

- **Speed Limit on Andersons Road, Charteris Bay**
  It was reported that a recent meeting of the Charteris Bay Community Association had noted residents’ concerns about speeding traffic on Andersons Road, and had requested that the Council introduce a 30kph limit and associated traffic calming measures.

  The Board requested that staff review the speed limit and traffic calming on Andersons Road.

- **Port Welfare Committee**
  The Board requested that staff investigate and report back on the possibility of establishing a Port Welfare Committee (as outlined in the Maritime Labour Convention) in Lyttelton as a sub-committee of the Board.

- **Underwater Noise from Land Based Piling**
  The Board received correspondence from Lyttelton Port Company (LPC) on underwater noise during land-based piling at the new cruise berth. The Board noted its appreciation for LPC’s efforts to be open and transparent in providing this information to the community.

4. **Part A Recommendations to Council**
   4.1 Nil.

5. **Significant Council Projects in the Board Area**
   **Infrastructure Projects**
   5.1 Twenty seven infrastructure projects are underway on Banks Peninsula, ranging from the Naval Point Development Plan to several toilet block renewals to new outdoor exercise equipment in Little River.

   **Recreation and Sporting Provision on Banks Peninsula**
   5.2 An overview of Banks Peninsula community recreation and sporting provision is underway. The purpose of the project is to provide a broad overview of the community’s recreation and sporting provision as well as major issues affecting that provision.
5.3 The project will establish what currently exists in recreation and sport provision and will use this information to help identify the most effective, efficient and equitable path of action to take to meet the long term recreation needs and interests of the Banks Peninsula community.

6. Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area

Proposal to Construct Waterdrome in Lyttelton Harbour

6.1 Peninsula Air Limited updated the Board on its proposal to construct a waterdrome for seaplanes in Lyttelton Harbour, and its application to the Civil Aviation Authority New Zealand (CAA) for permission for this project.

6.2 The Board made a submission to CAA noting that it is unable to endorse the proposal without further information on the impact on the environment, marine life and the lifestyle and values of residents, including local hapu, and would find difficulty in supporting a proposal where the impacts were negative.

6.3 As consideration of these issues is outside the scope of CAA, the Board welcomed the opportunity to provide further input to other agencies.

Public Safety Concerns for Lyttelton Farmers’ Market

6.4 Project Lyttelton spoke to the Board about safety concerns for the Lyttelton Farmers’ Market following the March 2019 terror attacks. Stall vendors would like the two entrances to the market to be blocked off.

6.5 Project Lyttelton is liaising with Council staff to investigate options to improve safety.

Committee and Working Party Matters

6.6 Reserve Management Committees

The Board received the minutes of meetings of four of its Reserve Management Committees – Okains Bay, Lyttelton, Diamond Harbour and Pigeon Bay.

7. Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan

7.1 The Community Board Plan for 2017/19 is available here. The next six monthly progress report will be reported to the Board following 30 June 2019.

8. Community Board Matters of Interest

Destination Management Planning for Akaroa

8.1 The Board discussed the proposed cruise ship schedule for the 2019/2020 season in Akaroa and noted that it includes several days when there would be a large number of cruise ship passengers in the town.

8.2 The Board expressed concern that there did not appear to be any destination planning taking place for a large number of cruise ship passengers and other visitors in the town, particularly in relation to the capacity of local infrastructure. The Board also noted that there needed to be a properly constructed conversation with the community about visitor planning.

8.3 The Board requested that ChristchurchNZ be asked to urgently come to talk to the Board about destination management planning for Akaroa, including timeframes, details of community engagement and specific examples showing demand capacity, associated constraints and how it is going to address this.
Planning for Return of Cruise Ships to Lyttelton

8.4 The Board requested an update from ChristchurchNZ and Council staff regarding what planning is underway for the return of cruise ships to Lyttelton and the resulting impact on Akaroa, including infrastructure requirements and opportunities for community engagement.
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9. Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board Report to Council
Reference: 19/500847
Presenter(s): Kim Money, Chairperson Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board

1. Purpose of Report
The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations
That the Council:

3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation
The Coastal-Burwood Community Board held meetings on 2 and 20 May. Decisions made under delegation were, the Board:

   - Received information on the Midge Control Programme Update - 2018-19 Season from staff
   - Allocated funds from the 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to seven local competing students
   - Allocated funds from the 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to two local recipients
   - Allocated funds from 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Brighton Gallery Trust
   - Recognised the Prestons Residents’ Association
   - Approved the criteria and timeline for the Coastal-Burwood Community Resilience Support Fund
   - Approved the removal of the significant cabbage tree at 548 Marshland Road together with any other trees affected by the Marshland, Hawkins and Lower Styx Road intersection improvement works. The Board acknowledged the significance of the cabbage tree and noted that consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga had taken place and the Rūnanga were agreeable to the significant cabbage tree being removed, with seeds being harvested before removal
   - Allocated funds from the 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund towards the Ōtautahi Rugby Club to build a new car park
   - Allocated funds from the 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Scouting NZ Burwood

4. Part A Recommendations to Council
No reports presenting Part A recommendations from the Board are included in this agenda.
5. **Significant Council Projects in the Board Area**

5.1 **Donnell Park**

This project is to remediate the earthquake damage to the tennis and basketball courts and replace the toilet at Donnell Park. Construction is planned for completion in approximately September 2019. The community, in partnership with the community governance team and Community Board are looking to organise a celebration event at the park once the repairs are completed.

5.2 **Thomson Park**

Thomson Park is a popular park in New Brighton, regularly used for community events and recreation. This project includes a car park upgrade, construction of a basketball court and general landscaping and garden renewals. This project and new construction works at Thomson Park is in line with the park development and compliments the Rawhiti Domain and Thomson Park Management Plan. The work is in construction phase currently and is planned for completion mid-June 2019.

The community, in partnership with the community governance team and Community Board are planning a community event at the park once the works are completed.

---

6. **Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area**

6.1 **Estuary Green Edge Pathway**

Ms Judith Millar and Mr Ken Couling, representing Christchurch 360 Trail (Inc) presented to the Board about the group’s concerns about the delays in the implementation of the Estuary Edge project.

6.2 **South New Brighton Park Erosion Management Options**

The findings of an independent report into erosion and management options along the estuary edge of South New Brighton Park were presented to the Community Board at a seminar on Monday 6 May.

On Thursday 9 May, the Council agreed to take over leadership of the work currently within scope of the Regeneration Strategy for Southshore and South New Brighton. The Regeneration Strategy project will be split into two projects: Earthquake legacy repairs and an adaptation...
strategy. The South New Brighton Park estuary edge will be included in and will be reported on as part of the earthquake legacy repairs project.

Council staff have been instructed to undertake urgent work on the earthquake legacy investigations project and report back in August 2019 for a Council decision on Estuary edge current and pre-earthquake state and risk analysis – to identify outstanding community needs. This will include specific actions and opportunities to mitigate inundation and erosion that addresses earthquake legacy. This report will inform this earthquake legacy project.

6.3 Hot Pools Hoarding wall mural

Development Christchurch Limited in collaboration with the community governance team and school children from the community have completed a mural on the hoarding at the Hot Pools site on Marine Parade. A group of students from local schools put their own ideas on the south wall.

7. Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan

7.1 The Board approved the Coastal-Burwood Community Board Plan for 2017-19 on 16 October 2017. The Plan can be found at the following link: https://www.ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/The-Council/Community-Boards/Coastal-Burwood-Community-Board-Plan-2017-19.pdf

7.2 The Board's ongoing decisions are being included as measures against the Outcomes and Priorities contained in the 2017 – 2019 Community Board Plan.

8. Community Board Matters of Interest

8.1 Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust

The Board received a deputation from the Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust on the importance of the designation of the Estuary as part of the East Asia/ Australasian Flyway. The presenters noted their support for recreational use of the Estuary, including Christchurch 360 Trail initiatives, provided consideration is given to bird life protection areas.
8.2 **Recreate Project**

The Board received a deputation from Sue Davidson, Co-ordinator of The Old School regarding the Recreate Project. Sue provided the Board with a short video of artists and visitors at the Recreate space.

8.3 **I love New Brighton 2019 report back**

Representatives of Youth Alive Trust, Eastern Community Sport and Recreation, Renew Brighton and Council staff presented to the board on the success of the I Love New Brighton event. The 8th annual event was held on Waitangi Day 6 February 2019 in Thomson Park where approximately 6,000 people attended. Their vision for the future is to continue to strengthen connecting community in greater New Brighton.

8.4 **Student Parking - Ōrua Paeroa Campus: Shirley Boys' and Avonside Girls' High Schools**

Council’s Transport Network Planner and Traffic Engineer spoke to the board on student parking around the Shirley Boys' and Avonside Girls' High Schools area. Statistics showed increased use in the cycle lanes in the surrounding area and less student parking than anticipated.

Staff are working with the two schools on Transport Management Plans. There are no known issues with parking at Taiora: QEII Recreation and Sports centre and this is being monitored.

Initial assessment is that some time-restriction and no-stopping areas may be required. Staff undertook to provide regular updates to the Board on the matter.

8.5 **Ōtautahi Community Housing Trust**

The Board held a seminar with representatives of Ōtautahi Community Housing Trust. The presentation covered the Trust’s vision, values, the roles of staff, an overview of who their tenants were and the portfolio of complexes.

8.6 **Regeneration Strategy for Southshore and South New Brighton**

The Board acknowledged and appreciated the Council’s recent decision to take over the leadership of the Regeneration Strategy for Southshore and South New Brighton.

The Board received updates from staff on 16 and 27 May on the Earthquake Legacy Issues Project (Southshore South New Brighton Regeneration Strategy).

8.7 **Burwood Christian Centre**

Board members had a site tour of the Burwood Christian Centre where representatives of the Centre updated the Board on the development of the facility.

**Attachments**

There are no attachments to this report.
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1. **Purpose of Report**

   The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. **Community Board Recommendations**

   That the Council:


3. **Community Board Decisions Under Delegation**

   The Waimāero/Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board held meetings on 29 April 2019 and 13 May 2019. Decisions made under delegation were:

   - **196 Roydvale Avenue - Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Ward - Proposed Road Names**: The Board approved the new road name for the subdivision at 196 Roydvale Avenue as Lake Bryndwr Lane.

   - **Wairakei Road at Holt Place - Proposed No Stopping Restrictions**: The Board approved no stopping restrictions at the intersection of Wairakei Road and Holt Place.

   - **Gardiners Road near Cullahill Street - Access to Public Transport - Provision of Bus Stops**: The Board approved the installation of new bus stops beside numbers 89 and 82 Gardiners Road.

   - **Harewood Road near Gardiners Road - Access to Public Transport - Bus Stop Relocations**: The Board resolved to leave the existing inbound bus stop beside 312 Harewood Road, and to approve the relocation of the outbound bus stop on Harewood Road near Gardiners Road to outside number 385 Harewood Road.

   - **Nunweek Park Car Park - Proposed P120 Parking Restrictions**: The Board approved the installation of P120 parking restrictions for the Nunweek Park public car park located next to the hockey fields on Woolridge Road.

   - **Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund**: The Board approved grants totalling $2,395 to two organisations, Te Ora Hou Otautahi towards printing costs of Polyphony 2019 Incorporated and St Marys/The Merevale Corner towards the purchase of equipment for their new community space.

   - **Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood 2018-19 Youth Development Fund**: The Board approved grants totalling $2,750 from its 2018-19 Youth Development Fund towards seven young people participating in a variety of events including trips to Shoaxing China, Ohio USA, and Massachusetts USA.
4. **Part A Recommendations to Council**

   The following reports presenting Part A recommendations from the Board are included in this agenda for Council consideration:

4.1 **Roto Kohatu Reserve - New Toilets, Carparking and Access Road Improvements**

   The Board’s consideration and recommendation of the Roto Kohatu Reserve - New Toilets, Carparking and Access Road Improvements report will be considered by the Council at its meeting on 13 June 2019.

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

5.1 **Fendalton Library HVAC and Building Upgrade**

   Internal - The work inside the building is 80 percent complete with just the installation of the new ceiling tiles to be done and the new Customer Services counter. Both are expected to be completed by the end of June.

   External - The new butynol (weather-proof rubber membrane) has been applied on the south side of the roof and is currently being applied to the north side. The new HVAC plant has arrived on site and plinths will be installed on the roof next week so the plant can then be craned up to be installed.

   The work at the Library and Service Centre is on track for the facility to reopen to the public on Monday, 29 July 2019.

5.2 **Harewood Road, Gardiners Road, Breens Road Intersection**

   Consultation on two proposed options to improve safety at the intersection of Harewood Road/Gardiners Road/Breens Road opened on Monday, 6 May 2019.

   - Option 1 is for Left in/Left Out with signalised pedestrian crossing
   - Option 2 is for traffic signals.

   Drop-in Information sessions were held on 21 May at Breens Intermediate School hall and 23 May at Ōrauwhata: Bishopdale Library and Community Centre.

   The Consultation period closes on Monday, 10 June 2019. Further information can be found on the Have Your Say section of the Council’s website:


   Approximately 100 people attended the first information session at Breens Intermediate School.
5.3 **Jeffreys Reserve Water Suction Tank**

At its Seminar on Monday 20 May Board members received a progress update on the Jeffreys Reserve Water Suction Tank project. The updated included information on the key aspects of the preliminary Design and access requirements during the construction period.

On Tuesday, 21 May 2019 an information evening was held to present the preliminary design to neighbouring residents.

![Proposed building to be constructed on Jeffreys Reserve](image)

6. **Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area**

6.1 **Local Response Fund – Bryndwr BBQ**

The BBQ and picnic was held at Morley Reserve on 13 April 2019. Approximately 100 people from the local community attended. The event was well supported by the local Muslim community. The halal BBQ was very popular and people brought a range of food to share. There were plenty of activities for the kids including a bouncy castle, bubbles, face-painting and group games. *Photos courtesy of Cole Yeoman.*
6.3 **Mona Vale Gatehouse – Artist in Residence**

At its Seminar on Monday, 29 April 2019 the Board hosted members of the film crew who created the animated TV series, Kiri and Lou. Antony Elworthy, Animation Director, Ian Whitlock, Animator and Josie Meachen thanked the Board for its backing of the Artist in Residence programme at Mona Vale Gatehouse and talked about the making of the Kiri and Lou TV Series.

The Board was also treated to an episode of what is shaping up to be a very successful television series.

It is hoped that the Mona Vale Gatehouse will become part of the wider arts strategy for the city. This could mean that there are greater opportunities in the future as part of the wider strategy.

6.4 **Bishopdale Village Regeneration Project**

A working group has been established consisting of representatives from local community groups, the Business Association, local residents and Council staff to progress regeneration activities. Projects underway include the painting of the bench seats throughout the mall, a mural and the development of a ‘Village Green’ on the vacant site of the old library and community centre.

7. **Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan**

7.1 The next summary of measures against the Outcomes and Priorities contained in the Community Board Plan will be presented to the Board at its 1 July 2019 meeting.

**Attachments**

There are no attachments to this report.
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11. Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Report to Council

Reference: 19/578419
Presenter(s): Mike Mora, Chairperson
Matthew Pratt, Community Governance Manager

1. Purpose of Report
The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations
That the Council:

3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation
The Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board held meetings on 14 May 2018 and 28 May 2019. Decisions made under delegation were:
- The approval of parking restrictions for school buses at 265 Riccarton Road.
- An allocation of $3,000 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to the Board’s 2018-19 Youth Development Fund.

4. Part A Recommendations to Council
There are no Part A Board recommendations in this agenda for the Council to consider.

5. Significant Council Projects in the Board Area
5.1 Strengthening Community Fund Projects
5.1.1 The Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board will consider the applications made to its 2019-20 Strengthening Communities Fund on 13 August 2019.

Of the 55 applications received, the Board has already approved multi-year funded grants to six organisations in 2017-18 and 2019-20.

A workshop is scheduled for early July 2019 to assist the Board in its initial deliberations ahead of its decision making meeting on 13 August 2019.

5.1.2 One of the projects that the Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board funded through its Local Response Fund featured on the Sunday current affairs television programme on 12 May 2019. (https://www.tvnz.co.nz/shows/sunday/clips/blood-brothers)

The Board granted $1,000 towards the University of Canterbury Muslim Students Association to provide a retreat for Muslim youth from 25 to 27 April 2019.

The group of young Muslim males has been challenged by the passing of two of the group members, brothers and other family and friends in the 15 March tragedy. The retreat was an opportunity for the group to bond again outside of the city, providing
avenues to deal with some of the issues they are facing in a non-threatening environment.

5.2 Other partnerships with the community and organisations

5.2.1 Staff continue to liaise with the University of Canterbury in a variety of areas. Recent projects include a local body election awareness project and a combined presentation to the upcoming International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) Australasia symposium on community and student relationships.

5.3 Community Facilities

5.3.1 Riccarton Community Centre - Update

Excavation work for the building is now complete and work on the backfill stage is substantially advanced.

The lift pit and first half of the external foundation beams have been poured and much of that boxing removed. The photos below refer.

During June, things will get visually interesting on site with the pour of the ground floor scheduled for early in the month and the precast panels to be installed by mid-June.

The dewatering of the site presented considerable challenges affecting the programme and methodology, however the project remains on target for completion by December 2019.
5.3.2 **Community Link Building**

The Community Link building in Wycola Avenue in Hei Hei, has had a recent upgrade including internal painting, insulation and the installation of a heat pump. There is currently no tenant in the building.

In the interim, staff are making the building available for casual hire to the community to use for meetings. It is proposed that this will happen by the end of June 2019.
6. **Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area**

6.1 **City Mission**

In the upcoming month, the City Mission’s free light bulb initiative will be targeting Broomfield.

Residents will be able to have up to five energy efficient light bulbs installed in their home, potentially saving them $200 per year. The initiative also partners with Fire and Emergency New Zealand to install smoke alarms as well as Community Energy Action and the Curtain Bank.

6.2 **126 On The Corner – Food Shed**

The food shed has recently opened at 126 on the Corner (Hei Hei Broomfield Community Development Trust).

The organisation receives donated food from City Harvest twice a week as well as donations from an egg farm, other local suppliers and residents in the area.

The shed was a donation from Mitre 10 and additional work such as painting, was carried out by local volunteers. Any food waste from the shed goes to the nearby poultry farm.

The shed is open during the day and closed at nights. It has created a lot of interest in the centre, with more people popping in to find out about local activities.

6.3 **Walking Festival 2019**

Online registrations for the Walking Festival are now live.

Groups and organisations are invited to submit their plans for walks at [www.ccc.govt.nz/walkingfestival/registraion](http://www.ccc.govt.nz/walkingfestival/registraion).

Last year’s walking festival included 50 walks, including seven feature walks, led by 23 different groups and with over 7,000 participants.

It is expected that this year will bring even more walks, highlighting walking and recreation opportunities within the city and surrounding districts.

Registrations will close on 18 June 2019.
7. Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan
   7.1 Updates are being presented quarterly (September 2019) to the Board throughout 2019 on its Community Plan 2017-19 to measure progress against the Board’s approved outcomes and priorities.

8. Community Board Matters of Interest
   8.1 On 6 June 2019, the Board made a submission on behalf of the Council regarding the proposed Roydon Quarry in Templeton.

Attachments
There are no attachments to this report.
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12. (LCH) Delegation of sign off of Main Contract for Linwood Pool to Chief Executive

Reference: 19/503967
Presenter(s): Kent Summerfield – Senior Project Manager

1. **Staff Recommendations**

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

   1. Recommend to the Council that delegation for sign off of the Main Contract for the Linwood Pool be delegated to the Chief Executive, subject to that execution being consistent with capital and operational provision for the Linwood Pool within the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan as updated by the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

2. **Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Recommendation to Council**

   **Part A**

   That the Council:

   1. Approve the authority to sign off the Main Contract for the Linwood Pool be delegated to the Chief Executive, subject to that execution being consistent with capital and operational provision for the Linwood Pool within the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan as updated by the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.
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1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Council to approve delegation of execution of the main contract for the Linwood Pool to the Council’s Chief Executive.

2. Executive Summary
   2.1 The Council have included funding allowances for the development of a Linwood Pool within the 2015–2025 Long Term Plan as updated by the 2018–2019 Annual Plan.
   2.2 At their meeting of 16 May 2018 the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board resolved (under resolution LCHB/2018/00065) to:
      1. Approve 141 Smith Street as the site for the Linwood Pool facility.
      2. Approve staff proceeding with procurement and development of a concept design for the Linwood Pool facility.
   2.3 Staff have been proceeding in line with the resolutions in 2.2, and in response to consistent stakeholder feedback seeking earliest delivery of the facility possible, are exploring all options to accelerate the programme.
   2.4 Execution of the Main Contract is a critical path activity i.e. any delay to this item will directly result in a delay to the end date of the project. Currently delegation for executing the Main Contract sits with Council (as the value is anticipated to exceed $15m).
   2.5 If Council were to delegate sign off of the Main Contract to the Chief Executive it would significantly expedite completion of this item and therefore assist in meeting stakeholder expectations around timeline.

3. Staff Recommendations
   That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:
   1. Recommend to the Council that delegation for sign off of the Main Contract for the Linwood Pool be delegated to the Chief Executive, subject to that execution being consistent with capital and operational provision for the Linwood Pool within the 2015–2025 Long Term Plan as updated by the 2018–2028 Long Term Plan.

4. Context/Background
   Issue or Opportunity
   4.1 Execution of the Main Contract is a critical path activity within the Linwood Pool project i.e. any delay to this item will directly result in a delay to the end date of the project. Currently delegation for executing the Main Contract sits with the Council (as the value is anticipated to exceed $15m).
4.2 If Council were to delegate sign off of the Main Contract to the Chief Executive it would significantly expedite completion of this item and therefore assist in meeting stakeholder expectations around timeline.

**Strategic Alignment**

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

4.3.1 Activity: Recreation, Sport, Community Arts & Events

- Level of Service: 7.0.1.1 Provide citizens access to fit-for-purpose recreation and sporting facilities - 8 outdoor pools and 8 paddling pools are open seasonally.

**Decision Making Authority**

4.4 With the value of the Main (Design & Build) Contract for Linwood Pool expected to exceed $15 million, delegation for its approval sits with the Council itself under Council’s policy. Recommendation is sought from the Community Board that specific approval for this item be delegated from the Council to the Council Chief Executive.

**Previous Decisions**

4.5 No specific decisions relating to this delegation have been made previously, although in Resolution CNCL/2018/00049 which delegated decision making on site selection and final Concept to the Community Board it was noted that financial delegation relating to executing the main build contract remained with Council.

**Assessment of Significance and Engagement**

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

4.7 The low level of significance reflects that the decision relates only to the sign off of the Contract and does not otherwise impact Project Stakeholders.

5. **Options Analysis**

**Options Considered**

5.1 The following reasonably practicable options were considered and are assessed in this report:

- Option 1 (preferred) - Sign off of Main Contract delegated to Chief Executive.
- Option 2 – Council retain delegation for sign off of Main Contract.

**Options Descriptions**

5.2 **Preferred Option:** Sign off of Main Contract delegated to Chief Executive.

5.2.1 **Option Description:** Under this option Council would delegate sign off of the Main (Design & Build) Contract for Linwood Pool to the Council Chief Executive.

5.2.2 **Option Advantages**

- If Council were to delegate sign off of the Main Contract to the Chief Executive it would significantly expedite completion of this item and therefore assist in meeting stakeholder expectations around timeline.

5.2.3 **Option Disadvantages**

- Council would no longer see the Contract prior to its execution although the execution would still need to consistent with capital and operational provision for
the Linwood Pool within the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan as updated by the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

5.3 **Option 2:** Council retain delegation for sign off of Main Contract.

5.3.1 **Option Advantages**
- Council retain ownership of this item.

5.3.2 **Option Disadvantages**
- Timeframes involved in the decision making process would significantly extend the overall project programme as sign off is a critical path item.

**Analysis Criteria**

5.4 The sole criteria used to assess preference in this instance is the respective timeline impact of the two options. Depending on exact timing it is estimated that retaining delegation of this decision could add six to eight weeks to the project programme.

6. **Community Views and Preferences**

6.1 While this matter has not been discussed with the community it is expected that they would support delegation of the Main Contract sign off to the Chief Executive as they have repeatedly expressed a desire to see the project programme accelerated wherever possible.

7. **Legal Implications**

7.1 There not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision

7.2 This report has been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

8. **Risks**

8.1 There are not significant risks associated with the decision in this report. Regardless of which party holds delegation, sign off of the Main Contract will be subject to remaining consistent with capital and operational provision for the Linwood Pool within the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan as updated by the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan, and the same level of information would be provided to prove that consistency.

9. **Next Steps**

9.1 Once a Concept Design is approved by the Waikura/Linwood Central Heathcote Community Board, the Request for Proposal package will be completed and released to the shortlist of candidates, and ultimately a preferred tenderer identified.

**Attachments**

There are no attachments to this report.

**Confirmation of Statutory Compliance**

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

(a) This report contains:

(i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
(ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

**Signatories**

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kent Summerfield - Senior Project Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved By</strong></td>
<td>Alistair Pearson - Manager Capital Delivery Major Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Down - Finance Business Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigel Cox - Head of Recreation, Sports &amp; Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Richardson - General Manager Citizen and Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. (SC) 40km/h variable speed zone extension – Hoon Hay Road

Reference: 19/508233
Presenter(s): Privinn Mwene, Traffic Engineer

1. Waihoro/Spreydon-Cashmere Community Board Recommendation to Council

(Original staff recommendation accepted without change)

Part A

That the Council:

1. Approves, pursuant to Part 4 Section 27 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, and Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017, that speed limits on Sparks Road and Hoon Hay Road be revoked and set as identified in Attachment A and detailed in 1a-1c below including resultant changes made to the Christchurch City Council Register of Speed Limits and associated Speed Limit Maps;

   a. Revoke the existing 40 kilometres per hour variable speed limit (school speed zone) on Sparks Road commencing at a point 62 metres southwest of its intersection with Hoon Hay Road and extending in a south-westerly direction for a distance of 402 metres to a point 22 metres southwest of its intersection with Maryhill Avenue.

   b. Approve that a 40 kilometres per hour variable speed limit (school speed zone) be set on Sparks Road, commencing at a point 80 metres northeast of its intersection with Hoon Hay Road and extending in a south-westerly direction for a distance of 556 metres to a point 26 metres southwest of its intersection with Maryhill Avenue, as it meets the requirements of the New Zealand Gazette Notice (21/04/2011, Number 55, Page 1284) including the times of operation.

   c. Approve that a 40 kilometres per hour variable speed limit (school speed zone) be set on Hoon Hay Road, commencing at a point 229 metres northwest of its intersection with Sparks Road and extending in a south-easterly direction for a distance of 305 metres to a point 76 metres southeast of its intersection with Sparks Road, as it meets the requirements of the New Zealand Gazette Notice (21/04/2011, Number 55, Page 1284) including the times of operation.

2. Approves the speed limit changes listed in clauses 1a – 1c above come into force following the date of Council approval, installation of all required infrastructure (signage and/or markings) and removal of obsolete infrastructure (as indicated in Attachment A), and the required notice provided to New Zealand Transport Authority and New Zealand Police in accordance with Section 2.7(6) of Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017.
## Attachments

<table>
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1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waihoro/Spreydon-Cashmere Community Board to consider the extension of a variable speed limit (40 kilometres per hour) from Sparks Road to include Hoon Hay Road as shown on Attachment A, and make a recommendation to the Council for approval and its inclusion in the Christchurch City Council Register of Speed Limits.

2. Executive Summary
   2.1 This report is staff generated, in response to community requests and this site being a top priority on the Council’s approved school zone implementation priority list.
   2.2 The implementation of the preferred option means:
      - Reduction in operational speed, improving the safety in the area during the school hours.
      - Enhanced driver awareness of the presence of children.

3. Staff Recommendations
   That the Waihoro/Spreydon-Cashmere Community Board recommends that the Council:
   1. Approve, pursuant to Part 4 Section 27 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, and Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017, that speed limits on Sparks Road and Hoon Hay Road be revoked and set as identified in Attachment A and detailed in 1a-1c below including resultant changes made to the Christchurch City Council Register of Speed Limits and associated Speed Limit Maps;
      a. Revoke the existing 40 kilometres per hour variable speed limit (school speed zone) on Sparks Road commencing at a point 62 metres southwest of its intersection with Hoon Hay Road and extending in a south-westerly direction for a distance of 402 metres to a point 22 metres southwest of its intersection with Maryhill Avenue.
      b. Approve that a 40 kilometres per hour variable speed limit (school speed zone) be set on Sparks Road, commencing at a point 80 metres northeast of its intersection with Hoon Hay Road and extending in a south-westerly direction for a distance of 556 metres to a point 26 metres southwest of its intersection with Maryhill Avenue, as it meets the requirements of the New Zealand Gazette Notice (21/04/2011, Number 55, Page 1284) including the times of operation.
      c. Approve that a 40 kilometres per hour variable speed limit (school speed zone) be set on Hoon Hay Road, commencing at a point 229 metres northwest of its intersection with Sparks Road and extending in a south-easterly direction for a distance of 305 metres to a point 76 metres southeast of its intersection with Sparks Road, as it meets the requirements of the New Zealand Gazette Notice (21/04/2011, Number 55, Page 1284) including the times of operation.
   2. Approve the speed limit changes listed in clauses 1a – 1c above come into force following the date of Council approval, installation of all required infrastructure (signage and/or markings)
and removal of obsolete infrastructure (as indicated in Attachment A), and the required notice provided to NZTA and NZ Police in accordance with Section 2.7(6) of Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017.

4. Context/Background

Issue or Opportunity
4.1 Hoon Hay Primary School and Our Lady of the Assumption School (OLA) have frontages to Hoon Hay School and Sparks Road. There is an existing School Speed Zone on the Sparks Road frontage.

4.2 The intersection of Sparks Road and Hoon Hay Road was recently upgraded to traffic signals from a roundabout as part of the Quarrymans Trail Major Cycleway Route project. Removal of the roundabout has resulted in higher traffic speeds.

4.3 Following the introduction of traffic signals, various traffic surveys were commissioned on Hoon Hay Road between Muirson Ave and Sparks Road around September 2018. Key findings reported below:

- Average weekday traffic volume of approximately 11,000 vehicles per day (vpd)
- Weekday 85% speed – 53.6km/h
- Weekday median speed – 49.0km/h
- Approximately 85-90 pedestrians recorded walking outside OLA on Hoon Hay Road before and after school hours.

4.4 These conditions meet the legal warrant to implement a variable 40km/h School Speed Zone.

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

4.5.1 Activity: Traffic Safety and Efficiency

- Level of Service: 10.0.6.1 Reduce the number of casualties on the road network - =129 (reduce by 5 or more per year)

Decision Making Authority
4.6 Part 4, Clause 27 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to set speed limits for roads. Council has not delegated this authority.

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

4.8 The level of significance was determined by the project being low cost and affecting a limited group of residents. The decision is easily reversible.

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

5. Options Analysis

Options Considered
5.1 The following reasonably practicable options were considered and are assessed in this report:

- Extend 40km/h variable speed limit to include Hoon Hay Road.
• Do Nothing.

5.2 The following options were considered but ruled out:
• No other options were considered.

Options Descriptions

5.3 **Preferred Option:** Extend the 40km/h variable speed limit to include Hoon Hay Road.

5.4 **Option Description:** Install the 40km/h Variable Speed Limit (school speed zone) as shown on Attachment A.

5.4.1 **Option Advantages**
• Likely reduction in operational speed, therefore improving the safety in the area during the school hours.
• The electronic speed zone signs enhance driver awareness of the likely presence of children.

5.4.2 **Option Disadvantages**
• None identified.

5.5 **Option 2** - Do nothing

5.5.1 **Option Description:** Do nothing.

5.5.2 **Option Advantages**
• None identified.

5.5.3 **Option Disadvantages**
• It does not address the safety concerns of the school and that of the community.

Analysis Criteria

5.6 Options have been assessed by their contribution to the following issues:
• Reducing traffic speeds due the school drop off and pick up times thus increasing the safety for the school children.
• Alerting drivers of the school zone.

6. Community Views and Preferences

6.1 Engagement was carried out with the NZ Transport Agency, NZ Police, Hoon Hay School and Our Lady of the Assumption School. The Police have provided written support for the proposal. The Transport Agency has no objections and the operating times were set following engagement with the principals from Hoon Hay School and Our Lady of the Assumption.

6.2 On 26 March 2019, an information leaflet was delivered to all properties within the proposed zone between 60-131 Sparks Road and between 155-186 Hoon Hay Road which included a plan of where the new signage was proposed to be located and contact details should any residents have any concerns regarding this option.

6.3 An objection was received from a resident at one of the proposed locations for the signs. He argued that the sign would obstruct his view to his house and wanted the sign relocated. Modifications were made to the initial proposed location and the sign was moved to an area in front of vegetation along his property. This mitigates the obstruction of view for the resident. The resident still requested the sign be moved all together in front of his property. The
resident was informed of all the options which were considered and why the area in front of his property was chosen. No further comments/replies have been received from the resident.

6.4 To date no further objections or concerns have been received.

7. **Legal Implications**

7.1 The installation of any signs and/or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004 and the New Zealand Gazette notice (21/04/2011, Number 55, page 1284).

7.2 The Interpretation Act 1999 provides for the New Gazette notice (21/04/2011, Number 55, page 128) and NZTA Traffic Note 37 to have continued effect, despite those documents being established under (and referring to) the now repealed Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003.


7.4 In accordance with the Christchurch City Council Delegations Register, Council has not delegated its powers under the above legislative framework.

8. **Risks**

8.1 None identified.

9. **Next Steps**

9.1 Implementation dependencies - dependent on endorsement by the Community Board and approval by Council to legalise school speed zone.

## 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 – Extend School Speed Zone</th>
<th>Option 2 – Do Nothing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Implement</td>
<td>Approximately $55,000 to supply, install and commission signs.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Ongoing</td>
<td>Covered under the traffic signals maintenance contract.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Minor Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Rates</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety</td>
<td>Supports school safety and is responsive to recent changes to travel patterns</td>
<td>Does not support school safety and is unresponsive to recent changes to travel patterns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confirmations 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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14. (FWH) Roto Kohatu Reserve - New Toilets, Carparking and Access Road Improvements

Reference: 19/531485
Presenter(s): Sam MacDonald, Chairperson Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board

1. Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board Recommendation to Council

(Original Staff Recommendation accepted without change)

Part A

That the Council:

1. Approve the Landscape Plan for Roto Kohatu Reserve LP377501, which includes the following:
   a. Two permanent toilet blocks
      i. One near the southern shore of Lake Tahi with two accessible toilets.
      ii. One near the northern shore of Lake Rua with three accessible toilets.
      iii. Provide drinking fountains.
   b. Upgrade of the Lake Rua car park.
   c. Upgrade the existing access road including traffic safety improvements.
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Roto Kohatu Reserve - New Toilets, Carparking and Access Road Improvements

Reference: 19/248247

Presenter(s): Steven Gray, Project Manager
Robbie Hewson, Area Head Ranger
Aliesha Esker, Engagement Advisor

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek the Waimāero/Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board to recommend to the Council to approve:

1.1.1 Landscape Plan – Roto Kohatu Reserve Car Parking and Toilet LP377501, dated 18/04/2019 (Attachment A) which includes the following key items,

- Proposed two toilet blocks, path connections and associated landscape works
- Proposed upgrade of the existing gravel car park by Lake Rua to a formalised asphalt car park
- Proposed upgrade of the existing gravel access road including traffic safety improvements. (Note that this upgrade will be undertaken in stages as funding becomes available)

2. Executive Summary

2.1 Roto Kohatu Reserve is a metropolitan facility located in Harewood.

2.2 There have been a number of issues over the last few years in regards to poor toilet behaviour (using existing gardens) and traffic safety in the informal car park and along the road access.

2.3 Community engagement was recently undertaken for the construction of two toilet blocks, each containing two fully accessible cubicles and cold water outside showers, and for the upgrade of the existing informal car park to an asphalted car park and access road improvements.

2.4 The conceptual design of the toilet blocks and car park layout was presented to the Community Board via a seminar on the 11 February 2019, prior to the commencement of consultation.

2.5 The Community Board were informed that due to the distance to lay services (power, water and sewer) to these locations, a high portion of the cost to build toilets in this reserve is on services.

2.6 Results of the consultation are included in this report, item 6, with 88 percent of submissions clearly supporting this project.

2.7 Following public consultation the following items have been amended on the proposed landscape plan:

2.7.1 The toilet block by Lake Rua (Northern Lake) will have a third fully accessible toilet added on.

2.7.2 Lake Rua toilet location to move approximately 45 metres north to provider safer access for users without having to cross the access road.
2.7.3 A drinking fountain will be included with each toilet block.

2.8 Once the landscape plan is approved, the project will proceed to detailed design and construction with the aim to have the toilets open for summer 2019/20

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waimāero/Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board recommend to the Council to:

1. Approve Landscape Plan Roto Kohatu Reserve LP377501 which includes the following:
   a. Two permanent toilet blocks
      i. One near the southern shore of Lake Tahi with two accessible toilets.
      ii. One near the northern shore of Lake Rua with three accessible toilets.
      iii. Provide drinking fountains.
   b. Upgrade of the Lake Rua car park.
   c. Upgrade the existing access road including traffic safety improvements.

4. Context/Background

Issue or Opportunity

4.1 Roto Kohatu Recreation Reserve is located north-east from Sawyers Arms Road. It contains Lake Rua and Lake Tahi. The access road from Sawyers Arms Road is 1.4 kilometres to the car park at Lake Rua. The Reserve is Council owned.

4.2 Each of the lakes are spring fed. Regular water quality tests show this spring fed lake water is of high quality.

4.3 The Reserve is popular with a wide range of recreationalists, both land and water based.

4.4 Lake Rua attracts a significant number of people over the summer period. Over warm periods these numbers can over-crowd the lake shore picnicking and swimming area.

Lake Rua on a busy summer day. Photo Arthur Adcock
4.5 The water based recreation is split between lakes. On Lake Tahi, the Canterbury Jet Ski Club operates from its southern shore. On the water polo lake (adjacent to where Canterbury Jet Ski operate on Lake Tahi), Canoe Polo and many school teams train and compete.

4.6 Land based recreation includes: walking, cycling, picnicking, remote control car activities, dog walking and cross country running (both training and events).

4.7 On Lake Rua, many users utilise the lake, most from the northern shore. This includes informal swimmers, kayakers and anglers. User groups include: kayaking, Sailing, Model Yachts, Waka Ama, Fishing Club, Dragon Boating, Dive training, and club swim.

4.8 In recent years two Porta-loo units have been sited all year around, one at the northern end of Lake Rua, and one at the southern end of Lake Tahi. In addition, two additional Port-a-loo’s are provided for the busier summer months. Staff report that visitor numbers in the summer of 2017/2018 were so high, that the capacity of the Port-a-loo’s were inadequate, quickly filling before servicing could be arranged, and the public were using the areas behind the bushes and containers as toilets.

**Strategic Alignment**

4.9 This project contributes to achieving the community outcome of providing a safe, clean, and functional community by providing safe access and clean facilities.

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

4.10.1 Activity: Parks & Foreshore

- Level of Service: 6.8.1.2 Parks are provided managed and maintained in a clean, tidy, safe, functional and equitable manner - (Provision) - Regional Parks: 20 ha/1000 people

**Decision Making Authority**

4.11 As per the Christchurch City Council’s Delegation Register, this is a metropolitan facility that requires Council’s approval.

**Previous Decisions**

4.12 There have been no previous decisions in relation to this report.

4.13 Staff attended a Community Board Seminar on 11 February 2019 to discuss the proposed landscape plan prior to community engagement.

**Assessment of Significance and Engagement**

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

4.15 The level of significance was determined by the suggested thresholds for assessing criteria, which has a low level of possible risk to the Council on carrying out the decision and whether the impact of a decision can be easily reserved, a medium-low level of community interest and possible benefits/opportunities to the Council and wider community and a medium assessment on level of impact on those people affected due to areas of the park being closed during construction.

4.16 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflects the assessment.

5. **Options Analysis**

**Options Considered**

5.1 The following reasonably practicable options were considered and are assessed in this report:
- Provide new toilets facilities (five cubicles) in two locations that will service the highest use areas and upgrade the car park and access road. Preferred Option

- Provide new toilets facilities (four cubicles) in two locations that will service the highest use areas and upgrade the car park and access road

- Continue using Port-a-loo style toilets and upgrade the car park and access road

5.2 The following options were considered but ruled out:

- Provide toilet facilities and services using a septic tank or a composting system.
  - These options were ruled out due to the nature of the reserve and location to large fresh water lakes, the ongoing high operational cost to service septic tanks, and the unlikelihood of gaining resource consent approvals with these system types when we have the ability to connect to the city mains

- Provide one toilet facility at the park entranceway and upgrade the car park and access road
  - This option was ruled out as the toilet at the park entrance would not be in a location that services the greatest needs. The only advantage of this option is the lower cost to provide services (sewer, water, power) to this site

Options Descriptions

5.3 Preferred Option: Provide new toilets facilities (five cubicles) in two locations that will service the highest use areas and upgrade the car park and access road.

5.3.1 Option Description: To construct two new toilet blocks, one with two fully accessible toilets at Lake Tahi and one with three fully accessible toilets at Lake Rua. To upgrade the car park (in 2019) and sections of the access road as funding becomes available. Attachment B shows the artist impression of the proposed triple accessible toilet.

- This option is a change from the consultation plan with adding in one extra fully accessible toilet at Lake Rua toilet block, changing the location of the toilet by moving it further north by 45 metres so uses don’t need to cross the access road, and providing drinking fountains at each toilet block

- The proposed toilets are an Exeloo pre-fabricated building that is a factory assembled unit which provides a high quality finish

- The building exterior has been designed to use similar materials already used in other landscape features in the reserve

- Two cold water outside showers will be attached on the side of the buildings to allow people to wash down after using the lakes

- Both buildings will be connected to the city mains supply – sewer, water and power which will provide the best solution for managing waste water and to have a potable drinking supply on site. Currently there is no services in this reserve

- There is a total distance of 770 metres to lay services to both toilet blocks

- Each toilet block will be fully accessible and have accessible parking close by

- Each cubicle will have a seat / changing bench. The space in each cubicle will be big enough to use as a changing area

- The toilets will be locked outside of the Parks open hours
• Landscaping will be provided to soften the effects of the buildings on the landscape but will be designed to meet CPTED (Crime Prevention through environmental design) principles

• The car park will be upgraded to have an asphalt surface providing longevity to this asset. The car parks will have line marking to provide a more useable space along with directional markings

• The final car park layout may vary from the conceptual layout once the technical design is completed to allow the best traffic flow into and through the car park

• Separate trailer parking bays were requested as part of the consultation. These have not been included as it was not considered a feasible option to include them with no way to control non-trailer users parking in these spaces. It was also noted by the Regional Park Rangers that users with trailers tend to occur outside high use times and associated with club activity. Clubs can arrange access through the Park Rangers for drops if required

• A separate entry and exit road into the car park will help reduce speeding and manage traffic flow

• Overflow parking area has been allowed for on part of the grass area. This will be managed by the Regional Park Ranger Team, as required

• Traffic calming measures will be used to help reduce speed in the car park and on the access road. This will be in the way of speed humps, changes to road width and bollard adjustments

• The access road will be upgraded to either an asphalt surface or chip seal surface depending on location and use. High wear areas will be Asphalt

• The full length of the access road will take a number of years to complete. Additional funding to complete this will be applied for in future Annual Plan / Long Term Plan (LTP) but will be subject to Council approval. Note: that if tender prices are favourable for the car park then some sections of the road improvements will be implemented from the FY19 and FY20 budget allocation.

• The section of road by the canoe polo will be left as a gravel surface in the short term as this section of road may change and will be addressed as part of the Master Plan for the reserve. It may however still require some form of traffic calming to help reduce speed in the short term

5.3.2 Option Advantages

• Having toilets in high use areas to service the greatest needs

• Will resolve unsanitary issues with people currently using planted areas as a toilet

• Provide five toilets which will be fully accessible and provide space for changing

• Drinking fountains will be provided at each toilet block

• Toilets will be connected to the city mains, providing the best and healthiest options for managing waste water and drinking water.

• Services connected to the city mains provides the lowest risk to the environment with no need for septic tanks and the risk of overflows, especially being close to fresh water lakes
This option reduces the operational cost (currently $25,000 to service five port-a-loos per year) to $10,000 per year

Car parking and access road improvements to provide a safer environment. Sealing of the car park and access road will provide a longer life to these assets

Overflow parking has been allowed for and will be managed by the Regional Parks Rangers

Additional landscaping to enhance the reserve.

5.3.3 Option Disadvantages

- Due to the distance from city mains, there is a high cost to run these service to each toilet site with an estimated total cost for both toilets of $440,000
- The cost to add one extra cubicle will be approximately $95,000
- Amount of road upgrades will be reduced to cover the extra toilet cubicle.

5.4 Provide new toilets facilities (four cubicles) in two locations that will service the highest use areas and upgrade the car park and access road.

5.4.1 Option Description: This is the option that was consulted on with the public but was to provide only four cubicles in two toilet blocks. The proposal for the car park and access road will remain the same as the preferred option above

5.4.2 Option Advantages

- All advantages as listed for the preferred option but with one less toilet cubicle

5.4.3 Option Disadvantages

- There was a lot of comments about future proofing the services to allow for growth. One less toilet cubicle in this option may not meet that need and could be required in the future. To add an extra single toilet in later would cost more than building it now with construction set up costs, modifications to the existing building, plus the cost of the single building of $95,000, not including inflation for future years

5.5 Continue using Port-a-loo style toilets and upgrade the car park and access road

5.5.1 Option Description: The reserve currently has five Port-a-loo’s which cost $25,000 per year to service. Through the Community Engagement, feedback received from on-site canvasing it identified that people don’t use these loos but prefer to toilet in the shrub gardens. This is creating health issues for the public, council staff and contractors who maintain these gardens.

5.5.2 Undertake the access road and car park improvements and noted in the preferred option

5.5.3 Option Advantages

- No cost to build new toilet facilities
- Undertake car park and access road improvements as noted in the preferred option

5.5.4 Option Disadvantages

- High operational costs to continue to service Port-a-loo’s
- Doesn’t resolve the poor toilet behaviour and has a high health risks to the public

Analysis Criteria

5.6 The options were analysed on their cost and community feedback and preferences.
6. Community Views and Preferences

6.1 Consultation on the project was open from Friday 15 March 2019 to Monday 8 April 2019.

6.2 Prior to consultation starting, a pre-engagement meeting was held with the key user groups of the Reserve on Thursday 14 March 2019. This meeting was an opportunity for the groups to ask any questions and provide initial feedback.

6.3 There were some unique considerations with Roto Kohatu Reserve which shaped our engagement approach. As the largest body of fresh water suitable for swimming in Christchurch, the Reserve is a recreation asset for the whole city. It is also located within an industrial area, so our ‘affected residents’ are therefore not the immediate neighbours, but people who travel from across the city to use the reserve.

6.4 Printing and distributing hard copy flyers would not have been an effective way of reaching people, so instead we sent out emails to a database of 166 stakeholders (groups and individuals) letting them know about the consultation. We also promoted the consultation via a Newsline story and put up five information signs on site with an address to the ‘Have your Say’ web page.

6.5 In total we received 72 pieces of feedback with a clear majority showing strong support for the proposal.

6.6 We received 49 submissions via the ‘Have Your Say’ webpage:

6.6.1 40 submissions clearly stated their support for the proposed improvements.

6.6.2 Six submissions did not state their support, but made suggestions for alterations or other considerations to be factored into the proposed improvements.

6.6.3 Two submissions based on the submitter promoting their product.

6.6.4 Only one submission voiced any apprehensions around the proposed improvements and that was around new toilets and showers potentially encouraging freedom camping at the Reserve.

6.7 Council staff also visited the Reserve on Saturday 23 March and Monday 25 March to promote the consultation and canvas opinions. We received 23 pieces of feedback from Reserve users - all in support of the proposal.
6.8 The most common themes to come about during engagement that are within the scope of this project were:

6.8.1 Road safety (including road condition and driver behaviour).
6.8.2 Vandalism and the question of ‘will the toilets be locked at night?’ was asked frequently.
6.8.3 Access to drinking water.
6.8.4 Rubbish bins.
6.8.5 The safety and practicality of the Lake Rua toilet block location.
6.8.6 Requests for changing rooms and the total number of toilet cubicles provided.

6.9 Common themes that were raised during engagement that are not part of the scope of this project were (note this information will be passed on to the appropriate staff):

6.9.1 The observed unsavoury behaviour of some users and the safety concerns around this.
6.9.2 Water safety.
6.9.3 Additional structures e.g. playground, pontoons picnic tables and BBQ’s.
6.9.4 The health and ecological integrity of the Reserve including water quality.

7. **Legal Implications**

7.1 There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision other than meeting statutory requirements for consenting.

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

8. **Risks**

8.1 Risk of cost increases to install these facilities in the future if this report is not approved.
8.2 Risk around health issues with people currently toileting in shrub gardens.
8.3 Potential risk with pollution of the fresh water lakes if poor toileting behaviour continues.
8.4 Risk to the park users with speeding traffic through the reserve if not access road improvements are undertaken.

9. **Next Steps**

9.1 Following approval of this report by the Council, the project will move into detailed design, consenting and tendering stage.
9.2 Supply of the toilets will take 19 weeks from ordering with installation planned to be completed before the 2019 summer season.
9.3 The car park will be underway at the same time with the car park completed for summer.
9.4 The road improvements will be detailed up and if funding allows then sections will be upgraded as part of the car park construction work.
9.5 Future funding will be sort to complete the full length of the access road out to the park entrance on Sawyers Arms Road.
## 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 – (Preferred)</th>
<th>Option 2 - Provide new toilets facilities (four cubicles) in two locations that will service the highest use areas and upgrade the car park and access road</th>
<th>Option 3 - Continue using Port-a-loo style toilets and upgrade the car park and access road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>Provide new toilets facilities (five cubicles) in two locations that will service the highest use areas and upgrade the car park and access road</td>
<td>There is funding of $1.8M in FY19 and FY20 to complete items 1 to 3 below. A breakdown of each stage is shown: 1. Toilets $660,612 (five cubicles) 2. Services to toilets $480,000 3. Car park $609,300 4. Access Road entry / exit to car park $317,900 (Note: Additional funding to be applied for in future Annual Plan / LTP to complete this item) 5. Access road from Sawyers Arms Road to car park $732,600 (Note: Additional funding to be applied for in future)</td>
<td>There is funding of $1.8M in FY19 and 20 to undertake this proposed work. Total cost to complete items 1 to 3 below is $1.65M. A breakdown of each stage show: 1. Car park $609,300 2. Access Road entry / exit to car park $317,900 3. Access road from Sawyers Arms Road to car park $732,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to Implement</td>
<td>Option 2 - Provide new toilets facilities (four cubicles) in two locations that will service the highest use areas and upgrade the car park and access road</td>
<td>Option 3 - Continue using Port-a-loo style toilets and upgrade the car park and access road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is funding of $1.8M in FY19 and FY20 to complete items 1 to 3 below. A breakdown of each stage is shown: 1. Toilets $565,612 (four cubicles) 2. Services to toilets $440,000 3. Car park $609,300 4. Access Road entry / exit to car park $317,900 (Note: Additional funding to be applied for in future Annual Plan / LTP to complete this item) 5. Access road from Sawyers Arms Road to car park $732,600 (Note: Additional funding to be applied for in future)</td>
<td>There is funding of $1.8M in FY19 and 20 to undertake this proposed work. Total cost to complete items 1 to 3 below is $1.65M. A breakdown of each stage show: 1. Car park $609,300 2. Access Road entry / exit to car park $317,900 3. Access road from Sawyers Arms Road to car park $732,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>Option 3 - Continue using Port-a-loo style toilets and upgrade the car park and access road</td>
<td>Option 3 - Continue using Port-a-loo style toilets and upgrade the car park and access road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to Implement</td>
<td>Option 3 - Continue using Port-a-loo style toilets and upgrade the car park and access road</td>
<td>Option 3 - Continue using Port-a-loo style toilets and upgrade the car park and access road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is funding of $1.8M in FY19 and 20 to undertake this proposed work. Total cost to complete items 1 to 3 below is $1.65M. A breakdown of each stage show: 1. Car park $609,300 2. Access Road entry / exit to car park $317,900 3. Access road from Sawyers Arms Road to car park $732,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3 - Continue using Port-a-loo style toilets and upgrade the car park and access road</td>
<td>There is funding of $1.8M in FY19 and 20 to undertake this proposed work. Total cost to complete items 1 to 3 below is $1.65M. A breakdown of each stage show: 1. Car park $609,300 2. Access Road entry / exit to car park $317,900 3. Access road from Sawyers Arms Road to car park $732,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Issue Specific Criteria**

Option 1 – (Preferred) Provide new toilets facilities (five cubicles) in two locations that will service the highest use areas and upgrade the car park and access road.

Option 2 - Provide new toilets facilities (four cubicles) in two locations that will service the highest use areas and upgrade the car park and access road.

Option 3 - Continue using Port-a-loo style toilets and upgrade the car park and access road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance/Ongoing</th>
<th>Annual Plan / LTP to complete this item)</th>
<th>for in future Annual Plan / LTP to complete this item)</th>
<th>$7,500 / year for each toilet block $20,000 year for current road access maintenance. This will reduce as the road is sealed</th>
<th>$7,500 / year for each toilet block $20,000 year for current road access maintenance. This will reduce as the road is sealed</th>
<th>$25,000 year for Port-a-loo cleaning and $20,000 year for current road access maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Rates</td>
<td>Currently funded in the LTP FY19-21 Future Annual Plan / LTP funding required to complete the access road - $800K to $1M (rates impact c. 0.01%)</td>
<td>Currently funded in the LTP FY19-21 Future Annual Plan / LTP funding required to complete the access road - $800K to $900K (rates impact c. 0.01%)</td>
<td>Currently funded in the LTP FY19-21 for the car park and access road improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change doesn’t not affect this option</td>
<td>Provides accessible toilets on site which are currently not available. All new facilities will be built to meet current accessibility standards which includes car parking with easy access to the facility</td>
<td>The existing Port-a-loo’s do not meet the required accessible standards or have dedicated car parking available The proposed new car park will provide accessible parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides accessible toilets on site which are currently not available. All new facilities will be built to meet current accessibility standards which includes car parking with easy access to the facility</td>
<td>Provides accessible toilets on site which are currently not available. All new facilities will be built to meet current accessibility standards which includes car parking with easy access to the facility</td>
<td>The existing Port-a-loo’s do not meet the required accessible standards or have dedicated car parking available The proposed new car park will provide accessible parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option resolves current unsanitary behaviour. New toilet facilities will be built to high standards with all</td>
<td>This option resolves current unsanitary behaviour. New toilet facilities will be built to high standards with all</td>
<td>Port-a-loo’s use a holding tank and requires to be pumped out. This has a risk of overflows in high use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Modern Fitting
- The toilets will be connected to City mains sewer and water supply
- Periods or spillage during cleaning. This option does not resolve the poor toilet behaviour with people using gardens to toilet

### <enter text> (Criteria 4 e.g. Future Generation Impacts)
- The services proposed will allow for future expansion if additional facilities are required, however this will be partially addressed with adding in one additional toilet cubicle
- This option does not resolve the poor toilet behaviour with people using gardens to toilet

### Statistical Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 - (Preferred)</th>
<th>Option 2 - Provide new toilets facilities (four cubicles) in two locations that will service the highest use areas and upgrade the car park and access road</th>
<th>Option 3 - Continue using Port-a-loo style toilets and upgrade the car park and access road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Mana Whenua</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment 1 - Original Staff Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Act</td>
<td>Building Act</td>
<td>Resource Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Management Act</td>
<td>Resource Management Act</td>
<td></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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15. (LCH & PI) Christchurch Northern Corridor Downstream Effects Management Plan
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Joint Community Boards Decision

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community and Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Boards:

2. Do not endorse the Downstream Effects Management Plan.

Notes:

a. The concerns held by the community over the negative impacts of the Northern Corridor and the Downstream Effects Management Plan.

b. The discussed Travel Demand Management package of works proposed for the Northern Corridor.

c. That not all aspects of the Travel Demand Management package of works are approved or will be implemented before the opening of the Northern Corridor.

2. Joint Meeting - Linwood-Central-Heathcote and Papanui-Innes Community Boards Recommendation to Council

Part A

That the Council:


4. Requests that staff investigate a delay in the opening of the Northern Corridor south of Queen Elizabeth II Drive until the package of Travel Demand Management measures are all approved and implemented.

5. Proceeds with proposals outlined in the DEMP for stage 1A and 1B in the 2019-2020 Annual Plan including the outlined work on Cranford and Sherborne Streets as outlined in 6.3 of the DEMP.

6. Requests that staff investigate the possibility of an additional Park and Ride facility near Queen Elizabeth II Drive.

7. Requests that staff investigate a congestion levy on the Northern Arterial Extension.

8. Provides north and south-bound peak-time Public Transport lanes on Cranford and Sherborne Streets.
Ali Jones requested that her vote against 7. and 8. be recorded.
John Stringer requested that his vote against 1. to 8. be recorded.
Sally Buck requested that her vote against 7. be recorded.
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1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to request the Waipuna/Papanui-Innes and Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Boards receive the final Downstream Effects Management Plan and recommend to Council the endorsement of the final Downstream Effects Management Plan.

1.2 Council staff have worked with the relevant Community Boards throughout the development of the methodology that has informed the Downstream Effects Management Plan. Although the decision-making authority for the final Downstream Effect Management Plan belongs to Council, staff wish to continue to communicate and seek the endorsement and support for any recommendation to Council for matters relating to the Christchurch Northern Corridor.

2. Executive Summary

2.1 Under the conditions of the relevant Consent Order, Christchurch City Council is required to:

2.1.1 Mitigate the downstream traffic effects arising from the operation of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.

2.1.2 Engage an independent traffic expert to identify the potential impacts on those streets at the end of the Christchurch Northern Corridor which may be potentially affected as a result of the operation of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and recommend appropriate traffic mitigation measures to Council.

2.1.3 Engage with certain owners/occupiers and specified persons/groups regarding the Independents Expert’s recommendations.

2.1.4 Carry out ongoing monitoring and identify the anticipated future increase in traffic as a result of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.

2.1.5 Carry out any recommended traffic mitigation measures if traffic volumes are anticipated to increase by over 30% on any street. Council must implement mitigation measures as soon as reasonably practicable and in accordance with the timeframes required by the Consent.

2.2 Council received the draft Downstream Effects Management Plan in February 2019 for consultation and Council staff have now completed the second phase of community engagement. Feedback received during this engagement has fed into the attached final version of the Downstream Effects Management Plan (Attachment A) that has been prepared by the Independent Traffic Expert.

2.3 The final Downstream Effects Management Plan anticipates that main roads and some local roads in the study area will likely see an increase of more than 30% in traffic volume upon the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor. The report proposes a prioritised work programme to address this.
3. **Staff Recommendations**

That the joint Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board and Papanui-Innes Community Board:

1. Receive and endorse the final Downstream Effects Management Plan.
2. Recommend to Council to endorse the final Downstream Effects Management Plan.
3. Note that Council Staff will proceed to design and consult on the proposed interventions in Stage 1A and will develop a programme and costings for the remaining stages.

4. **Context/Background**

**Designation Conditions**

4.1 In mid-2015 a Hearings Panel of Independent Commissioners confirmed the Notice of Requirement for the Northern Arterial, the Northern Arterial Extension and the Cranford Street Upgrade, subject to conditions.

4.2 That decision was appealed to the Environment Court. One appeal related to the turning bays and u-turn bays north of Innes Road on Cranford Street and the other was property-related. None of the appeals lodged concerned the condition which addressed downstream traffic effects or the proposal as a whole. Both appeals were settled by agreement without the need for a hearing.

4.3 In February 2016 the Environment Court considered the consent memorandum of the parties which resolved the appeals lodged and issued a Consent Order which included the addition of one further condition and associated plans for turning bays and u-turn bays on the northern end of Cranford Street. All other conditions for the Northern Arterial Extension and the Cranford Street Upgrade remained unchanged.

4.4 Along with the Northern Arterial, these projects would subsequently become collectively known as the Christchurch Northern Corridor.

4.5 Condition 26 of the Notice of Requirement Conditions for the Northern Arterial and Cranford Street Upgrade Designation, RMA92024074 (Designation condition) relates to downstream traffic effects. Condition 26 states:

> “Prior to operating the Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade (NAE/CSU) authorised by this designation Christchurch City Council shall implement the Downstream Effects and Property Amenity Traffic Management Plan contained in Appendix A to these conditions to address any downstream effects relating to traffic arising from the operation of the NAE/CSU.”

4.5 Appendix A of the Notice of Requirement Conditions is the *Downstream Effects and Property Amenity Traffic Management Plan* (management plan). This management plan outlines the following objectives:

- To identify preferred vehicle access routes, particularly for trucks, between the end of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and Central City;
- To identify strategies to keep vehicles on preferred vehicle access routes; and
To discourage vehicles away from public transport and walking or cycling routes such as Main North Road/Papanui Road and Rutland Street corridors respectively.

4.6 Appendix A then goes on to state that the purpose of the management plan is to:

- Assess the existence, nature and extent of any increased traffic on streets adjacent to, or adjoining Cranford St attributed to the Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade that might cause or contribute to a loss of a service to any of these streets for up to 10 years after the opening date of the Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade;
- Implement measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate such effects, where these are more than minor, in a timely and cost effective manner and where appropriate and practicable; and
- Monitor efficacy of the measures for an appropriate period and implement further remedial action, if this is necessary and appropriate.

4.7 Appendix A also requires Council to appoint an independent expert, who is a suitably qualified traffic engineer. They will investigate and design an appropriate methodology to identify the potential impacts (if any) and address the requirements of the Designation conditions.

Independent Expert

4.8 Council appointed Dr Shane Turner as an independent traffic expert to develop a methodology to identify potential impacts and draft the Downstream Effects Management Plan. As part of the development of a methodology, Dr Turner recommended preliminary engagement with the local community prior to drafting the Downstream Effects Management Plan. This preliminary engagement was not required as part of the Designation conditions.

4.9 Dr Turner completed the draft Downstream Effects Management Plan and Council staff sought community feedback on this in March/April 2019 in accordance with the Designation conditions.

4.10 Following consideration of the community feedback received, Dr Turner has completed the final Downstream Effects Management Plan. This sought to balance the needs of local communities with safety and accessibility considerations, while ensuring an accessible city for all Christchurch residents, businesses and visitors. The staged approach proposed timely monitoring, an arterial corridor upgrade, local road traffic calming and improving access to schools, parks and commercial areas.

Strategic Alignment to National, Regional and Local Strategies

4.11 Various national, regional, and local strategies exist which have also helped guide the direction of the attached Downstream Effects Management Plan. Any options developed need to be conscious of the relevant objectives contained within those strategies.

National

4.12 The Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018 has four strategic directions:

- Safety.
- Access.
- Environment.
- Value for Money.
4.13 These strategic directions were considered during option conception and in the application of the multi-criteria analysis to assess the efficacy of any proposed options regarding the impact on the local community.

4.14 The Safer Journeys Strategy (2010-2020) guides how safety concerns will be addressed in New Zealand over the period 2010-2020. It outlines the Safe System approach which recognises the vulnerability of road users, and the four pillars of safe roads and roadsides, safe speeds, safe vehicles, and safe road use, under which safety is to be addressed. In urban areas the safety of pedestrians (especially vulnerable pedestrians; young, and elderly) and cyclists needs to be considered alongside vehicle safety. This is considered as an integral part of the staged recommendations of the Downstream Effects Management Plan. It suggests safer speeds for the local areas and has an emphasis on developing safer access to schools, parks and commercial areas. The plan also recommends investing in an alternative secondary cycle route on the eastern side of Cranford Street and if required, an additional pedestrian crossing facility along Cranford Street.

Regional

4.15 The Regional Land Transport Plan (2015-2025) outlines five regional objectives:
- A land transport network that addresses current and future transport demand
- A land transport system that is increasingly free from death and serious injury
- The Canterbury Earthquake recovery is supported
- The land transport network is resilient and supports long-term sustainability
- Investment in land transport infrastructure and services is efficient.

4.16 In addressing the downstream effects, the formation of the Downstream Effects Management Plan has been particularly conscious of regional objectives 1, 2, and 5, as well as long-term sustainability mentioned in objective 4. Resilience was considered less of a priority due to the various routes available in Christchurch should, for example, Cranford Street become temporarily unavailable. Any implementation of works must also be conscious of earthquake recovery projects when they occur.

Sub-regional

4.17 The Greater Christchurch Transport Statement 2012 provides an overarching framework for managing the transport network and focuses on key links within Greater Christchurch. It acknowledges northern growth issues as a priority for the sub-region and refers to the importance of connectedness, travel choice, safe journeys and liveable communities.

4.18 Whilst the Downstream Effects Management Plan is prepared in support of the Christchurch Northern Corridor, it primarily focusses on discouraging through traffic onto local residential streets, as well as away from the key prioritised routes for public transport and cycling.

4.19 The Downstream Effects Management Plan also aims to improve accessibility and safety for schools, commercial areas and parks within the study area. It proposes a secondary cycle route on the eastern side of Cranford Street and endorses using the Healthy Street Framework to create safe, healthy and liveable local streets.

City

4.20 The Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan has four goals:
- Improve access and choice
• Create safe, healthy, and liveable communities
• Support economic vitality
• Create opportunities for environmental enhancements.

4.21 The Downstream Effects Management Plan seeks to align with the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan by:
• Supporting the Christchurch Northern Corridor that is currently being built to support growth and economic activity within the region. The CNC will improve access into the City from the north and will remove heavy and other traffic off some sub-urban roads, making them safer, encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport – especially through Redwood and Belfast.
• Discouraging general traffic from the Main North Road/Papanui Road Public Transport corridor and Papanui Parallel Major Cycle Route corridor. The Plan seeks to improve safe access to schools, parks and commercial activity areas. It proposes a secondary cycle route to the east of Cranford Street and develops Healthy Street Framework to encourage mode choice.
• It integrates with a wider package of workstreams referenced in from section 4.23 below which seek to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips and encouraging Public Transport express services.

4.22 The Long Term Plan 2018-2028 sets out Christchurch City Council’s funding priorities for transport over the next 10 years. Funding has been allocated in the Long Term Plan for projects from the Downstream Effects Management Plan in the period 2018/19 to 2023/24. This Long Term Plan outlines Council’s commitment to the Christchurch Northern Corridor along with other key programmes such as Central City Transport, Major Cycle Routes, a local cycle network (connecting to major cycle routes), pedestrian improvements plan, and Public Transport Infrastructure.

Other related workstreams
4.23 There are a number of inter-related workstreams across the northern area of Christchurch that Council are managing or actively participating in. These specifically include the High Occupancy Vehicle lane and Northern Travel Demand Management measures, as well as a city-wide programme of work to address growth, safety and changing travel patterns across the city.

4.24 These workstreams are all investigating ways for either managing the downstream effects for when the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens, or reducing the number of single occupancy vehicle trips during peak hours. To integrate these workstreams, a Programme Steering Group has been established which includes staff from Christchurch City Council, the New Zealand Transport Agency, Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council.

4.25 High Occupancy Vehicle lane – Christchurch Northern Corridor:
• The New Zealand Transport Agency has competed a detailed business case for the High Occupancy Vehicle lane on the Christchurch Northern Corridor. This was endorsed by their Board in late 2018.
• The current proposal is to install a High Occupancy Vehicle lane from the Tram Road interchange to approximately 450 metres north of the Cranford Street roundabout.
Through an update report to the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee (Attachment B), it has been confirmed that investigation, design and construction funding has been allocated to the project.

4.26 Christchurch Northern Area Supporting Travel Demand Management Measures

4.27 The New Zealand Transport Agency, along with partners including Christchurch City Council, Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council, have developed a Business Case titled ‘Christchurch Northern Area Supporting Travel Demand Management Measures’ to support the southbound High Occupancy Vehicle lane and cycle path across the Waimakariri Bridge on State Highway 1 and along the Christchurch Northern Corridor. This is yet to be endorsed by the partners. A copy of the draft business case forms Attachment C.

4.28 The business case recommends a range of interventions across an extended timeframe. Outlined below are the measures it recommends occur prior to or upon opening the HOV lane and CNC:

- Communication Plan - to promote new infrastructure and to provide regular updates on construction and disruptions.
- Marketing and promotional campaign - This will aim to raise awareness and understanding in the community regarding the High Occupancy Vehicle lane and its operation as well as the improved public transport service offering.
- Mobility as a Service – This considers first and last mile connections and includes the launch/development of an app based tool that combines public transport, carpooling/rideshare and micro mobility travel options.
- Training and education – Provide training and education to make commuters more comfortable with using alternative modes of transport.
- Downstream travel demand management measures – Continued investigation into downstream measures which incentivise greater use of the High Occupancy Vehicle lane such as parking incentives.
- Park and Ride - Interim Park and Ride sites in Kaiapoi and Rangiora, each with a capacity of 120 spaces. The Park and Ride will facilitate existing bus services (Blue Line and Service 95) and could include secure cycle lockers and bus and vehicle access.
- Travel planning - Residents will be invited to participate in a personalised journey planning programme to encourage behaviour change to alternative modes of transport. This initiative will also target schools and workplaces.
- New express public transport service - an additional express bus service targeting peak hour commuters and travelling between Rangiora, Kaiapoi and the central city along the new High Occupancy Vehicle lane. This includes 10 minute frequencies (between 7-9 AM and 4-6 PM) and a total of 24 additional services a day (12 in each peak period).

4.29 Public Transport Business Case:

Staff from the Greater Christchurch Partnership have prepared a business case for the sub-region, titled Public Transport Futures. This has been endorsed by the Public Transport Joint Committee and is currently with the New Zealand Transport Agency awaiting the approval of their Board. If approved, this will likely result in three further business cases as follows:

- Rapid Transit (on the North and South-West Corridors).
Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board and Papanui-Innes Community Board
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- Foundations (focusing on the current five core bus routes – Orbiter, Yellow Line (Rolleston/Hornby - New Brighton), Blue Line (Rangiora/Belfast - Cashmere), Orange Line (Halswell – Queenspark) and Purple Line (Airport/Sheffield Crescent – Sumner).

- Rest of Network (the remaining bus routes, including the four additional core routes proposed in the Regional Public Transport Plan).

4.30 The intention is to complete these business cases so they can feed into the 2021-2031 Long Term Plan’s for the relevant authorities and the 2021 National Land Transport Programme.

4.31 All of the above workstreams, including the cycle clip-on lane across the Waimakariri Bridge, are important improvements to the northern corridor to encourage more people to move in fewer vehicles and to provide alternative choices to how they travel between the Waimakariri District and Christchurch City.

Decision Making Authority
4.32 Christchurch City Council.

Previous Decisions
4.33 On 14 February 2019 Council resolved CNCL/2019/00025, that the Council:

- Receive the draft Downstream Effects Management Plan for staff to commence engagement with the community on the recommendations contained within the draft Downstream Effects Management Plan.

- Request Staff to work with the local communities on local access needs and provide the relevant Community Boards a briefing on the Travel Demand Management options currently being investigated.

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

4.35 The level of significance was determined by comparing factors relating to this decision against the criteria set out in Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. The level of significance reflects the high numbers of people affected and the high level of community interest and involvement in the Christchurch Northern Corridor over many years.

4.36 The community engagement outlined in this report reflects the assessment and has been developed in accordance with the Designation conditions within the Consent Order approving the Northern Arterial, the Northern Arterial Extension and the Cranford Street Upgrade and previous feedback received during the initial engagement in 2018.

5. Options Analysis

Options Considered

5.1 The following options are considered and assessed in this report:

- Option 1 – Endorse the final Downstream Effects Management Plan
- Option 2 – Do not endorse the final Downstream Effects Management Plan

5.2 Staff did not consider any other options.
Options Descriptions

5.3 Preferred Option: Option 1 – Endorse the final Downstream Effects Management Plan (Attachment A)

5.3.1 Option Description: The final Downstream Effects Management Plan is the result of the methodology to assess the likely downstream effects of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.

5.3.2 The report notes the following:

- The modelling analysis indicates that the traffic impacts on Cranford Street south of Innes Road is anticipated to be immediate upon the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.
- A number of local streets are also expected to be affected by increased traffic volumes of more than 30% following the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.
- Given the uncertainty around these effects, based on land use estimates and expected driver behaviour, a key aspect is monitoring traffic volumes once the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens.
- Community feedback has followed a number of themes (further detail in Section 6):
  - Feedback on community impacts
  - Support for non-car transport
  - Specific plan related feedback
  - A proposed community plan
  - Working with strategic partners

5.3.3 The report recommends a prioritised work programme in three stages.

- Stage 1 – Works that need to be undertaken prior to the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor. These fall into two sub-stages:
  - Stage 1A - Work that must be completed to meet the Designation conditions of the Consent Order.
  - Stage 1B - Work that would be of benefit to the community to complete, but is not a requirement of the Designation conditions.
- Stage 2 – Monitoring the efficacy of Stage 1 implementation and undertaking additional works as required. Commencement, completion and implementation of identified studies. This will occur for up to three years following the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.
- Stage 3 – Implementation of works as required by monitoring and studies, until the end of the commissioning period.
- Some of the above projects in Stages 2 and 3 may be required by the Designation conditions. This will be identified by staff at the time that projects are identified to the Community Board and Council.

5.3.4 The proposed work programme for Stage 1 is summarised below (the complete programme is available as Attachment F):
Stage 1A - Recommendations required in order to meet the Designation conditions prior to the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor:

- Major Road Upgrades:
  - Cranford Street (Innes Street to Berwick Street) and Cranford Street/Sherbourne Street (Berwick Street to Bealey Ave), or
  - Berwick Street/Warrington Street to Forfar Street/Madras Street and Barbadoes Street.
- Intersection Upgrades:
  - Westminster Street/ Cranford Street, Berwick Street/ Cranford Street, Forfar Street/ Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street/ Warrington Street.
- Traffic Calming:
  - Mersey and Berwick Streets (Innes Road to Forfar Street), Knowles Street, Weston Road, McFaddens Road, Malvern Street (left in left out at Cranford St intersection) and Dee Street (left in left out at Cranford St intersection).
- Traffic Monitoring:
  - Traffic counts be collected at over 50 locations on main roads and local streets with a high potential for rat-running.

Stage 1B – Further recommendations to be carried out prior to the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor

- Environmental Monitoring:
  - Vehicle emission, noise, vibration impacts.
- Introduce nine 30km/h (or 40km/h) reduced speed limit areas through the downstream local road network.
- Interim improvements on Cranford Street to increase the safety of pedestrians crossing Cranford Street.
- Initiate the following studies:
  - Safe Access to Schools across Cranford Street.
  - Safe Cycling Routes including: Cycle Wayfinding Signage, McFaddens Road Secondary Cycle Corridor, Westminster/ Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor.

5.3.5 Option Advantages

- The final Downstream Effects Management Plan is in accordance with the conditions of the Notice of Requirement, in particular condition 26 and Appendix A of the Environment Court Consent Order.
- The final Downstream Effects Management Plan seeks to balance the needs of local communities with safety and accessibility considerations, while ensuring an accessible city for Christchurch residents, businesses and visitors through:
  - Assisting with traffic congestion relief and encourages vehicles to remain on preferred routes (arterials) and away from residential roads and community facilities (including schools).
  - Improve/retain amenity in residential streets.
- Provide public transport benefits through reliable journey times.
- Encouraging modal shift away from single occupancy journeys.
- Improving access to schools, parks and commercial areas.
- Introduction of cycle routes through local roads.

- The proposed projects form an integral part of a wider work package to manage the volume of traffic travelling into Christchurch from the north. This includes the development and implementation of travel demand measures to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips, such as a high occupancy vehicle lane and park and ride/rapid bus services.
- Provides a prioritised programme of monitoring and implementation projects to mitigate the effects of increased traffic from the operation of the Christchurch Northern Corridor. Some of these will be implemented before opening in 2020.

5.3.6 Option Disadvantages

- The recommendations have financial implications that have been allowed for in the Long Term Plan 2018-2028.
- The development of work packages and monitoring requirements will result in a staged approach to the delivery of solutions for the community. This will need to be reviewed regularly to ensure that it addresses the needs of the community.
- Monitoring of traffic volumes on local streets may result in a delay to implementing interventions to prevent rat-running traffic. The use of regular monitoring and assessments against baseline counts will improve the ease of decision making and speed of implementation.
- Community concern has been raised over the number of single occupancy vehicle trips that will travel through the local community following the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor. This is being addressed through the Northern Travel Demand Management package and other projects across Council and the New Zealand Transport Agency.
- Detailed responses to the submissions are outlined in the table after section 6.11 of this report.

5.4 Option 2 – Do not endorse the final Downstream Effects Management Plan

5.4.1 Option Description: This option is to not endorse the final Downstream Effects Management Plan (Attachment A) or proceed with the prioritised work programme identified in Section 5.3.3.

5.4.2 This option has significant impacts on the ability of New Zealand Transport Agency and Council to effectively operate and obtain the benefits from the Northern Arterial, Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade, as detailed in Sections 6 and 7 of this report. The Northern Arterial could open between Chaney’s Corner and Queen Elizabeth II Drive as it is not a party to the Consent Order as this section of the Christchurch Northern Corridor is owned by the New Zealand Transport Agency.

5.4.3 However, according to Section 7 of this report, if Council wishes to comply with the Designation condition, then withholding approval of the final Downstream Effects Management Plan would mean Council cannot open the Northern Arterial Extension to public traffic.
5.4.4 The resulting impact on the road network would be that all Northern Arterial traffic would have to exit at the Queen Elizabeth II interchange, which is not designed to accommodate these traffic volumes. This would likely lead to severe traffic congestion due to rerouting traffic along Queen Elizabeth II Drive, Main North Road-Papanui Road Corridor, Marshland Road Corridor and Innes Road Corridor and filtering through the local road network.

5.4.5 Public transport and cycling routes would also be affected due to the impacts associated with increased traffic flows on these routes.

5.4.6 **Option Advantages**
- The funding allocated in the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 to construct the recommendations in the Downstream Effects Management Plan could be reallocated to other projects.

5.4.7 **Option Disadvantages**
- The main disadvantage of this option is that Council will not fulfil its statutory obligations. This is detailed in Section 7 under legal obligations.
- Furthermore, there is potential for enforcement action due to a breach of Designation conditions.
- The Northern Arterial Extension section of the Christchurch Northern Corridor could not open, leading to:
  - Increased congestion on the road network.
  - Negative impact on Public Transport journey times and reliability.

**Analysis Criteria**

5.5 The Designation conditions require Council to produce a Downstream Effects Management Plan and sets out how this should be delivered. It specifies that an Independent Expert be engaged to provide a methodology to assess the impact of the Christchurch Northern Corridor on the local network. It also requires Council to have completed this Plan prior to opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor. If Council fails to fulfil this requirement then it cannot operate the Northern Arterial Extension. Council have already begun construction of the Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade, due to be completed mid-2020. The preferred option allows Council to legally operate the Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade.

**Options Considerations**

5.6 Endorsing the attached Downstream Effects Management Plan fulfils Council’s statutory obligations under the Resource Management Act and allows Council to open the Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade.

6. **Community Views and Preferences**

6.1 In May 2018 engagement was undertaken with an information document seeking early community feedback to inform the draft Downstream Effects Management Plan. This was sent to approximately 12,000 properties.

6.2 As a result of this engagement Council staff received 408 submissions including a “Change.org” petition signed by over 2,000 people (Attachment D). The results from this engagement were reported to the Community Board in January 2019 and then Council in
February 2019. The feedback received was considered and helped inform the draft
Downstream Effects Management Plan.

6.3 Comment was then sought on the draft Downstream Effects Management Plan between

6.4 Council Staff delivered the consultation document to 6350 properties and posted to 1880
absentee landowners. An email was sent to 101 key stakeholders and all submitters from the
previous engagement in 2018 were also advised we were now seeking feedback on the draft
Downstream Effects Management Plan.

6.5 Information was available on the Have Your Say web site, Council Staff ran a Newsline story
and three Facebook posts were shared with the St Albans Community Group. The Facebook
posts generated very little engagement. However, we had 1823 views on our Have Your Say
web page and 185 views on the Newsline article.

6.6 Council Staff held four drop in sessions for the community to discuss the draft Downstream
Effects Management Plan and ask any questions of the project team prior to providing their
feedback. Representatives of the St Albans Residents Association also set up an information
stand at these sessions and spoke to the residents about the Community Plan. Overall these
sessions were attended by approximately 60 people.

6.7 A joint meeting of the Papanui-Innes and Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Boards was
held on Wednesday 8 May 2019 for submitters to speak to elected members regarding their
submission prior to the final Downstream Effects Management Plan being prepared.

6.8 At the close of consultation we received 227 submissions. A full analysis of these submissions
forms Attachment E.

6.9 All submitters have been advised the outcome of the consultation, with links to the
consultation analysis, and details of the Community Board and Council meetings.

Summary of matters raised as a result of community engagement:

6.10 Issues raised during consultation can generally be sorted into three groups:

6.10.1 Key transport issues that need to be considered and have solutions implemented prior
to the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor, these include:
  - Interventions that are required to be completed to meet the requirements of the
    Designation conditions.
  - Interventions that would be of benefit to the community but are not a requirement
    of the Designation conditions.

6.10.2 Transport issues that require monitoring and will be implemented when required. Many
of the issues raised by the community (especially site-specific issues) fall into this
category.

6.10.3 Local transport issues that would have occurred despite the Christchurch Northern
Corridor opening (e.g. outside the study area or as a result of baseline traffic growth).

6.11 The Table below summarises the matters raised as a result of consultation and the
Independent Traffic Expert’s responses to those issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Strong emphasis on reducing single occupancy vehicle trips</td>
<td>- The Downstream Effects Management Plan recommends that Council should investigate adding additional peak hour capacity to the main...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and overall number of vehicle trips from the north traveling through St Albans.

- arterial roads south of Innes Road to reduce rat-running through local road network.
- This additional capacity could include additional lanes at traffic signals, peak hour tidal clearways and clearways that are restricted to buses and other high occupancy vehicles.
- However, High Occupancy Vehicle lanes will not increase the capacity of general traffic on main arterial roads and can lead to:
  - Rat-running on local streets.
  - Vehicles diverting to Main North/Papanui Road and Rutland Street, which are principal bus and cycling corridors.

B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More emphasis needs to go on getting people onto buses (public transport) rather than using private motor-vehicles. Request for 24-7 bus lanes on Cranford Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Downstream Effects Management Plan supports wider Travel Demand Management measures.
- Traffic analysis completed as part of the report shows the Christchurch Northern Corridor along with proposed peak hour clearways will likely reduce traffic levels on Main North Road/Papanui Road Corridor and supports public transport improvements.
- Through monitoring, the proposed clearway can be adjusted as a managed lane to encourage more car sharing per vehicle (High Occupancy Vehicles) along with express buses and eventually this managed lane could be re-designated as a bus lane.
- There are concerns that the immediate installation of permanent bus lanes on Cranford Street will:
  - Push traffic back onto Main North Road and Rutland Street impacting on safe and efficient bus and cycle usage of these routes.
  - Lead to increased rat-running on local streets in St Albans.
  - Result in the permanent removal of on-street parking.
- The negative impacts associated with bus lanes would be considerably greater than with High Occupancy Vehicle lanes.
- Compare to permanent bus lanes on Cranford Street, the managed lane allows a flexibility to timely implement other Travel Demand Management measures and encourage mode shift.

C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport partners (e.g. Christchurch City Council and New Zealand Transport Agency) need to do work together to change travel behaviour (e.g. looking at parking controls in Central City and allocating road space to buses). The focus should be on moving people not vehicles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Since September 2018, a Programme Steering Group comprising members from Christchurch City Council, New Zealand Transport Agency, Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council has been established to lead the following key studies along the Northern Corridor:
  - Christchurch Northern Corridor High Occupancy Vehicle Lane Business Case (New Zealand Transport Agency lead).
  - Travel Demand Management (Northern Package) Study (New Zealand Transport Agency lead).
  - Downstream Effects Management Plan (Christchurch City Council lead).

- Measures that are being investigated include:
  - A peak-hour southbound High Occupancy Vehicle lane on the Christchurch Northern Corridor.
  - Interim Park ‘n Ride sites in Kaiapoi and Rangiora.
  - Investigations into measures which incentivise greater use of High Occupancy Vehicle lane such as parking incentives.
  - New express bus service between Rangiora, Kaiapoi and the central city along the new High Occupancy Vehicle lane.
  - A marketing and promotional campaign to raise the awareness and understanding of the High Occupancy Vehicle lane and the improved public transport offering.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Not enough measures around walking, cycling and public transport to be introduced before the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens. Most of the changes appear to come later after traffic volumes have increased and should be in place before Christchurch Northern Corridor opens (Stage 1 improvements).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>The Stage 1 proposals improve safety and access for these modes. For example:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The implementation of a High Occupancy Vehicle lane will assist less congestion on public transport and MCR (Major Cycle Route) Corridors which will ultimately improve safety, journey times and trip reliability for buses and cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The traffic signals at Warrington/Forfar Streets and Warrington/Barbadoes Streets intersections will improve access and safety for pedestrians and cyclists crossing Warrington Street and using St Albans Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Signage and marking of an alternative north-south cycling route through quiet local streets to the east of Cranford Street. This could be done relatively quickly and be in place before the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Confusion around the type of cycling facilities to be installed as part of secondary cycle routes network. Are they to be separated cycle lanes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>The Downstream Effects Management Plan recommends the installation of secondary cycleways.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- It is not recommended these cycleways will not include separators like those provided on the Major Cycle Routes (e.g. Papanui Parallel). These cycleways will consist of painted cycle lanes and bicycle greenways (i.e. use of quiet streets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Proposed cycleways will be consulted on with the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Lack of safe cycling facilities on Cranford/Sherborne Streets during Clearway operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>The Downstream Effects Management Plan encourages Council to investigate how a consistent level of service throughout the Cranford Street Corridor can be provided to cyclists during clearway operation.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Downstream Effects Management Plan includes a number of recommendations to encourage cyclists away from the Cranford/Sherborne Street Corridor and onto the Papanui Parallel and other quieter routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Concerns around staging of traffic calming on various streets and concerns on the time it might take to implement measures to address rat-running that does occur after the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>The Downstream Effects Management Plan recommends that Council should carry out vehicle monitoring before the Christchurch Northern Corridor is opened.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vehicle monitoring will be collected to establish baseline data which will be used:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To confirm the validity of the traffic modelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- As part of the ongoing monitoring of each street in relation to the impact of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>The Downstream Effects Management Plan allows Council to implement traffic calming on streets that have not been identified in the plan that have been found to have 30% plus increase in traffic compared with pre Christchurch Northern Corridor.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>The Downstream Effects Management Plan recommends that Council should look to implement improvements as early as possible on streets with a 30% plus increase compared with pre Christchurch Northern Corridor.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.: 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment 1 - Original Staff Report Item 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board and Papanui-Innes Community Board</strong></td>
<td><strong>31 May 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn movements during clearway operation (e.g. into new play-centres on Cranford Street) will impact on capacity of two-lane clearway operation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Temporary measures (or rapid implementation measures) are an option to reduce rat-running on some streets, especially if the effects are well over 30%. For example, use of temporary islands and hit posts to ban some turning movements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns around peak period prohibition of car parking for clearways on roads with high kerbside parking demand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Right turns on the proposed clearways can reduce the capacity of the road, however it has limited effect on the capacity of the road if opposing flow (non-peak direction) is low as the right turning vehicle can make this manoeuvre quickly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The recommendations in the Downstream Effects Management Plan propose:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Right turning restrictions at side-roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The provision of right turn bays at most traffic signals allowing traffic to turn right safely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why the Downstream Effects Management Plan does not consider the downstream effects of Christchurch Northern Corridor on Innes Road and McFaddens/Mays/Normans corridors, given Innes Road is already heavily congested in peak periods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The traffic analysis completed as part of the Downstream Effects Management Plan indicates that traffic levels on Innes Road will not be affected due to the Christchurch Northern Corridor and is not considered as part of the study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Congestion can be addressed as part of the operational or capital improvements through the Council’s Long Term Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will there be monitoring of air, noise and vibration from traffic before and after the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Council will monitor air, noise and vibration before the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens to establish baselines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It also recommends that Council monitors annually or biennially so that any impacts of the additional traffic can be assessed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The recommended locations to carry out this monitoring are at:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cranford Street north of McFaddens Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cranford Street north of Berwick Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Berwick Street immediately east of Cranford Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Madras Street north of Edgeware Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Barbadoes Street north of Edgeware Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns around pedestrian safety of children in the proximity of schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Downstream Effects Management Plan has identified pedestrian safety concerns on Cranford Street between the Westminster and Berwick Street intersections. It recommends Council to improve both intersections considering pedestrian safety. It also recommends to monitor and investigate additional signalised crossing facility on Cranford Street, if required in front of the English Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Downstream Effects Management Plan also suggests to lower the speed limit on Cranford Street at school peak hours to further improve pedestrian safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is currently proposed that these measures will be implemented as part of a package of works on Cranford Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests to install tolls on the Waimakariri Bridge (SH1) to reduce number of cars travelling into Christchurch (as a traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tolls:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Current New Zealand legislation does not permit existing roads to be tolled. Tolls can only be applied to new roads where suitable alternative routes are available. This option was not investigated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as part of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and is not part of the existing Designation conditions.

- Changes would be required to the Designation conditions and associated conditions for the Northern Arterial, Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade.

- If Council were to implement tolling on the Northern Arterial Extension, then the alternative available transport route would be through the Christchurch Northern Corridor /Queen Elisabeth II Drive interchange. This interchange has not been designed to cater for the likely additional traffic and will require significant changes which is not part of the existing Alliance design.

- Additionally, the likely re-routing will significant impact the operation of Main North Road and Cranford Street north of the roundabout.

- Congestion Charging:
  - Similar to the road tolling option, Congestion Charging has not been investigated as part of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and does not form part of the existing Designation conditions.
  - Best practice recommends the following factors to be investigated prior to making a decision on congestion charging –
    - Political position.
    - Well planned public relations campaigns.
    - Single empowered agency.
    - Public recognition of need.
    - Ring fencing of revenues.
    - Proven technology.
    - Lengthy development.
    - Clear business case.

- This option is not currently considered as part of the northern package Travel Demand Management study that was recently completed by the New Zealand Transport Agency.

- While implementation of such a measure will require ministerial and wider public approval, there is limited information to evaluate the likely impact of such a significant Travel Demand Management measure.

### Table 1: Matter raised during engagement and the Independent Traffic Expert’s response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Legal Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 There is legal context, issues and implications relevant to this decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 This report has been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Condition 26 of the Northern Arterial and Cranford Street Upgrade Designation (RMA92024074) states:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> “Prior to operating the Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade (NAE/CSU) authorised by this designation Christchurch City Council shall implement the Downstream Effects and Property Amenity Traffic Management Plan [Management Plan] contained in Appendix A to these conditions to address any downstream effects relating to traffic arising from the operation of the NAE/CSU.” |

| 7.4 Appendix A of the Designation conditions contains the Management Plan. Under Section 2 of the Management Plan, Council must appoint an independent traffic expert to investigate and design an appropriate methodology to identify the potential impacts (if any) of traffic effects on those streets at the end of the Christchurch Northern Corridor which may potentially be |
affected as a result of the operation of the Northern Arterial and Cranford Street Upgrade. This includes identifying potentially affected streets; the use of modelling to identify future increases in traffic caused by or attributable to, the operation of the Northern Arterial and Cranford Street Upgrade; and, consider the effects arising from growth in traffic flows on potentially affected streets.

7.5 After the traffic expert has carried out their investigation, Clause 2.2(e) of the Management Plan states that, where an increase in traffic-related effects within potentially adversely affected streets is caused by or contributed to by the Northern Arterial and Cranford Street Upgrade, the independent traffic expert must recommend appropriate mitigation measures to Council and, where required, the local Community Board (where that Board holds the requisite delegation for any works required) as soon as practicable, and institute monitoring procedures to verify the outcome of the mitigation measures.

7.6 The recommendations made to Council must include appropriate remedial steps to be taken to avoid, remedy or mitigate any increase in adverse traffic-related effects where such effects are more than minor. These remedial steps may include a programmed series of measures to be delivered over time, with the intention that any recommended remedial steps must be undertaken as soon as reasonably practicable after that recommendation is made. All remedial steps must be completed within 10 years of the road opening (the Commissioning Period).

7.7 The Downstream Effects Management Plan – Report and Recommendations prepared by the independent traffic expert appointed by Council, Dr Shane Turner (Dr Turner), has been done in accordance with the Management Plan as outlined above. Modelling has been carried out, potentially affected streets have been identified and recommendations have been made to avoid, remedy or mitigate any increase in adverse traffic-related effects.

7.8 Section 4 of the Management Plan contained in the Designation conditions sets the traffic level at which Council must implement the recommendations made by Dr Turner in the Downstream Effects Management Plan – Report and Recommendations. Clause 4.1 states:

“If the independent traffic expert determines that the increase in traffic to be experienced prior to the expiry of the Commissioning Period that is caused by or attributable to the operation of the NAE/CSU, is likely to raise or has raised the level of vehicle movements on any of the potentially affected streets by more than 30 per cent above the traffic level that would have occurred without the operation of the NAE/CSU then measures to improve the operation of Cranford Street and Sherbourne Street and/or calming work will be undertaken by the Council as recommended.”

[Emphasis added]

7.9 The modelling and investigations conducted by Dr Turner as part of the Downstream Effects Management Plan – Report and Recommendations indicates the threshold of more than 30 per cent will likely be triggered as soon as the Christchurch Northern Corridor is opened. In accordance with the Management Plan, Dr Turner has made recommendations to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects in Stage 1A of his Downstream Effects Management Plan – Report and Recommendations.

7.10 The other recommendations made in the Downstream Effects Management Plan – Report and Recommendations are part of the programmed approach and Section 4 of the Management Plan does not require those works to be carried out at this time.

7.11 To comply with its obligations under the Designation conditions, Council must undertake the Stage 1A recommendations in the Downstream Effects Management Plan – Report and
Recommendations as soon as reasonably practicable to ensure any effects of traffic increases remain at an acceptable level. Council will be in breach of Condition 26 of the Designation conditions if it does not adopt (and carry out) the Stage 1A recommendations in Dr Turner’s Downstream Effects Management Plan – Report and Recommendations to mitigate the more than 30% increase in traffic on the affected streets.

7.12 The timeframe within which the Council must undertake any of the recommended remedial steps is “as soon as reasonably practicable”. In this context, this will be as soon as possible allowing for some delays to implement design, contractual and other matters required to allow the physical works to be undertaken. Council staff have advised that, if Council adopts the Stage 1A recommendations now (which on an as soon as reasonably practicable basis would be consistent with the Designation conditions/Management Plan requirements), then the mitigation measures can be implemented immediately with completion prior to the road opening.

7.13 Failing to comply with Appendix A is a breach of Condition 26 of the Designation. A breach of the Designation conditions exposes Council to the risk of enforcement action. Enforcement action could include some form of abatement or enforcement order under the Resource Management Act 1991. Penalties could also be imposed, which could be financial and/or prosecution.

7.14 There are both legal and reputational risks if Council breaches its obligations under the Designation condition and enforcement action is taken against it. Any enforcement action would likely result from complaints being made by members of the public in the Christchurch area to this Council as the local authority. Any enforcement action required to be taken would be this Council in its capacity as the local authority (and therefore the enforcement body) against this Council in its capacity as the designation authority. As well as this potential enforcement action, New Zealand Transport Agency may also choose to take some form of enforcement action against this Council, who is a party to this roading project and is contractually obligated to complete the project.

7.15 If Council did not adopt the Stage 1A recommendations under the Downstream Effects Management Plan – Report and Recommendations there are two options available to Council to achieve compliance with the conditions of the Designation.

7.16 The first option is to not operate the Northern Arterial and Cranford Street Upgrade. Cranford Street is an existing road so this could operate as it currently operates. However, using any of the additional lanes or services that form part of the upgrade is likely to be considered as operating the Cranford Street Upgrade.

7.17 Not operating the Northern Arterial and Cranford Street Upgrade would expose Council to serious risk in terms of its contractual and legal obligations under the Christchurch Northern Corridor Alliance and any other contractual obligations it has entered into.

7.18 Council is party to a number of contracts with New Zealand Transport Agency in relation to the governance, funding and construction of the Northern Arterial Extension. As defined in the contracts, the Northern Arterial Extension includes the Cranford Street Upgrade. Under the Multi-Party Funding Agreement Council records that it has agreed to “deliver the construction of the NAE… including obtaining the Required Approvals and the Required Land to enable construction and operation of the NAE as a local road”.

7.19 A failure to open and operate the road could therefore expose Council to a claim for fundamental breach of contract not only by New Zealand Transport Agency, but by express extension under the contracts, the other Alliance participants. By way of remedy, the New
Zealand Transport Agency (or another of the Alliance participants) could pursue the Council for an award of damages or an order for specific performance. Council also risks significant reputational damage with key stakeholders for breaching these contracts and failing to do what it has represented it will do.

7.20 Another issue is that a decision by Council not to operate the Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade does not affect New Zealand Transport Agency operating the Northern Arterial. New Zealand Transport Agency will likely be in breach of its obligations under the Christchurch Northern Corridor Alliance and other contractual arrangements if it does not operate the Northern Arterial, so it is likely to begin operation of the Northern Arterial mid-2020, which will push traffic onto Queen Elizabeth II Drive.

7.21 The second option if Council did not wish to adopt the recommendations set out in Stage 1A of the Downstream Effects Management Plan – Report and Recommendations would be to make an application under Section 181 of the Resource Management Act 1991 to delete or vary Condition 26 (and any other associated conditions) of the Designation. Lodging such an application would not legalise the use of the road, the road would still need to remain closed until all matters concerning the change of the condition application were resolved (including appeal periods and appeal processes).

7.22 Any application made to change the Designation condition(s) that proposed changes that reduced the requirement for mitigation measures to address the downstream effects, or left the effects unaddressed, may not be successful. Clauses 1.2 and 1.3 of the Management Plan record that, during the hearing for the Designation, expert reports identified potential adverse effects on residences and businesses in the immediate area around the southern end of the CSU. This was the reason for condition 26 being included in the Designation conditions. The Management Plan was proffered by Council (as designation authority) at the hearing and then finalised with the input of the relevant party’s traffic experts.

7.23 Council cannot mitigate the adverse effects identified without dealing with downstream effects in some way. As a result, there is a risk that any application to change the designation condition or Appendix A would be declined or, Council would be left with a new condition and/or Management Plan which has similar (or even more onerous) requirements and/or obligations to the existing Designation condition and Management Plan.

8. Risks

8.1 Therefore, according to Section 7 of this report, the following key risks have been identified by Council Staff if Council does not endorse the Downstream Effects Management Plan:

8.1.1 Christchurch City Council will not be able to open the Northern Arterial Extension to public traffic as outlined in Section 7 of this report.

8.1.2 The resulting impact on the road network is that all Northern Arterial traffic would have to exit at the Queen Elizabeth II interchange which is not currently designed to accommodate these traffic volumes. This would likely lead to severe traffic congestion due to rerouting traffic along Queen Elizabeth II Drive, Main North Road-Papanui Road Corridor, Marshland Road Corridor and Innes Road Corridor and filtering through the local road network.

8.1.3 The Cranford Street Upgrade may have to be closed between Cranford Street/Main North Road and Cranford Street/Innes Road.

8.2 Other potential risks include:
8.2.1 Possible contractual penalties could be applied if Council did not comply with the contractual obligations for the Christchurch Northern Corridor.

8.2.2 Option 2 will likely impact the relationship with the Greater Christchurch Partnership and undermine the success of delivering the Northern Package Travel Demand Management measures including the High Occupancy Vehicle lane along Christchurch Northern Corridor.

9. Next Steps

9.1 Council to consider the endorsement of the final Downstream Effects Management Plan.

9.2 Staff will undertake a programme of work to design, consult on and implement the work programme identified in Section 5.3.3.
## 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th><strong>Option 1</strong> – Endorse the Downstream Effects Management Plan <em>(Preferred Option)</em>.</th>
<th><strong>Option 2</strong> – Do not endorse the Downstream Effects Management Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Implement</td>
<td>• Preliminary estimate = approximately $10–15 million</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The financial implication of the projects will be reported at the time of implementing the work programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Ongoing</td>
<td>The proposed managed lane option will increase operational cost however it is envisage that the additional cost will be recovered through the enforcement measures.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>• ID#17088 RONS Downstream Intersection Improvements: Cranford Street Downstream</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ID#41976 Route Improvement: Barbadoes St &amp; Madras St (Bealey to Warrington)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Rates</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 1 - Climate Change Impacts</td>
<td>• Overall, the Downstream Effects Management Plan, with the other supporting TDM measures, encourages mode shift by supporting alternatives to single occupancy vehicle trips.</td>
<td>• Not endorsing the Downstream Effects Management Plan will not support the Northern Corridor Travel Demand Management measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Additionally the Downstream Effects Management Plan supports the Northern Corridor Travel Demand Management measures.</td>
<td>• As indicated by the traffic analysis the Christchurch Northern Corridor will likely increase traffic congestion on the arterial road network and traffic re-routing through residential areas. This situation will ultimately result in slow moving vehicles which will likely increase CO₂ emissions within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Downstream Effects Management Plan also:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supports journey time reliability for the Main North Road-Papanui Road Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transport corridor and Papanui Parallel Major Cycle Route.  
- Investigate a secondary cycle route on the eastern side of Cranford Street.  
- Proposes to use the healthy street framework on local streets.  
  - The traffic analysis confirmed that the Downstream Effects Management Plan will not induce any additional traffic on the network. |
| Criteria 2 - Central City regeneration |  
- The Downstream Effects Management Plan supports the Central City regeneration by providing reliable journey times for all modes especially during peak periods between the north of Christchurch and the City Centre. |
| Criteria 3 - Transport Congestion |  
- The Downstream Effects Management Plan proposes interventions to reduce traffic re-routing through the local residential areas and other key Public Transport and Major Cycle Route corridors.  
- Overall it improves network capacity for all modes.  
  - Traffic analysis confirmed significant traffic congestion along Cranford Street Corridor and its surrounding residential areas. |
| Criteria 4 - Impact on partnership relationship |  
- Supports the Christchurch Northern Corridor and Northern Corridor Travel Demand Management Measures.  
  - Significant – as this option will likely undermine the success of delivering the Northern Package Travel Demand Management measures including High Occupancy Vehicle lane along Christchurch Northern Corridor. |
| Criteria 5 - Timing |  
- Delay in approving the Plan will create significant pressure to deliver the recommendations as proposed within the Plan.  
  - Nil |

**Statutory Criteria**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 - (Preferred Option)</th>
<th>Option 2 -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Mana Whenua</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Council Plans &amp; Policies</td>
<td>• The proposal is aligned with Council Plans and Policies</td>
<td>• Negative impact on Council’s Plans and Policies, as it adversely affects the journey time reliability of Public Transport and Active Transport corridors which could discourage mode shift.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

Introduction

This Report recommends a programme of work to reduce the downstream traffic effects of the Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC). It has been compiled in accordance with the northern Arterial and Cranford Street Upgrade Designation for the CNC for an independent traffic expert to investigate and design an appropriate methodology to identify the potential impacts (if any) of those streets at the end of the CNC which may be potentially affected as a result of the operation of the NAE/GSU (CNC) (the Report). Where possible, it has been formulated to be consistent with national, regional, and local transport policy and to address transport concerns raised by stakeholders and the public during consultation. To minimise the impact of improvements on private land, the Report has focused as far as possible on remedial treatments that can occur within the existing road reserve.

The Report supports further travel demand management initiatives in northern Christchurch and beyond, to reduce the volume of vehicles with single occupants entering the urban road network. To discourage single occupancy vehicles, the report recommends that Council investigate whether much of the additional road capacity added to arterials roads (e.g. the peak period clearways) can be restricted to high occupancy vehicles (HOV), including buses only when first opened. The use of HOV lanes better aligns with the community who want a reduction in vehicles and more people on buses through St Albans.

Issue Identification

As specified in the designation conditions, key objectives of the Report are to identify the preferred vehicle access routes for the additional traffic from the CNC, including trucks, that will occur on the downstream road network. To manage this traffic so that it uses the preferred routes and mitigate where possible adverse effects of the increase in traffic resulting from the operation of the CNC, especially on local streets. A transport model has been used to assess the routes drivers are likely to take travelling from the CNC into the city centre in 2021 (opening year) and 2031 (design year).

This modelling indicates that the preferred traffic routes, the arterials and collector streets, do not have adequate capacity to accommodate all the additional traffic (including trucks) and, without intervention, there would be a lot of rat-running traffic in local streets. The designation conditions specify that when the rat-running traffic volumes on these local streets are greater than 30% above what would have been expected had the CNC not been built, then intervention is required to avoid, remedy, or mitigate these effects. The modelling shows that many local streets trigger this greater than 30% increase, especially in 2031, if there is no mitigation measures taken.

Whether on the main routes or local streets, the additional traffic from the CNC will adversely impact other road users, and specifically pedestrians and cyclists that use the roads affected. Of particular concern is how this traffic will impact on safety and access of less able pedestrians, such as school children, elderly, and those with a disability. The additional traffic will in some cases impact on local residents’ ability to safely access various community facilities (e.g. schools, parks, and commercial centres) and their own properties by walking, cycling, and driving/parking. The Report has considered how these impacts might be avoided, remedied, or mitigated. In most cases localised studies have been recommended to look at these matters and develop suitable interventions.

Option Development

Based on an understanding of the likely transport impacts of the additional CNC traffic, two option development stages were undertaken. The first stage of the option development focused on options that would encourage the additional vehicles from the CNC to primarily use arterial and collector routes, and not use local streets. The second stage then considers how the increased safety and access requirements of different road users can be improved on streets with additional traffic flows.
Stage 1: Major Route and Traffic Calming Upgrades

During the first stage of option development both arterial/collector upgrades and traffic calming options were developed to keep the extra traffic from the CNC on the main routes. In the first assessment the independent expert considered either arterial/collector upgrades or traffic calming measures on their own. Several options were developed that looked at a combination of arterial upgrades (e.g. peak period clearways) and traffic calming measures were considered. The arterial/collector road improvements were developed to address capacity constraints that were identified along these routes; both midblock and at intersections, using local experience and the transport modelling. The traffic calming measures were developed for local streets that are expected to have a significant amount of rat-running traffic (defined as greater than 30% increase in traffic) with or without arterial/collector upgrades. The full list of major upgrade options considered in the modelling are presented below.

Table 1-1 Major route and traffic calming upgrades

- Do Nothing – this results in rat-running on a lot of local streets
- Option 1. Traffic Calming Only
  - Option 2. Arterial Upgrades Only. This included three-laning of Barbadoes Street and Madras (Forfar) Street, Cranford Street Clearways and Berwick Street / Warrington Street capacity improvements
- Option 3 (a). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades. Arterial upgrades as per Option 2 except clearways on Barbadoes Street and Madras (Forfar) Street instead of permanent three-laning
- Option 3 (b). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades. Arterial upgrades as per Option 2, so permanent three-laning of Barbadoes and Madras (Forfar) Streets
- Option 3 (c). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades. Arterial upgrades as per Option 2 except extension of Barbadoes / Madras one-ways to Warrington Street.
- Option 4 (a). Traffic Calming and Clearways on Cranford / Sherborne Streets from Innes Road to Bealey Avenue
- Option 4 (b) Traffic Calming and permanent four-laning on Cranford / Sherborne Street (option included to allow comparison of options with a more major upgrade of arterial roads)
- Option 5. Traffic Calming plus combined Arterial Options (Options 3(a) and 4(a))

The analysis of these options was undertaken using the CAST (Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic) transport model. This model indicated how successful the options were in keeping traffic on the main routes and discouraging rat-running in local streets.

A multi-criteria analysis (MCA) workshop was then undertaken of each option to determine the best performing options. This involved a number of transport specialists and an urban designer. The MCA looked at a number of factors, including impact on safety of different road users, whether the options met the objectives of the Designation, journey time benefits, timeframe to implement, construction costs, impacts on local businesses, social and amenity impacts, and environment impacts. The workshop participants, including the independent traffic expert, agreed the criterion and the weighting of each criteria and discussed and assessed the various options. The highest weighting went on community impacts (the last three criteria above). Journey time benefits only had a 10% weighting. The best performing options in order were 3 (c), 4(a) and 3 (a).

All three options have very similar upgrades on Cranford Street north of Berwick Street and along Berwick Street and Warrington Streets. They differ in the improvements south of Berwick Street on Cranford/Sherborne Streets, Forfar/Madras Streets and Barbadoes Street. Hence the Report recommends that the improvements along Berwick and Warrington Streets and Cranford Street north are progressed to scheme design and the three options south of Berwick Street are further investigated and presented to the community for input before deciding on a preferred southern option (see Table 1 below).
The arterial upgrades include adding peak period clearways. While the modelling assumed that these clearways would be for all vehicles, our preference is that the clearways are high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes giving priority access to buses and vehicles with more than one occupant, as this better aligns with the national and local transport strategies and the feedback from the public during consultation.

While some submitters to the Report have requested that any additional capacity (be it clearways or permanent four-laning) be bus lanes, the relatively low bus volumes on Cranford Street, even if express buses to the Waimakariri District where to be added, would in our view cause severe congestion on this route. This would result in an increase in rat-running on local streets and diversion of traffic back onto Main North Road which is undesirable given it is the preferred bus corridor to northern Christchurch. With HOV lanes commuters would have additional options to the bus through carpooling which would reduce the number of vehicles entering Cranford Street, which is desirable.

In the future if further TDM measures (e.g. parking restrictions in CBD and other employment hubs) are successfully implemented and bus patronage levels to the Waimakariri District and northern Christchurch increase then these clearways could be converted to bus lanes and even the hours of operation of the clearways could be extended, after further consultation with the local community. While the independent expert has a preference for HOV clearways over general traffic clearways, further investigation (including modelling) is required to assess the impacts of HOV lanes on rat running and wider network impacts. This further work and a decision on the operation of the clearways needs to be undertaken and implemented before the CNC opens.

In addition to infrastructure changes, education, and enforcement aspects of the improvements, especially the peak period clearways, needs to be investigated and implemented.

A list of routes that are expected to require traffic calming has also been developed, based on the transport modelling. Careful monitoring of traffic volumes on local streets is required before the CNC is opened to assess the benefits of traffic calming measures and any streets that are adversely impacted by rat-running traffic as a result of drivers selecting alternative rat-running routes. Nine safe speed community areas are also proposed in the wider St Albans network to discourage rat-running.

Stage 2: Safe Access to Community Facilities

During the second option development phase, the impacts the additional traffic would have on all road users was considered, specifically those who live in or near the impacted road network and their ability to safely access various destinations within the local road network. The project has been split up into:

1. Safe access to School
2. Safer Cycling
3. Access to Parks
4. Access to Commercial Centres

Most of the issues raised by the public and stakeholders fit into one of these categories. One specific matter that does not is safe access into properties on arterial and collector roads with peak period clearways, like Cranford Street. The identification of issues with access and possible solutions to improve access will need to be assessed as part of the implementation of the clearways.

The key issues in terms of safe access to schools is access across Cranford Street for children walking to and from St Albans School. The children primarily use the Cranford Street /Westminster Street signalised intersection to access the school, but some also use the Berwick Street/Cranford Street signalised intersection. Due to several close (crash) misses, the school currently employs a cross warden at the Cranford Street /Westminster Street intersection to help children cross the road. With the proposed upgrades of this intersection (also Berwick Street /Cranford Street) the potential for a crash will increase if no safety improvements are made. As an interim measure it is proposed to investigate a lower the speed limit to 40km/h from north of Westminster Street to south of Berwick Street during school start and finish times, install a textured surface at the Westminster Street intersection and look at changes to the signals before the CNC opens. Further improvements need to be investigated and implemented within 3 years of the CNC opening.
The introduction of peak period clearways along Cranford Street down to Berwick Street and possibly other clearways further south makes such routes less safe for cycling, especially during the peak periods. While not ideal, it is proposed to make the footpath along Cranford Street a shared path for those who live on this road or still choose to cycle along it during clearways operation. Given the shared path will have a lower standard than normally provided it is important that the route is subject to a safety audit, and that sight lines between vehicles at driveways and cyclists are maximised and that the cycle facilities at intersections are closely examined. It is also important that safety is monitored during the ten years after the CNC is opened. In addition to the vehicle versus cycle conflict, the cycle versus pedestrian (including scooter) conflict needs to be considered.

Our preference however is to direct cyclists onto other routes, like the Papanui Parallel. The general increase in traffic across the network will also make it less safe to cycle on a number of other roads (e.g. Edgeware Road) without improved cycle facilities. To encourage local people to cycle and to direct them to use the Papanui Parallel cycleway (a separated north-south cycle path) on Rutland Street, Trafalgar Street, and Colombo street, it is proposed to develop three east-west secondary cycle routes (along McFaddens Road, Westminster/ Courtenay Streets and Edgeware Road). These will be feeder routes to the Papanui Parallel and will be a combination of on-road cycle lanes and off-road paths. It is also proposed that a secondary north-south cycle route be provided on the eastern side of Cranford Street to link cyclists that have origins and destinations on the eastern side of the main route to the city centre and St Albans Park.

The additional traffic generated by the CNC will also increase traffic volumes around St Albans Park, and to a lesser degree around Malvern Park. The three main roads around St Albans Park; Barbadoes Street, Forfar Street and Warrington Street, will have increased traffic flows making it more difficult to access the Park. The proposed traffic signals at Forfar Street /Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street / Warrington Street and the proposed new north-south cycleway to the east of Cranford Street will improve access to the north of the park. However, there are still challenges for pedestrians wanting to cross Forfar Street and Barbadoes Street further south. There have been a number of vulnerable road user crashes at the northern end of Barbadoes Street and the additional traffic from the CNC will exacerbate existing access issues. Hence, a study is proposed to look at access and safety issues for St Albans Park (and Malvern Park) and develop options to make access safer.

Local residents also need to have safe access to their local (shopping and eating) commercial centres. Christchurch City Council are keen to see local centres become more vibrant and for locals to walk and cycle to these centres. Access to these centres by vehicle, along with parking, is also required for some trips, especially those made by less able-bodied residents. A neighbourhood improvement plan has already been developed for the Edgeware Village and so a new plan for that centre is not proposed, although improvement options for cycling and walking along Edgeware Road will need to be integrated into that plan. It is a requirement of the transport studies are undertaken for the four local activity centres impacted by the CNC traffic, the Westminster Street /Cranford Street, Warrington Street /Barbadoes Street, Edgeware Road /Barbadoes Street and Rutland Street activity centres. Corridor assessments, along Edgeware Road and Westminster/Courtenay Streets are also required to look at enhancing access and amenity for pedestrians of all abilities. The improvements that are required in these studies should be implemented to offset the access and safety consequences of the additional traffic.

The key outcomes that are desired from all the proposed studies and improvements is a network of roads that are safer and ‘healthier’, even with the increased traffic volumes. Hence it is important that all designs go through a road safety and healthy streets review in order to maximise the benefits of such improvements. With respect to safety, in addition to traditional safety audits, it is recommended that all designs are assessed using the Austroads safe system assessment framework which targets crash risk that could lead to serious injury and fatal crashes. To achieve healthier streets, it is recommended that all street upgrades are assessed using the Healthy Streets framework that has been developed by Transport for London.

The Downstream Effects Management Plan

Table 1-2 shows a summary of the studies and improvement options that are proposed to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the impacts of the CNC. This is based on analysis and review of the transport issues using modelling and experience.

Council are required to undertake ongoing monitoring of the transport flows (including pedestrian and cycle volumes), vehicles speeds, and environmental impacts (vehicle emissions, noise and vibration). Of particular importance will be how traffic flows through the downstream road network in the years following the opening of the CNC. While arterial and collector upgrades and traffic calming measures will be introduced to encourage drivers to use the major roads, it is
highly likely that some drivers will choose to use local streets as rat-runs, and that they may behave in ways not
predicted by the transport models. Hence the monitoring will identify issues that may require other changes to the road
network such as traffic calming of additional streets and upgrades of signalised intersections. The monitoring is expected
to have the greatest impact on the composition of the Stage 3 projects.

While ideally some of the Stage 2 projects are undertaken before the CNC opens, there is limited time to make all the
changes and hence the most crucial changes to prevent excessive congestion and rat-running have been prioritised in
Stage 1 (to be in place ideally before CNC opens), with other projects delayed. The impact of this maybe adverse
transport effects in the short-term. Hence it is important that Council act as soon as reasonably practicable to address
the worst of any adverse transport effects (e.g. high levels of rat-running) once the CNC opens. The independent expert
would recommend rapid implementation of projects, where this is practical, and other temporary measures to address
the effects that are identified in the monitoring.

Table 1-2 – Lists of improvement projects and studies categorised by stage
(note some projects appear in two or more stages as they consist of more detailed studies and the implementation of improvements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 – Projects and studies to be undertaken before the CNC opens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Road (MR) Upgrades:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR1 (Cranford Street Clearways) – Peak Period Clearways along Cranford Street from Innes Road to Berwick Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR2 (Westminster/Cranford Intersection) – Upgrades to Westminster Street/Cranford Street intersections, including pedestrian and bicycle access and safety measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR3 (Berwick/Warrington Upgrades) – Upgrading of Berwick Street/Cranford Street signalised intersection and signalisation of the Forfar Street/Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street intersections, including pedestrian and bicycle access and safety measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR4 (South Berwick Upgrades) – Option scoping study of potential improvements to arterial routes south of Berwick Street at intersections and along the mid-block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR5 (HOV lanes on Cranford-Sherborne) – Undertake investigation for extending the southern HOV (high occupancy vehicle) lanes on the CNC through to Bealey Avenue and investigate the potential for installing a northbound HOV lane. Based on these investigations implement any recommendations around HOV lanes before CNC opens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe System Community Areas (SSCA):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSCA 1 to 9 – Introduce nine 40km/h (or 30km/h) reduced speed limit areas through the downstream local road network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce traffic calming on TC1 – Mersey and Berwick Streets (Innes Road to Forfar Street), TC2 – Knowies Street, TC 3 – Weston Road, TC 4 – McFaddens Road, TC7 – Malvern Street (LILO) and TC8 – Dee Street (LILO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Access to Schools (AS):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS1 – Safe Access Across Cranford Street – Commence a study that will look at a range of options, including upgrades at the Berwick/ Cranford and Westminster/ Cranford intersections and a new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AS2 – Interim Improvements on Cranford Street – As an interim measure it is suggested that as part of MR1 (Cranford Clearways) and MR2 (Westminster/Cranford Intersection) a 40km/h speed limit be introduced during school arrival and departure time on Cranford Street from approximately 50m north of Westminster Street to 50m south of Berwick Street, a coloured surfacing be installed at the Westminster/Cranford Intersection, and left and right turning
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red arrows be used as protection for crossing pedestrians. These options and others to be investigated in ASI, MRI and MRR.

**Safe Cycling Routes (SC):**

**SC1 (Cycle Wayfinding Signage)** – Development of and implementation of a wayfinding signage plan that directs cyclists at the northern end of Cranford Street (at McFaddens Road) and southern end of Cranford Street to safer cycling routes on adjoining streets (e.g. Papanui Parallel and other quiet local streets).

**SC2 (McFaddens Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Commence a route study of a cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road.

**SC3 (Westminster/Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Commence a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

**SC4 (Edgeware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Commence a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

**SC5 (North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Commence a route study of an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street. Use the MCA and SANF process to select the preferred route.

Any quick-wins projects (e.g. - signage and marking improvements) in SC2 to SC5 are to be identified and implemented where possible before the CNC opens. Studies will commence in Stage 1 and be completed early on in Stage 2.

**Monitoring** collections of baseline data on traffic, pedestrian and cycle volumes, vehicle speeds and environmental effects (emissions, noise and vibration) on key routes.

**Stage 2 – Projects and Studies that need to be undertaken within three years of CNC opening**

**Monitoring**

All key local routes that are expected to be impacted by rat-running traffic (or for which there have been a number of public complaints about rat-running) will have traffic counts undertaken within 3 months of the CNC opening. For streets impacted in a major way a further traffic count will be collected at around 6 months after the CNC is opened and then annually. Those streets that have a more than 30% increase in traffic volumes will be included in the traffic calming street list for Stage 2 (even if not currently on the lists below). Where large increases occur temporary works (using rapid implementation methods where relevant) may be implemented ahead of more permanent upgrades.

Undertake monitoring of pedestrian and cycle volumes and environmental effects (emissions, noise and vibration). Compare with baseline data where relevant.

**Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:**

When the monitoring confirms a 30% increase in traffic values, introduce traffic calming on TC9 – Roosevelt Avenue, TC12 - Caledonian Road, TC13 - Edgeware Road (Village), TC14 – Manchester Street and TC15 - Westminster Street /Courtenay Street. Implement traffic calming on any other local streets that have a greater than 30% increase in traffic following CNC.

**Safe Access to Schools (AS):**

**AS1 – Safe Access Across Cranford Street** – Assess effectiveness of interim measures in AS2. Where required implement any further options identified in this study. This may include new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance.

**Safe Cycling Routes (SC):**
### SC2 (McFaddens Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)
Design and implement a secondary cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road.

### SC3 (Westminster/Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor)
Design and implement a secondary cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

### SC4 (Edgeware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)
Design and implement a secondary cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

### SC5 (North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor)
Design and implement an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street.

### Access to Parks (AP):
Several of the improvements in Stage 1 will improve access to the two parks. For St Albans Park the two new traffic signals on Warrington Street and the South of Berwick upgrades will improve safe access. The traffic calming of Malvern Street (2020) will also limit rat-running past Malvern Park. The Access Plan in this section will focus on other access and safety improvements that can be made.

Implement any quick wins and priority projects that come out of the AP1 and AP2 plans within Stage 2.

#### AP1 (St Albans Park Access Plan)
Development of a plan that will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists.

#### AP2 (Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan)
Development of a plan that will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists.

### Access to Commercial Centres (AC):
Some of the improvements in Stage 1 will also improve access and safety at commercial areas. Transport studies will consider additional improvements that can be made.

#### AC1 – Westminster/Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study
Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

#### AC2 – Barbadoes/Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study
Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

#### AC3 – Barbadoes/Edgeware Local Activity Centre Transport Study
Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

#### AC4 – Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study
Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

#### AC5 – Westminster/Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar)
Undertake this study which will focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users.

#### AC5 – Edgeware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes)
Undertake this study which will focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users.

Implement any quick wins and priority projects that come out of the studies in Stage 2.

### Stage 3 – Projects that could be undertaken any time between the opening of the CNC and the end of the Commissioning Period

### Monitoring

---
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Ongoing monitoring of traffic, pedestrians and cycle volumes, crashes and vehicles speeds, emissions, noise and vibration on major roads and some local streets is to occur annually, or when required more often, after the CNC opens to validate the Reports and projects already identified in this document, and through the various studies that are specified.

It is expected that additional interventions will be required to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of the additional CNC traffic including the impact of trucks, that is identified in this monitoring. In terms of local streets, intervention is required if the traffic volumes increase by greater than 30% above what might have been expected on the route if the CNC had not been built. In terms of other interventions (e.g. arterial upgrades) this will be the result of congestion or safety concerns with respect to all road users. Some improvement may also not be required (e.g. if local road traffic does not increase by greater than 30%, as predicted by the modelling). Consultation on all proposed changes will be undertaken.

An indication of Stage 3 improvement projects is provided below. This list will need to be reviews and where necessary revised once the actual impacts of the CNC traffic is known from the monitoring.

**Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:**

Introduce traffic calming only where monitoring indicates high levels of rat-running are occurring (may include additional streets): TC – 5 McFadden, Knowles, Weston (east Cranford), TC6 – Jameson, TC10 – Forfar Street, TC11 – Flockton Street, TC16 – Severn Street, TC17 – Thames Street, TC 18 – Aylesford Street, TC19 – Kensington Avenue, TC 20 – Philpotts Road and TC 21 – Francis Avenue.

**Safe Cycling Routes (SC):**

Monitor and upgrade routes as required.

**Access to Parks (AP):**

AP1 (St Albans Park Access Plan) – Implementation of the access plan as required to address access and safety issues.

AP2 (Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan) – Implementation of the access plan as required to address access and safety issues.

**Access to Commercial Centres (AC):**

AC1 – Westminster/Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations

AC2 – Barbadoes/Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations.

AC3 – Barbadoes/Edgeware Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations

AC4 – Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations

AC5 – Westminster/Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar) – Implement study recommendations.

AC6 – Edgeware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes) – Implement study recommendations
1. Introduction and Background

Planning for a new arterial route from the Christchurch CBD (Four Avenues) to the northern suburbs of Christchurch and beyond has been ongoing for many decades. Over the last decade a preferred route has been identified and designed for the northern section of this route. This preferred route is called the Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC) which, at the time of this report, is under construction with a planned completion date of mid-2020. The CNC is expected to increase traffic volumes on the urban road network south of the project\(^1\). The Downstream Effects Management Plan (the Report) considers the impact of this additional traffic and what changes are required to the network to minimise the impact of this additional traffic travelling from the CNC through to the CBD. The Report has been compiled to satisfy the requirements of the Notice of Requirement (Designation) ruling for the CNC (Appendix A). The rest of this introduction provides background and history of the CNC (decades of transport planning on a northern route), that helps set the context of the Report.

1.1 Christchurch Northern Corridor and Requirement for a Downstream Effects Management Plan

The Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC) project is an alliance project currently being undertaken by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZ Transport Agency), and Christchurch City Council\(^2\). As part of this project a new four-lane motorway will connect SH1 from just south of the Waimakariri Bridge with Cranford Street about 500m north of the McFaddens Road / Cranford Street Intersection (see Figure 1.1). The project also includes new pedestrian and cycle facilities\(^3\).

![Figure 1-1: Christchurch Northern Corridor](https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/projects/christchurch-northern-corridor/CNC-Map-Poster.pdf)

A section of Cranford Street (the southern end of the CNC) will also increase from a two-lane road to four-lanes with a median. As part of the project the Innes Road / Cranford Street intersection will also be subject to works to enlarge its capacity. A representation of these changes, including active mode provisions, are shown in Appendix B.

In July 2015 Independent Hearings Commissioners heard the designation case for the CNC. The designation was approved subject to a number of conditions. A major concern raised by submitters was the downstream effects of the CNC, especially on local roads within St Albans and adjoining suburbs. To address this concern a condition was added

---

\(^{1}\) Refer to Section 4.1.2.1

\(^{2}\) Information on this project can be found at [https://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/christchurch-motorways/christchurch-northern-corridor/](https://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/christchurch-motorways/christchurch-northern-corridor/)

that required Christchurch City Council to engage a suitably qualified independent traffic expert who would produce a Downstream\textsuperscript{4} Effects Management Plan. Dr Shane Turner of Stantec, now Abley, was appointed to this role.

The Report is the outcome of investigations on likely downstream effects of the CNC and recommends works that could be undertaken to address those effects. Given the uncertainty around the effects, which are based on land use estimates and expected driver behaviour, a key aspect of the Report is the monitoring of transport effects once the CNC opens, and comparing these with conditions prior to the CNC (minus expected network growth without the CNC). However, given the increase in traffic volume from day 1 some improvements do need to be in place before the CNC is opened (expected to be in 2020).

Following discussions with Christchurch City Council, the NZ Transport Agency have investigated the addition of a third southbound lane (high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane) across the Waimakariri River and the extension of the HOV lane in the southbound direction initially to just north of the GEII interchange. Hence southbound along the CNC one traffic lane will be for general traffic and the second lane will be restricted to vehicles with two or more passengers (called a T2 lane). A subsequent study has recommended that this HOV lane be extended further south to just north of the Cranford Street Roundabout.

A study is also in progress on a travel demand management (TDM) strategy for Northern Christchurch which is considering among other measures, express bus services from Kaiapoi and Rangiora to the city centre via the CNC with supporting ParkNRide facilities in the Waimakariri District. The study is also considering extension of the HOV lanes southbound along Cranford and Sherbourne Streets as peak period clearways to Bealey Avenue and also northbound from Bealey Avenue through to at least north of Innes Road. In this analysis the permanent HOV lanes southbound only to just north of GEII were considered, as this was all that had been formally agreed when the main study was undertaken. Conformation of additional TDM measures has not been made at the time this report was issued.

1.2 History of the Christchurch Northern Arterial (now CNC)

Various traffic corridor plans have been conceived in planning for Christchurch since the 1950s. In 1962 the Christchurch Regional Planning Authority proposed the Northern Arterial Concept Route, roughly following the path of the current Northern Arterial however extending further south through St Albans. During the 2nd review of the Reports the corridor was changed so that new arterial would extend to Bealey Avenue where it would connect with the one-way pair, Barbadoes and Madras Street. In 1989 the Northern Arterial Designation was narrowed in width at the Redwood/Belfast portion. Later, the St Albans portion of the designation was removed from the Christchurch City District Scheme.\textsuperscript{5} The following excerpt is taken from Christchurch City Centre – 40 years of Change, and it explains some of the reasons why the network has been developed the way it has in Northern Christchurch:

\begin{quote}
\textquote{During the 1980s... the Christchurch City Council made successive reductions to the proposed road network in suburban areas. These changes were in response to a combination of other factors including: slower population growth, economic downturn – less central employment, limited funding based on benefit/cost ratios, community acceptance of greater congestion, increasing opposition from affected residents, councillor opposition in the 70s and 80s. Subsequently in the agreed 1989 regional plan the road network and hierarchy of roads were generally retained but the motorways were deferred still further on the assumption that the arterial “at-grade” road network would suffice. This policy, together with the reliance on benefit/cost for national funding, supported the ongoing construction of major arterial all-purpose roads in the suburbs.”} \textsuperscript{6} \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{6}} (Christchurch City Centre – 40 Years of Change, Traffic, Planning – 1959-1999, Malcom Douglass, Christchurch City Council, 2000 (p11)).
\end{quote}

Clearly there has been much discussion and investigation on the north – south transport connections in Northern Christchurch for at least the last 50 – 60 years. During that time larger motorway connections (passing through urban Christchurch) have been considered, planned, and eventually withdrawn. The history of these decisions has been important in the preparation of the Report as it is not intended to re-litigate or reconsider past discarded options, or options of a similar nature and scale, which have shown to be out of favour.

\textsuperscript{4} Downstream as defined by the Notice of Requirement means south of the Innes Road / Cranford Street intersection. For the purposes of the DEMP, ‘south’ of the CNC has been interpreted as including local and collector roads between Innes and McFaddens due to the interconnectivity of the local road network.

\textsuperscript{5} \url{https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/projects/northern-arterial/docs/nart-project-timeline.pdf}

\textsuperscript{6} Christchurch City Centre – 40 Years of Change, Traffic, Planning – 1959-1999, Malcom Douglass CCC, 2000 (p11)
Given the history and strong views of the local community, the Report is focused on using existing roads to carry the additional traffic associated with the CNC. It also seeks to minimise the impact of any upgrades on private property and especially building structures within the urban area. Hence wherever possible the focus is on remaining within current road reserves.

An important part of the Report is understanding the impact that the additional CNC traffic could have on the local community, and how this can be avoided, remedied or mitigated. This includes minimising the impact of the additional CNC traffic on safe access to parks, schools, businesses and housing. It is also important that the future transport network supports transport choice, and in particular walking, cycling, and public transport. A legacy of the Report should also be improvements in amenity and urban design to streets within the community.
2. **Report Structure**

The report begins (Section 3) by summarising (in brief) the various national, regional, and local transport planning strategies that have been agreed and outlines the current road network and operating conditions for different road users, including any existing road safety issues.

The report then outlines the purpose and objectives of the study and the methodology that has been adopted to undertake the transport assessment (Section 4). It also specifies the ‘balanced’ transport planning approach that has been applied to minimise the impact of the additional traffic on local streets, but also provides for, and encourages, greater use of other transport modes, or at the very least, higher occupancy rates in motor vehicles.

Section 5 discusses the transport modelling that has been undertaken to understand the likely impacts of the additional traffic from CNC (currently expected to open in mid-2020) on the downstream road network in 2021 (represents opening year) and 2031 (design year) if no changes are made. The modelling assesses the impacts of the CNC against what is expected in terms of traffic growth on the wider network if the CNC was not built.

The consultation undertaken with stakeholders and the public in both rounds of consultation are summarised in Section 6. Wherever possible the concerns raised by the public and various organisations have been addressed in the option development. However, not all issues raised can be addressed, as many fall outside the scope of this assessment, or are in conflict with other issues and options raised.

The option development phase is presented in Section 7. The first iteration of the option development focused on the local streets that had greater than a 30% increase in traffic and also capacity constraints on the urban arterial/collector network. The focus at this level being to minimise the number of local streets impacted by a combination of arterial/collector road upgrades and local road traffic calming and speed limit reductions. The second iteration of the option development looks at options to minimise the impact of the additional traffic on safe access to schools, safe cycling through the network, access to parks, and access to local and neighbourhood activity/community centres.

Section 8 and 9 present the recommended downstream improvement plan. It highlights key outcomes to achieve and associated improvements that need to be undertaken before the opening of the CNC to address impacts associated with the sudden increase in traffic as a result of the CNC opening. It then outlines outcomes to be achieved and improvements that could be undertaken shortly after the opening and through to approximately ten years after the opening (up to design year 2031). The Report has a strong monitoring focus to assess the impact of traffic growth between opening and 2031. The timing of upgrades beyond the opening will be tied to the impacts observed in the monitoring. Some upgrade projects may be delayed, and other projects brought forward depending on the monitoring outcomes, and new projects may be identified based on traffic effects not predicted in the modelling (e.g. local street rat-running).
3. Background Review

This section outlines briefly the key national, regional, and local transport strategies that have been agreed by various organisations for transport planning activities within Christchurch. It then provides an overview of the existing transport network and how this operates. This includes bus and cycling routes, and road safety issues. There are a number of existing transport issues on the current road network but only some of these issues will be impacted by the CNC traffic, and need to be addressed in the Report. More information on these issues is presented in Section 6.

3.1 National, Regional, and Local Strategies

Various national, regional, and local strategies exist which have guided the direction of the Report. Their respective relevance to the Report is that the options need to be conscious of, and aim to satisfy (where possible), the relevant objectives contained in those strategies.

National

The latest Government Policy Statement has four strategic directions: Safety, Access, Environment, and Value for Money. This strategic direction was considered during option development, and influenced the criteria used in the multi-criteria evaluation of the options.

The Safer Journeys Strategy (2010-2020) guides how safety concerns will be addressed in New Zealand over the period 2010-2020. It outlines the Safe System approach which recognises the vulnerability of road users, and the four pillars of safe roads and road sides, safe speeds, safe vehicles, and safe road use, under which safety is to be addressed. In urban areas the safety of pedestrians (especially vulnerable pedestrians; young, and elderly) and cyclists needs to be considered alongside vehicle safety.

Regional

The Regional Land Transport Plan (2015-2025) outlines five regional objectives; 1) A land transport network that addresses current and future transport demand, 2) A land transport system that is increasingly free from death and serious injury, 3) The Canterbury earthquakes recovery is supported, 4) The land transport network is resilient and supports long-term sustainability, and 5) Investment in land transport infrastructure and services is efficient.

In addressing the downstream effects, the formation of the Report considered the regional objectives 1, 2, and 5, as well as long-term sustainability mentioned in objective 4. Resilience was considered less of a priority due to the various routes available in Christchurch should, for example, Cranford Street becomes temporarily unavailable. It should be noted, however, that any implementation of works must also be conscious of earthquake recovery projects when they occur.

Local

The Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan (CTSP) has four goals; 1) Improve access and choice, 2) Create safe, healthy, and liveable communities, 3) Support economic vitality, and 4) Create opportunities for environmental enhancements. The Report seeks to align with the CTSP, namely to use the existing road network more efficiently. Therefore, the Report has concentrated on low impact, at grade, treatments.

The Long-Term Plan (LTP) sets out Christchurch City Council’s funding priorities for transport over the next 10 years (2018-2028). The Council’s commitment to the CNC is outlined there, along with other key projects such as Accessible City, Major Cycle Routes, a local cycle network (connecting to major cycle routes), pedestrian improvements plan, and Public Transport Infrastructure. Achieving mode shift (including better mode choices) is one of the level of service targets for the active transport in the LTP. Indicative funding has also been allocated in the LTP for Down-stream Effects Management Plan projects in the period 2018/19 to 2023/24.

3.2 Local Network Conditions & Description

This section of the report provides an overview of the existing down-streams urban transport network south of the CNC.

Route and Road User Hierarchy

Streets vary significantly in function. Some are used only for through movements (for example a motorway), while others are mainly used for access (a cul-de-sac). In response to this, the road network is categorised into hierarchy which enables planning and decisions to be made, some of which have wide effects. The route hierarchy in the vicinity of Cranford Street (which is relevant here) is presented in Figure 3-1 from Christchurch City Council’s District Plan. A similar hierarchy is given in the CTSP.

![Map of Cranford Street vicinity](http://www.proposeddistrictplan.ccc.govt.nz/images/DistrictPlanImages/Chapter%207%20Transport/Operative/OperativeFig7_17a.jpg)

Figure 3-1: Road Hierarchy
(Source: http://www.proposeddistrictplan.ccc.govt.nz/images/DistrictPlanImages/Chapter%207%20Transport/Operative/OperativeFig7_17a.jpg
(not: some street names added))

A key objective of the Report is to keep the majority of vehicles on principal routes (arterials, distributors, and collectors).

Cranford Street from the connection of the CNC to Innes Road is a major arterial, south from there it becomes a minor arterial primarily as it moves through community centres like Westminster Street / Cranford Street, and Edgeware Village. Innes Road and Berwick Street / Warrington Street are also classified as minor arterials. Collector roads in the vicinity of Cranford Street include McFaddens Road, Rutland Street, Westminster Street / Courtenay Street / St Albans Street, Madras Street, and Barbadoes Street.

Based on this hierarchy the bulk of the north-south traffic from the CNC should be accommodated on Cranford, Berwick, Warrington, Madras, Barbadoes, and Sherborne Streets. While Rutland Street and Springfield Road are also collectors.

---

9 Definitions of the respective road hierarchies can be found in the Council’s District Plan.
Rutland Street now forms part of a major cycle route and hence it is desirable to keep traffic volumes on Rutland Street at lower levels.

NZ Transport Agency’s One Network Road Classification (ONRC) system\(^{10}\) also classifies Christchurch’s urban roads. This system shows Madras Street and Barbadoes Street on an equivalent hierarchy to Cranford Street and Sherborne Street (arterials\(^{11}\) ), and also highlights the importance of Forfar Street, which is classified as a primary collector under the ONRC.

**Active Modes and Public Transport**

Christchurch City Council have been active in promoting active and public transport modes in the northern suburbs of Christchurch, by identifying and installing infrastructure to support these travel options. Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury (EC) are planning to do more upgrades, and promotion, to support greater use of these modes. Further improvements are important in order to move people out of cars (especially single occupancy car trips) and into other transport modes.

Christchurch City Council are currently investing in the development of separated cycleways\(^{12}\) as part of their Major Cycle Route (MCR) project, which will eventually deliver 13 major cycleways. The Papapiu Parallel Cycleway was one of the first to be constructed, and its alignment through the subject area can been seen in Figure 3-2. Further cycleways are planned in the wider area including; the Northern Line, and the shared use path along the CNC, as well as a network of secondary cycle routes connecting to the major cycleway network\(^{13}\). The CNC shared use path will eventually allow cyclists to travel from the Waimakariri District to the Papapiu Parallel and into the city. The CNC also includes a shared use path to the east along QEII Drive. Limited work has been undertaken to date around key secondary cycle routes (normally unseparated cycle lanes and quiet streets) linkages to the Papapiu Parallel. The development of such routes is important to encourage safer journeys and more people cycling as traffic volumes grow in this network.

Christchurch City Council have a project to create a link between the CNC and the Papapiu Parallel, called the Grassmere Link. Council have allocated funding for this project in the 2020 to 2024 financial years.

---


\(^{11}\) ONRC divides New Zealand’s roads into categories based on how busy they are, whether they connect to important destinations, or are the only route available. Within this arterial is broadly defined as ‘link regionally significant places and industries’ (Source: [https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/Road-Efficiency-Group/docs/ONRCP3generalguide.pdf](https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/Road-Efficiency-Group/docs/ONRCP3generalguide.pdf)).


Bus routes in the vicinity of Cranford Street are shown in (Figure 3-3). The Orange Line bus route is located on Cranford Street. From the Christchurch Northern Corridor connection, the Orange Line continues down Cranford Street as far as Edgeware Road where it moves across to Colombo Street. Other nearby bus routes include ‘44 Shirley’, ‘100 Wigram/The Palms’, the Orbiter which turns right from Innes Road (east) onto Cranford Street under the new route, and the Blue Line which connects Rangiora to Christchurch City Centre via Papanui Road. ECan has plans to increase the frequency of bus services (on the Orange Line) on Cranford Street.

One benefit of the CNC is that it is expected to reduce traffic volumes on Main North Road and Papanui Road allowing better bus priority on this corridor especially for people living in Northern Christchurch. The Main North Road and Papanui Road corridors have been identified in previous transport planning studies of northern Christchurch as the key bus route to the north, especially for the Christchurch northern suburbs. Further bus priority measures are currently being planned for this corridor after some of the through traffic is diverted across to the CNC14.

ECan, CCC, WDC and the NZ Transport Agency are investigating Park N Ride facilities in the Waimakariri District as part of a package of travel demand management (TDM) measures. This package is also investigating express bus services from potential Park-N-Ride sites and the satellite towns of Rangiora and Kaiapoi/Pegasus to the city centre. The provision of a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane southbound on the CNC will provide a priority corridor for these express buses, shared with those who carpool (cars with two or more occupants). Further investigation will consider extending the HOV lanes (using clearways) onto Cranford Street and Sherborne Street through to Bealey Avenue in both southbound and northbound directions.

The implementation of these initiatives would encourage less travel in single occupancy vehicles by prioritising trips by bike, bus, or walking (especially for shorter trips).

**Existing Traffic Conditions and Crash Analysis**

Historical crash data is available for the network south of the CNC but there are limited traffic counts available for the existing road network. The traffic counts that are available are shown in Appendix C. As part of the monitoring a lot more (baseline) traffic counts are being collected before the CNC opens.

---

The crash history shows that generally the majority of crashes (in the period 2012-2016) in the downstream network have occurred on higher volume roads such as Cranford Street, Innes Road, and Hills Road. In general, the data aligns with what would be expected relative to a typical network hierarchy; high volumes on arterials and collectors, and a relationship between traffic flow and crash incidence.

Of the death and serious crashes that have occurred during the 2012-2016 timespan, the majority have involved turning or crossing traffic mainly at intersections. Hence particular attention needs to be given to reducing the occurrence of such crashes in the re-design of intersections, especially given traffic volumes are expected to increase.

Pedestrian crashes have occurred east of Cranford Street on Innes Road (near school crossing), and also around Edgeware Village and near St Albans Park. In total there were 11 pedestrian (including one mobility) crashes that occurred in the study area in the period of 2012-2016. Of these, two pedestrian crashes involved minor injury, and three crashes involved people older than 65. Two of the crashes involved two Death and/or Serious Injuries (DSI) (only 8% of the total DSI crashes) which is lower than the national average for 2016\(^\text{15}\) (10%).

There were three recorded bicyclist crashes involving death or serious injury in the study area (12.5% of the total DSI crashes), which is higher than the national average of 6.2% for 2016, but fairly typical of Christchurch where cycle numbers are higher than other urban areas of New Zealand. Cyclist crashes have generally occurred south of Westminster Street. Cranford Street has also experienced a relatively higher amount of motorcycle crashes.

Speed has also been a factor in many crashes. Cranford Street had a lower number of speed related crashes compared with other arterial roads, except around the Westminster Street / Cranford Street intersection, and immediately south of the Berwick Street / Cranford Street intersection. Locations where speeds were a key factor in crashes include Barbados Street between Edgeware Road and Warrington Street, and Flockton Street. This is likely to be due to the wide lanes on these roads (which encourage higher speeds) and the unsignalised Barbados/Warrington intersection.

More detail on current crash patterns is provided in Appendix C. The pre-CNC crash data will form an important baseline for monitoring the crash impacts on the network following the opening of the CNC.

---

4. Purpose of the Report

4.1 CNC Northern Arterial and Cranford Upgrade Designation (Designation)

The primary purpose of the Report, as specified in Appendix A the Designation Conditions, is to identify the potential traffic impacts (if any) on those streets at the end of the CNC downstream effects (from the southern end of the NAE/CSU\(^{16}\)) which may be potentially affected as a result of the operation of the NAE/CSU (CNC) and recommend appropriate mitigation measures to Council and, where required, the local Community Board. This requires identifying what streets adjacent to or adjoining Cranford Street will be affected by the operation of the NAE/CSU and what level of monitoring and interventions are required to mitigate adverse effects throughout the commissioning period.

Objectives

The objectives of the investigation, as stated in Appendix A to the Designation conditions, into the downstream effects are:

a) To identify preferred vehicle access routes, particularly for trucks, between the end of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and the Central City (that is between the end of the NAE/CSU and the City centre); and

b) To identify strategies to keep vehicles on preferred vehicle access routes; and

c) To discourage vehicles away from priority public transport routes and walking or cycling routes such as Main North Road / Papanui Road and Rutland Street corridors respectively.

These objectives are limited in scope and are motor vehicle centric. While objective 3 may consider other modes, it does not cover improved infrastructure over the network for other modes to offset the additional traffic volumes. To be consistent with the various national, regional, and local transport strategies it is important that the recommendations developed consider a number of other transport planning matters (e.g. safe access to schools), and especially the impacts of the additional CNC traffic on walking, cycling, and public transport on the downstream road network. Hence the recommendations include improvements that extend beyond these objectives.

Designation Effects Management

Appendix A to the Designation conditions also states that: This Management Plan is to ensure downstream effects are appropriately managed and to:

a) Assess the existence, nature, and extent of any increased traffic on streets adjacent to, or adjoining Cranford Street attributable to the NAE/CSU that might cause or contribute to a loss of service to any of these streets for up to 10 years after the opening date of the NAE/CSU;

b) Implement measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate such effects, where these are more than minor, in a timely and cost-effective manner and where appropriate and practicable; and

c) Monitor the efficacy of the measures for an appropriate period and implement further remedial action, if this is necessary and appropriate.

Here the independent expert has taken a broader view on the measures that need to be undertaken to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the traffic effects. It is not just a matter of keeping the traffic on main roads and discouraging vehicle users from using local streets and routes currently prioritised for public transport (Main North Road) and cycling (Rutland Street), but also mitigating the effects on other modes of the increased traffic. For example, the large increase in traffic on Cranford Street will impact 1) on safety of school children crossing the corridor to access St Albans School, 2) cyclists who use

\(^{16}\) NAE refers to 'Northern Arterial Extension' (the connection between SH74 and Cranford Street), CSU refers to 'Cranford Street Upgrade'. Both form part of the greater Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC) project.
Cranford Street and 3) pedestrians and drivers who want to access the Westminster/Cranford local activity centre. Measures to mitigate these three risks have been considered in the Report.

30% Traffic Growth Threshold

The Designation condition stipulates that in order to be considered for improvements and/or calming work a street must have experienced in excess of 30% increase on the traffic volume that would have occurred without the operation of the CNC. Underlying traffic growth is not included. It was also made clear that in the event of a street exceeding the threshold that works did not necessarily need to be undertaken to reduce the traffic volume.

When the CNC is completed and connected to the existing network, it will be relatively simple to deduce where a more than 30% increase has occurred exclusive of non-CNC related growth. However, the complexity of accurately making this calculation will concatenate the longer time passes from the opening date and near the end of the Commissioning Period.

While this threshold will be relatively simple on local roads, which carry modest volumes, arterial roads and some collector streets will be complex to assess. Many of the arterials, and especially some of the intersections, will experience congestion well before there is more than a 30% increase in traffic. If changes are not made to the arterials to remove severe congestion, it will be difficult to mitigate an excess of 30% growth in traffic on some local streets. Hence our approach with arterials is to look at where severe congestion is expected to occur and look at options to reduce it where this will also reduce the number of local streets impacted by more than 30% additional traffic. It is acknowledged that some congestion is advantageous (especially in peak periods) in getting people to change transport mode (e.g. to bike) or car-pool.

Monitoring the over 30% Threshold

The streets that are expected to reach the greater than 30% traffic threshold by end of the commissioning period or are likely to increase based on local knowledge will be monitored from 2020 through to the end of the commissioning period. Baseline data from these streets was collected in 2018.

There are many societal events which affect the number of trips undertaken on a network; land use changes, economic changes, and political changes to name a few. Given time, changes will occur, which will require updating in a base model. There are also many specific changes that will occur on the network which will also need to be updated within the base model. These changes are relatively simple to take care of in a model. However, a much more difficult undertaking is to uncouple changes made to the downstream network in response to the CNC, changes which affect the traffic volume on various streets (increases and decreases) which may not have been undertaken had the CNC not been constructed, or at least not within the set timespan outlined in the Designation. Over time it will become increasingly difficult to separate the impact of these downstream treatments and the CNC itself in terms of their consequence to the network's performance. Section 8.1 discusses the monitoring method that is suggested to be used to monitor traffic volume increases.

It is recommended that Council monitor the vehicle emission, noise, and vibration impacts of the additional traffic on arterials and collector routes. This monitoring is in response to concerns raised by the community.

4.2 Methodology

The Designation sets out the framework for the appointment and methodology for the recommendations made. Prior to the operating of the CNC, Christchurch City Council were to appoint a suitably qualified independent traffic engineering expert to investigate and design an appropriate methodology. To avoid doubt the Designation states what is expected to be included in the methodology. The following headings outline the methodology I have adopted to respond to the various elements expected by the Designation. Identify affected streets – Ad joined to and Adjoining Cranford Street Affected by the Operation of the CNC Streets expected to be affected by the operation of the CNC were primarily identified using the CAST Saturn Model. The model outputs highlighted midblock locations that exceeded the over 30% growth requirement of the Designation in the AM Peak, PM Peak, and all-day.

A model was used as the network size is too great to attempt to conceptualise the impact only through the experience of individuals.
Models are limited in their ability to reflect dynamic human choices, due to the many variables, and varying importance of the variables, that can influence trip distribution. Therefore, a sense check of the streets likely to be affected was undertaken, taking into account local knowledge of the road network and views expressed during consultation and by discussion with other traffic experts.

The monitoring of the majority of local streets in this area of the city between 2020 and the end of the commissioning period will identify the actual streets impacted by the operation of the CNC by more than a 30% increase in traffic, which may or may not align with that shown in the modelling. The local streets affected by the operation of the CNC (from modelling and local knowledge) if no arterial upgrades occur are shown in Section 5.4. The local streets expected to be impacted under the two arterial upgrade options are shown in Section 7.2.

Assess Current Vehicle Usage and Service of Affected Streets in Proximity to Southern End of CNC

Various sources were available to assess the baseline traffic volumes for the recommendations. The primary source is the CAST transport model (flow estimates are included in Appendix D1) and a small number of manual counts (Appendix C). Before the CNC is opened, traffic counts will be collected at over 50 locations in the road network to establish baseline traffic volumes which will be used as part of the ongoing monitoring of each street in relation to the impact of the CNC. Monitoring screens have been developed and are presented in Appendix E. I recommend traffic counts be collected on streets with high potential for rat-running within three months of the CNC opening, and then at 6 months. After this initial monitoring I recommend ongoing annual or biannual monitoring of the streets that are expected to carry most of the additional traffic is required, while other streets only need to be monitored if adverse effects are reported (e.g. an increase in rat-running or speeding). These counts will include the proportion of heavy vehicles. Separate baseline intersection counts will also collect pedestrian and bicycle traffic volumes.

Consider Extent of and Effects of Growth in Traffic Flows on Potentially Affected Streets That is Reasonably Attributable to the Operation of the CNC

The effects on all transport modes as a result of the increased CNC traffic flows have been assessed based on community issues raised during consultation, expert knowledge of the network, and advice from transport engineers and an urban designer during three issue and option development workshops. These methods are limited insofar that they require a reliance on the predicted affected streets from the CAST model. The monitoring programme is therefore required to help ascertain and confirm exactly where and to what level the transport effects actually manifest. This may identify that streets not shown in the transport modelling are impacted.

Recommendation of Appropriate Mitigation Measures

An issues and options workshop was held involving a number of transport professionals. The purpose of the workshop was to review the feedback from the community consultation and identify key issues raised. Workshop participants helped develop a range of options that could address the issues for the major improvements (arterial upgrades). A multi-criteria analysis framework was developed by the transport professionals, and the options were rated against different pre-agreed outcome measurements (which reflected key national and local transport priorities).

Once the type and scope of the major improvements and arterial upgrades were settled upon a second iteration of mitigation measures were investigated, which concentrated on improvements that could mitigate the effects on access to schools, parks, commercial centres, and cycling in light of the arterial upgrades.

This process identified issues that need to be addressed before the CNC opens, and after opening depending on monitoring outcomes following the CNC opening, up to the end of the commissioning period.

Recommendation of Further Remedial Steps if Monitoring Confirms a Continued Increase in Adverse Traffic Effects on Affected Streets that is More than Minor

While the Report outlines the issues and upgrade options that may need to be actioned in the few years following the opening of the CNC to the expiry of the Commissioning Period, what recommendations are made or need to be done will depend on the outcome of transport monitoring. It is possible that new issues arise as a result of the operation of the CNC that are not reflected in the transport modelling undertaken or in the crash history. The routes expected to be affected may not be affected as predicted and thus not need to be upgraded.
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4.3 Balanced Transport Planning Approach

Wherever possible, I have taken a balanced transport planning approach to the development of my recommendations that looks to mitigate some of the impact of the additional traffic on arterial roads and local streets without widening existing road designations i.e. with minimal impact on private property.

As cities grow they are faced with growth in land transport trips. It is not suitable to accommodate all such trips in single occupancy vehicles. NZ Transport Agency and Christchurch City Council have actively looked to provide transport options for these trips in Northern Christchurch. This includes the provision and promotion of bus, cycle, and car-pooling initiatives, along with infrastructure upgrades to ease congestion and reduce the proportion of people in single occupancy vehicles. While I am supportive of more investment and promotion in this area, I am of the view that such initiatives, particularly in the short term, will have limited impact on the number of vehicles that will enter Cranford Street when the CNC opens.

To achieve a balanced transport planning outcome, which encourages the use of other transport options, means provision of an expressway (e.g. permanent four-lane route) through St Albans to the City Centre via widening the road reserve of current arterials or on a new arterial alignment was not considered. Only a small number of people who participated in the consultation favoured such an approach. The support for a balanced approach to transport planning and the promotion of alternative transport modes and car-pooling was promoted by many stakeholders and the general public in the consultation. This is consistent with the findings of a number of consultation processes managed by Christchurch City Council citywide (e.g. Share an Idea campaign) in northern Christchurch.

However, the CNC is currently being constructed, and it is clear from the transport modelling undertaken that its operation will significantly increase vehicle flows on Cranford Street (south of Innes) on opening and through to 2031. While one option is to do nothing and allow congestion to occur, this will result in severe congestion which is undesirable to the community in terms of pollution and road safety. Hence to address severe congestion and discourage use of local streets by commuter traffic, a measured plan of arterial upgrades and traffic calming of local and collector roads is proposed. Wherever possible the upgrades are being achieved within the current road reserve. Given this constraint, there will still be congestion on the arterial/collector roads, especially at the Berwick Street/Cranford Street and Westminster Street/Cranford Street intersections as traffic volumes grow towards 2031.

The Report also includes a number of transport improvements that are expected to encourage more walking and cycling in the community. Where possible this includes mitigating the adverse impacts of the additional CNC traffic. While this is not possible on all routes, this is to a degree offset with other transport improvements in the local road network e.g. improved bicycle routes running parallel with and crossing Cranford Street.

The Report gives limited attention to travel demand management measures to move people out of cars, other than improving transport facilities to support use of other transport modes (e.g. walking and cycling). Travel demand management is typically an intervention considered strategically for a wide area; such as the Greater Christchurch urban area or the northern part of Christchurch and Waimakariri District. Any demand management interventions specific to this project would shift or create issues across the network if not coordinated with other projects. For example, bus priority lanes on Cranford Street are likely to push a considerable amount of traffic back away from the CNC and onto Main North Road and Rutland Street, which will impact on bus priority and bicycle improvements on these corridors.

Therefore, the Report does not closely look at hard mode shift interventions or other wider demand management strategies for treating rises in traffic volumes. This is not required, as Christchurch City Council and its partners ECan and the NZ Transport Agency, are already investigating and planning to introduce more travel demand management measures in Northern Christchurch that focus on reducing congestion and travel in single occupancy vehicles on the Northern Corridor. I strongly support these initiatives. Such measures include a southbound HOV lane on parts of the CNC, improvements to bus services to the Waimakariri District, potential HOV lanes on Cranford and Sherborne Streets, promotion of carpooling, and investigation of park and ride (and bike) facilities.

Another key aspect of the project scope is that only problems that arise directly attributable to the operation of the CNC are being addressed as part of this project. All other network issues are to be addressed via other funding arms of the...
relevant transport authority. The Designation provides that an increase of vehicle movements on any of the potentially affected streets by more than 30% on top of traffic expected to have occurred without the operation of the CNC is the trigger point to take measures to mitigate those affected streets. Hence transport impacts created by general traffic growth in Northern Christchurch, and not by the CNC, will not necessarily be addressed by the Report.
5. Transport Modelling

Transport modelling forms an important part of the analysis that informs problem identification and option analysis. Modelling has been used as the effects of the project are yet to be experienced, and in many instances will be significant enough to warrant treatment prior to the opening of the CNC. For example, this is likely to be the case on arterial routes and at busy intersections where a sudden influx of traffic will make upgrades after the CNC more disruptive.

The important outputs required from the modelling were to estimate which local roads were likely to experience a 30% increase of traffic volume (either during the morning or evening peak, or daily) on top of what would have been expected at the same point of time in a scenario where the CNC was not constructed.

Therefore, the transport modellers were requested to model:

a) The downstream network in 2021 and 2031 without the CNC
b) The downstream network in 2021 and 2031 with the CNC
c) The downstream network in 2021 and 2031 with the CNC and various downstream treatment packages (as outlined below)

These were to be modelled during the weekday AM Peak and PM Peak, and all (week) day.

No modelling of weekend traffic flows was undertaken as there is no current CAST weekend model. Weekend traffic volumes peaks can be relatively high but are not lateral like weekday peaks, so do not generally cause the same level of congestion. It will be important to monitor traffic volumes after CNC opens in the weekends to identify any capacity issues during the weekends.

The 2021 model represents the open year of the CNC (currently expected to open in September 2020). The 2031 model represents the design year. The expected effects beyond 2031 have not been assessed in this report as per the requirements of the Designation.

Modelling was undertaken for this study by Jacobs (a modelling consultant). This modelling included the road changes associated with the Papanui Parallel cycleway that makes Rutland Street and Trafalgar Street less attractive for through traffic. The model also assumed the latest version on the CNC design, including a third motorway lane southbound on the Waimakariri River and southbound HOV lanes south of this extending to north of the QEII Drive interchange. The most recent land-use forecasts (at the time the modelling commenced) for Northern Christchurch and the Waimakariri District were used in the modelling. A summary of the modelling undertaken by Jacobs has been prepared for Christchurch City Council.

5.1 Limitations of Transport Modelling

Modelling a network requires a series of assumptions to estimate trip patterns. These include assumptions relating to land use, population, and the propensity of people to choose particular modes given the attraction of trip generators. All of these (and others not mentioned here) have varying degrees of certainty. The assumptions can become erroneous following events such as policy changes, land developments, and economic changes. They can also be erroneous in how they predict the movements of vehicles which are controlled by individual humans who can (and do) employ dynamic decision making, rather than decisions made with rigid logic.

Christchurch has a grid like network (owing to primarily to its topography), where drivers have many route choices. In such circumstance, models are a useful tool to show how congestion on one corridor can impact vehicle rerouting and the subsequent impact on adjacent corridors, with the route choice being determined by the congestion levels on each corridor. It is fair (at least relatively) to assume drivers will use direct arterial routes (which operate, and are generally modelled with higher speeds and less aggressive volume delay relationships than local streets) if the level of service is acceptable to the driver. When the arterial becomes less desirable, due to congestion, exactly which local streets, and to
what magnitude, will be affected is a complex behavioural issue which is approximated in the model with vehicle routing decisions being based upon changes in travel time and distance on each route.

Underlying assumptions, such as traffic growth, will also change in response to changes in the rate of land-use development in different parts of the city. Indeed, the rate of development of identified growth areas (or approved subdivisions) is influenced by market forces.

As such, the model will be more accurate in 2021 than in 2031, due to the assumed rates of development to the north of the city in 2031. Therefore monitoring to track growth following 2021 is critical to validating the model findings.

Nonetheless, even with these limitations, modelling is the best tool we have to estimate what may occur in the future, and to develop a program of improvement projects.

5.2 Expected Transport Impacts Caused by CNC Traffic

In order to understand impacts caused by the CNC, it is important to first understand what level of growth on roads in Northern Christchurch would have occurred if the CNC had not been built. The pattern of travel would be impacted by the ability of the transport network to accommodate additional traffic. The modelling then considers how the CNC will concentrate traffic where it links to the arterial network at O’Reilly Drive and Cranford Street. The pattern of travel is then influenced by the future road networks ability to accommodate this traffic. Upgrades to roads will influence which roads the traffic will use. This includes both capacity upgrades on arterials/collectors and at intersections and discouraging traffic through using traffic calming. Even small changes will impact on the route drivers take to travel through Northern Christchurch.

Expected Traffic Growth Without CNC

Initial modelling has been undertaken (using CAST (Saturn) model) to identify the level and location of expected network traffic growth and traffic congestion if CNC had not been built. Refer to Figure 5-1. Note that ‘V/C’ stands for volume over road capacity.

Areas of the network in excess of 80% experience congestion, as traffic volumes approach capacity (V/C = 1) and unstable flow conditions occur. This results in slower moving vehicles and smaller, and less frequent, gaps for vehicles to enter traffic flow from side streets. This in turn results in queuing on side streets, and risk taking when selecting gaps to enter.

Marshland Road and Main North Road are two important arterial routes in Northern Christchurch, and without the CNC additional congestion would have occurred on these routes by 2021 and be worse in 2031 due to growth in traffic flows from Northern Christchurch suburbs and Waimakariri District (dark red and red sections). But, as the maps shows, there are other congestion areas further south on Cranford Street and Hills Road. Barbadoes Street, especially closer to the intersection with Bealey Avenue, is also affected. All of these areas have been circled on the maps.
Figure 5-1: Expected Underlying Growth 2031 (Without CNC) (Left AM, right PM)

Additional Traffic Growth Across Local Network as a Result Of CNC

Modelling has been undertaken to assess the growth of traffic in the network overall and around the southern end of the CNC following the completion of the CNC (less the underlying expected growth if CNC had not been built). Streets (arterials, collectors, and local streets) that are likely to have an increase of 30% more traffic in peak periods by 2031 compared to 2021 without the CNC have been highlighted in the following figures. Figure 5.2 shows the larger picture and how traffic will divert from Marshland Road, Main North Road and Johns Road (blue lines) to the CNC and downstream routes (red lines).
Figure 5-2: Major changes in traffic volumes as a result of CNC (compared with no CNC) in 2031

At a more localised level the impact of CNC on traffic volumes in the AM Peak, PM Peak, and all day in 2021 and 2031 are shown in Figure 5-3 to 5-8. Those streets which are expected to have a greater than 30% increase in traffic are shown in black (arterials) and orange (local roads).
These figures show a significant number of local streets are expected to have at least a 30% increase in traffic volumes due to rat-running traffic. The effect is more pronounced in 2031, although the majority of streets are also impacted in 2020/21. If no arterial/collector upgrades progress, then a lot of streets need to be traffic calmed before the CNC opens. However, with the level of congestion expected on Cranford Street it will be challenging to design and construct traffic calming that deters rat-runners.

It was agreed early on in the project with CCC that the impacts of the CNC on Innes Road and several parallel routes, especially west of Rutland Street, would not be considered in the DEMP. Rather Council will monitor the effects after the CNC opens and if necessary, look at what changes may need to be made to the transport system.

5.3 Modelling of Improvement Options

The initial modelling excluded any change to downstream routes and intersections. This was done subsequent to options being developed and is presented in the following sections, and Appendix D.

5.4 Impacts of Additional Traffic

The main impacts of the additional traffic are road safety, access to shops, parks, school and housing, air pollution, pavement deterioration, and amenity (urban design).

There is a known relationship between traffic volume and crash risk. This means streets with an increase in traffic volume (particularly if not treated) tend to experience more crashes if not treated. Deterring vehicles, especially heavy vehicles away from local streets (for example by traffic calming) and onto better designed arterial routes will reduce the safety impact of the CNC traffic. Lower operating speeds (ideally around 30km/h) on local roads will also reduce both the number and severity of crashes. On arterial and some collector (distributor) streets where traffic volumes will increase significantly, a combination of route upgrades and temporary speed limit reductions (for example school zones) can be used to address crash risk. As traffic volumes increase, the headway between vehicles decreases and consequently the ability for drivers to enter and exit the traffic flow (via accesses, or intersections) reduces.

Road pavement tends to wear out faster with higher traffic volumes; however, this is more dependent on the relative volume of heavy vehicles, rather than necessarily the total traffic volume.

The Report looks to address as many of these impacts of the CNC traffic as possible, acknowledging that some issues cannot be easily addressed. The intention of the Report being to minimise rather than fully eliminate the effects of the additional traffic volumes as a result of the CNC.
6. Community and Stakeholder Concerns

6.1 Purpose and Outcomes of Early Community Engagement

Consultation with the public and key stakeholders has and will continue to be an important part of the development and advancement of the Report. The St Albans community, in particular, have been very active in expressing their views on the various northern arterial scenarios that have been presented by Christchurch City Council and the Crown over the last 50 plus years, including the Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC). A major concern expressed during consultation on the CNC, is how the additional traffic from the arterial will impact on the St Albans and surrounding communities, and how this can be mitigated. Concerns that were expressed at the CNC Designation hearing led to the requirement to produce a DEMP (the Report).

In order to involve the public and key stakeholder in the process as required by the Designation and Christchurch City Council’s own internal processes, a consultation strategy was developed by Christchurch City Council. The first step of the strategy focused on capturing all the issues and concerns of the general public, key stakeholders, and politicians (community board and Christchurch City Council). In order to achieve an independent perspective (from Christchurch City Council) on the issues and concerns, the independent expert participated in the majority of the consultation meetings.

Subsequent phases will involve consultation on the Report and each of the improvement projects within the Report. The Designation has some specific requirements around consultation which are stated below. Most of these matters apply to consultation on the options that are developed in the Report. Section 4.5 list some of the key stakeholders that need to be consulted.

4.5. Where traffic calming work is recommended, Christchurch City Council will consult with:

4.5.1. Residents of the streets where traffic calming measures are proposed to be taken;

4.5.2. Canterbury District Health Board;

4.5.3. Mairehau Primary School, Our Lady of Fatima School\(^{21}\), Paparoa Street Primary School, St Albans Catholic Primary School, and St Albans School;

4.5.4. St Albans Residents Association and Mairehau Community Trust; and

4.5.5. Cyclists through Spokes;

4.6. Consultation shall include the distribution of a newsletter including feedback form prior to the review.

Section 5 of the Designation also provided guidance on the process for consultation prior to implementation of the Report.

5.2 Owners and occupiers of properties on streets identified by the independent traffic expert as requiring mitigation measures shall be:

5.2.1 Advised of the recommendations of the independent traffic expert under clause 3, including proposed mitigation measures, within 30 working days following the provision of the recommendation to Christchurch City Council;

5.2.2 Provided a period of 20 working days to comment on the proposed mitigation measures; and

5.2.3 Advised by Christchurch City Council of the final mitigation measures to be implemented, at least 20 workings days prior to commencement of any works.

\(^{21}\) Now known as St Francis of Assisi School
The initial phase of stakeholder and public consultation was focused on identifying all the existing and potential future transport issues associated with the CNC traffic on the downstream transport network. To help the public in assessing the potential effects of the CNC, transport modelling outputs of the likely impacts of the CNC were provided. More specifically, this identified the streets that are expected to have more than 30% additional (rat-running) traffic in 2031. In order for the public to consider how changes to the arterial and collector roads may reduce the amount of traffic using local streets, the benefits of a potential arterial upgrade options were provided. This preliminary option included clearways on Cranford Street, upgrades to three intersections on Berwick and Warrington Street and three-laning of Madras/Forfar and Barbadoes Streets from Bealey Avenue to Warrington Street in the higher flow direction.

The first-round consultation (May and June 2018) consisted of the following steps:

1. One-on-one meetings with 20 key stakeholders, which included the parties specified in the Designation (e.g. the local schools) and other stakeholders such as shop owners expected to be impacted.
2. Four public open days attended by 123 members of the community at which plans were presented of the impacted area and a potential arterial upgrade option.
3. Distribution of a newsletter to approximately 12,000 households and businesses in the affected road network (Appendix F). This included a submission form. Over 400 submissions were received from the community.
4. Several meetings with the Papanui-Innes Community Board and Infrastructure, Transport and Environment (ITE) Council committee of Council to discuss the process being used in consultation and the issues identified in the transport modelling.
5. A half day consultation hearing of submissions from stakeholder and the public that was chaired by the Community Board.

The feedback from the public and stakeholders was compiled into common themes for consideration at future stages of the project. The key topics raised from consultation are as follows 22 (Christchurch City Council have prepared a report that provides more detail on each submission):

**Clearway comments (mostly Cranford Street, but also in general)**

| Take the clearway through to Bealey Avenue | Ongoing monitoring/policing | Loss of parking |
| Pedestrian safety – upgrades required and design concerns | Improved facilities for public transport / park and ride | Provision of safe cycling facilities |
| Access to English Park | Impact on Cranford Street properties | Impact on businesses |
| Impact on side streets | Impact on driveway safety | Consider HOV lanes |

**Intersection changes comments**

| Parking concerns | Impact on businesses | Leave as is and monitor traffic impact first |
| Forfar Street roundabout doesn’t need to change, and safety concerns | Impact on St Albans Park | Pedestrian safety – both concern for increasing pedestrian risk and also support for changes |

---
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| + Cycling safety – both concern for increasing cyclist risk and also support for changes | + Barbadoes / Warrington needs lights | + Berwick Street – pinch point and congestion |
| + Traffic light phasing | + Two new sets of lights could cause short cutting through side streets | + Flockton Street issue – will vehicle and bus manoeuvres be possible due to proximity to traffic signals |

#### Three laning – Madras Street and Barbadoes Street

| + Prefer clearway | + Loss of parking undesirable | + Bus blocking inside lane during clearway operation |
| + Leave as is and monitor | + Pedestrian safety | + Impact on businesses |
| + Improve public transport options | + Cyclist safety | + Impact on St Albans Park users |
| + Impact on residents | + Increase in truck movements undesirable – vibration and noise | + Continuation of the one-way system all the way through |

#### Cranford / Westminster, Cranford / Berwick, Madras / Edgeware, and Barbadoes / Edgeware

| + Safety – driver behaviour and vehicle speed concerns, pedestrian safety (especially children), and also desire to leave as is. | + Turning arrows or separate turning lanes | + Lower the speed |
| + Leave intersection(s) as is | + Have red light camera at intersection | + Pedestrian and cycle focus |
| + Parking – provision for shops/businesses and increase P15 to P30. | + Impact on businesses and residents | + Widen road – do not narrow |

The feedback from consultation provided good insight into the community's thoughts and concerns on the project. The results were considered during the issue and options workshops which led into option development, and the multi-criteria analysis of different options. Refer to Section 7.4 for discussion on how the consultation outputs informed option analysis.

Many of the issues with the options can be mitigated, or possibly resolved, during the later design phases of this project, however others may be more challenging. On-going dialogue and consultation will therefore be crucial to try to achieve the best upgrade options for the community.

As per the requirements of Section 5.2 of the Designation, and Christchurch City Council's own processes, the second round of consultation has also occurred on the Proposed Downstream Effects Management Plan and a further third round of consultation will be undertaken on the projects that are recommended in the Report. This third round of consultation will inherently be more detail specific on the individual treatment selection (say speed platform vs carriageway narrowing); however, it is important that the resultant decisions remain holistic to the network. A treatment decision on one street may result in a significant impact on another; perhaps even acting as a catalyst for another street exceeding the 30% threshold. Consequently, decisions cannot be made in isolation, or without consideration of their wider impact. The monitoring regime will be an important part of monitoring the impacts of various interventions and identifying any knock-on effects of such changes to other parts of the transport network.
6.2 Changes in Transport Modelling

Since the initial transport modelling was undertaken, that informed the consultation material, further modelling has been undertaken of the downstream effects. The most recent transport modelling has changed some of the streets that are expected to be impacted by greater than 30% traffic in 2031 and also looked at the impacts in 2021. One major change to the modelling that impacts on routes impacted downstream is the proposed layout of the Innes Road/Cranford Street intersection, which is being upgraded as part of the CNC project. Other changes that have been made include restricting a number of side-roads on major routes to left-in and left-out (LILO). For example, Malvern Street and Dee street intersections on Cranford Street. These network changes have impacted on traffic flows on Mersey Street (which now carries more traffic) and Malvern Street (which carries less traffic).

6.3 Changes to the Report following second round of Engagement

The second round of consultation sought to understand the community and stakeholder view on the proposed works in the draft management plan and identify any gaps and concerns with this plan. There was active participation by the community and stakeholder groups with four open days and 230 submissions received on the proposed plan.

A review of the submissions and comments received during the open days was undertaken. Issues raised during consultation can be sorted into three groups:

1. General local transport issues that are not caused by the construction of the CNC (e.g. outside the study areas or would have occurred even if CNC was not constructed). These are being referred to the relevant transport and project manager within Council.

2. Transport issues that can be addressed at the next stage of option development or that can await the results of monitoring after the CNC is opened. Many of the issues, and especially site-specific issues fall into this category. These do not need to be addressed by this plan.

3. Key transport issues have been considered in finalising this report.

Key issues and the response to these issues are as follows (this report has been modified in line with these responses):

- **ISSUE**: Strong emphasis on reducing single occupancy vehicle trips and overall number of vehicle trips from the north traveling through St Albans RESPONSE – That the Council should investigate the additional link capacity (clearways and additional lanes at traffic signals) being restricted to buses and higher occupancy vehicles (e.g. to be HOV or T2 lanes). There are expected negative local and wider network impacts of HOV lanes, in terms of more rat-running on local streets and a high likelihood that significant number of vehicles will be diverted to Main North/Papanui Road and Rutland Street, which are principal bus and cycling corridors, and associated adverse effects of this. These transport effects need to be understood before a decision can be made to restrict access to the clearways to HOVs.

- **ISSUE**: More emphasis needs to go on getting people onto buses (public transport) rather than using private motor vehicles. Request for 24/7 bus lanes on Cranford Street. RESPONSE – We support endeavours to get more people onto public transport and to apply further TDM measures. However, our preference is on HOV clearways (not bus lanes) in study area given the limited number of people that we believe would use bus services from the Waimakairi District to the city centre. Permanent bus lanes on Cranford Street will push traffic back onto Main North Road and Rutland Street impacting on safe and efficient bus and cycle usage of these routes. It would also lead to a lot of rat-running on local streets in St Albans; considerably more than HOV lanes.

- **ISSUE**: Transport partners (e.g. CCC and NZTA) need to do work together to change travel behaviour (e.g. looking at parking controls in CBD and allocating road space to buses). The focus should be on moving people not vehicles. RESPONSE The Greater Christchurch Transport Partnership has been considering measures to change travel choices in Northern Christchurch for many years. There are several studies on the go at present. This matter is complex as while changes like parking management in CBD and other key employment hubs may move some people to alternative transport modes like buses, there are also impacts, especially in the CBD, on retail businesses, and on parking outside residential properties. Also, with many trips with destinations outside the CBD it is not simply a matter of putting in an express bus from Waimakairi District to the city but also to other destinations. Making such network changes takes considerable time and the timing is not ideal for introducing further parking changes in the CBD given the retail sector is still recovering from the...
earthquakes. The proposed arterial changes do not preclude the provision of HOV and bus-lanes in the future, once TEM measures like parking management and ParkNRide is further progressed.

- **ISSUE:** Not enough measures around walking, cycling and public transport to be introduced before the CNC opens. Most of the changes appear to come later after traffic volumes have increased and should be in place before CNC opens (Stage 1 improvements). **RESPONSE:** The Stage 1 improvements focus on safety and a test for these modes. For example, the traffic signals at Warrington/Forfar and Warrington/Barmboeoe will improve access and safety for pedestrians and cyclists crossing Warrington Street and using St Albans Park. We have also added a requirement in stage 1 to commence several studies and implement quick wins before the CNC opens and other changes as early as possible within the three years after the CNC opens. An example would be signage and marking of an alternative north-south cycling route through quiet local streets to the east of Cranford Street. This could be done relatively quickly and be in place before the CNC opens. We have also moved the construction of the north-south route into the three years following the CNC (previously in Stage 3). The timeframes for other projects need to allow time for suitable engagement with the community.

- **ISSUE:** Confusion around the type of cycling facilities to be installed as part of secondary cycle routes network. Are they to be separated cycle lanes? **RESPONSE:** In the DEMP report we have made it clear that the secondary cycle-ways won’t generally include separators like provided on the MCRs (e.g. Papanui Paarallel). There may be some shared paths proposed, but most of these routes will consist of painted cycle lanes and bicycle greenways (i.e. use of quiet streets). Also, the public will get to see all designs that impact on street cross-section including kerbside parking provision as part of consultation on specific projects.

- **ISSUE:** Lack of safe cycling facilities on Cranford/Sherborne Streets during Cranford operation. **RESPONSE:** Two strategies to address this are 1) directing majority of through cyclists away from corridor and onto Papanui Parallel and other routes, and 2) improvements to be made to Cranford Street to better accommodate cyclists who still chose to cycle on this route. Council will investigate several options to achieve this, including providing a wider kerbside lane during Cranford operation.

- **ISSUE:** Concerns around staging of traffic calming on various streets and concerns on the time it might take to implement measures to address rat-running that does occur after the CNC opens. **RESPONSE:** Have made it clear that monitoring of rat-running in local streets needs to happen soon after CNC opens. RESPONSE: The DEMP report states that a study of these effects was excluded from the brief. Generally modelling does not indicate that Innes Road, especially the western end, will be heavily impacted by the CNC and the impacts are well below the levels of transport impact on Cranford Street. This issue is mainly an existing problem and Council will monitor the situation and determine after CNC is opened whether anything needs to be done on this route. The expectation is that congestion on Innes Road will result in drivers re-route further north and use Botham Road and the Blighs/Idris corridor to head west. Additional road capacity may add additional traffic to Cranford Street and Innes Road which is undesirable.

---
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 ISSUE: Will there be monitoring of air, noise and vibration from traffic before and after the CNC opens.  
RESPONSE: Made it clear in the DEMP that Council will be doing this monitoring both before and after the CNC opens so that any impacts of the additional traffic can be assessed.

 ISSUE: Concerns around pedestrian safety of children in the proximity of schools. RESPONSE: We have highlighted the improvements that will be made before the CNC opens to address safety concerns from crossing school children, especially across Cranford Street. Such improvements are being made as part of the arterial road upgrades, especially at the Cranford/Westminster and Cranford/Berwick intersections. Speed limit reductions on local streets to 30 or 40km/h will also improve safety for school children, general pedestrians and cyclists.

 ISSUE: Requests to install tolls on the Waimakariri Bridge (SH1) to reduce number of cars travelling into Christchurch (as a traffic demand management measure). RESPONSE: Current New Zealand legislation does not permit existing roads to be tolled. Only new roads.
7. Issues and Option Development

This section of the report outlines the expected transport issues that will result from the CNC, along with associated improvement options and desired outcomes (as identified during the stakeholder and public consultation), transport modelling, and review of the network by the independent expert. The Report presents various options that have been developed to avoid, remedy or mitigate the expected transport issues (i.e. the desired outcomes) and fulfill the objectives stated in the Designation conditions. The main objective is to achieve the desired outcomes of avoiding, remedying and mitigating the transport effects of the CNC, especially on the local community. In most cases this will be achieved by undertaking the proposed improvement options in this plan or from the recommended studies. However, given the Report extends over a period of more than ten years, the options implemented may change as a result of the monitoring results or if alternative options will result in even better transport outcomes.

As with any area-wide transport plan, it is also important that the options are as consistent as possible with the objectives of local, regional, and national strategies. As outlined in the CTSP and the national Government Policy Statement (GPS) on transport, road safety, and access for all road users is a high priority.

Section 7.1 outlines the issue and option development process that has been adopted for the Report. Given the focus on keeping upgrades within the existing road reserve wherever possible (e.g. not looking at any new arterials or major arterial upgrades), there are a limited number of options available for increasing road capacity and mitigating the impact of the additional traffic on various road users (e.g. cyclists and pedestrians) and the local community.

7.1 Issues and Option Development Process

The first step in developing options was to clearly set out all of the issues that may be experienced on the network following the opening of the CNC. These included existing issues that may be exacerbated, and new issues. Compiling the issues was done by using the data available on the network (such as crash data), outputs from the model (such as where congestion might occur), feedback from the public, and expert knowledge of the network. A knowledge of the issues (or at least likely issues) was important so that the subsequent options considered would be focused on addressing these issues.

The option development was focused on the key desired transport outcomes specified in the Designation (e.g. keep traffic on preferred traffic routes) and also was to be as consistent as possible with the objectives of local, regional, and national strategies. It has been separated into two development stages. Stage One involved developing options to encourage the additional traffic that will come down the CNC, when it opens and through to the end of the commissioning period, to stay primarily on the arterials and collector routes and off the local streets. This can be achieved by using a combined ‘carrot’ and ‘stick’ approach. The carrot being to upgrade some of the arterial and main collector routes. The stick being to traffic calm a number of local streets to push traffic back onto the arterial and collector routes. In addition to the traffic calming, up to 9 safe speed community areas (SSCA) are proposed in the study area to deter rat-running traffic on local streets and to reduce the risk of serious and fatal crashes from any traffic.

It is acknowledged that the community wants to also see travel demand management measures that reduce the volume of vehicles coming down the CNC and into the St Albans road network. Christchurch City Council, Ecan, Waimakairiri District Council and NZ Transport Agency are investigating measures that encourage more trips by alternative transport modes (e.g. bikes and bus) and more car-pooling. While such measures would reduce traffic volumes, the impact on traffic volumes coming off the CNC, at least initially, is likely to be relatively small (it is estimated that effective measures might result in up to 10% reduction in traffic volumes) and so the focus of this study has been dealing with a significant increase in traffic through the network when the CNC opens and out to the end of the commissioning period.

The second development stage focuses on improvements that need to be made on several roads to mitigate the impact of the additional traffic from the CNC on all road users and the community. The key outcome is a network of roads that supports and promotes use of transport options other than the single occupancy motor vehicle, which retains or improves access to key community facilities (parks, schools, and shops) and, where possible, addresses the safety impacts of the additional traffic. The second stage of option development included projects in the following four categories:

1. Safe Access to Schools
2. Safe Cycling Routes
3. Access to Parks
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4. Access to Commercial Centres

Two over-arching principles are promoted in the development of the options: delivering healthier streets and a safer (transport) system. With the growing understanding that streets have a vital role to play in developing vibrant and healthy communities, the Report includes a requirement to develop street improvements that lead to healthier streets wherever possible. It is proposed doing baseline (before treatment) and design assessments of each impacted route using the Healthy Streets framework developed by Transport for London (see Guide to the Healthy Streets Indicators). The ten key healthy street indicators are shown in Figure 7-1 below. Preference should be given to options that lead to more healthy streets or, where this is not possible due to increasing traffic volumes, that minimise the impact on the health of a street.

![Healthy Streets Check scores diagram](source: lucysandleses)

Figure 7-1: Healthy Street Framework

In terms of improving road safety and moving towards a safer transport system the Austroads safe system assessment framework should be used, in addition to safety auditing, to evaluate all infrastructure improvement options. The safe system framework breaks the risk of fatal and serious injury crashes into three components: exposure, likelihood, and severity. The exposure is typically the volume of transport users (pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists) on the street. With the increase in traffic volumes on many routes in the network as a result of the CNC, the crash risk will increase if no improvements are made. To compensate for this increase in crash risk it is proposed that both the ‘likelihood’ and ‘severity’ of crashes must go down. To achieve a reduction in ‘likelihood’ the facilities for road users, especially pedestrians and cyclists, in urban areas must improve. For example, the introduction of traffic signals, the greater use of pedestrians crossing aids (islands) and shorter crossing distances, and introduction of cycle lanes and paths. Crash severity is influenced by operating speeds which are related to speed limits and road design. Hence improvements that reduce operating speeds and lower speed limits reduces crash severity. In this network this will be achieved on local roads through introduction of the safe speed areas.
While at first reading the DEMP does not provide much in the way of public transport improvement options it is important to realise that the CNC itself does support public transport in two ways. The first is to attract traffic away from the Main North/Papanui Road corridor so that better bus priority measures can be applied to that route, without causing severe congestion. The second is with the inclusion of the high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes southbound across the Waimakariri River and through to just north of the new Cranford Street Roundabout. The HOV lanes will provide priority for buses and vehicles with at least two occupants. As traffic volumes grow on this corridor this will result in buses having travel time savings.

As part of this plan, extending the HOV lanes further south, and providing them northbound is to be investigated, as this would give priority to buses and people who carpool (i.e. increasing vehicle occupancy). Given that the bulk of buses will be on Main North Road, the principal northern bus route, there is no requirement for a bus-only lane on Cranford Street, at least not initially. It is possible in the future, with further growth in the Waimakariri District and Northern Christchurch (e.g. Belfast), and once further TDM measures (like parking controls in CBD) are implemented, a case may be made to change the proposed clearway lanes to bus-lanes. If special purpose lanes (HOV lanes in this case) are installed from the start then it is a lot easier to change the vehicles that have access to them, than if they were to start as general traffic lanes. However, there are potential adverse effects of providing HOV lanes down Cranford Street in that they may cause more rat-running in local streets and also divert traffic back onto Main North Road, making it more difficult to install bus priority onto that route. This matter needs more investigation, and hence why this plan does not specify that the clearways have to be HOV. But rather this option needs to be well investigated.

In terms of specifics on the proposed HOV north of Innes this would result in permanent HOV lanes in both directions. South of Innes the HOV would be provided in peak period clearways. Extension of the HOV lanes through to Bealey Avenue is already being investigated by CCC and their partners... In terms of the study area, the needs of public transport should be considered in the more detailed designs, including location of bus stops, bus shelters, and reducing delays on routes, especially at traffic signals.

The next five sections talk in more detail about the issues and options in the Report.

### 7.2 Arterial/Collector Capacity Issues

#### Context

One of the main issues identified for the arterial and collector roads was that they would be under greater strain (in terms of vehicle flows) than before the CNC during peak periods. When a road becomes severely congested vehicle movements slow and gap selection becomes more difficult and dangerous leading to greater queuing on local streets. It also becomes more dangerous to cross the road; especially before vehicle speeds drop due to congestion. To a degree, arterial/collector congestion is to be expected, especially during peak hours. However, the modelling outputs indicate that congestion will rise (especially during weekday peak hours) to a point where drivers will be more likely to choose to use local roads impacting on safety and amenity in primarily residential areas. Therefore, the issue identified was that the key arterial roads will likely be unable to cater for the increased vehicle demands, resulting in a redistribution of movements to local roads. The key arterial and collector capacity constraints have been identified for the current network in the transport modelling (during weekday peaks periods) and are as follows (noting that an extensive number of plots have been used to identify these issues):

1. The merge south of the Cranford Street / Innes Road intersection when the CNC opens. Two through lanes north and through the intersection become one lane southbound. The modelling in the AM Peak indicates that the V/C (expected volume to road capacity) ratio in 2021 would be 0.97 and in 2031 would be 0.98 (noting that anything over 0.8 is poor and will lead to disruptive traffic flows). Modelling indicates a lot of rat-running, especially onto Mersey Street if this matter is not addressed.

2. The through lane capacity at the Westminster Street / Cranford Street intersection. The current intersection has a shared through and right lane and through and left lane with a short merge lane, especially northbound (due to parking for the shops). With right turning demand there is effectively only a single through lane at the intersection, which severely constrains the capacity of intersection in both north and southbound directions. Queues already form heading northbound in PM Peak period.

3. Northbound and southbound through lane capacity at the Benwick Street / Cranford Street intersection. Currently only one through lane and a short right turn lane is provided heading north through the intersection. With CNC flows, the northbound through movement has a V/C of 0.85 in 2021. There is currently one through and one short...
left turn lane heading southbound. With CNC flows and the clearaways on Cranford to Berwick the V/C is 0.91 in 2021. Both constraints would cause peak period delays.

4. Right turn capacity turning right from Berwick Street into Cranford Street. The single right turn lane is a major capacity constraint for traffic heading north on Madras Street /Forfar Street wishing to turn into Cranford Street. The impact of this constraint in isolation is difficult to assess given upstream capacity constraints. Option modelling has shown that with a double right turn in 2021, this route will have a V/C 0.74. From this it can be determined that a single right turn will have a much poorer V/C.

5. The single-lane Forfar Street /Warrington Street roundabout is also a capacity constraint. In 2021 the North bound Forfar Street approach will be 0.81 in the PM Peak and this deteriorates further in 2031. The impact of this has again been assessed using the option modelling because of upstream capacity constraints. The option modelling includes traffic signals with a double left turn from Forfar Street into Berwick Street. This movement has a V/C is 0.62 in the PM Peak. A single left turn, as provided with the roundabout, would have a V/C well over 0.8. In the AM Peak the single through lane V/C from Berwick Street into Warrington Street at a signalised intersection would be 0.87. This indicates that two through lanes (or both a through and through and right turn lane) are required which can not be accommodated at the current roundabout. In addition, roundabouts often experience safety problems when they operate near capacity due to risk taking as drivers pick smaller gaps. It is expected crash numbers will increase if the roundabout is not upgraded.

6. Capacity constraints at Barbados Street /Warrington Street priority T-intersection. Right turn movements out of Barbados Street will become increasingly difficult due to increased traffic volumes during peak periods. At the priority intersection the V/C for the right turn out of Barbados Street is 0.82 in the evening peak in 2021. Considerable delays for this movement in the evening peak, in the absence of CNC traffic was observed.

7. Edgeware Road intersections at Cranford Street /Sherborne Street, Madras Street, and Barbados Street can only effectively accommodate a single through lane, like Westminster Street /Cranford Street, due to right turns sharing the lane with through vehicles, and short shared left and through lanes.

8. Southbound capacity constraint at Barbados Street / Bealey Avenue intersection. The single lane through movement on the mid-block approach to the intersection (there are two through lanes at the intersection itself) already causes congestion in the AM Peak, which the models predict to increase going forward, especially if more traffic from the CNC is pushed down this route.

9. Northbound capacity constraint at Madras Street /Bealey Avenue intersection. In the PM Peak the two through lanes have to merge quickly on the exit of the intersection due to a short merge to accommodate kerbside parking. This creates safety issues for motor vehicles and especially cyclists as the motor vehicles are often travelling at higher speeds having come off the one-way system with traffic signal coordination.

10. Southbound capacity constraint at the Sherborne Street /Bealey Avenue intersection. The single lane right-turn at this intersection into Bealey Avenue and single through lane approach up Sherborne Street causes queuing especially in the AM Peak, mainly to right turns but also to left turns stuck in the queue. The modelling of clearways down Sherborne Street indicates V/C of 0.91 in 2021 and 0.95 in 2031 for right turn into Bealey Avenue if this intersection is not upgraded.

11. While the Innes Road /Cranford Street intersection is being upgraded as part of the CNC the left turn from the west into Cranford Street has only a short lane and hence drivers travelling north on Rutland Street may choose to travel through on Rutland Street and use Knowles Street, Weston Road, or McFaddens Road to access Cranford Street instead of Innes Road.

12. The installation of traffic signals at St Albans Street /Rutland Street intersection and limited right turn phase time from Rutland Street into Innes Road at the St Albans Street /Rutland Street intersection as part of the cycleway upgrade has reduced the traffic volumes on this route (a good outcome given cycle safety considerations), and also the influenced how drivers heading north access Cranford Street, as in bullet point 11.

Arterial upgrades typically involve increasing the capacity of transport corridors to attract trips from local roads to arterials and collectors during peak flow periods. The idea is that if arterials/collector routes have adequate capacity then drivers are less inclined to use local roads which tend to be designed more for accessing adjacent residential land uses rather than for movement of vehicles.
There is a range of ways in which the capacity of a road can be increased, such as physically creating more capacity (more lanes) at intersections and mid-blocks. Time controlled additional capacity is another treatment such as ‘clearways’ where part of the carriageway can be used as an additional lane during heavier traffic flows but returns to parking at other times of the day, so it can be used for other purposes i.e., parking. These clearways are further divided into general traffic clearways and special purpose lanes/clearways. Special purpose clearways range from bus-lanes (which are already being used on high frequency bus routes across Christchurch) to high occupancy lanes (with 2 or more or 3 or more occupants – T2 and T3 lanes). These are typically used on routes with fewer buses. Christchurch currently does not have one of these special purpose lanes. There are though many HOV lanes across New Zealand. These special purpose lanes are normally used as part of a wider package of TDM measures to support more bus-use and car-pooling. Applying right turning bays at intersections can also increase road capacity.

Bealey Avenue, as a key arterial, forms a southern boundary of this project. Bealey Avenue runs approximately west to east and provides connections with the one-way pair box and four avenues. There are several arterials and collectors located south of the CNC and north of Bealey Avenue that will carry additional traffic from the CNC. The key ones being Cranford Street, Sherborne Street, Berwick/Warrington Street, Barbadoes Street, Madras Street, and the Innes, Rutland/Springfield corridor. The extent to which each street will carry the extra traffic depends on the capacity that is added to these streets at intersections and to midblock. Early on in the study, modelling was undertaken to assess whether improvements to the GEl Drive/Innes roundabout, Innes Road, and Hills Road might move some of the traffic expected down Cranford Street onto Hills Road. The modelling indicated that even with higher cost improvements along this route very few drivers would divert to the Hills Road route.

As with all capacity improvement projects, there is a risk that adding capacity can simply shift the location of congestion; for example, by relieving pressure at one location traffic will flow freely until encountering the next constriction. However, if there is too much congestion on arterial roads then drivers will be more inclined to ‘rat-run’ using local roads. Hence the Report, therefore balances these issues by providing some additional arterial capacity, while calming local streets. While capacity is being added to arterial and collector roads there will still be some peak period congestion. The actual traffic effects after CNC is opened will be monitored to see whether more arterial capacity, and/or local road traffic calming is required.

North of Berwick Street Issues and Options

North of Berwick Street there are only two existing arterial and collector route options available to drivers coming down from the CNC. One option is the Rutland Street/Springfield Road corridor. As discussed previously, with the improvement made to the corridor as part of the Paparangi Parallel separated cycleway (on Rutland Street), and being less direct, this corridor is less attractive than the main route option of Cranford Street.

The split of extra traffic between the routes is approximately 550vpd (vehicles per day) on Rutland Street and 4,100vpd on Cranford Street south of Innes Road when the CNC opens in 2020 (without any improvements). This increases to around 900vpd on Rutland Street and 6,000vpd on Cranford Street by 2031. While there is an increase in traffic on Rutland Street, it is minimal given the total increase in traffic from CNC and will have minimal adverse effects on the Paparangi Parallel cycleway. Further details on traffic volumes on various routes are provided in Appendix D2.

As indicated earlier, the main issues on this route are the capacity constraints as traffic heads south in the morning and north in the evening, via one single through lane south of Innes Road. The other constraint is right turning vehicles blocking the through lane at side roads and at the English Park carpark. While this will occur at other accessways along the route, the intersections and the carpark are the major traffic generators of right turning movements. Other issues, such as the safety of school children crossing Cranford Street, are covered in later sections.

While no changes are proposed to Rutland Street, the key outcome needed for Cranford Street is the provision of additional capacity from Innes Road to Berwick Street in order to accommodate the increase in traffic from the CNC. The two main options that can be accommodated in the current road reserve are four-laning and peak period clearways. The latter is preferred because it allows parking on Cranford Street near the Westminster Street /Cranford Street local commercial centre outside peak periods. Ideally these clearways are HOV lanes so that priority is provided to buses and higher occupancy vehicles. Changes are also proposed at the Westminster Street /Cranford Street intersection (see Figure 7.2). A right turn ban will apply at this intersection during the AM peak period, to provide two through lanes southbound. There is no room to accommodate a right turn bay given the close proximity of the shops. Northbound a new right turn bay is required on the southern approach of the intersection. Given the increased traffic volumes through the intersection, to accommodate cyclists (via cycle lane) and to address safety concerns with drivers hitting the signal pole (westbound) along Westminster Street, widening of the western approach is proposed (more on this later). Right
turn bans will be installed permanently at the Dee Street and Malvern Street approaches on both sides of Cranford Street using throat islands. It is also proposed that the English Park carpark access be redesigned and right turns in and out of this carpark be banned.

Figure 7-2: Proposed Arterial Upgrades North of Berwick Street

South of Berwick Street Issues and Options

A key outcome desired for the arterial network south of Berwick Street is again the provision of additional capacity for the increased volume of traffic from the CNC. South of Berwick Street there are three preferred traffic routes that could carry the additional traffic from the CNC through to Bealey Avenue, being Cranford Street /Sherborne Street, Forfar Street /Madras Street, and Barbadoes Street. The extent to which each route carries this additional traffic depends on the best combinations of upgrades to accommodate this additional traffic. The key capacity issues are at the nine intersections in the network that are on these routes intersecting with Berwick Street /Warrington Street, Edgeware Road, and Bealey Avenue. The key intersection constraints are along Berwick and Warrington streets. The issues being lack of right turn capacity (from a single right turn lane) from Berwick into Cranford, and the capacity and safety of the Forfar Street/Warrington Street roundabout and Barbadoes Street /Warrington Street priority-controlled intersection with the increase in traffic volumes. The other six intersections capacity issues can be addressed by installing right turn bays or banning right turn and/or adding approach lane capacity.

In terms of a continuous route connecting Cranford Street (clearway) and Bealey Avenue, there are two main options with several sub-options for one of the options proposed. Both options involve upgrading the Cranford Street /Berwick Street, Forfar Street /Warrington Street, and Barbadoes Street /Warrington Street intersections along with some capacity improvements to Berwick and Warrington Streets to provide approach-lane capacity. Option A involves adding clearways to Cranford and Sherborne Streets and Option B involves upgrading the capacity of Barbadoes and Madras/Forfar Streets (two sub-options being clearways or extending one-ways). Ideally much of the additional capacity provided, especially mid-block, is in the form of HOV lanes, rather than general traffic lanes, to encourage increasing bus use and
In addition, there are a number of intersection upgrades required. More on each of these options and analysis is given later on in this report.

Figure 7-3: Proposed Arterial Upgrade South of Berwick Street

Local Streets Affected by Traffic following Arterials Improvements

Transport modelling was undertaken to assess how effective the arterial upgrades would be in reducing the number of local streets that have a greater than 30% increase in traffic in 2021 and 2031. This analysis effectively repeated that undertaken early on in the study for no network changes (as presented in section 5.4) but this time including the two arterial upgrade options. Both options looked at the clearway from Innes Road to Berwick Street, improvements to the Cranford Street / Westminster Street intersections and upgrades to capacity along Berwick and Warrington Streets. The two options south of Berwick were A (Cranford/Sherrborne clearways) and B (Madras Street /Forfar Street and Barbadoes Street clearways) as shown in Figure 7-3.

Figures 7-4 to 7-9 shows the local streets that will trigger the 30% increase in AM Peak, PM Peak and all-day in 2021 and 2031 for Option A. Figures 7-10 to 7-15 show the same plots but for Option B. These figures were produced using
the change flow maps from the transport modelling, as presented in Appendix D4. These figures show the streets that are expected to trigger a greater than 30% increase in traffic compared with what might have occurred if the CNC had not been built.

Figure 7-4: Streets expected to be affected by more than 30% in AM Peak, 2021, Option A

Figure 7-5: Streets expected to be affected by more than 30% in AM Peak, 2031, Option A

Figure 7-6: Streets expected to be affected by more than 30% in PM Peak, 2021, Option A

Figure 7-7: Streets expected to be affected by more than 30% in PM Peak, 2031, Option A
Care needs to be taken in interpreting these plots as there is considerable uncertainty in how much these streets will be impacted by the CNC traffic, due to the limitation in transport modelling. What it does indicate is streets that need to be treated before the opening of the CNC or shortly after. For the other streets (those not impacted by an additional 30% traffic in 2021), the traffic monitoring will identify the actual increase and determine whether traffic calming changes are required to these streets.

The outcome of this analysis informs the streets that are likely to need traffic calming when the CNC is opened or shortly after (e.g. Mersey Street). These are streets that are shown to be impacted in most scenarios, and those that can be monitored and treated at a later date (e.g. Forfar Street). Figures 7-4 to 7-9 show the additional rat-running streets south of Berwick Street, including Edgeware Road, Manchester Street, and Caledonian Road (the last two are wide local streets) that are impacted by Option A, extending clear-ways down Sherborne Street. A detailed list of streets that need to be (or may need to be) treated are provided in Chapter 8. Details on the types of traffic calming that should be provided, along with supporting speed limit restrictions, are provided in Section 7.5. Specific traffic calming treatments need to be developed and discussed with affected parties and the public for each street.

7.3 Options Considered to Address Issues

During the first stage (iteration) of option development, the independent traffic expert developed project options that used a combination of traffic calming of local streets and capacity upgrades of arterial and collector routes to attract the extra vehicles from the CNC to the arterial and collector routes. The intention of each of the options is to encourage the additional CNC traffic to use the preferred arterial and collector roads and reduce rat-running on local roads. In the transport modelling it was assumed that the arterial upgrades would be for all vehicles.

The Stage 1 options were developed following the first round of consultation with stakeholders and the public. The public expressed interest in 1) a greater use of clearways, rather than permanent three-laning 2) the option of extending the Barbadoes Street /Madras Street one-way system north to Warrington Street, and 3) using clearways down the Cranford Street /Sherborne Street corridor south of Berwick Street. The full list of options was discussed and evaluated during several issue and option workshops and meetings.

The main options considered in Stage 1 are summarised as follows (see Appendix G for option diagrams).

- Do Nothing – this results in rat-running in a lot of local streets.
- Option 1. Traffic Calming Only.
- Option 2. Arterial Upgrades Only. The option used was three-laning of Barbadoes Street and Madras (Forfar) Street, Cranford Street Clearways and Berwick Street / Warrington Street capacity improvements).
- Option 3 (a). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades. Arterial upgrades as in Option 2 except clearways on Barbadoes Street and Madras (Forfar) Street instead of permanent three-laning.
Option 3 (b). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades. Arterial upgrades as in Option 2, so permanent three-laning of Barbadoes and Madras (Forfar) Streets.

Option 3 (c). Traffic Calming and Arterial Upgrades. Arterial upgrades as in Option 2 except extension of Barbadoes Street / Madras Street one-ways to Warrington Street.

Option 4 (a). Traffic Calming and Clearways on Cranford Street / Sherborne Street from Innes Road to Bealey Avenue plus Berwick Street and Warrington Street Improvements.

Option 4 (b) Traffic Calming and permanent four-laning on Cranford Street / Sherborne Street (option included to allow comparison of options with a more major upgrade of arterial roads).

Option 5. Traffic Calming plus combined Arterial Options of all three routes (Options 3(a) and 4(a)).

Most of the options include new right turn bays or right turn bans at intersections, including traffic signals (e.g. Cranford Street / Westminster Street) to improve through-traffic efficiency. The traffic signal right turn bans only operate when the clearways are operating.

Some of the stakeholders have also suggested use of bus lanes or high occupancy vehicle (HOV) clearway lanes. These lanes encourage people to car-pool and/or use the bus. Currently HOV lanes are proposed on part of the CNC; in southbound direction but ending before the Cranford Street Roundabout. Further modelling is required to demonstrate the impact of these restrictions on local street rat-running and on the wider transport network, before limiting the use of these lanes. Subject to further investigation the restriction of these additional clearway traffic lanes to HOV lanes is recommended as this is expected to reduce the number of vehicles with one occupant. Given that even with express buses from the Waimakariri this corridor will have a relatively low number of buses, the independent expert does not support bus-lanes like on Main North Road and Papanui Road.

7.4 Multi-Criteria Analysis of Options

Before commencing the MCA assessment, an MCA facilitator was selected by the independent traffic expert. The facilitator developed a number of criteria for evaluating the options based on previous assessments of this type he had undertaken and based on the strategic transport documents that were relevant for this study area. During the first issues and options workshop the criterion and weightings for each criterion were discussed and agreed by a panel of transport professionals, selected by the independent traffic expert and Council. The attendees at the workshops were selected to cover various transport and other relevant disciplines, including urban design. The attendees intentionally wanted limited weighting placed on journey time and more on community impacts to reflect the outcomes from the consultation, which wanted a focus on community impacts.

During the second and third workshops, participants gave ratings to the various options listed above. This involved robust discussion over each of the ratings. Feedback from the consultation process was used during discussion (such as exactly where safety or environmental concerns were) which allowed for more specific rating analysis. The ratings of each option (considering the positive and negative consequences) are compared with the transport network in 2020 immediately before the CNC becomes operational; the baseline option. Hence, the sum of rankings for all options do have a negative value as they include CNC traffic, while the baseline option does not. To provide a relative score between the options each option has been compared with the do-nothing option and, in this case, most of the options have a positive score. The results of the MCA are presented in Table 7-1.
Table 7-1: Multi-Criteria Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for vulnerable users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for cyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for motorists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Context</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep vehicles on preferred vehicle access routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage mode change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligned with local and national transport strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey Time (End to End)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay for motor vehicles on arterial roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate or improve PT travel times and reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Considerations</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to local businesses and economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and amenity impact</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementability</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and ongoing costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MCA indicates that option 3(c), which involves extending the one-way pair of Madras (Forfar) Street and Barbadoes Street, along with clearaways on Cranford Street to Berwick and capacity upgrades including new signals on Warrington Street and traffic calming of local streets has the best overall (score) ranking.

However, two other options also rank relatively well being option 3(a) which is similar to option 3(c) but has clearaways on Madras (Forfar) Street and Barbadoes Street rather than converting them to one-way streets. The other high ranked option is 4(a) which includes clearaways on Cranford Street /Sherborne Street through to Bealey Avenue, with traffic signals at Forfar Street /Warrington and Barbadoes Street /Warrington Street. While option 3(b) also has a similar scoring overall it did score more poorly in terms of ‘main considerations’, with permanent three-laning impacting more on business and residential kerb-side car parking. Given that additional capacity is only required in peak periods, the peak period clearway option (3a) is preferable as a two-way configuration, and so it has not been carried forward.

Option 5 provides both sets of upgrades. It is unlikely by 2031 that both upgrade Options (3(a) and 4(a)) will be required. Indeed, capacity constraints on Cranford Street north of Berwick Street will limit need for all upgrades. Hence this option is not preferred.
Preferred Option Discussion

Option 3(a) includes upgrades to Berwick Street and Warrington Street, as does Option 3(c). However, instead of extending the one-way streets it proposes peak period clearways on Madras (Fortfar) Street and Barbadoes Streets south of Warrington Street. A key reason this option is not scoring as well as the one-way extension is the additional lane during peak periods would impact on the following: 1) Kerbside parking (for business and residents), 2) Difficulty accommodating cycle facilities (due to clearway), and 3) Much wider crossing distance across Forfar Street and Barbadoes Street to St Alans Park. The main negatives with the one-way extension is extra travel distance for some trips to Madras Street and Barbadoes Street businesses and residents (this is minimal in this case due to the grid network of roads), and a potential increase in speeds if road does not get suitable narrowing.

Option 4(a) includes extending clearways further south on Cranford Street and along Sherborne Street. This option has slightly better travel time savings compared to Options 3(a) and 3(c). But, as can be seen in the MCA analysis, travel time has a relatively low weighting overall (at 10%) compared to many other matters assessed. Negative impacts include poor provision for cyclists when clearway is in operation, right turn ban at Berwick Street (from Cranford Street), additional traffic through Edgeware Village, and removal of parking on Sherborne Street from Bealey Avenue to Purchase Street permanently as part of upgrading the Bealey Avenue/Sherborne Street intersection. The main advantage of this option is that change will not need to be made to most of Madras (Fortfar) Street and Barbadoes Street. However, this is also a negative as these routes, especially Madras (Fortfar) Street, will experience traffic growth which will impact on safe access to St Alans Park as there will be additional traffic that pedestrians have to give-way to.

Development of a Preferred Option

All three options would provide the additional traffic capacity required to minimise rat-running on local streets. All three include peak period clearways on Cranford Street to Berwick Street and improvements to the Westminster Street /Cranford Street and Berwick Street /Cranford Street intersections. The modelling indicates that Madras Street would have significant additional traffic using it with all three options and that the Warrington Street /Fortfar Street intersection needs to be signalised, along with associated upgrades to Berwick and Warrington Streets. It is also highly recommended upgrading the Barbadoes Street /Warrington Street intersection, which already experiences considerable delays and has safety concerns, especially for crossing pedestrians and buses.

For the three highest ranking options, the capacity upgrades required on Berwick Street /Warrington Street and north of Berwick Street (Cranford clearways) are very similar and hence these elements of the options are included as part of the proposed Plan (some differences in intersection layouts at new traffic signals). However, south of Berwick Street there are three options, with one, Sherborne Street clearways, appearing to be quite different to the other two that utilised Barbadoes Street and Madras Street to carry the additional CNC traffic. However, all three routes, Sherborne Street /Cranford Street, Madras Street /Fortfar Street, and Barbadoes Street already have a role in distributing traffic from Cranford North to Bealey Avenue and further south, and vice versa. Drivers tend to choose the route that best positions them to use Bealey Avenue and access the two sets of one-way pairs (Madras Street /Barbadoes Street and Durham Street /Montreal Street), depending on their destination (or origin). Drivers will still have both choices following the opening of the CNC but will distribute themselves depending on the level of congestion on each route.

Modelling to date on this study has been undertaken with the CAST model. This model is useful for looking at preferred route choice at a network level. It is not sensitive enough to assess the more detailed operation of the road network at an intersection and individual road link level. Also, stakeholders and the public are keen to see more detail on what each upgrade option would look like, and the detailed effects. These effects include removal of parking outside residences and business, rat-running through several local routes, such as Edgeware Road through the village. It has also been suggested during consultation that express buses from the Wainuiariki District could be routed down Cranford Street, then Edgeware Road onto the top end of Manchester Street and eventually into the bus-street section of Manchester Street and the transport (bus) interchange. It is therefore suggested that all three options are progressed to a scoping study.

This scoping study would look in more detail at the design of each route, the nine main intersections from Warrington Street to Bealey Avenue and possible routes for express buses. This would involve more detailed modelling of each option to look at how the options might be staged (e.g. where are clearways required in 2020, compared with 2031), and seek further community and stakeholder input on the proposed upgrades. It is possible that the preferred option may involve some upgrades to all three routes.
In all three cases the upgrades would connect into the Benwick Street / Warrington Street capacity improvements which should progress to detail design and construction ideally ahead of the CNC opening. It is expected that during the design phase and based on community feedback that these will be changes made to the preferred option that may differ to options assessed in this report. As long as those changes still achieve an outcome that encourages traffic to stay on the preferred (arterial and collector routes) and are not a major deviation to the preferred options (e.g. no permanent four lanes of Cranford St) then they can be considered to be in general alignment with what has been proposed in this report.

7.5 Traffic Calming and Safe Speed Community Areas

Development of Traffic Calming Measures

Local streets have a primary function of providing access to adjoining land-use and lack some of the safe design features of arterial and, to a lesser degree, collector routes. While many of the streets in the St Albans area are narrow or have been narrowed to reduce vehicle speeds, there are a number of local streets in the study area that are very wide and may attract fast moving rat-running traffic, including larger trucks. Speeding issues if not treated, can increase the risk of crashes involving serious injuries and deaths. A range of treatments exist which can limit, dissuade, or mitigate vehicle movements through parts of the transport network where these movements are less desired, or unexpected. Most of these treatments are categorised as ‘traffic calming’ and should also reduce vehicle speeds and discourage access by larger vehicles (except on bus routes). Treatments typically include23:

- Vertical deflection - Watts profile speed humps, raised platforms (mid-block and intersection), raised pavements, and wombat crossings (raised pedestrian crossings).
- Horizontal deflection – lane narrowing/kerb extensions, slow points, centre blister islands, driveway links, median treatments, and roundabouts.
- Diversion devices – full road closure, half road closure, diagonal road closure, modified T-intersection, left-in/left out islands.
- Signs, line marking, and other treatments – speed limit signs and indication devices, prohibited traffic movement signs, one-way street signs, give-way signs, stop signs, shared zones, school zones, threshold treatments, tactile surface treatments, bicycle facilities, and bus facilities.

The traffic calming measures range in severity. Some completely close off available movement, such as converting a street that had multiple vehicle entries to a cul-de-sac. A treatment such as this would remove all through movements from the street. Other treatments are less severe, allowing for full access but reducing vehicle speeds and making the street less comfortable to negotiate. In the Report less severe traffic calming measures should be implemented to start, as these are typically more acceptable to the public prior to high levels of rat-running being observed on streets.

If traffic monitoring indicates this is not effective, more severe traffic calming, such as banning movements or partially or fully closing streets, may be necessary. While there is a focus on the less severe traffic calming to start, there are some obvious more severe traffic calming measures (e.g. restricting arms of intersections to entry or exit only) that could be made for relatively low cost, compared to traffic calming an entire street. Such options should be discussed with local residents and if supported progressed.

Another beneficial side effect of traffic calming streets is that it can improve the level of service for cyclists and pedestrians. This can be achieved by treatments such as kerb protrusions that reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians, or by reducing speeds so cyclists feel more comfortable cycling in the traffic lane.

The Report identifies the streets that are expected to have a greater than 30% increase in traffic volumes as a result of the CNC in the AM or FM peak periods (in some cases in both) or all day by 2031. The modelling indicates some of these streets may need to be treated before or shortly after the CNC opens.

While permanent traffic calming schemes may be installed on some routes initially, the use of temporary upgrades (rapid-implementation trials) is recommended when 1) timeframes for getting a permanent design constructed are too long (e.g. pressures to install all schemes before CNC opens and if a route is getting a lot of rat-running after CNC opens and a quick response is required) and 2) where there is a number of affected land owners who have concerns with a

23 Adapted from Austroads Guide to Traffic Management Part 8 Local Area Traffic Management. p121
proposed design and want it trialled (and assessed) before it is made permanent. An example is closing the local street at an intersection and installing a cul-de-sac head or banning specific traffic movements.

The monitoring programme will pick up changes in traffic volumes and speeds and indicate which streets need to traffic calmed later on; between 2021 and 2031.

**Safe Speed Community Areas (SSCA)**

In addition to physical changes to streets it is proposed to create up to 9 safe speed (community) areas either side of Cranford and Sherborne Streets as shown in Figure 7-16.

In addition to reducing travel speeds on local streets and reducing crash risk, the SSCA also signal to drivers that they are entering lower volume and lower speed streets where they should be more alert as children and elderly people may be on or crossing the road; hence the reason for including ‘safe’ in the signage. Ideally SSCA should have a 30km/h speed limit, as that is the ‘safe speed’ where collisions with pedestrians and cyclists have a very low likelihood of causing fatal or severe injuries. However, under the current guidelines (speed management guide) a 40km/h speed limit is more likely to be approved.

It is recommended that all traffic calmed local streets be designed to operate at around 30km/h. However, some of the streets within these areas will remain untreated and so a 40km/h speed limit may be more appropriate until such time as all the streets in an area are treated and have operating speeds between 30 and 40km/h. The 40km/h speed limit is also more consistent with what has already been applied to other residential streets in the city. In either case, a drop in the speed limit and the associated signage is expected to reduce the number of crashes and the severity of any crashes which do occur.

Note that it is not essential to lower the speeds in area 2B, as these are not through routes, although as part of the changes it is strongly recommended these routes have lower speed limits.

The public have also suggested other streets that could have lower speed limits, such as the streets in and around the Papamoa Primary School and streets either side of the northern section of Barbadoes Street. A number of people also suggested dropping the speed limit on Rutland Street to 40km/h given the narrow width of the traffic lanes and the number of cyclists along the route. As part of consultation on these speed limit changes the Council should consider adding additional streets to those being treated.
7.6 2nd Stage of Option Development

The additional CNC traffic coming into Cranford Street causes a number of transport, social, and environment effects on the downstream (primarily St Albans) community. The proposed arterial/collector street upgrades (and associated traffic calming and speed management) address some of these effects, but do not address others, and in some cases create new traffic effects. The Stage 2 option development process considered these other effects. Other issues and associated improvement options have been divided into five categories;

1) Safe access to schools,
2) Safer cycle facilities,
3) Access to parks,
4) Access to commercial activity centres, and
5) Other effects.

The other effects include issues like access to properties along the arterial routes.

A number of the Stage 1 infrastructure improvement options do address these wider transport effects. For example:

- New traffic signals at the Warrington/Forfar and Warrington/Barbadoes will improve access and safety for pedestrians and cyclists crossing each of these routes, including those from the north wanting to walk to St Albans Park.
The upgrades at the Westminster/Cranford and Berwick/Cranford intersections will involve changes that make it safer for pedestrians (general and school children) and cyclists. The introduction of a reduced speed limit of 40km/h on Cranford during school start and finish and turning arrows at both intersections will improve pedestrian safety. Cycle lanes are also to be installed on the approach of Westminster Street on Cranford Street.

The safe speed areas and associated lower speed limits on local streets will improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists using these roads.

A number of studies are proposed to look at the specific impacts of the additional traffic on each focus area and how these impacts can be mitigated. These studies, which will commence before the CNC is opened, will identify the ‘quick wins’ improvements that can be implemented before the CNC opens (e.g. signage directing through cyclists to quiet local streets).

An outcome of these studies will be a number of improvement options, some of which need to be implemented soon after the CNC is opened, and others which can be made later in the ten-year monitoring period (known as the commissioning period). The ongoing monitoring may also indicate that additional improvement options are required in these categories to address specific issues. As mentioned earlier, the healthy streets and the safe system framework methods are proposed, alongside traditional safety auditing, to maximise the safety and amenity benefits of route and intersection upgrades.

The next few sections outline some of the issues that need to be addressed by these improvement options.

**Safe Access to Schools**

Increased traffic volumes in the area will impact on safe access to key destinations in the local area, and specifically schools, parks, and commercial activity centres, and especially for those walking to these locations. Of particular concern, is access to these locations by the young (e.g. school children), elderly (which there are increasing numbers of), and those with disabilities, such as those with a mobility or visual impairment. Increased risk of crashes is a direct result of the additional traffic from the CNC, especially on arterial and collector roads. Hence improvements need to be made including infrastructure improvements and speed limit changes.

There are a number of primary schools in the study area and consideration needs to be given to how the additional traffic from the CNC may impact on the safety of school children that are walking around the network and especially crossing the road. Typically, it is older primary school children (year 5 and 6) that are walking unaccompanied by adults. There may also be a small number of primary school pupils that cycle to school. While there are also a number of preschools in the area, children of this age will in almost all cases be accompanied by an adult.

The main school impacted by the CNC downstream traffic is St Albans Primary School. Some of the school children need to cross Cranford Street to walk to the school. Children also cross Westminster Street (west of Cranford) and Courtenay Street. While signalised intersection crossings are provided at the Westminster Street and Berwick Street intersections, there have been a number of near misses, particularly at the former, between crossing children and turning traffic (typically turning when the signal has gone red, often due to traffic congestion and no turning arrows). St Albans School currently employs a cross-guard at this intersection before and after school to guide pupils across the road. Traffic calming has already been introduced on Westminster Street both sides of Courtenay Street, including a pedestrian refuge and road narrowing, to slow down traffic and aid crossing of the route by school children.

The additional traffic on Cranford Street, as a result of the CNC, will increase the risk of crashes involving pedestrians, including school children, if no changes are made. There are several improvements that can be made on Cranford Street to address this safety risk including a temporary speed limit before and after the school north of Westminster to south of Berwick, putting the Westminster Street / Cranford Street intersection on a platform or using a textured surface, and introducing smarter signals phasing as part of widening the western approach of the intersection. The latter being part of a proposed upgrade of Westminster Street and Courtenay Street to improve amenity and accommodate cycling infrastructure. Banning of right turns into Westminster Street in the AM peak (and PM commuter peak) will also reduce the risk of turning crashes involving pedestrians crossing Westminster Street. Additional enforcement be it a red-light running camera, or increased Police presence, is also recommended.

Another option that should be considered is a mid-block crossing outside the English (ASB) Park carpark, approximately mid-way between the two intersections (Berwick and Westminster). An at-grade mid-block crossing would have the advantage of no turning movements. As raised by submitters, a grade separated crossing (sub-way or overbridge) would
remove the conflict with vehicles altogether. However, there are a number of issues with such an option, with the key issue being the lack of room to accommodate the overbridge within the current road reserve. It would be difficult based on the number of daily users to justify the cost of such a structure and there are major visual impacts associated with installing an overbridge in this location.

The banning of right turn vehicles from Cranford Street north into Westminster Street in the morning peak will also help reduce this risk.

Another safety issue identified during the consultation was the school crossings on Innes Road outside Mairehau Primary School and Our Lady of Fatima School. While there are zebra crossings outside each school, many drivers are not stopping, especially at the Mairehau Primary School crossings. A signalised crossing would be more effective, perhaps located at the Mairehau school crossing. Although the traffic volumes on Innes Road are not expected to increase significantly (and not above 30%) when the CNC is opened, it is strongly recommended Christchurch City Council signalise one of the crossings as part of its safer routes to school programme.

There are also incidents on Rutland Street outside St Albans Catholic School between school children and cyclists on the cycleway. Christchurch City Council have been looking into these issues as part of the major cycleway programme and hence the Report does not consider this matter further, other than raising it as an issue that needs to be monitored going forward. It is possible that the increased traffic flows on Rutland Street as a result of the CNC may impact on the safety of crossing school children. Options to address any concerns may need to be considered as a Stage 3 project.

It is important that through the ‘safe routes to school programme’ that there is additional education of pupils, teachers, and parents, especially associated with safe crossing behaviour in and around each school, leading up to the opening of the CNC.

**Safer Cycle Facilities**

A key impact of the additional CNC traffic and the need for peak period clearways on Cranford Street and other routes is a deterioration in the facilities provided for cyclists on these routes. Not only is there additional traffic on the clearway routes, there is no adequate room to provide cycle lanes or adequate room for cyclists when clearways are in use. The proposed 3.7m wide kerbside lane is not adequate for a truck or bus to safely pass a cyclist. When parking is occurring in the clearway lanes then cyclists have some space between the parked car and main traffic lane. Such a facility is only suitable for confident cyclists and not the new cyclists that Christchurch City Council want to encourage into cycling. It is also a poorer option than the cycle paths that are provided down the CNC and on Cranford Street down to McFaddens Road. The option of a shared path on the berm is also less than ideal due to safety concern associated with backing vehicles from residential properties. Because of issues associated with visibility from backing vehicles, narrowing the berm and widening the carriageway to accommodate cycle lanes is also not considered a safe option.

With the Paparua Parallel nearby and with the provision of additional infrastructure and suitable wayfinding (at each end of clearway sections), the majority of cyclists should be accommodated on alternative routes. Some cyclists will choose to cycle on Cranford Street anyway, mostly the confident cyclists that will use the space when available or cycle in the traffic lane. Others of varying abilities with origins or destinations on routes like Cranford Street will either ride on the footpath or cycle in the narrow traffic lane during the clearway operations. While riding on the footpath is less than ideal the independent expert believes it is the safer option than riding in a narrow traffic lane. We recommend marking and signing the footpath as a shared path but retaining the current footpath width to help manage down cycle speeds. While there are concerns with pedestrian safety, the installation of signs will alert pedestrians to cyclists riding on the footpath, as is the case at many similar locations around Christchurch, such as in the Edgeware village. The provision of a berm also provides room for cyclists to overtake pedestrians. It is also recommended that the Council contacts residents along the treated section of Cranford Street that they back into their driveways and exit in the forward direction where-ever possible. We recommend that the operation of this shared path be monitored and if it is found to be unsafe that fuller works are undertaken to slow down cyclists or divert them to alternative routes.

To provide improved facilities for cyclists coming from the north (to and from the city) and the local community it is recommended that investigation of several secondary cycle routes including one further north-south cycle link and at least three east-west cycle links to the Paparua Parallel and the new north-south cycleway, which needs to be on the eastern side of Cranford Street. These secondary cycle routes will typically consist of marked cycle lanes (of around
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1.6m width) and bicycle greenways (low volume and low speed streets). There may be some use of shared paths but unlikely to be any fully separated cycleways as provided on Rutland Street and northern section of Colombo Street.

The need for the new north-south route, especially north of Westminster Street, is that the deviation to the Papanui Parallel will be too great for some cyclist’s trips, especially from cyclists that originate from Mairehau, which is to the east of Cranford Street. Wayfinding needs to be provided at the McFaddens Road/Cranford Street intersection to the north. In the south, cyclists heading north from the city should be encouraged to use the Colombo Street cycleway or the Manchester Street cycle lanes.

The new north-south link should start on the eastern side of Cranford Street at the McFaddens Road / Cranford Street intersection. The preferred route needs to go through a routes selection process and Safety Audit and Network Functionality (SANF) assessment (see Appendix H for details). One potential route that utilises streets that need to be traffic calmed, is shown in Figure 7-17. The route follows McFaddens Road, Jameson Avenue, Severn Street, Forfar Street, then alongside Madras Street and through St Albans Park, Allard Street, Packe Street, Purchas Street, and then onto Manchester Street. The route would be a combination of quiet streets and shared paths. Suitable crossings would need to be provided across Innes Road, Westminster Street, and Edgware Road. Signing and marking of this alternative route for cyclists is one of the ‘quick-win’ options that could be installed before the CNC is opened. Further work could be undertaken to make this route safer for cyclists including formal crossings of the arterial roads, like Innes Road and Westminster Street.

The key east-west links are McFaddens Road, Westminster/Courtenay Street and Edgware Road. The McFaddens Road cycle connection would be considered as part of the traffic calming of this route on both sides of Cranford Street. The Westminster Street/Courtenay Street and Edgware Road cycle facilities would be included in two corridor studies that are recommended for these routes, with the extent of these studies shown in Purple in Figure 7-17. This will be a combination of on-road cycle lanes and shared facilities. Extension of the Manchester Street cycle lanes from Bealey Avenue to Edgware Road is also recommended.

Figure 7-17: Suggested new cycle routes
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Safe Access to Parks

The additional traffic from the CNC will potentially impact on traffic flows around at least two of the parks, St Albans Park and to a lesser degree Malvern/Rugby Park. Given St Albans Park is surrounded by three main routes that are likely to have an increased traffic volume, being Warrington Street, Barbadoes Street, and Forfar (Madras) Street, it is the most affected by additional traffic. Current pedestrian (and cycle) access to the park is not ideal with the wide carriageway on Forfar Street and Barbadoes Street, and a roundabout and only pedestrian crossing aids at Forfar/ Warrington and Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street respectively. Cycle access to the north is provided by these main roads. With the relatively lower traffic volumes the impact on access and safety has been limited. With the increased traffic it will be difficult in peak periods to access the Park.

The installation of traffic signals at Forfar Street/Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street as part of the major road improvement (MR3) will improve access and safety considerably to pedestrians and cyclists even with the increasing traffic volumes. The new north-south cycle facility (SC5) in conjunction with east-west links (SC3 and SC4) will also improve cycle access to the park. The remaining issues are mid-block crossings across Forfar Street/Madras Street and Barbadoes Street. The new design of these routes needs to consider how both routes can be narrowed alongside the park so that pedestrians have shorter crossing distance and speeds are managed to lower levels. This is particularly an issue for the mobility impaired and also caregivers with prams.

In terms of Malvern Park, rat-running traffic on Roosevelt Avenue and Malvern Street would impact on access to the park. Traffic calming measures will be required to manage traffic volumes and speeds around the park. Access across Innes Road to Malvern Park will also become more difficult due increasing traffic volumes. There is an alleyway provided between Innes Road and Knoxles Street/Wessex Road which includes a refuge island on Innes Road. With increased traffic flows on Innes Road, the mid-block crossing will be more difficult.

Safe Access to Commercial Centres

There are a number of commercial centres that are likely to be impacted by the downstream traffic generated from the CNC. This includes the Edgware Village Neighbourhood Centre and four local commercial centres, being Westminster/Cranford shops, Barbadoes/Warrington shops, Barbadoes/Edgware shops, and the Rutland Street shops.

Recent changes on Rutland Street have provided improved access to these shops by bicycle (Papanui Parallel) and pedestrians (crossing aids). Parking has also been considered in the new design. However, there are concerns from businesses that there is not enough short-term parking nearby. This is a matter that needs to be monitored by Christchurch City Council and addressed as needed.

The Edgware Village has been the subject of several recent studies, including the Edgware Village masterplan. This has resulted in improved north-south cycle facilities (Papanui Parallel) and a signalised pedestrian crossing of Edgware Road. Modelling indicates that traffic volumes may increase on Edgware Road, both to west (and east) of Cranford Street and on Cranford Street/Sherborne Street. This is likely to impact on cycle access to the village and the Papanui Parallel, especially from the east. The corridor plan recommended for Edgware Road (in Figure 7-17) should consider how cyclists can move through the Village east to west and vice-versa. Any option development through the village needs to be developed in conjunction with refinement of the Edgware Village masterplan.

The centre most impacted by the extra CNC traffic is the Cranford Street/ Westminister Street local centre. Since the earthquakes this centre has become more vibrant with several new businesses setting up in this area. The current pedestrian and cycle connections around the centre are not good, although there is a signalised intersection to get across Cranford Street. With Christchurch City Council wanting to promote walking and cycling, and encourage people to use these local centres, in addition to the increasing traffic through the centre, preparation of a plan for the centre in conjunction with the corridor study of Westminster (and Courtenay) Streets is recommended. The Report should look at cycle and pedestrian linkages to the centre. This will require widening of the western approach to the traffic signals and new footpaths. The Report should also consider parking requirements and options to provide additional parking, especially off-road parking.

The Warrington Street/ Barbadoes Street local centre also has relatively poor pedestrian and cycle facilities. Access to the north will be improved with the proposed traffic signals. A plan should also be prepared that looks at opportunities to improve pedestrian facilities, especially to the park west side of Barbadoes Street. The study should also look at parking requirements, as parking demand is high from residents and the café customers who are not able to use the off-road carpark, with the clearway option impacting on parking availability. Special consideration needs to be given to the Audiology
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business on west side of Barbadoes Street (sensitive to noise, including construction) and also the location of the bus stop outside the café (can this be moved to allow short stay parking for the café).

The Barbadoes Street /Edgware Road local centre has poor cycle facilities but reasonable pedestrian access via the traffic signals. Again, a plan should be prepared for this centre. Cycle facilities should be provided on Edgware Road as part of the Edgware corridor study. Parking requirements should be considered given the potential for the clearway to limit parking in the morning peak period.
8. Recommendations (Management Plan)

The overall downstream effects plan will be implemented over approximately a 10-year period. Some network changes need to be in place before the CNC is opened in mid-2020 due to the expected jump in traffic volumes on Cranford Street from traffic diverting from other routes. While the focus is on routes that are expected to be impacted by traffic growth of greater than 30% by end of the commissioning period as result of the CNC, the timing of upgrades is dependent on a number of factors, such as increased crash risk, overall increase in rat-running, level of congestion on arterial roads and impacts of construction after CNC opens.

The following sections outline the recommended improvements and further studies that are proposed to avoid, remedy and mitigate the traffic impacts of the CNC on the downstream road network. This builds on the option development process discussed above. Firstly, discussion of the staging of the upgrades and monitoring requirements before presenting the options across the seven option (and study) categories occurs.

8.1 Monitoring and Project Staging

Introduction

The Report presented in this report is based on traffic modelling, which is based on land-use projections and assumptions on drivers' behaviours. There is no certainty of how much traffic will use the CNC and downstream roads, especially by 2031. However, there is an expectation that there will be an initial increase in traffic due to drivers diverting to the CNC from Marshlands Road and Main North Road, and hence the Report looks to address the impact of this increase and then monitoring will be used to confirm transport impacts between 2021 and 2031 and determine what needs to be addressed.

Some parts of the network may be initially more sensitive to the impact of the CNC than others, and once drivers become more accustomed to the new layout, driving behaviours will become more obvious. Driver rat-running behaviours are difficult to predict using a transport model and so it is expected some behaviour will be different to what has been modelled.

The capacity interventions, particularly on Cranford Street and Benwick Street, do need to be in place before the CNC becomes operational to restrict excessive rat-running (greater than 30% increase) on a large number of local roads.

There were some suggestions during consultation that no works should be undertaken prior to the CNC opening, and to see how the network performs. This approach has merit on parts of the network, however if universally adopted it is likely to result in major traffic impacts on a large number of (rat-running) routes after the CNC is opened and severe congestion on arterial roads. Making changes following the opening of the CNC may also be very disruptive on commuters and the community once the network is already heavily congested.

Proposed Monitoring

As previously stated, the Report is focused on parts of the network that are expected to experience a greater than 30% increase in vehicles (minus underlying traffic growth). In order to ascertain whether a part of the network has exceeded the 30% threshold, the simplest approach would be interpolate between the growth expected on 2021 and 2031 with the volume recording at any given time. However, there are a number of limitations in using this approach as outlined below.

There are many societal events which affect the number of trips undertaken on a network; land-use changes, economic changes, and political changes to name a few. Given time, changes will occur, and these will need to be updated in a base model. There are also many specific changes that will occur on the network which will also need to be updated within the base model. These changes are relatively simple to take care of in a model. However, a much more difficult undertaking is to uncouple changes made to the downstream network in response to the CNC; changes which affect the traffic volume on various streets (increases and decreases) which may not have been undertaken had the CNC not been constructed, or at least not within the set timespan outlined in the Designation. One example of this is the provision of additional capacity on (any) arterial corridor in order to relieve traffic from local streets. Any expansion of capacity on the network will likely illicit a redistribution of vehicle movements, but the net effect may on balance be the most desirable.

Consequently, there may be scenarios where Christchurch City Council are best to increase the traffic flow on some arterial or collector roads (perhaps even in excess of the 30% threshold). Over time it will become increasingly difficult to separate the impact of these downstream treatments and the CNC itself in terms of their consequence to the network's performance.
The easiest method, therefore, is to gather baseline data from the monitoring sites, and apply an assumed base growth rate on the network to these streets as representing growth that would have occurred if the CNC was not build. Then traffic volumes can be monitored and, when a site increases beyond a 30% growth above this standard level of growth, the next step of investigation can begin. In our view, a greater than 30% downstream wide blanket threshold is a relatively blunt approach to network management of this magnitude. It fails to acknowledge fundamental network differences, and the interrelationship between hierarchy elements. Networks vary in where it can, and cannot, accommodate growth, or indeed what exactly might be considered acceptable or unacceptable growth. The relationship between effects of traffic, and volume of traffic, is also not strictly linear. Some effects respond differently to the volume of traffic, and effects also vary depending by road environment.

A time unit for the traffic volume increase was not stipulated in the Designation (for example a greater than 30% increase on the number of vehicles per day). The tidal nature of the commuter flow in Northern Christchurch means that the greatest effects is usually experienced during the morning peak, and to a lesser extent the evening peak. Therefore, for the purposes of the Report, the assumed time unit for the greater than 30% threshold includes the daily count, AM peak count, or the PM peak count.

A decision tree conceptualisation of the process outlined in the Designation is shown below:

![Decision Tree](image)

**Figure 8-1: Decision Tree for Designation Monitoring of Traffic Volumes**

The monitoring programme will involve the collection of daily traffic volumes and vehicle speeds (over a minimum of three 24-hour days – normally seven days). The baseline data (pre-CNC) has been collected in 2018 at over 50 sites/streets in the downstream road network. The locations of the counts are shown on the screen lines in Appendix E. Following the opening of the CNC, Christchurch City Council will typically collect counts annually or biennially on the routes that are most likely to impacted by rat-running traffic, as indicated by the transport modelling. A number of the streets included in the baseline counts are not expected to be impacted, but counts are being collected in case rat-running does occur so there can be a comparison made of traffic conditions before the CNC opened. For these streets, and also the regularly monitored streets out of sequence, special counts may be collected if rat-running does appear to be an issue. It may also be necessary to monitor adjoining streets after traffic calming is applied if traffic just diverts across to these other streets.
It is also important to monitor pedestrians and cyclists volumes before and after the CNC opens. Intersection movement counts will be collected around the network. At the very least at the Westminster/Cranford, Berwick/Cranford and Fortan/Warrington intersections. Council should also investigate collecting data on the origins and destination of pedestrians and cycle trips in order to understand the key destinations and help prioritise improved facilities for these modes.

One of the key issues raised during consultation was the impact of additional traffic on an arterial route as vehicle emissions, noise and vibration. Many residents reported they already experience the impacts of these environmental effects and are concerned about these effects being exacerbated by the additional traffic. To assess the impact of the additional CNC traffic it is proposed to monitor the vehicle emission, noise, and vibration impacts on the key arterials. Baseline data (before the CNC is opened) will be collected along with annual or biennial measurements through to 2031. The arterial sites being monitored include:

- Cranford Street south of McFaddens Road
- Cranford Street north of Berwick Street
- Berwick Street immediately east of Cranford Street
- Madras Street north of Edgeware Road
- Barbados Street north of Edgeware Road

The intention being to collect air pollution levels using detectors at the same site at each of these locations. Christchurch City Council will investigate suitable technology for this monitoring and decide appropriate sites to collect the data.

Noise and vibration measurements should also be collected at sites along these routes which are worst affected by heavy vehicles (e.g. houses and businesses closest to the vibration and noise source). The source of noise and vibration should be identified using video (CCTV) cameras.

Based on the monitoring, Christchurch City Council will assess how the additional traffic has impacted on vibration, noise and emissions at each monitored site. Where impacts are significant the Council will investigate whether any measures can be undertaken to mitigate the effects. Any improvements will be at the discretion of Council.

**Staging of Improvements**

The proposed improvements and associated studies have been grouped into three time periods. Stage 1 upgrades are those upgrades that need to be in place before the CNC is opened, to address severe traffic congestion and excessive rat-running in local streets. It also includes studies that need to commence before the CNC is opened (but not necessarily completed). Stage 2 upgrades are those improvements that will reduce other traffic effects of the CNC opening traffic flows, including additional traffic calming schemes, safe cycling, and safe access to schools, parks, and commercial areas. These improvements should be implemented within three years of the opening of the CNC, with higher priority upgrades being made as early as possible following opening of the CNC. It is recommended that the studies into the issues and options for these upgrades also commence before the CNC opens, with any quick wins being implemented as soon as practicable. While these improvements should ideally also be in place before the CNC opens, it is acknowledged that it will take time to develop and implement these options. Stage 3 upgrades are those improvements that the modelling indicates will be required between 2021 and 2031. This includes traffic calming and some additional safe cycling improvements. The timing of these upgrades will depend on the outcomes from the monitoring. In some cases (e.g. high levels of rat-running) temporary measures (by rapid implementation) may be put into place to address traffic impacts.

### 8.2 Proposed Improvement Options

This section outlines the various improvement options and associated studies that are recommended to address the expected impacts of the CNC traffic that will flow into the downstream road network. The options have been split into Stage 1, 2, and 3 depending on when the upgrades should be implemented. The improvements options have been grouped into the following categories:

1. **Major Roads (MR Options)**
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2. Traffic Calming (TC Options) and Safe Speed Community Areas (SSCA Options)
3. Safe Access to Schools (AS Options)
4. Safe Cycling Routes (SC Options)
5. Access to Parks (AP Options)
6. Access to Commercial Centres (AC Options)

Each of the options are presented in the following sections and have been developed in-line with the processes outlined previously.

**Major Roads (MR Options)**

All of the major road upgrade options need to be in place before the CNC opens. So, all options are in Stage 1.

The major road options have been separated into those north and south of Berwick Street, and on Berwick Street / Warrington Street.

**North of Berwick Street Options**

The options proposed north of Berwick Street include the following:

**MR1 (Cranford Clearways)** – Peak Period Clearways along Cranford Street – to extend from Innes Road through to Berwick Street. This option is to include right turn restrictions at Dee Street and Mavrm Street and at English Park Carpark. Council need to assess the vehicle accesses along the route and how drivers will be able to manœuvre in and out of each driveway when the clearway is operating (the same to be applied to other clearway options further south). Council is to consider options to accommodate cyclists that still choose to use Cranford Street. A plan will also need to be produced on how to enforce the clearways.

**MR2 (Westminster/Cranford Intersection)** – Upgrades to Westminster Street / Cranford Street Intersection. This is to include banning right turns into Westminster Street West in the morning peak period, widening of the western approach and include cycle lanes on Westminster Street. It should also include other changes to improve safety for crossing school children as discussed later on.

Along Berwick Street and Warrington Street the following option is proposed. This should be undertaken as a single option given the close proximity of the intersections and associated road widening between each.

**MR3 (Berwick/Warrington Upgrades)** – Upgrading of Berwick Street / Cranford Street intersection to include double right turn into Cranford Street and signalisation of the Forfar Street / Warrington Street and Barbados Street Warrington Street Intersections, plus any road widening between these intersections. Simulation modelling will be required to assess what extra lanes are required.

**South of Berwick Street Options**

South of Berwick Street there are several upgrade options possible on the three arterial/collector routes (i.e. options 3(a), 3(c), or 4(a), refer to Section 7.3). A scoping study needs to be undertaken, using a simulation model to develop these options further and determine what needs to be in place by 2021 and then through to 2031. Consideration needs to be given to the high kerbside parking demands on Madras Street and Barbados Street due to medium density developments in this area in the development of options. A parking survey needs to be undertaken as part of the scoping study. The access requirements of the proposed St Albans Shopping Centre on Madras Street also need to be considered in option development. It is suggested up to three options should then go to the public for feedback before finalising the option. This may delay the project construction until after the CNC opens, but ideally these changes are made before the CNC opens. The MR 1, 2, and 3 options above are the more critical projects that need to be in place when the CNC opens.

**MR4 (South Berwick Upgrades)** – Preferred downstream of Berwick Street arterial upgrade option that comes out of the scoping study that will look in more detail at Options 3(a), 3(c) and 4(a) and any sub-options of these options. These improvements will consist of upgrades to up to six traffic signal intersections and midblock capacity improvements.
Investigation of High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes

MR5 (HOV lanes on Cranford Sherborne) – Council to investigate with the NZ Transport Agency extending the southern HOV lanes on the CNC through to Bealey Avenue and installing a northbound HOV lane.

It is recommended that Christchurch City Council work with NZ Transport Agency to do a study extending the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on the CNC in the southbound direction from north of the Cranford Roundabout down through the arterial road network and along Cranford and Sherborne Streets. This study is to also consider HOV lanes on Cranford Street north of the Innes Road intersection. Alternatively, the HOV lanes could go down Madras and Barbadoes Streets south of Berwick Street. The HOV lane should also be provided northbound from Bealey Avenue though to at least the CNC roundabout on Cranford Street. The study will assess the likely movement of traffic onto local streets (rat-running) and other arterial routes like Main North Road. With HOV, further traffic calming of local streets may be required. If the study recommends the HOV (clearway) lanes, these should be implemented during Stage 1.

No other major road upgrade options are proposed.

Local Roads: Traffic Calming of Local Streets (TC Options) and Safe Speed Community Areas (SSCA Options)

As mentioned in Section 7.5, it is proposed that nine safe speed community areas (SSCA 1 to 9) are introduced in the downstream road network making up most of the local streets. Council to investigate whether to apply a 40km/h or 30km/hr speed limit in these areas. The location of these areas on each side of Cranford Street and Sherborne Street are shown in Figure 8-1 and listed below.

- SSCA1 – Ranger Street
- SSCA2 – Knowles Street
- SSCA3 – Thames Street
- SSCA4 – Roosevelt Avenue
- SSCA5 – Flockton Street
- SSCA6 – Trafalgar Street
- SSCA7 – Oxley Ave
- SSCA8 – Caledonian Road
- SSCA9 – Bishop Street

It is desirable that all the SSCA areas speed restrictions are in place before the opening of the CNC, as a deterrent for rat-running. It is recommended over time that all the streets in these areas are traffic calmed so that the reduced speed limit is self-explanatory on each street. It is also recommended that Council investigate dropping the speed limit on Rutland Street to 40km/h.

The modelling has identified the streets that are likely to require traffic calming through to 2031. As specified previously, some of these streets need to be traffic calmed in Stage 1 (before CNC opens), while others can wait until the CNC opens and following monitoring of actual rat-running traffic (to implement in Stage 2 and 3). It is also possible the monitoring will identify rat-running streets not identified in the transport modelling. Table 8-1 shows the streets that are expected to have an increase in traffic volumes through to 2031 even with the arterial upgrades and the proposed staging of these options, based on the expected timing of a greater than 30% increase in rat-running traffic on these routes. Potential rat-running routes west of Rutland Street have been excluded from assessment (Christchurch City Council will monitor and treat these routes if required separate from this Plan).

Table 8-1: Traffic Calming Routes and Their Likely Staging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Start and Finish</th>
<th>Staging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC1 - Mersey Street (plus Berwick)</td>
<td>Innes Road to Forfar Street</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| TC2 - Knowles street | Rutland Street to Cranford Street | Stage 1 |
| TC3 – Weston Road | Rutland Street to Cranford Street | Stage 1 |
| TC4 – McFaddens Road | Rutland Street to Cranford Street | Stage 1 |
| TC5 – McFaddens Road | Cranford Street to Ranger Street | Stage 2 |
| TC6 – Jameson Avenue | McFaddens Road to Innes Road | Stage 2 |
| TC7 – Malvern Street | Rutland Street to Cranford Street | Stage 1* |
| TC8 – Dee Street | Roosevelt Avenue to Cranford Street | Stage 1* |
| TC9 – Roosevelt Avenue | Innes Road to Westminster Street | Stage 2 |
| TC10 – Forfar Street | Westminster Street to Warrington Street | Stage 3 |
| TC11 – Flockton Street | Westminster Street to Warrington Street | Stage 3 |
| TC12 – Caledonian Road | Bealey Avenue to Edgeware Road | Stage 3 |
| TC13 – Edgeware Road | Caledonian Road to Manchester Street | Stage 3 |
| TC 14 – Manchester Street | Bealey Avenue to Edgeware Road | Stage 3 |

* As part of the Cranford Street Clearways Project (MR1) these streets will become left-in and left-out only which effectively works as traffic calming. If the clearways are extended down Sherborne Street, then left-in and left-out restrictions may also be required at Purchas and Cannon Streets.

* This is also to include the short section of Berwick Street between Forfar and Mersey Streets.

**Safe Access to Schools (AS)**

The main school impacted by the CNC downstream traffic is St Albans Primary School. Some of the school children need to cross Cranford Street to walk to the school. Given the range of options that are possible to address this risk it is recommended that a study be undertaken to identify the preferred option(s). This study is to commence in Stage 1 and be implemented during Stage 1 and Stage 2. Improvements to address safety concerns are also proposed as part of the upgrades to the Cranford/Westminster and Cranford/Berwick intersections upgrades.

**AS1 – Safe Access across Cranford Street** – This study will look at a range of options, and confirm the interim improvements in AS2 and other potential improvements like a new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance. Some improvement (interim improvements AS2) will be made during Stage 1 and monitored for effectiveness once the CNC is opened. Other options will only be progressed if these earlier options are not effective.

**AS2 – Interim Improvements on Cranford Street** - As an interim measure it is suggested that, as part of MR1 (Cranford Clearways) and MR2 (Westminster/Cranford Intersection), a 40km/h speed limit be introduced during school arrival and departure time on Cranford Street from north of Westminster Street, a coloured surfacing be installed at the Westminster Street /Cranford Street intersection, and left turning red arrows be used as protection for crossing pedestrians. As with MR1 and MR2 these changes should be undertaken as a Stage 1 improvement.

**Safer Cycling Routes (SC Options)**

One of the new transport effects of the CNC, is that during clearway operation Cranford Street will be less safe for cyclists. Given the future traffic volumes down Cranford Street, this is not ideal. The preferred approach is to direct cyclists onto the Papanui Parallel and other secondary cycle routes that are proposed below. However, some cyclists will...
still use Cranford Street and so the Council needs to investigate how these cyclists can be accommodated along the route, including widening of the roadway.

A number of secondary cycle routes are required to help direct cyclists off Cranford Street and to address safety concerns associated with additional traffic on roads through this part of Christchurch. It is highly recommended that the Council use the MCA and SANF processes used in developing the major cycling routes (MCR) to refine the options (an example is provided in Appendix H).

The proposed five cycle facility upgrades are as follows:

**SC1 (Cycle Wayfinding Signage)** – Development of a wayfinding signage plan that directs cyclists at the northern end of Cranford Street (at McFaddens Road) and southern end of Cranford Street to safer cycling routes. This should be a Stage 1 improvement and coincide with introduction of the peak period cleanways.

**SC2 (McFaddens Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Development of a safe cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road of ideally slow streets or off-road routes. Route study to commence in Stage 1 and any ‘quick win’ improvements identified should be implemented in Stage 2.

**SC3 (Westminster/Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Development of a safe cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street. May consist of on-road and off-road cycling facilities, or just on-road facilities. Route study to commence in Stage 1 and any ‘quick win’ improvements identified should be implemented in Stage 2.

**SC4 (Edgeware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor)** - Development of a safe cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street. To consist of mainly on-road cycling facilities. Route study to commence in Stage 1 and any ‘quick win’ improvements identified should be implemented in Stage 2.

**SC5 (North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor)** – Development of an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic-calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street. To consist of bicycle greenways, cycle lanes and shared paths. A key cycle linkage to St Albans Park from the north and south. Route study to commence in Stage 1 and any ‘quick win’ improvements identified should be implemented in Stage 2.

These Westminster Street /Courtenay Street and Edgeware Road corridors are also key accesses routes for pedestrians to the Westminster Street /Cranford Street local activity centre and the Edgeware Village, as specified below.

**Access to Parks (AP) Options**

Two studies are proposed to look at safe access to St Albans and Malvern parks and what improvements could be made to improve safety around the parks.

**AP1 (St Albans Park Access Plan)** – This plan will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists. It will consider carparking requirements, given the proposed arterial upgrades likely on Forfar Street and Barbados Street, and parking requirements of cyclists. The study will commence early in stage 2, with any quick-win options identified being implemented also in Stage 2. The remaining options identified will be implemented during Stage 3.

**AP2 (Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan)** – This plan will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists. It will consider carparking requirements of Malvern Park and also what traffic calming may be required to reduce traffic speeds on Malvern Street and Roosevelt Avenue to create safer crossing places. The study will commence early in stage 2, with any quick-win options identified being implemented also in stage 2. The remaining options to be implemented during Stage 3.

**Access to Commercial (Activity) Centres (AC options)**

It is recommended that four activity centre transport studies and two corridor studies be undertaken early in Stage 2 and ‘quick wins’ implemented in Stage 2. The remaining options to be implemented during Stage 3, as outlined below. With a Masterplan having already been prepared for the Edgeware village it not proposed to do a further study of that centre. There are some overlaps between these studies and the safer cycling route studies, so this will need careful coordination to get the best outcomes.
AC1 – Westminster/Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study. This study will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. It will consider amenity improvements that can be made to the centre. A key focus will be on improving access along Westminster Street and Courtenay Street in the associated corridor study and across the intersection as part of MR2.

AC2 – Barbadoes/Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study. This study will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. It will consider amenity improvements that can be made to the centre. A key change at this location will be the installation of traffic signals at the Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street intersection to improve walking access to the north. High kerbside parking demands and the noise sensitive audiology centre are key matters that need to be considered.

AC3 – Barbadoes/Edgware Local Activity Centre Transport Study. This study will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. It will consider amenity improvements that can be made to the centre.

AC4 – Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study. This study will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. It will consider amenity improvements that can be made to the centre. Given that there have been several changes outside these shops with the new cycleways, major changes are not likely to be required at this activity centre.

AC5 – Westminster/Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar) – This study will be a companion study to the cycle corridor study (SC3) but focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route, especially for vulnerable road users.

AC6 – Edgware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes) – This study will be a companion study to the cycle corridor study (SC4) but focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users.
9. Summary

Table 9-1 summarises the improvements and studies (to commence) that are required before the CNC opens (Stage 1 improvements and studies) and those options that should be implemented within three years of the opening (Stage 2 - less critical but expected to be actioned early in the ten-year monitoring period). Given the big increase in traffic volumes on Cranford Street expected when the CNC opens some work needs to be undertaken before it opens to avoid excessive congestion and rat-running in the down-streams network.

While some of the Stage 2 projects should ideally be in place before the CNC opens there is limited time to progress all the studies and projects identified before it opens and hence the more crucial projects have been prioritised in Stage 1 and the remaining projects listed in Stage 2. Any ‘quick wins’ projects from Stage 1 that could be completed before the CNC opens or shortly after should be implemented. This will mainly be projects that only require signage and marking or could be enhancements to existing projects. The impact of delaying some projects to Stage 2 (up to three years after the CNC opens) is that there may be some adverse transport effects in the short term. Council will need to prioritise the worst of these transport effects, as identified in the monitoring (e.g. excessive rat-running in some local streets), for early intervention, including rapid implementation projects (using interim measures) where practical.

Other projects, those in Stage 3, can be implemented after the CNC opens. The traffic monitoring will show the actual transport impacts of the CNC and allow the projects developed in Stage 3 (and studies and projects in Stage 2) to be refined and changes made to the streets treated and options implemented in response to the observed traffic, pedestrian and cycling volumes, operating speed and other adverse outcomes (e.g. increase in crashes).

Table 9-1: Lists of improvement projects and studies categorised by Stage
(note some projects appear in two or more stages consisting of the studies and the implementation of improvements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 – Projects and studies to be undertaken before the CNC opens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Road (MR) Upgrades:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR1 (Cranford Street Clearways) – Peak Period Clearways along Cranford Street from Innes Road to Berwick Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR2 (Westminster/Cranford Intersection) – Upgrades to Westminster Street /Cranford Street intersections, including pedestrian and bicycle access and safety measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR3 (Berwick/Warrington Upgrades) – Upgrading of Berwick Street /Cranford Street signalised intersection and signalisation of the Forfar Street /Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street /Warrington Street intersections, including pedestrian and bicycle access and safety measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR4 (South Berwick Upgrades) – Option scoping study of potential improvements to arterial routes south of Berwick Street at intersections and along the mid-block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR5 (HOV lanes on Cranford-Sherborne) – Undertake investigation for extending the southern HOV (high occupancy vehicle) lanes on the CNC through to Bealey Avenue and investigate the potential for installing a northbound HOV lane. Based on these investigations implement any recommendations around HOV lanes before CNC opens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe System Community Areas (SSCA):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSA 1 to 9 – Introduce nine 40km/h (or 30km/h) reduced speed limit areas through the downstream local road network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce traffic calming on TC1 – Mersey and Berwick Streets (Innes Road to Forfar Street), TC2 – Knowles Street, TC 3 – Weston Road, TC 4 – McFaddens Road, TC7 – Malvern Street (LIMO) and TC8 – Dee Street (LIMO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Access to Schools (AS):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS1 – Safe Access Across Cranford Street – Commence a study that will look at a range of options, including upgrades at the Berwick/ Cranford and Westminster/ Cranford intersections and a new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AS2 – Interim Improvements on Cranford Street – As an interim measure it is suggested that as part of MR1 (Cranford Clearways) and MR2 (Westminster/Cranford Intersection) a 40km/h speed limit be introduced during school arrival and departure time on Cranford Street from approximately 50m north of Westminster Street to 50m south of Berwick Street, a coloured surfacing be installed at the Westminster/Cranford Intersection, and left and right turning red arrows be used as protection for crossing pedestrians. These options and others to be investigated in ASI, MRI and MRR. Safe Cycling Routes (SC):

SC1 (Cycle Wayfinding Signage) – Development of and implementation of a wayfinding signage plan that directs cyclists at the northern end of Cranford Street (at McFaddens Road) and southern end of Cranford Street to safer cycling routes on adjoining streets (e.g. Papanui Parallel and other quiet local streets).

SC2 (McFaddens Road Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Commence a route study of a cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road.

SC3 (Westminster/Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Commence a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

SC4 (Edgeware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Commence a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

SC5 (North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Commence a route study of an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street. Use the MCA and SANF process to select the preferred route.

Any quick wins projects (e.g. - signage and marking improvements) in SC2 to SC5 are to be identified and implemented where possible before the CNC opens. Studies will commence in Stage 1 and be completed early on in Stage 2.

Monitoring collections of baseline data on traffic, pedestrian and cycle volumes, vehicle speeds and environmental effects (emissions, noise and vibration) on key routes.

Stage 2 – Projects and Studies that need to be undertaken within three years of CNC opening

Monitoring

All key local routes that are expected to be impacted by rat-running traffic (or for which there have been a number of public complaints about rat-running) will have traffic counts undertaken within 3 months of the CNC opening. For streets impacted in a major way a further traffic count will be collected at around 6 months after the CNC is opened and then annually. Those streets that have a more than 30% increase in traffic volumes will be included in the traffic calming street list for Stage 2 (even if not currently on the lists below). Where large increases occur temporary works (using rapid implementation methods where relevant) may be implemented ahead of more permanent upgrades.

Undertake monitoring of pedestrian and cycle volumes and environmental effects (emissions, noise and vibration). Compare with baseline data where relevant.

Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:

When the monitoring confirms a 30% increase in traffic values, introduce traffic calming on TC9 – Roosevelt Avenue, TC12 - Caledonian Road, TC13 - Edgeware Road (Village), TC14 – Manchester Street and TC15 - Westminster Street /Courtenay Street. Implement traffic calming on any other local streets that have a greater than 30% increase in traffic following CNC.

Safe Access to Schools (AS):

AS1 – Safe Access Across Cranford Street – Assess effectiveness of interim measures in AS2. Where required implement any further options identified in this study. This may include new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance.

Safe Cycling Routes (SC):
SC2 (McFaddens Road Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Design and implement a secondary cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road.

SC3 (Westminster/Courteney Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Design and implement a secondary cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

SC4 (Edgeware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Design and implement a secondary cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

SC5 (North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor) – Design and implement an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street.

Access to Parks (AP):

Several of the improvements in Stage 1 will improve access to the two parks. For St Albans Park the two new traffic signals on Warrington Street and the South of Berwick upgrades will improve safe access. The traffic calming of Malvern Street (2020) will also limit rat-running past Malvern Park. The Access Plan in this section will focus on other access and safety improvements that can be made.

Implement any quick wins and priority projects that come out of the AP1 and AP2 plans within Stage 2.

AP1 (St Albans Park Access Plan) – Development of a plan that will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists.

AP2 (Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan) – Development of a plan that will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists.

the Report Access to Commercial Centres (AC):

Some of the improvements in Stage 1 will also improve access and safety at commercial areas. Transport studies will consider additional improvements that can be made.

AC1 – Westminster/Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

AC2 – Barbadoes/Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

AC3 – Barbadoes/Edgeware Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

AC4 – Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Undertake study that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

AC5 – Westminster/Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar) – Undertake this study which will focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users.

AC5 – Edgeware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes) – Undertake this study which will focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users.

Implement any quick wins and priority projects that come out of the studies in Stage 2.

Stage 3 – Projects that could be undertaken any time between the opening of the CNC and the end of the Commissioning Period

Monitoring

Ongoing monitoring of traffic, pedestrians and cycle volumes, crashes and vehicles speeds, emissions, noise and vibration on major roads and some local streets is to occur annually, or when required more often, after the CNC opens.
to validate the Reports and projects already identified in this document, and through the various studies that are
specified.

It is expected that additional interventions will be required to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of the additional CNC
traffic including the impact of trucks, that is identified in this monitoring. In terms of local streets, intervention is required
if the traffic volumes increase by greater than 30% above what might have been expected on the route if the CNC had
not been built. In terms of other interventions (e.g. arterial upgrades) this will be the result of congestion or safety
concerns with respect to all road users. Some improvement may also not be required (e.g. if local road traffic does not
increase by greater than 30%, as predicted by the modelling). Consultation on all proposed changes will be undertaken.

An indication of Stage 3 improvement projects is provided below. This list will need to be reviews and where necessary
revised once the actual impacts of the CNC traffic is known from the monitoring.

**Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:**

Introduce traffic calming only where monitoring indicates high levels of rat-running are occurring (may include additional
streets): TC – 5 McFadden, Knowles, Weston (east Cranford), TC6 – Jameson, TC10 – Forfar Street, TC11 –
Flockton Street, TC16 – Severn Street, TC17 – Thames Street, TC 18 – Aylesford Street, TC19 – Kensington
Avenue, TC 20 – Philpotts Road and TC 21- Francis Avenue.

**Safe Cycling Routes (SC):**

Monitor and upgrade routes as required.

**Access to Parks (AP):**

AP1 (St Albans Park Access Plan) – Implementation of the access plan as required to address access and safety
issues.

AP2 (Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan) – Implementation of the access plan as required to address access and
safety issues.

**Access to Commercial Centres (AC):**

AC1 – Westminster/Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations
AC2 – Barbadoes/Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations.
AC3 – Barbadoes/Edgware Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations
AC4 – Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study. Implement study recommendations
AC5 – Westminster/Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar) – Implement study recommendations.
AC6 – Edgware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes) – Implement study recommendations
Appendices
Appendix A – CNC Designation Conditions associated with DEMP

Introduction and Purpose

1.1. Christchurch City Council (Council) lodged an application for a Notice of Requirement (Designation) for the Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade (NAE/CSU) in October 2013. As part of that application, on 3 November 2014, the Council lodged a report: Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street Upgrade Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA).

1.2. The TAA reported on the Christchurch Northern Corridor and included an assessment that, at the city end of that corridor, more traffic is expected to use Cranford Street than would be the case without the Project. The principal reason for this anticipated increase in use is re-routing traffic within the Christchurch Northern Corridor to benefit from the improved travel conditions provided by the NZ Transport Agency's Northern Arterial, and the Council's NAE/CSU.

1.3. While the project, and the full Christchurch Northern Corridor is considered by the Council to be necessary to deliver a wide range of outcomes for the urban form, shape and growth for northern Christchurch and Waimakariri District, additional traffic may have potential adverse effects on residences and businesses in the immediate area around the southern end of the NAE/CSU (referred to as "downstream effects") in this Management Plan. In particular, more vehicles may travel on adjacent or nearby roads which were not the subject of any improvement or upgrading as part of the Designation application.

1.4. The modelling used for the Designation predicts what will happen at 2031 so long as the modelled assumptions are borne out. The TAA recommends continued investigation of the downstream effects of the Christchurch Northern Corridor (i.e. NAE/CSU) with the following objectives:

(a) To identify preferred vehicle access routes, particularly for trucks, between the end of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and the Central City (that is between the end of the NAE/CSU and the City centre); and

(b) To identify strategies to keep vehicles on preferred vehicle access routes; and

(c) To discourage vehicles away from public transport routes and walking or cycling routes such as the Main North Road / Papanui Road and Rutland Street corridors respectively.

1.5. This Management Plan is to ensure downstream effects are appropriately managed and to:

(a) Assess the existence, nature and extent of any increased traffic on streets adjacent to, or adjoining Cranford Street attributable to the NAE/CSU that might cause or contribute to a loss of service to any of these streets for up to 10 years after the opening date of the NAE/CSU;

(b) Implement measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate such effects, where these are more than minor, in a timely and cost-effective manner and where appropriate and practicable; and

(c) Monitor the efficacy of the measures for an appropriate period and implement further remedial action, if this is necessary and appropriate.

1.6. Some traffic increase can be expected if development to the north of Christchurch continues to grow or exceeds present expectations, whether or not the NAE/CSU project proceeds. For the avoidance of doubt, this Management Plan is to identify any adverse traffic effects that arise between the commissioning date of the NAE/CSU (expected to be approximately 2021) and up to ten years after that opening date (referred to in this Management Plan as the "Commissioning Period"). If any adverse effects are identified, a response to appropriately-manage these adverse effects, within this Commissioning Period will be considered and implemented.

1.7. The precise areas to be covered under this Management Plan will be established as part of the methodology referred to below. The methodology will assess the existence, nature and extent of any increased traffic attributable to the NAE/CSU on a number of streets at the southern end of the NAE/CSU including, but not limited to Mersey Street, Malvern Street, Roosevelt Avenue, Severn Street, Dee Street, Weston Road, Knowles Street and McFaddens Road (potentially adversely affected streets).
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1.8. For the avoidance of doubt, while these listed streets are described as potentially adversely affected streets, this Management Plan is not confined to those streets, nor does it mean all of these listed streets will be adversely affected.

Appointment and Methodology

2.1. Prior to operating the NAE/CSU the Council will appoint an independent expert who is a suitably qualified traffic engineer to investigate and design an appropriate methodology to identify the potential impacts (if any) on those streets at the end of the Christchurch Northern Corridor which may be potentially affected as a result of the operation of the NAE/CSU.

2.2. That methodology is to apply commonly accepted professional standards to assess traffic-related effects and, for the avoidance of doubt, will include procedures to:

(a) Identify and confirm all streets adjacent to or adjoining Cranford Street affected by the operation of the NAE/CSU;

(b) Assess the current level of vehicle usage and service of each of the potentially adversely affected streets in proximity to the southern end of the NAE/CSU;

(c) Include modelling where appropriate to identify the anticipated future increase in the use of potentially affected streets that may be caused by, or attributable to, the operation of the NAE/CSU;

(d) Consider the extent of and effects (if any) arising from such growth in traffic flows, on those potentially affected streets that are reasonably attributable to the operation of the NAE/CSU;

(e) Recommend appropriate mitigation measures (where an increase in traffic-related effects within potentially adversely affected streets, is caused by or contributed to by the NAE/CSU) to Council and, where required, the local community board (if the community board holds the requisite delegation for Council for any of the traffic calming works required) as soon as practicable, and institute monitoring procedures to verify the outcome of the mitigation measures; and

(f) Recommend further remedial steps to Council and, where required, the local community board (if the community board holds the requisite delegation for Council for any of the traffic calming works required) (under 3.1 below) if monitoring confirms a continued increase in adverse traffic-related effects on the affected streets that is more than minor.

2.3 Any appropriate mitigation measures may be delivered on an iterative basis that is by first assessing the efficacy of an initial stage of mitigation measures before undertaking a further stage or stages of mitigation measures.

2.4 Where monitoring is required that monitoring must be completed within six months from the completion of the mitigation works.

2.6 The independent expert will support and where necessary, assist Council with consultation and/or the communication required as part of this management Plan.
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3. Recommendation to Council

3.1. The independent traffic expert recommendation to Council must include appropriate remedial steps to be taken to avoid, remedy or mitigate any increase in adverse traffic-related effects where such effects are more than minor, identified under the methodology as being caused by or attributable to the operation of the NAE/CSU. This may include but is not limited to:

(a) Measures to improve the operation of Cranford Street and Sherborne Street, including capacity measures such as peak hour clearways;

(b) The introduction of speed restrictions in some or all affected streets;

(c) The introduction of chicanes in some or all affected streets;

(d) The introduction of speed bumps in some or all affected streets;

(e) Any other suitable traffic calming mechanisms, including those identified within the Council's Infrastructure Design Standard.

3.2. The remedial steps may include a programmed series of measures to be delivered over time, with the intention that any recommended remedial steps must be taken as soon as reasonably practicable after that recommendation is made. All remedial steps must be completed within the Commissioning Period.

4. Work to be Carried Out by Council

4.1. If the independent traffic expert determines that the increase in traffic to be experienced prior to the expiry of the Commissioning Period that is caused by or attributable to the operation of the NAE/CSU, is likely to raise or has raised the level of vehicle movements on any of the potentially affected streets by more than 30 per cent above the traffic level that would have occurred without the operation of the NAE/CSU then measures to improve the operation of Cranford Street and Sherborne Street and/or calming work will be undertaken by the Council as recommended.

4.2. Any calming work may be undertaken iteratively, (that is by first assessing the efficacy of an initial stage of calming work before undertaking a further stage or stages of calming work). In such a situation the monitoring previously undertaken must be repeated within six months of each stage of calming work being completed. This further monitoring is to assess whether further or other calming work is needed.

4.3. For the avoidance of doubt no calming work will need to be investigated or carried out unless the NAE/CSU has raised the level of vehicle movements by more than 30 per cent above the traffic level that would have occurred without the operation of the NAE/CSU. Further, the purpose of any calming work undertaken is to mitigate (effects from) any increased traffic movement to an acceptable level but does not mean a requirement to reduce traffic movements or their effects to the levels occurring prior to the opening date of the NAE/CSU.

4.4. The desired outcome of this Management Plan is to, within the Commissioning Period, avoid, remedy or mitigate downstream traffic effects, such that they are no more than minor. The Council shall take all practicable steps to ensure any works reasonably-necessary to achieve this outcome are completed within that time.

4.5. Where traffic calming work is recommended Council will consult with:

1. Residents of the streets where traffic calming measures are proposed to be taken;
2. Canterbury District Health Board;
3. Mairehau Primary School, Our Lady of Fatima School, Paparoa Street Primary School, St Albans Catholic Primary School and St Albans School;
4. St Albans Residents Association and Mairehau Community Trust; and
5. Cyclists through Spokes;
6. Consultation shall include the distribution of a newsletter including feedback form prior to the review.
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5. Communication with Residents

5.1. Prior to operating the NAE/CSU, the Council shall prepare and implement a Communication Plan that sets out procedures detailing how the public and stakeholders will be communicated with throughout the Commissioning Period. As a minimum, the Communication Plan shall include:

1. Details of a public liaison person including contact details;
2. Methods to inform and to communicate details to property owners and occupiers within potentially affected streets of the recommendations from the independent traffic expert and any proposed mitigation measures to be carried out by Council;
3. Methods to deal with any concerns raised by property owners or occupiers; and

5.2 Owners and occupiers of properties on streets identified by the independent traffic expert as requiring mitigation measures shall be:

1. Advised of the recommendations of the independent traffic expert under clause 3, including proposed mitigation measures, within 30 working days following the provision of the recommendation to the Council;
2. Provided a period of 20 working days to comment on the proposed mitigation measures; and
3. Advised by Council of the final mitigation measures to be implemented, at least 20 workings days prior to commencement of any works.
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Appendix B - Cranford Street (north of Innes Road) Details
Figure B-1: Cranford Street Changes (Source: https://www.mta.gov.nz/assets/projects/christchurch-northern-corridor/CNC-Project-Update-Cranford-Street-August-2017.pdf)
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Insightful solutions. Empowering advice.
Appendix C - Existing Traffic Flow and Crash Record

There is currently in excess of 20,000 vehicles per day on Cranford Street north of Berwick Street (2017). Warrington Street (2013) and Berwick Street (2014) have traffic counts of 10,790 and 12,326 vehicles per day respectively. Madras Street and Barbados Street have traffic counts of 8,274, and 8,191 vehicles per day (in 2016). The counts presented here are reasonably recent. Older counts are also available however become less useful over time.

Crash Record

Given the large area impacted by traffic from the CNC, aggregated crash maps from Urban KiwiRAP (New Zealand Road Assessment Programme) is referred to. Urban KiwiRAP uses estimate death and serious injury equivalents along with distance (risk per kilometre for collective risk). It is a useful tool to examine safety risks comparative to the rest of the transport network, including other cities in New Zealand. Sections with high and medium-high risk are the key areas of focus.

An interrogation of Urban KiwiRAP data highlighted corridors that currently experience high numbers of crashes; either by kilometre (collective risk), or by number of vehicles (personal risk) in the study area.

Figure C-1: Collector Risk Map (Source: https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/maps/collective-risk#Canterbury)

The Collective Crash Risk\(^\text{25}\) in the vicinity of Cranford Street for 2012-2016 is shown in Figure C-2 (note the maps have been filtered so that only the High and Medium-High risk corridors are shown). The streets with the highest risk\(^\text{26}\) that relate most directly to the potential downstream effects are Cranford Street (to Edgeware Road), Innes Road, and Madras Street. It is typical that the highest volume routes have the greatest concentration of crashes, and so this is to be expected.

For the period 2012-2016 there are few routes in the study area with a high Personal Risk (this is the risk per vehicle going down each street). The only routes that have medium-high crash risks are Malvern Street, Westminster Street (west of Cranford) and Edgeware Road through and either side of the Edgeware village. Improvements to these routes should consider local safety risks.

\(^{25}\) The highest collective risks are often located on streets with the higher traffic volumes

\(^{26}\) Note that the maps present a risk that aggregates the crash history over the length of the road section selected, and that these sections have not been created to only constitute streets directly affected by CNC. For example, the Madras Street section length extends from Warrington Street to Gloucester Street.
Figure C-2 shows the existing incidence of crashes and DSI within the project area. The majority of DSI crashes involved turning or crossing traffic mainly at intersections. Hence particular attention needs to be given to the design of intersections.

Crash heat maps for the period of 2012-2016 period are shown in Figures C-3 to C-6.

Figure C-3: Pedestrian (Source: https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/maps/heat-maps#43.50249565148537,172.6360273361206.15)

Figure C-4: Cyclist (Source: https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/maps/heat-maps#43.50249565148537,172.6360273361206.15)

Figure C-5: Motorcyclist (Source: https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/maps/heat-maps#43.50249565148537,172.6360273361206.15)

Figure C-6: Speed (https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/maps/heat-maps#43.50249565148537,172.6360273361206.15)

In terms of vulnerable users Cranford Street has experienced a higher amount of motorcycle crashes than most other nearby streets.

Pedestrian crashes have occurred east of Cranford Street on Innes Road (near school crossing), and also around Edgeware Village and near St Albans Park. In total there were 11 pedestrian (including one mobility) crashes that
occurred in the study area in the period of 2013-2017. Of these 2 were minors, and 3 were older than 65. The crashes
resulted in 2 DSI (8% of the DSI) which is lower than the national average\textsuperscript{27} for 2016 (10%).

There were 3 recorded cyclist DSI in the study area (12.5% of the DSI), which is higher than the national average of
6.2% for 2016. Cyclist crashes have generally occurred south of Westminster Street.

Figure  shows crashes that had speed as a main factor. Cranford Street performed relatively well compared with other
major roads, except around the Westminster Street / Cranford Street intersection, and immediately south of the Berwick
Street / Cranford Street intersection. Locations were speeds was a bigger factor include Barbadoes Street between
Edgeware Road and Warrington Street, and Flockton Street. This may be a result of the current wide lanes on these
roads and the unsignalised Barbadoes/ Warrington intersection.

The pre-CNC crash data will form an important part of monitoring the crash effects of the CNC.

Table C-1: Selection of Existing Vehicle Counts (Source: \url{http://ccc.interpret.co.nz/trafficcount/})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>AADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berwick Street (East of Cranford)</td>
<td>12,326 (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford Street (North of Berwick)</td>
<td>20,596 (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Street (East of Forfar)</td>
<td>10,790 (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay Street (NE Trafalgar)</td>
<td>2,632 (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbadoes (North of Bealey)</td>
<td>8,191 (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras (North of Bealey)</td>
<td>8,274 (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherborne (South of Canon)</td>
<td>12,974 (2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{27} National data for pedestrians and cyclists obtained from: \url{https://www.transport.govt.nz/resources/road-safety-resources/roadcrashstatistics/motorvehiclecrashesinnewzealand/motor-vehicle-crashes-in-new-zealand-2016/}
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Item No.: 15
Appendix D - Jacobs Modelling (D1 to D4)

The figures in this appendix are to be viewed with the understanding that traffic modelling has certain limitations. In particular, the predicted changes to low volume roads have more ambiguity due to there being a multitude of route choices.

Furthermore, there are streets that appear in these modelling plots as affected that may not necessarily be affected. This is resultant from a limitation of the modelling tools that they show effects well away from the major network changes. We have made this judgement based on expert knowledge of the network, and monitoring will pick-up any wider effects that are significant.
Do Nothing Change Flow Plots
Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC
CNC03 vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Legend
PM Change
- Between 0% to 20% increase
- Between 20% to 30% increase
- Between 30% to 40% increase
- More than 40% increase

Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC
CNC03 vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Legend
Daily Change
- Between 0% to 20% increase
- Between 20% to 30% increase
- Between 30% to 40% increase
- More than 40% increase

Year 2021: Daily Traffic Volume Difference - with/without CNC
CNC03 vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 500 vpd are not shown on the plot)
Legend
AM Change
- Between 0% to 20% increase
- Between 20% to 30% increase
- Between 30% to 40% increase
- More than 40% increase

Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC
CNC03 vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC03 vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Daily Traffic Volume Difference - with/without CNC
CNC03 vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 500 vpd are not shown on the plot)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crawford Street</td>
<td>10,381</td>
<td>16,815</td>
<td>17,287</td>
<td>17,562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jameson Avenue</td>
<td>20,513</td>
<td>20,536</td>
<td>20,997</td>
<td>23,051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Avenue</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philpotts Road</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papanui Road</td>
<td>8,516</td>
<td>8,345</td>
<td>8,786</td>
<td>8,308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browns Road</td>
<td>6,211</td>
<td>6,927</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somno Street*</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Street</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>3,229</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloss Street (not in model)</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>5,792</td>
<td>5,167</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrington Street</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs Street (not in model)</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Avenue</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford Street</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>2,102</td>
<td>2,169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menno Street*</td>
<td>3,508</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>3,942</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Street</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Street</td>
<td>3,761</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Avenue</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Avenue</td>
<td>3,936</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahers Road</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaka Street*</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills Road</td>
<td>5,633</td>
<td>5,467</td>
<td>4,672</td>
<td>4,658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Street</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Avenue (not in model)</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldersley Crescent</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Street (not in model)</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Road</td>
<td>5,969</td>
<td>6,195</td>
<td>5,669</td>
<td>5,766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafalgar Street*</td>
<td>5,273</td>
<td>9,143</td>
<td>7,490</td>
<td>7,490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2019</td>
<td>20,894</td>
<td>37,953</td>
<td>38,784</td>
<td>38,352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merivale Street*</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>2,966</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>2,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forfar Street*</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>5,646</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>4,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,017</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>8,865</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>3,763</td>
<td>9,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not in model)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Avenue</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flockton Street*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford Street</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>3,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>5,580</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>6,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford Street</td>
<td>8,557</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>14,607</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>9,114</td>
<td>15,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,003</td>
<td>15,851</td>
<td>30,854</td>
<td>15,022</td>
<td>18,228</td>
<td>33,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forfar Street</td>
<td>5,414</td>
<td>5,743</td>
<td>11,157</td>
<td>10,614</td>
<td>7,107</td>
<td>17,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,960</td>
<td>10,454</td>
<td>21,414</td>
<td>18,092</td>
<td>14,781</td>
<td>32,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados Street</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>3,974</td>
<td>5,951</td>
<td>926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,596</td>
<td>7,676</td>
<td>15,272</td>
<td>11,517</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>26,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine Street*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>AAOT 2019</td>
<td>DM 2019</td>
<td>DM with CNC 2019</td>
<td>Clearway with CNC (inns to Bradby &amp; signals) 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McFaddens Road</strong></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weston Road</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowles St</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innes Road</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>8,123</td>
<td>6,761</td>
<td>6,895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>6,239</td>
<td>8,004</td>
<td>8,462</td>
<td>8,924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malvern Street</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dee Street</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westminster Street</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3,215</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Berwick Street</strong></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Osley Avenue</strong> (not in model)</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canter Street</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,055</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchas Street</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>3,887</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McFaddens Road</strong></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>4,233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>4,732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winton Road</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>5,486</td>
<td>5,653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowles St</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innes Road</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,009</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malvern Street</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westminster Street</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courtenay Street</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>4,087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edgware Road</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>4,186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canter Street</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchas Street</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rutland Street</strong></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>4,413</td>
<td>4,297</td>
<td>4,285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* zones connected
** on screenline, not mentioned
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crawford Street</td>
<td>23,580</td>
<td>40,249</td>
<td>63,829</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>2,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jameson Avenue</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>5,328</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Avenue</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips Road</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papanui Road</td>
<td>9,763</td>
<td>8,405</td>
<td>18,168</td>
<td>9,647</td>
<td>9,710</td>
<td>19,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browns Road</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>2,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrow Street*</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>3,483</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolland Street</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>2,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosset Street (not in model)</td>
<td>3,081</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>3,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrington Street</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>2,838</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs Street (not in model)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Avenue</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford Street</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>4,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury Street*</td>
<td>18,918</td>
<td>22,910</td>
<td>41,828</td>
<td>27,073</td>
<td>27,830</td>
<td>54,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Street</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>2,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Street</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Avenue</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Avenue</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahau Road</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuka Street*</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>4,668</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>4,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills Road</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Street</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Avenue (not in model)</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>3,208</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>2,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberley Crescent</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Street (not in model)</td>
<td>6,236</td>
<td>6,113</td>
<td>12,349</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td>6,056</td>
<td>12,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Road</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>15,174</td>
<td>16,980</td>
<td>14,465</td>
<td>14,296</td>
<td>28,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafalgar Street*</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cranford Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>10,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mersey Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forfar Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>3,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayfield Avenue</strong></td>
<td>(not in model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fleckton Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aylsham Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>1,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **East Ward A** (north of Arthur Street) |  |
| **Cranford Street** |  |
| NB | 8,887 | 9,172 | 7,061 | 9,173 |
| SB | 7,097 | 8,458 | 8,419 | 10,333 |
| Total | 15,984 | 17,630 | 15,485 | 20,113 |
| **Forfar Street** |  |
| NB | 6,102 | 6,531 | 11,173 | 7,778 |
| SB | 4,580 | 4,710 | 2,500 | 3,954 |
| Total | 10,682 | 11,241 | 13,673 | 11,732 |
| **Barbadoss Street** |  |
| NB | 2,432 | 1,441 | 1,772 | 2,311 |
| SB | 6,110 | 6,329 | 11,108 | 7,013 |
| Total | 8,542 | 7,770 | 12,880 | 9,323 |
| **Geraldine Street** |  |
| NB | 35 | 30 | 78 | 217 |
| SB | 29 | 51 | 9 | 11 |
| Total | 64 | 81 | 87 | 227 |
| **Cleveland Street** |  |
| NB |  - |  - |  - |  - |
| SB |  - |  - |  - |  - |
| Total |  - |  - |  - |  - |
| **Woodville Street** |  |
| NB |  - |  - |  - |  - |
| SB |  - |  - |  - |  - |
| Total |  - |  - |  - |  - |
| **Hills Road** |  |
| NB | 9,040 | 8,926 | 8,675 | 8,829 |
| SB | 9,167 | 8,942 | 8,170 | 8,835 |
| Total | 18,207 | 17,868 | 16,845 | 17,664 |
V/C Ratios and Delay for Key Intersections
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Year 2021: Volume/Capacity Ratio - Option CNC03
(V/C less than 60% are not shown on the plot)
Legend
AM V/C - With CNC
- 60% to 70%
- 70% to 80%
- 80% to 90%
- Over 90%

Year 2031: Volume/Capacity Ratio - Option CNC03
(V/C less than 60% are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Volume/Capacity Ratio - Option CNC03
(V/C less than 60% are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Volume/Capacity Ratio - Option CNC03
(V/C less than 60% are not shown on the plot)
Figure 1: Barbados / Warrington Intersection, 2021 PM peak CNC03

Figure 2: Barbados / Warrington Intersection, 2031 PM peak CNC03
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Figure 3: Bealey / Sherborne Intersection, 2021 AM peak CNC03

Figure 4: Bealey / Sherborne Intersection, 2031 AM peak CNC03
Figure 5: Berwick / Cranford Intersection, 2021 AM peak CNC04e

Figure 6: Berwick / Cranford Intersection, 2021 PM peak CNC04e
Figure 7: Forfar / Warrington Intersection, 2021 AM peak CNC04e

Figure 8: Forfar / Warrington Intersection, 2031 AM peak CNC04e
Change Flow Plots with Arterial Upgrades
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Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Daily Traffic Volume Difference - with/without CNC
CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 500 vpd are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Daily Traffic Volume Difference - with/without CNC CNC04e vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 500 vpd are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC
CNC04g vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2021: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04g vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Legend
AM Change
- Between 0% to 20% increase
- Between 20% to 30% increase
- Between 30% to 40% increase
- More than 40% increase

Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04g vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Hourly Traffic Volume Difference (PCUs) - with/without CNC CNC04g vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 50 pcu/h are not shown on the plot)
Year 2031: Daily Traffic Volume Difference - with/without CNC
CNC04g vs NoCNC03 (Differences less than 500 vpd are not shown on the plot)
Appendix E - Monitoring Screens

Contains data sourced from the LINZ Data Service licensed for reuse under CC BY 4.0.
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**Item 15**

---

**HAVE YOUR SAY**

*Proposed changes to Cranford Street and the surrounding area*

Open until Monday 4 June 2018

[ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay](ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay)

---

**Why we need to make changes**

We're proposing changes to Cranford Street and the surrounding area to coincide with the completion of the Christchurch Northern Corridor. We're keen to hear your thoughts on how to make the works for communities and local businesses.

We're expecting a significant increase in people travelling on Cranford Street when the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens in 2023. The Christchurch Northern Corridor will improve travel times and from the north of the city. It will decrease the number of people travelling on major roads, such as Main North Road and increase the number of people using parts of Cranford Street.

We need to make some changes to Cranford Street and the surrounding area to improve the travel times for people travelling through and minimise people taking short cuts through side streets which could affect local residents.

---

**Drop-in sessions**

Come and talk to staff about the proposal.

**Monday 7 May 2018**
Anytime between 4pm – 7pm
St Albans School
17 Shippings Place, St Albans

**Thursday 10 May 2018**
Anytime between 10am – 2pm
English Park
Cranford Street, St Albans

**Wednesday 16 May 2018**
Anytime between 4pm – 7pm
Poplar Street School
128 Poplar Street, Papara

**Thursday 17 May 2018**
Anytime between 10am – 2pm
Edgware Bowling Club, St Albans Park
4 Herd Street, Edgware
Options for your feedback

Proposed Cranford Street clearway and one-way connections

A clearway on part of Cranford Street and three-laning sections of Hadley/Forster Street and Baracks Street would help to improve the traffic flow in the area and maintain short cuts through local streets.

The clearway on Cranford Street would extend from its head to Jeffreys Street. There would be a clearway heading south towards the city in the morning peak and a clearway heading north at night. This will allow more people to travel through in peak hours.

There would be no parking during the hours that the clearway operates.

Morning peak hours: 7 - 9am

Afternoon peak hours: 4 - 6pm

Sections of Hadley/Forster Street and Baracks Street between Warrington and Baracks Avenue would be three lanes with the existing corridor resulting in some loss of parking. The intersections in the area would need to be upgraded to support this change as shown in the map below.

Proposal to reduce traffic on side streets

Our investigations show that if the Cranford Street clearway and improved links to the one-way streets are implemented there will be less short cuts through side streets.

These improvements will reduce the number of streets that will require traffic calming as shown on the map.

To encourage short cuts through side streets and improve safety there are a number of options:

- Raised intersections
- Narrowing sections of the road
- Chicanes, bollards and landscaping
- Mid-block raised platforms
- Turning restrictions

Raised intersection with improved pedestrian crossing facility.
HAVE YOUR SAY

How we propose to manage the increase in traffic when the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens

We are seeking your comment on recommendations for the St Albans, Edgeware and Mairehau areas.
Feedback received until 5pm, Monday 15 April 2019.

ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay

2018
We asked for your views on how we manage the increased traffic volume.

2018
An independent traffic expert reviewed your feedback and has developed a three-stage plan.

2019
We are now seeking your comment on the recommended projects and the three-stage approach.

2019
Your feedback will be used to inform a final plan which will go to Council for approval.

2019 onwards
We will consult on projects from the Management Plan.

2020 onwards
Construction of approved projects.
Background

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 are covered on the following pages.

The Plan 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.

However, some of the methods of reducing the number of vehicles, such as encouraging ridesharing, the use of public transport and active transport, require work to happen outside of the area considered by the Plan. These methods are:

- upgrading the bus network
- providing express buses
- park and ride facilities
- further developing the existing cycle network

The Christchurch Northern Corridor and the Downstream Effects Management Plan are part of a wider package of transport projects to improve travel to and from northern Christchurch. Other projects include the Main North Road bus priority lanes (still to be constructed), Western Bellast bypass, Papanui Parallel cycleway and Northern Line cycleway (still to be constructed) and the CNC shared path.

Previous feedback can be read at ccc.govt.nz/the-council/consultation-and-submissions/haveyoursay/show/142

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.

Read the full Management Plan at ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay
Where is the traffic coming from?

We investigated the traffic impact on the area south of Innes Road. Even without the CNC there is anticipated to be increased traffic through the area due to population growth.

The map shows how the CNC will free up space on the local road network for all types of travel, taking some traffic from Main North Road and Marshland Road. Main North Road is the major bus route to and from the north of the city and reduced traffic will help bus movements. Reduced commuter traffic on Marshlands Road will make room for increased local traffic as the area is developed.

The shared path that runs alongside the CNC will connect to the Papanui Parallel cycleway to provide a continuous cycle route.

- **Main North Road**
  - A decrease in traffic allows for improved bus priority

- **Marshland Road**
  - A decrease in commuter traffic allows for future residential growth

- **Christchurch Northern Corridor**

- **Shared path on CNC**

- **Connection from Christchurch Northern Corridor shared path to Papanui Parallel Cycleway**
What this draft Plan recommends

This draft Plan seeks to balance the needs of local communities with safety and accessibility considerations, while ensuring an accessible city for all Christchurch residents, businesses and visitors.

Major arterial upgrades
Using the existing road corridor, arterial road upgrades include:

- Upgrading of intersections
- Introducing clearways
- Investigating whether the clearway lanes should be High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes for vehicles carrying two or more people

Local road traffic calming
Options being considered:

- Raised intersections
- Narrowing sections of road
- Chicanes, bends and landscaping
- Mid-block raised platforms
- Turning restrictions

Introduction of speed zones
Nine safe speed community areas are proposed in St Albans to improve safety and discourage drivers selecting alternative short cut routes.

Safe access to school
The key issue in terms of safe access to schools is access across Cranford Street for children walking to and from St Albans School. Several improvements are being assessed.

Cycling
The introduction of peak period clearways on Cranford Street make this route during peak periods less safe for non-confident cyclists. It is anticipated that most cyclists will use the dedicated Papanui Parallel Cycleway and other quieter safer routes.

Access to parks
You have told us safe access to parks is important to you. A study is proposed to look at access and safety issues for St Albans Park and Malvern Park and develop options to make access safer.

Access to commercial areas
You have asked for safe access to your local (shopping and eating) commercial centres. The draft plan recommends transport studies are done for the four local activity centres impacted by the increased traffic. Corridor assessments along Edgeware Road and Westminster/Courtenay Streets are also required to look at enhancing access and amenity for pedestrians and cyclists.

Monitoring
Council will continue to monitor:

- Vehicle, pedestrian and cycle volumes
- Vehicle speeds
- Vehicle emissions
- Road noise and vibration
- Crashes

Additional projects might be required where monitoring indicates congestion or safety concerns.

Timeframes
Funding was allocated in the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 to complete projects identified in the Downstream Effects Management Plan.

The following pages break down the recommendations into three delivery stages:

Stage 1  Projects proposed before the CNC opens in 2020
Stage 2  Projects proposed within three years of the CNC opening
Stage 3  Projects proposed to be delivered any time between the opening of the CNC and 2031

Read the full Management Plan at ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay
Stage 1 – projects proposed before the CNC opens

There will be opportunities for further public input on projects within the Plan.

Proposed major road upgrades:

- Cranford Street clearways – peak period clearways along Cranford Street from Innes Road to Berwick Street.
- Westminster Street/Cranford Street intersection – upgrades to Westminster Street/Cranford Street intersection.
- Berwick Street/Warrington Street upgrades – upgrading of Berwick Street/Cranford Street signalised intersection and signalisation of the Forfar Street/ Warrington Street and Barbados Street/Warrington Street intersections.
- South Berwick upgrades – Downstream of Berwick Street arterial upgrade option that comes out of the scoping study.
- High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane on Cranford-Sherborne Streets – Investigate using the peak period clearways as HOV lanes (must have more than one person in the vehicle). This effectively extends the proposed CNC HOV lane south to Bealey Avenue and a northbound HOV lane up Sherborne and Cranford Streets.

Proposed introduction of speed zones
Introduce nine 30km/h (or 40km/h) reduced speed limit areas through the downstream local road network.

Proposed traffic calming measures
Proposed traffic calming on the following streets:

- Mersey Street (Innes Road to Berwick Street)
- Knowles Street (Cranford Street to Rutland Street)
- Weston Road (Cranford Street to Rutland Street)
- McFaddens Road (Cranford Street to Rutland Street)
- Malvern Street – left in and left out only at Cranford Street
- Dee Street – left in and left out only at Cranford Street

Proposed safe access to schools
Safe access across Cranford Street (study) – this study will look at a range of options including a new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park carpark entrance.

Proposed safe cycling routes
Cycle wayfinding signage
Development of and implementation of a wayfinding signage plan that directs cyclists at the northern end of Cranford Street (at McFaddens Road) and southern end of Cranford Street to safer cycling routes, such as Papanui Parallel Cycleway.

North-South cycle study
Undertake a study of an alternative north-south secondary cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street. This will enable safer north-south cycling without having to cross Cranford Street to access Papanui Parallel.

East-West cycle study
This will enable cyclists to more safely connect to the Papanui Parallel and the proposed north-south route.

- McFaddens Road secondary cycle corridor – undertake a route study of a cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards the proposed north-south route) on McFaddens Road.
- Westminster Street/Courtenay Street secondary cycle corridor – undertake a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.
- Edgeware Road secondary cycle corridor – undertake a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

Read the full Management Plan at ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay.
Stage 2 – projects proposed within three years of the CNC opening

There will be opportunities for further public input on projects within the Plan.

**Proposed traffic calming measures**
Proposed traffic calming on the following streets where expected increases in traffic volumes are validated by the monitoring data:

- Roosevelt Street
- Caledonian Road
- Edgeware Road (Village)
- Manchester Street
- Westminster Street/Courtenay Street

**Safe access to schools**
Safe access across Cranford Street – implement any options identified in the study undertaken that have not happened through the intersection stage 1 upgrades.

**Proposed safe cycling routes**
McFaddens Road secondary cycle corridor – construct a secondary cycling route both west (towards Papanui Parallel) and east towards new south route on McFaddens Road.

Westminster Street/Courtenay Street secondary cycle corridor – construct a secondary cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.

Edgeware Road secondary cycle corridor – construct a secondary cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street to connect to the Papanui Parallel and proposed north-south cycle routes.

**Access to parks**
St Albans Park – Develop a plan that will look at improving access to the park by pedestrians of different abilities, cyclists and motorists.

Malvern/Rugby Park – Develop a plan that will look at improving access to the park by pedestrians of different abilities, cyclists and motorists.

**Access to commercial centres**
A study that will consider safe access to activity centres by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists:

- Westminster Street/Cranford Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study.
- Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study.
- Barbadoes Street/Edgeware Road Local Activity Centre Transport Study.
- Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study.

A study which will focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users:

- Westminster Street-Courtenay Street Corridor Study (Rutland Street to Forfar Street)
- Edgeware Road Corridor Study (Springfield Road to Barbadoes Street).

[Read the full plan at ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay]
Projects proposed within three years of the Christchurch Northern Corridor opening

- Proposed local traffic calming (construction)
- Proposed safe access to school (construction)
- Proposed safe cycling routes running east to west (construction)
- Access to parks (plan)
- Access to commercial centres (study)
Stage 3 – projects proposed after the opening of the CNC and up to 2031

There will be opportunities for further public input on projects within the Plan.

**Proposed traffic calming measures**
Introduce additional traffic calming measures only where monitoring indicates high levels of short cutting are occurring. Possible routes include:

- McFaddens Road (Cranford Street to Ranger Street)
- Knowles Street (Cranford Street to Philpotts Road)
- Weston Road (Cranford Street to Nancy Avenue)
- Jameson Avenue
- Forfar Street (Warrington Street to Westminster Street)
- Flockton Street
- Severn Street
- Thames Street
- Aylesford Street
- Kensington Avenue
- Philpotts Road
- Francis Avenue

**Safe cycling routes**
North-South secondary cycle corridor – construct an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street. This is likely to involve road marking, signage and new crossing facilities.

**Access to parks**
St Albans Park Access Plan – implementation of the access plan as required to address access issues.

Malvern/Rugby Park – implementation of the access plan as required to address access issues.

**Access to commercial centres**
Implement the following study recommendations:

- Westminster Street/Cranford Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study.
- Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study.
- Barbadoes Street/Edgeware Road Local Activity Centre Transport Study.
- Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study.
- Westminster Street-Courtenay Street Corridor Study (Rutland Street to Forfar Street).
- Edgeware Road Corridor Study (Springfield Road to Barbadoes Street).

[Read the full Management Plan at ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay]
How to give feedback

You can provide your feedback in a number of ways:

**Fill out the submission form at:**
ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay

**Mail to:**
Postage is free (you don’t need a stamp),
if you send your comments to:
Freepost 178
Attention: Ann Campbell
CNC Downstream Effects Mitigation Plan
Public Information and Participation Unit
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 73016
Christchurch 8154

Feedback received until 5pm, Monday 15 April 2019.

**Email:**
Send your feedback and any attachments to
ann.campbell@ccc.govt.nz with Downstream Effects
Management Plan in the subject line. Please make
sure you include your full name and address with your
submission.

**Deliver to:**
Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street or
any Council Service Centre

---

**Drop-in sessions**
Come and talk to us about this plan.

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

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

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

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

---

Ann Campbell
Engagement Team

---

03 941 8717
ann.campbell@ccc.govt.nz
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch
PO Box 73016, Christchurch 8154
ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay
Have your say

Make sure your comments gets to us before 5pm on Monday 15 April 2019.

[ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay]

Please indicate your views:

Prior to final adoption of this plan for St Albans, Edgeware and Mairehau we would like to hear your views:

Do you have any comments on the recommended projects?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

Do you have any comments on the project stages?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

Have we missed anything?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

Would you like the opportunity to speak to the Community Boards about your feedback? (please provide a contact phone number)

☐ Yes  ☐ No
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).

Please fold with the reply paid portion on the outside, seal and return by 5pm, Monday 15 April 2019

Attention: Ann Campbell
CNC Downstream Effects Mitigation Plan
Public Information and Participation Unit
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 73016
Christchurch 8154
Drop-in sessions
Come talk to us about this plan.

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

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

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

Thursday 4 April
5pm – 7pm
St Albans School Hall
17 Sheppard Place, St Albans
Appendix G - Options Diagrams

Appendix G

Issue Date:
10 May 2019
Do Nothing (yellow streets & arterials affected) + Option 1 - traffic calming only (all yellow streets)
Option 3c - Arterial Upgrade + Traffic Calming - Barbadoes/Madras, one way extension
Appendix H- Cycle Route MCA and Safety and Network Functionality Assessments

Multi Criteria Analysis – SANF Application to Cycle Route Identification

Identification, evaluation and selection of a preferred cycle route requires an objective transparent process that can withstand peer review, public scrutiny and permit informed decisions by elected members. This is achieved through a Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) tool and Safety Audit and Network Functionality (SANF) process.

The purpose of an analysis is to select a preferred route from a number of identified on and off-road route options using a Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) tool. The MCA assessment process is presented in the July 2016 version of Council’s “Cycle Design Guidelines Part B: Design Principles Best Practice Guide”.

Route Identification and MCA Assessment

The assessment process involves a site and desktop review of streets within the Route Corridor (an area connecting the start and end points) with streets being linked to form possible routes. Possible facility types are identified, based on cross sectional width, traffic volumes and constraints and are presented on a plan overlaying the land use types.

A shortlist of Route Options is identified from the possible routes, based on logical links to key connections/attractors and available roads within the corridor.

The Route Options are scored in an MCA assessment by a diverse team of people. This assessment scores each option against the following criteria: Safety, Directness, Coherence, Attractiveness, Comfort, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), Business impact (i.e. change in access and loss of on-street parking), Residence impact (i.e. reduction in on-street parking), operational and network impacts (i.e. changes to the street layout, reduced road width, potential delay to other road users, additional signalised intersections), ease of construction and costs, land purchase/easements and consents. The results are reviewed using sensitivity testing (applying 70% weighting to the broad categories of cyclist criteria, impacts and costs) to confirm the best route option.

SANF Assessment

A SANF assessment involves an independent team of diverse people undertaking a holistic review of the route identification and MCA assessment outcomes to determine whether sufficient analysis has been completed to reach the conclusions and recommendations. A supportive SANF assessment provides transparency and confidence to decision makers that the analysis and impacts on affected parties has been adequately considered. A SANF demonstrates to the public that independent peer reviews have been undertaken.
5. Christchurch Northern Corridor and Christchurch Southern Motorway - Progress Update

Reference: 19/456402
Presenter(s): Jim Harland, Regional Director, New Zealand Transport Agency

1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee with relevant information on the progress made to date on the development of the Christchurch Northern Corridor Project, Christchurch Southern Motorway, managed lane investigations and the immediate next steps.

2. Relationship to Partnership Objectives
   2.1 These projects relate to improving transport system performances and mode choices.

3. Staff Recommendations
   That the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee:
   1. Receive this update information on the Northern Corridor and Southern Motorway Projects.

4. Christchurch Northern Corridor Project

Context/Background
   4.1 The NZ Transport Agency has been working closely with stakeholders to progress a series of business cases aimed at identifying integrated multimodal transport improvements that can be implemented on the Northern Corridor and the surrounding transport system to enhance the accessibility and liveability of communities.

   4.2 The focus of the business cases has been on ensuring a joint approach to addressing network challenges and to develop solutions that reflect the change in demands and priorities for the agency, stakeholders and communities. This approach was agreed with the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee.

   4.3 Stakeholders have placed an emphasis on investigating travel demand management (TDM) solutions such as High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV) facilities and public transport improvements to respond to these changing demands and to future proof the wider transport system.

   4.4 On 14 December, the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee received an update on the Northern Arterial Programme and recommended that NZTA report back early in the New Year with the final design and costs associated with the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane and recommendations on supporting TDM measures and preliminary associated costs. (GCPC/2018/00032).

   4.5 On 12 April 2019, the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee requested an update on the Northern Corridor Project and Southern Motorway project, including traffic flow data for the Southern entry to the city.
Business Case Development Update

4.6 In July 2017, the NZ Transport Agency Board endorsed the Greater Christchurch Northern Access Programme Business Case. The recommended improvements include several different transport elements such as HOV, public transit services, and cycling facilities.

4.7 In December 2018, the NZ Transport Agency endorsed the Waimakariri Connectivity Business Case to proceed to pre-implementation. The recommended option is comprised of an HOV lane, cycleway and TDM improvements as shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Recommended Option in Waimakariri Connectivity Business Case](image)

Recommended Option

4.8 The recommended option has now been taken forward to pre-implementation stage. This stage will focus on further refining the design and operation of the recommended option. The components include:

4.8.1 Physical lane design elements: comprises the detailed design of a 3rd southbound lane and a shared use path cycle facility.

4.8.2 Operational design elements: includes concept of operation, enforcement technology, and other ITS infrastructure.
4.8.3 Supporting TDM measures: comprises the development of TDM solutions for the HOV lane. This includes Park ‘n Ride facilities and express bus services.

4.9 Funding is a key concern for all GCP partners involved in the implementation of the various elements of the proposed HOV solution, in particular the TDM components. Below are details of aspects that are currently funded and those that funding is not yet confirmed.

4.9.1 Funding has now been approved for the construction of the HOV solution.

4.9.2 Funding for TDM measures such as any necessary public transport services, park ‘n ride facilities, marking and education initiatives is yet to be approved.

4.9.3 Discussion is continuing on contributions to support HOV project components relating to TDM.

4.10 An enforcement strategy and plan consistent with the national approach is under development.

5. Christchurch Southern Motorway

Background/context

5.1 The Christchurch Southern Motorway Stage 2 (CSM2) is part of a package of improvements designed to address increased travel demand, congestion and safety in the south of Christchurch and Canterbury. The Christchurch Southern Motorway Stage 2 (CSM2) is made up of a new section of four-lane median separated motorway, from Halswell Junction Road to SH1 near Robinsons Road and an upgrade of the existing Main South Road (SH1), from north of Robinsons Road to near Rolleston, to four lanes.

5.2 The CSM2 is currently under construction and is projected to be completed and opened by November 2020. With the opening of CSM2 in 2020 the Brougham Street corridor is expected to face significant issues related to increase demand up to 20% higher by 2046. Due to concerns for potential congestion and increasing single occupant vehicles (SOVs), the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee asked NZ Transport Agency to investigate the viability of implementing managed lane facilities along the corridor.

CSM Managed Lanes

5.3 The NZ Transport Agency has undertaken preliminary investigations into the viability of implementing managed lane facilities. These investigations are ongoing and will be incorporated into the testing for the Brougham Moorhouse Project.

Traffic Flow Data

5.4 As per request, the projected traffic volumes from the Christchurch Transport Model area are demonstrated below for the 2021 AM peak and the 2020 annual average daily traffic counts (AADT).
Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee
10 May 2019

2021 AM PEAK

2021 AADT

Attachments
There are no attachments to this report.
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## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABBREVIATION</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>An Accessible City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCR</td>
<td>Benefit Cost Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>Christchurch Assignment and Simulation of Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPEX</td>
<td>Capital Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTM</td>
<td>Christchurch Transport Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMP</td>
<td>Downstream Effects Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECan</td>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC TDMS</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Government Policy Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>High Occupancy Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaaS</td>
<td>Mobility as a Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Transport Agency</td>
<td>The New Zealand Transport Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEX</td>
<td>Operational Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE2</td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoNS</td>
<td>Roads of National Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH1</td>
<td>State Highway 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>Single Occupancy Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSBC</td>
<td>Single Stage Business Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>Travel Demand Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC</td>
<td>Waimakariri District Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TERM | DEFINITION
--- | ---
Reliability | Reliability in the context of this report relates to the ability of a traveller to plan and carry out a trip with a degree of confidence that the time taken will generally be as expected from one weekday peak to the next weekday peak
Attractiveness | Attractiveness in the context of this report relates to the comparison of total travel times and travel costs for each mode of transport, with all costs converted to travel time equivalents to give total perceived times. If the total perceived time for mode X is quicker than that for mode Y, then mode X is considered to be "attractive"
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to outline the investment case for the implementation of Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures to support the southbound High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane and cycle path proposed for the Waimakariri Bridge on State Highway 1 (SH1) and the Christchurch Northern Corridor.

Due to the increased population growth in the Waimakariri District and northern areas of Christchurch, travel demands are forecast to increase over time. The CAST travel demands show that without supporting TDM measures the additional capacity at the Waimakariri Bridge will be exceeded within a few years of opening.

Forecasts predict that the proposed supporting TDM measures will see a 15% reduction in Single Occupancy Vehicle travel and an increase to a 10% public transport mode share by 2048 for all traffic travelling south over the Waimakariri Bridge in the AM Peak period. This is expected to alleviate congestion downstream and ultimately help to achieve objectives identified for the proposed HOV lane and cycle path.

Context

The Christchurch Northern Corridor is under construction and is due to become operational by mid-2020. The HOV lane and cycleway improvements proposed for the Christchurch Northern Corridor are still being considered as part of a separate business case, the Waimakariri Connectivity Single Stage Business Case (December, 2018).

This project forms a part of a larger network wide programme which investigates the need for TDM solutions for Greater Christchurch. It follows the development of a Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management Strategy and a network-wide draft Travel Demand Management Strategic Business Case and aligns with the overarching objectives defined within these documents. This project is also guided by the problem statements identified within the draft Travel Demand Management Strategic Business Case:

- **Problem 1:** The current transport system and land use favours travel by car, which if continued will result in increased traffic and congestion, decreasing access to economic and social opportunities as the city grows.

- **Problem 2:** The relative attractiveness of travel in single occupancy vehicles encourages travel behaviours, which have broad negative effects to quality of life and liveability of local communities.

What is Travel Demand Management

The Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management Strategy defines TDM as a set of strategies, policies or interventions which aim to reduce travel demand or redistribute travel demand across multiple modes of transport or over longer time-periods of the day. TDM measures can drive behavioural change and encourage customers to rethink their travel choices and consequently change their travel patterns and behaviours.

As outlined above, the existing transport network and land use characteristics within Greater Christchurch favour car travel, with 85% of commuters travelling via Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOV). Without further mechanisms and incentives which drive
behavioural changes, the implementation of the proposed HOV lane and cycle path along the Christchurch Northern Corridor and Waimakariri Bridge will only go so far in promoting alternative modes of travel. TDM measures will maximise the benefits of larger infrastructure investments, such as the HOV lane.

**Growth Context**

Greater Christchurch currently has a population nearing half a million people as at June 2018. From July 2017 and June 2018, Christchurch City’s population increased by 1.8%, slightly lower than the national average of 3.9%. In the year to June 2018, the Selwyn District population increased by 4.8%, while the Waimakariri District population increased by 2.4%.

Future projections indicate this growth will continue over the next 10 years, with an average annual growth rate of 1.2% for Greater Christchurch.

The Greater Christchurch Partnership have recently updated the spatial plan (Our Space 2018–2048), which proposes several future developments areas within Kaiapoi, Pegasus and Woodend, indicating the region is expected to continue to grow into the future.

**Transport Context**

The rapid growth has led to a number of recent transport network developments and initiatives. Table 1 provides a summary of the existing transport systems servicing the northern corridor and the Waimakariri District and future developments in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 1 Transport system context summary</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS / FUTURE DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Downstream Effects Management Plan (DEMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport offering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Customer Insights

In 2016 the Waimakariri District Council and NZ Transport Agency, undertook initial customer research targeting commuters travelling from the Waimakariri District south to Christchurch at least once a week. More recent customer surveys (April 2019) have been undertaken providing insights of the existing travel behaviours and the propensity to change travel behaviours for commuters who will potentially use the Christchurch Northern Corridor.

The customer surveys provide the following key insights:

- Southbound trips are largely dominated by private vehicle travel with 90% of people survey in 2016 and 100% of people surveyed in 2019 driving as part of their morning commute.
- Travel times have significantly reduced since 2016 which has led to a greater overall commuter satisfaction for those travelling south. This may be due to the opening of the Belfast Western Bypass.
- The longer travel times by public transport was the number one factor stopping people from using public transport in both 2016 and 2019.
- Express bus services, higher frequency bus services and more convenient routes and stops were some of the interventions which would encourage greater public transport use.
- It was also identified that the provision of a HOV lane and greater flexibility with carpoolsing including a flexible carpoolsing app would influence greater uptake of ridesharing.

This data not only provides baseline measures which can be assessed overtime but also provides relevant information for the design and development of the TDM interventions and the potential uptake of public transport and ridesharing.

User Demand

The design of the TDM interventions is based on the existing and future user demand along the Christchurch Northern Corridor and the potential or propensity for customers to change their travel behaviours. A transport assessment has been undertaken which assesses origin

---

- destination patterns over time, total travel demand, and the potential mode change along the Christchurch Northern Corridor (assuming the HOV lane has been implemented).

The origin-destination patterns firstly show substantial southbound movements along the corridor by 2048 (approximately 15,000 person trips within the AM peak period). One third of these trips have a destination south of Queen Elizabeth II Drive and the city centre. A high proportion of southbound traffic also have a destination in the northern areas of Christchurch.

The projected high growth in demand over the next 30 years means that even with the new infrastructure being put in place now, the capacity available will become increasingly insufficient unless there is a significant shift to higher vehicle occupancies. Figure 1 highlights the increasing travel demand at Waimakariri Bridge (assuming the additional lane is operational but not a HOV lane or supporting TDM measures) and compares this against its capacity for the AM peak period. The figure shows the SOV demand exceeding capacity in 2021 with the problem worsening significantly by 2048.

![Figure 1 Traffic demand and capacity at the Waimakariri Bridge in the AM peak (one hour) without TDM measures](image)

**Travel Demand Management measures**

The following TDM measures have been identified to meet the requirements and customer needs as outlined within the user demand assessment and customer insights research. A staged approach is recommended given the various role each measure plays within the wider TDM strategy. Each stage is summarised in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Communication Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Focus Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication plan to promote new infrastructure and to provide regular updates on construction and disruptions</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 2 TDM measure summary**

NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY 12.04.2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDM Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Focus Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and promotion campaign</td>
<td>This will aim to raise awareness and understanding in the community regarding the HOV lane and its operation as well as the improved public transport service offering.</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility as a Service</td>
<td>This considers first and last mile connections and includes the launch/development of an app based tool that combines public transport, carpooling/rideshare and micro mobility travel options.</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Training and education      | Provide training and education to make commuters more comfortable with using alternative modes of transport  
- Cycle training courses  
- Bus information                                                                 | Kaiapoi, Rangiora & Woodend |
| Downstream TDM measures     | Continued investigation into Downstream measures which incentivise greater use of the HOV lane such as parking incentives                                            | Central City                |
| Park and Ride               | Interim Park and Ride sites in Kaiapoi and Rangiora, each with a capacity of 120 spaces. The Park and Ride will facilitate existing bus services (Blue Line and Service 95) and could also include secure cycle lockers and bus and vehicle access. | Kaiapoi and Kaiapoi        |
| Travel Planning             | Residents will be invited to participate in a personalised journey planning programme to encourage behaviour change to alternative modes of transport. This initiative will also target schools and workplaces.                 | Kaiapoi, Rangiora & Woodend |
| New Express public transport service | An additional express bus service targeting peak hour commuters and travelling between Rangiora, Kaiapoi and the central city along the new HOV lane.  
- 10 minute frequencies (between 7–9 AM and 4–6 PM)  
- Total of 24 additional services a day (12 in each peak period)                                                                 | Starts journey at Rangiora, passes through Kaiapoi Park and Ride and ends journey in Central City |
| Park and Ride expansion     | Expand Park and Ride to a permanent facility:  
- 200 to 350 space Park and Ride at Rangiora with capacity to increase as demand requires                                                                 | Rangiora and Kaiapoi        |
Recommended options assessment

Behaviour change opportunities

The potential for behaviour change along the Christchurch Northern Corridor has been determined by considering a number of different mode share scenarios and applying those to the traffic demand forecasts for the point along the corridor with the highest traffic flows. The highest flow point on the corridor between Tram Road and Bealey Avenue is forecast to be across the Waimakariri Bridge.

Figure 2 below compares the SOV volume against SOV capacity with and without TDM measures. As shown below, in 2048, there is a clear reduction in SOV travel demand in 2048 (approximately 15% reduction). This can be attributed to the behaviour changes expected for the corridor.

![Figure 2 Traffic demand and capacity at Waimakariri Bridge in the AM Peak period with and without TDM measures](image-url)

**SOV Capacity (1.1 volume to capacity) at Waimakariri Bridge = 3960 vsh/hr**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SOV Volume With TDM</th>
<th>SOV Volume Without TDM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>3900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>3960</td>
<td>4190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>3960</td>
<td>4780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3 provides a detailed comparison of traffic volumes and the resulting mode share for each of the modelled timeframes (2021, 2028 and 2048) at the Waimakariri Bridge. The figure highlights that by 2048, the TDM measures are likely to encourage a 15% public transport mode share, a 17% reduction in SOV's and a slight increase in cycling.

Furthermore, by 2048 the single HOV/bus lane is predicted to take around 3,100 people per hour, which is substantial and well in excess of either a general traffic lane (with a capacity of approximately 2,150 people per hour), or a lane for SOV's (approximately 1,800 people per hour).
Figure 3 Traffic volumes and mode share with and without TDM measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without TDM measures</th>
<th>With TDM measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2021</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🚙 3900 veh/hr</td>
<td>🚙 3900 veh/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🐫 685 veh/hr or 1600 pers/hr</td>
<td>🐫 550 veh/hr or 1280 pers/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🐕 0 pers/hr</td>
<td>🐕 270 pers/hr or 6 buses/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🤘 170 pers/hr</td>
<td>🤘 220 pers/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2028</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🚙 4190 veh/hr</td>
<td>🚙 3960 veh/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🐫 740 veh/hr or 1730 pers/hr</td>
<td>🐫 580 veh/hr or 1360 pers/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🐕 180 pers/hr</td>
<td>🐕 540 pers/hr or 12 buses/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2048</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🚙 4780 veh/hr</td>
<td>🚙 3960 veh/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🐫 840 veh/hr or 1970 pers/hr</td>
<td>🐫 870 veh/hr or 2030 pers/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🐕 220 pers/hr</td>
<td>🐕 1080 pers/hr or 24 buses/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The implementation of the TDM supporting measures will deliver wider improvements to the Greater Christchurch transport system including:

- Enabling and supporting growth
- Improving travel choice
- Travel time reliability and access by non-SOV modes
- Safety, health and the environment
- Value for money

Increasing the uptake of walking, cycling, public transport and ridesharing will help provide a more balanced transport system, and provides opportunities to optimise and extend the lifecycle of current and future assets and services.

Based on the assessments undertaken to date and the assumptions detailed in this report, the recommended TDM measures (from opening) are forecast to deliver the following transport outcomes as in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Objective 1: Increase the people moving capacity when the HOV lane is operational</th>
<th>Investment KPI</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI / Measure 1.1: Decrease in percentage of SOV mode split in AM peak:</td>
<td>Across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>69% SOV mode split by March 2021 across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Cranford/Innes intersection (southbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td>62% SOV mode split by March 2021 south of QE2 (southbound)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI / Measure 1.2: Increase in percentage of HOV mode split in AM peak:</td>
<td>Across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27% HOV mode split by March 2021 across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Cranford/Innes intersection (southbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td>34% HOV mode split by March 2021 at Cranford/Innes intersection (southbound)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI / Measure 1.3: Increase in average vehicle occupancy in AM peak:</td>
<td>Across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.3 average vehicle occupancy by March 2021 across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Cranford/Innes intersection (southbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 average vehicle occupancy by March 2021 at Cranford/Innes intersection (southbound)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment C

### Item 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Objective 2: Trip reliability for non-SOV vehicles between Tram Road and Bealey Avenue when the HOV lane is operational</th>
<th>KPI / Measure 2.1: Reduce/maintain peak travel time variability between Tram Rd and Bealey Ave for each priority mode:</th>
<th>HOV – reduce annual avg. travel time variability</th>
<th>Achieve annual average travel time variability within 1 minute for HOV's (along extent of priority lane) by March 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PT – reduce annual avg. travel time variability</td>
<td>80 seconds</td>
<td>Achieve annual average travel time variability within 1 minute for PT by March 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Objective 3: Improve the attractiveness of high occupancy vehicle travel when the HOV lane is operational</th>
<th>KPI / Measure 3.1: Reduce the travel time of HOV's comparable to SOV's in the AM peak for trips between:</th>
<th>Tram Rd and Bealey Av</th>
<th>HOV 10 minutes quicker by March 2021 for AM peak trips between Tram Rd and Bealey Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as SOV</td>
<td>HOV 6 minutes quicker by March 2021 for AM peak trips between Tram Rd and Cranford/Innes intersection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KPI / Measure 3.2: Reduce the travel time difference between public transport and SOV's in the AM peak for trips between:</th>
<th>Tram Road and Bealey Avenue</th>
<th>PT trips between Tram Road and Bealey Avenue to be at least 8 minutes quicker than SOV by March 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as SOV</td>
<td>PT trips between Tram Road and Cranford/Innes to be at least 6 minutes quicker than SOV by March 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Investment Objective 4: Minimise downstream impact consistent with the draft DSMP requirements | KPI / Measure 4.1: Limit the number of additional vehicles on Cranford St prior to the Innes Rd intersection | 1,000 | No more than 1,800 vehicles per hour on Cranford St (prior to Innes Rd intersection) by March 2021 |

| Investment Objective 5: Improve safety | KPI / Measure 5.1: Minimise the severity and number of accidents on the northern corridor by maintaining the KiwiRAP star rating and the personal risk rating | 5 star rating, personal risk rating low | Maintain 5 star safety rating and a personal risk rating of low on the northern corridor |
Table 3 demonstrates how the recommended TDM measures deliver well against the Investment Objectives and target outcomes identified for this project. The measures provide for the forecast growth north of the Waimakariri Bridge and allow for a phased approach to scale the TDM measures over time.

## Costs and Benefit Cost appraisals

An indicative programme cost has been estimated at approximately $7.470m to implement the TDM measures considered necessary prior to opening of the HOV lane. The estimated cost of implementing the longer term TDM measures is estimated to be between $17M and $39M (excluding land purchase).

A Benefit Cost appraisal has been undertaken for two scenarios:

- Scenario 1: a most likely estimate
- Scenario 2: a conservative estimate that shows what level of benefit would be required to lead to a Benefit Cost Ratio of 1.

The analysis indicates an expected Benefit Cost Ratio of 1.4 (for scenario 1), while scenario 2, with a more conservative set of assumptions, shows the level of benefit required to reach a Benefit Cost Ratio of 1.

It needs to be recognised that the Benefit Cost Ratio only provides part of the story. The project is anticipated to have a number of strategic transport benefits, including prioritising modes of transport that carry more people, as identified elsewhere in this report, which cannot fully be demonstrated within the current level of analysis of downstream benefits due to the project.

## Risks

The project team held a risk identification workshop with stakeholders at the commencement of the project. During this workshop stakeholders identified a range of risks relevant to the development and delivery of this project. Through the development of the recommended TDM measures the risk register has been updated to reflect any new information as identified. Key risks include:

- Land acquisition
- Consenting
• Integration with other workstreams
• Park and Ride facility utilisation
• Financial
• Funding
• Timing of delivery

Next steps

It is recognised that additional transport assessments, technical investigations and design work is required prior to the implementation of the supporting TDM measures identified in this report.

If the recommended TDM measures required by mid-2020 are approved and the funding secured, the next steps for the implementation of the TDM measures includes:

• NZ Transport Agency, Waimakariri District Council, Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury (supporting TDM measures)
  • Work collaboratively to consider the ‘end to end’ journey experience for customers through the design and development of the TDM measures
  • Implement the TDM measures required prior to and upon opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.
INTRODUCTION

This report sets out the investment case for the implementation of Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures to support the proposed improvements on State Highway 1 (SH1) and the Christchurch Northern Corridor to the north of Christchurch (referred to as ‘the project’ in this report).

The TDM measures aim to drive behavioural change and encourage customers to rethink their travel choices and consequently change their travel behaviour. TDM measures are required to support the new 10 kilometre section of State Highway between Tram Road and the intersection of Innes Road and Cranford Street, which includes a proposed southbound High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane and cycleways as shown in Figure 4. Whilst the physical infrastructure has a defined study area, this TDM project is focused on customers at their journey origin and destination and therefore the TDM study area spans from Waimakariri District to the Central City to consider end to end journeys.

Figure 4 Project location

---

attachment C
The New Zealand Transport Agency (NZ Transport Agency) is seeking to confirm a preferred package of TDM measures to progress to pre-implementation. These TDM measures are required to support a reduction in the use of Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOV’s). The measures aim to improve trip reliability and relative travel times for active modes and public transport users. This investment case has investigated TDM measures to support end to end journeys between Waimakariri District and Christchurch City.

The TDM measures also aim to maximise the benefits from investment in a proposed southbound HOV lane on the SH1 Waimakariri Bridge and Christchurch Northern Corridor (currently being designed and due to open mid-2020). The proposed southbound HOV lane is critical to achieving behaviour change and forms a key part of the TDM programme.

These measures are also planned to reduce the negative impacts that are being experienced and expected to worsen in the St Albans and Mairehau communities if the number of vehicles, including a high proportion of SOV’s, along this corridor are not carefully managed.

This report builds on previous studies undertaken in the area\(^2\) and also highlights the current risks and further planning, investigation and design that will be required to implement the recommended TDM interventions.

This report has been developed with key project partners from Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City Council and Waimakariri District Council, as well as a number of teams within the NZ Transport Agency.

**Project history**

**Waimakariri Connectivity Single Stage Business Case (2018)**

In July 2017, the NZ Transport Agency Board endorsed the Greater Christchurch Northern Access Programme Business Case which identified enhancements to SH1 between the Ashley River and Belfast to address reliability, safety and travel demand management challenges in this section of the road network.

The NZ Transport Agency sought to identify and confirm a preferred option through the Waimakariri Connectivity Single Stage Business Case (SSBC) that was completed in December 2018. The Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC builds upon previous studies undertaken in the area and identifies a recommended option for improving accessibility across the Waimakariri River on SH1 whilst also addressing demand management opportunities for the wider transport system.

The SSBC identified increasing demand for travel between the Waimakariri District and Christchurch City in the morning peak. This is due to a number of factors including increased population growth (which is at historically very high levels and forecast to remain at high levels in the future) and comparatively limited employment opportunities to the north. This is resulting in reduced access in the morning peak period due to low public transport patronage and a high proportion of single occupancy vehicles (SOV’s).

Many studies have been undertaken to identify solutions to these issues. This has resulted in a number of projects south of Waimakariri District being further investigated, designed or

---

\(^2\) This report should be read in conjunction with the Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC that outlines a preferred option for a southbound HOV lane on the SH1 Waimakariri Bridge and Christchurch Northern Corridor.
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implemented, such as the recently opened Western Belfast Bypass and the Christchurch Northern Corridor which is currently under construction.

Even with the implementation of these projects, the problems are forecast to worsen. The recent Picton to Christchurch Programme Business Case identified the short and long term plan for this area of the transport network. This included the provision of an additional lane over the Waimakariri Bridge in the southbound direction for the use of HOV and public transport vehicles only, and a new cycle lane ‘clip on’ bridge. This recommendation was supported by the NZ Transport Agency in June 2017.

The HOV solution allows for the provision of the forecast growth north of the Waimakariri River whilst minimising the increase in the number of SOV’s. This provides a more efficient use of existing infrastructure, providing for the forecast growth through the provision of increased people movement rather than increased vehicle capacity.

The Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC recommends that the HOV solution is supported by a suite of wider TDM measures to ensure the success of the HOV lane. The Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC recommends further investigation of the following TDM measures:

- Marketing and communications
- Park and Ride
- Mobility as a Service software
- Express bus services
- Customer insights research
- Education campaign
- Travel planning

Travel Demand Management

This project also forms part of a network-wide programme investigating the need for TDM solutions for Greater Christchurch. It follows the development of a Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management Strategy and a network-wide draft Travel Demand Management Strategic Business Case.

Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management Strategy (2009)

A Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management Strategy and Action Plan (GC TDMS) was adopted in 2009 by the Greater Christchurch partners (NZ Transport Agency, Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, and Waimakariri District Council).

The Strategy defines TDM as the application of strategies, policies and initiatives to reduce travel demand, or to redistribute this demand across multiple modes of transport or over longer time–periods of the day. TDM programmes typically attempt to redistribute demand away from SOV trips during peak hours to an increased use of public transport, carpooling and active modes such as walking and cycling.

The GC TDMS identifies a joint policy direction, targets and actions. It sets out four goals:

1. A reduction in the number of trips made by private car (single occupant)
2. An increase in proportion of trips made using sustainable travel options
3. A reduction in the distance travelled between origin and destination
4. A change in the time of travel.

---
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Travel Demand Management Business Case (Draft, 2018)

The Greater Christchurch partners progressed a Strategic Case for TDM in 2018, which provides further context and identifies two draft problem statements:

**Problem 1:** The current transport system and land use favours travel by car, which if continues will result in increased traffic and congestion, decreasing access to economic and social opportunities as the city grows.

**Problem 2:** The relative attractiveness of travel in single occupancy vehicles encourages travel behaviours which have broad negative effects to quality of life and liveability of local communities.

Four draft Investment Objectives were also developed with a series of key performance indicators to guide investment planning:

1. Improve the relative attractiveness of non-single occupancy vehicle travel compared to single occupancy vehicle travel in peak periods
2. Improve transport and land use integration to support liveability and reduce vehicle emissions
3. Improve travel time predictability for high occupancy vehicles, public transport and active modes on key corridors
4. Improve safety outcomes.

The draft Strategic Case also identified a wide range of alternatives and options for TDM in Greater Christchurch that are to be considered for further investigation to determine the preferred programme of interventions to achieve these Investment Objectives. This work also resulted in the development of an emerging programme of TDM measures for the northern area of Greater Christchurch.

A copy of the draft Greater Christchurch Strategic Case and the emerging Travel Demand Management Programme for the Northern Area are provided in Appendix A and B.

**Purpose of this report**

The purpose of this report is to set out the investment case for the implementation of a package of TDM interventions to support the proposed southbound HOV lane on the SH1 Waimakariri Bridge and Christchurch Northern Corridor and identifies next steps required for implementation of these interventions. This report includes:

- A summary of previous work undertaken and an overview of the future growth context
- Identification of the existing transport system and analysis of expected future demand
- A summary of the Investment Objectives and targeted outcomes from the investment
- Identification of the priority TDM measures and how these can achieve the targeted outcomes
- Commentary on supporting downstream TDM interventions (those outside the project area but critical to achieving the Investment Objectives)
- Identification of next steps and a potential implementation strategy
- A summary of the risks and uncertainties
GROWTH CONTEXT

Greater Christchurch currently has a population nearing half a million people as at June 2018. From July 2017 and June 2018, Christchurch City’s population increased by 1.8%, slightly lower than the national average of 1.9%. In the year to June 2018, the Selwyn District population increased by 4.8%, while the Waimakariri District population increased by 2.4%.

Future projections indicate this growth will continue over the next 10 years, with an average annual growth rate of 1.2% for Greater Christchurch.

Greater Christchurch experienced rapid population growth to the satellite towns located north of the Waimakariri River immediately following the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury earthquakes. The number of households in this region increased by 29% between 2008 and 2018. Within the same period the population increased by 14,800 people (32%). This high growth trend is forecast to continue with an additional 13,600 to 16,000 new dwellings (approximately 34,000 to 40,000 people) forecast for the Waimakariri District over the next 30 years.

Christchurch City is the key employment hub for the region with over 200,000 employees and 42,000 business located in the Christchurch City Council area. However, both Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts also saw considerable employment and business growth in the period after the earthquakes. Between 2012 and 2017, the number of people employed grew by 14% in Christchurch City, whilst in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts employment grew by 25%.

Employment growth outstripped population growth in both Christchurch City and the Waimakariri District indicating both a fall in unemployment across the region, increase in the working age people as part of the whole population and the intensification of the regions key activity centres such as Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Rolleston.

The Greater Christchurch Partnership have recently updated the spatial plan (Our Space 2018-2048), which proposes several future development areas as shown in Figure 5.
Figure 5 Proposed locations of future development in Greater Christchurch
TRANSPORT SYSTEM CONTEXT

New infrastructure investment

The Christchurch Northern Corridor was identified as a Roads of National Significance (RoNS) project in 2009. The project was rebranded as the Christchurch Northern Corridor and is currently under construction, which is expected to open in mid-2020.

The project aims to provide an improved connection between the SH1 Waimakariri Bridge and Cranford Street in Christchurch City in order to alleviate congestion along Main North Road and Marshland Road.

A full description of the preferred option is provided in the Waimakariri Connectivity Single Stage Business Case (SSBC) (a Detailed Business Case to proceed to Pre-Implementation draft, December 2018) and is summarised in Figure 6.

The project includes:

- The addition of a third north and southbound lane on the Waimakariri Bridge
- A four-lane motorway starting just south of the Waimakariri River to connect with Queen Elizabeth II (QE2) Drive near Winters Road and then continue to link with Cranford Street
- An upgrade of QE2 Drive to four lanes between Main North Road and the northern extent of Innes Road
- An upgrade of Cranford Street to Innes Road to four lanes with an improved Cranford/Innes intersection
- A southbound HOV lane from Tram Road to north of the Cranford Street roundabout
- A shared pedestrian and cycle path running the length of the Christchurch Northern Corridor. A clip-on shared path will be added to the SH1 Waimakariri Bridge
- Shared paths will also link to and improve cycle and pedestrian facilities along QE2 Drive
- From Cranford Street, a Christchurch City Council project will link the Christchurch Northern Corridor cycle facilities to the Papanui Parallel (a Major Cycle Route).

Figure 6 Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC recommended option
Note for the purposes of this study Park and Ride sites have been investigated at several locations and not just Tram Road.
Downstream Effects Management Plan

The Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC also identifies the need to manage the downstream effects of the new corridor. Higher traffic volumes travelling from the north will create additional transport movement demands particularly south of Cranford Street/Innes Road intersection.

The requirement for a Downstream Effects Management Plan (DEMP) came from an Environment Court ruling when the Christchurch Northern Corridor was approved. Christchurch City Council is responsible for completing the Plan before the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and mitigating the effects additional traffic will have on the local transport network.

A number of draft downstream measures have been identified to mitigate the impacts of this additional demand. These measures are staged based on future traffic volumes and are currently being consulted on as part of the DEMP. The projects proposed in stage 1 before the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens are summarised below and in Figure 7 overleaf:

- Cranford Street clearways: peak period clearways along Cranford Street from Innes Road to Berwick Street
- Westminster Street/Cranford Street intersection: upgrades to Westminster Street/Cranford Street intersection
- Berwick Street/Warrington Street upgrades: upgrading of Berwick Street/Cranford Street intersection and signalisation of the Forfar Street/Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street intersections
- South of Berwick upgrades: arterial upgrade option downstream of Berwick Street
- High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane on Cranford Street and Sherborne Street: Investigate using the peak period clearways as HOV lanes (must have more than one person in the vehicle). This effectively extends the proposed Christchurch Northern Corridor HOV lane south to Bealey Avenue and a northbound HOV lane up Sherborne and Cranford Streets
- Speed limit changes: Introduce nine 30km/h (or 40km/h) reduced speed limit areas through the downstream local road network
- Proposed traffic calming on the following streets:
  - Mersey Street (Innes Road to Berwick Street)
  - Knowles Street (Cranford Street to Rutland Street)
  - Weston Road (Cranford Street to Rutland Street)
  - McFaddens Road (Cranford Street to Rutland Street)
  - Malvern Street = left in and left out only at Cranford Street
  - Dee Street = left in and left out only at Cranford Street
- Proposed safe access to schools and develop and implementation a wayfinding plan
- Undertake a study of an alternative north–south secondary cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street
- East–West cycle study to connect the Papanui Parallel and the proposed north–south route

At the time of drafting this report Christchurch City Council is currently seeking public feedback on the recommendations detailed in the draft DEMP. Consultation is due to close on 15th April 2019.
Public transport offering

There are currently two existing public transport service routes that serve the suburbs to the north of Waimakariri Bridge. These are the Blue Line bus service that connects Rangiora with Christchurch City and the 95 bus service which connects Woodend, Pegasus and Waikuku to Christchurch City as shown in Figure 8.

Figure 8 Existing transport services serving Waimakariri District
Environment Canterbury are progressing a Waimakariri public transport service review that will shortly be undertaking public consultation. As part of the service review the public will be consulted on potential changes to the routing of the existing Blue Line service and service 95, which are shown in Figure 9 below. A new Waimakariri Link service (from Rangiora to Silverstream via Woodend and Kaiapoi) will also be consulted on in the near future. The Waimakariri Link will provide all-day connections between local suburban areas with connections to frequent services to enable travel to other destinations.

**Figure 9 Proposed new transport services serving Waimakariri District**
Multi-occupancy vehicle trips

Currently, a low proportion of vehicle trips have greater than one person per vehicle and the majority of the multi-occupancy trips are parents taking children to school. Recent survey data shows that only 4% drive with non-related passengers or are not work colleagues. This indicates that ridesharing or carpooling for journeys from the Waimakariri District across the Waimakariri River into Christchurch City is currently limited. This is further evidenced by the low occupancy rates of vehicles in peak periods. Northern area commuter research undertaken in 2016/17 indicates that 85% of vehicles travelling within the Waimakariri District were single occupant.

Anecdotal evidence suggests there is widespread general knowledge of ridesharing app based taxi services. However very few residents have visited the ‘Let’s Carpool Smart Travel’ website. This is an online resource that helps people to connect with each other so that they can carpool. The website matches individuals who share similar origin and destination points and also provides suggestions on the best routes. In the Northern Corridor Commuter’s Research 2016 survey it was stated that 80% of respondents had not visited this website, potentially suggesting that further marketing and promotion is required.

The demographics and trip purpose of each individual will play a large part in the likelihood of the individual adopting this type of arrangement. Parents needing to drop children off at school prior to going to work, individuals that work in shifts or not typical working hours and people who use their vehicle for their trade are unlikely to adopt carpooling or ridesharing initiatives. It is therefore crucial to understand both the demographic and their reason for travelling.

Walking and cycling

Walking and cycling networks are provided in Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Christchurch City but no dedicated connections are currently provided across the Waimakariri River. State Highway 1 is classified as a motorway environment. As such, pedestrians and cyclists are currently not permitted to use this route. Existing cycleways in northern Christchurch are shown in Figure 10 below.

The recommended option (as detailed in the Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC) is to provide enhanced walking and cycling facilities, including:

- Extension of the Christchurch Northern Corridor shared path across the Waimakariri River on a new dedicated bridge
- Shared path link to Wrights Road
- Two-way on-road cycleway from Wrights Road on the west side of Main North Road to the Tram Road intersection signals.

---

4 Ibid.
Figure 10 Existing cycle facilities

LEGEND
- Christchurch Northern Corridor (includes Waimakariri HOV & cycleway project)
- Existing cycle routes
- Indicative Papanui Parallel cycle connection
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CUSTOMER INSIGHTS

Customer insight research has formed an essential part of this project. The research has involved gathering information about customers’ experiences and using the information gathered to develop insights about an individuals present travel behaviours and to understand their needs to help develop appropriate TDM solutions.

Customer surveys were originally undertaken in January 2016 targeting individuals using the Northern Corridor at least once a week for their morning commute. The study has a survey sample of 388 respondents. Recent customer survey data (April, 2019) provides an up to date insight of commuter attitudes and behaviours and how they have changed since 2016. However this study has a slightly smaller survey sample of 265, which should be considered when comparing the two data sets. Key differences are summarised in Figure 11 and Figure 12 below.

It should be noted that since January 2016, there have been a number of variables which will have affected people’s travel behaviours and attitudes including:

- City Wide
  - Public transport service changes
  - Major Cycle Routes implemented or currently being designed or constructed
  - Parking provision
  - Micro-mobility uptake (e-scooters and e-bikes)
- Central City
  - Parking provision
  - An Accessible City which improves accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport in the Central City
- Northern Area
  - The opening of the Western Belfast Bypass

In addition the Waimakariri District has experienced significant population growth within the last few years.

Existing customer behaviour

Customer behaviour patterns and levels of satisfaction with the morning commute for residents north of the Waimakariri Bridge to destinations across the city are summarised in Figure 11. This report has not undertaken targeted analysis based on specific customer segmentation. It is recommended that this work is undertaken by the partners to better understand individual customer segments and their drivers and barriers to behaviour change. These insights will assist in informing a targeted behaviour change campaign.

Figure 11 Existing customer behaviours (2016 vs 2019 customer surveys)¹

---

³ Source: Northern Corridor Commuters Research Report
⁴ Note the time groupings for perception of journey time differ between the 2016 and 2019 surveys
The graphic emphasises the high dependency on private vehicles with the majority of people driving as part of their daily commute. It should be noted that 100% of people surveyed in 2019 use either a private or work vehicle for their commute compared with 90% in 2016.
Whilst this may be attributed to the smaller survey sample, the opening of the Western Belfast By-pass may have also contributed to this change in mode share patterns.

Passenger insights have been sourced from 2016 results as there were no passengers identified in the 2019 survey results. In 2016, an average of 76% of those driving did not travel with passengers. Of the 24% of drivers with passengers, the majority were related to the driver and most commenced their morning trips from home. However, 18% of passengers were picked up from somewhere else indicating that there may be some people utilising an ‘informal’ Park and Ride within the area, or picking up a neighbour or work colleague who lives nearby.

In 2019 the perceived peak travel time from Waimakariri District origins to the Central City was 57 minutes, while the average perceived off-peak travel time was 35 minutes (20 minutes quicker than at peak times). In 2019, journey times had changed significantly, with the majority of people indicating an average travel time of between 31 and 45 minutes. Again this may be attributed to the opening of the Western Belfast By-pass and other city centre initiatives. It may also be the result of fewer construction works along the route.

Subsequently, commuter satisfaction has also shifted, with a higher proportion of respondents being satisfied or highly satisfied with their commute.

Evidently, travel times plays a key role in the overall satisfaction of an individual’s commute. Shorter public transport travel times will likely encourage a greater mode shift. However there are several other factors affecting people’s travel choices.

Perceptions of alternative travel options

Individuals who usually drove for their commute were asked why they had not considered using other modes of transport, specifically public transport. Both the 2016 and 2019 survey results showed longer travel time to be the number one factor influencing commuters’ choices. Other significant factors stopping individuals using public transport include:

- Lack of flexibility
- Bus times and routes being inconvenient
- There were no other viable options for alternative modes of transport

Commuters were then asked what would encourage them to use public transport. In 2016 over half of the respondents stated more convenient routes would have an impact on their travel choices. However, the 2019 results show that both the provision of express bus services and high frequency bus services to be a influencing factor.

It should be noted however, that a much higher proportion indicated an unwillingness to change to public transport in 2019. It is recommended that further targeted analysis be undertaken to determine why there is an unwillingness to change.
Figure 12 Factors influencing behaviour change (2016 vs 2019 survey results)

What would encourage greater carpooling?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 customer survey data</th>
<th>2019 customer survey data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpool lanes</td>
<td>Would not consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward system</td>
<td>More T2 lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not consider</td>
<td>Flexibility to carpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better destination parking</td>
<td>Sharing the travel cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule/destination with others</td>
<td>Ability to verify people via app</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A system for matching carpoolers</td>
<td>17% Carpooling app</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18% indicated that they already drive with a passenger

22% indicated they were likely to use rideshare or carpool in order to use HOV lanes

63% indicated they were unlikely to use rideshare or carpool

What would encourage greater use of public transport?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 customer survey data</th>
<th>2019 customer survey data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better Park &amp; Ride options</td>
<td>I would never use buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing would make me consider PT</td>
<td>Express bus services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If car was unavailable</td>
<td>Higher frequency of bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Park &amp; Ride options</td>
<td>Park and Ride facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheaper fares</td>
<td>App with updated journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reliable bus journey times</td>
<td>Increase bus lane priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More convenient routes</td>
<td>Online trip planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72% expected public transport options to take less than an hour

56% indicated that if they were to commute by bus they would expect a frequency greater than 15 minutes
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The potential for carpooling was also tested. High occupancy vehicle lanes, rewards systems for carpooling, a carpooling app and greater flexibility were some of the top initiatives identified by respondents in both 2016 and 2019, which would encourage more people to carpool. However, 20% of people in 2016 and 39% in 2019 stated that they would not consider carpooling (see Figure 12).

In 2016, almost 50% of commuters indicated that they might use Park and Ride facilities. In 2019 however, only 22% of respondents stated they were likely to use a Park and Ride facility. The 2016 results also showed the top five locations being Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Tram Road, Woodend and Silverstream, with a total of 36% of respondents indicating that they would drive to the Park and Ride site and 13% indicating that they would ride or walk to the site. In the 2019 survey, only Rangiora and Kaiapoi were tested as potential Park and Ride locations, with slightly more indicating they would prefer Kaiapoi (53%).
STRATEGIC CONTEXT

National policy

Government Policy Statement (GPS) 2018 transforms the focus of investment for land transport in New Zealand. It has resulted in increased funding for public transport, walking and cycling improvements, local road improvements and promotion of road safety and travel demand management activities.

Three key themes have been included in GPS 2018 to assist local authorities to understand how to effectively deliver on the government’s transport priorities. The themes influence how projects should be delivered to achieve the best transport solutions for New Zealand. The themes are:

- A mode-neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions
- Incorporating technology and innovation into the design and delivery of land transport investment
- Integrating land use and transport planning, and delivery.

Figure 13 outlines the strategic priorities for the land transport in GPS 2018.

Figure 13 Government Policy Statement Strategic Priorities
GPS 2018 represents a transformational shift in New Zealand’s transport policy that focuses on the wider impacts of transport on the lives of all New Zealanders. In particular it supports:

- A stronger focus on road safety
- An emphasis on “access” as a critical transport outcome and greater focus on providing improved travel options (especially public transport, walking and cycling)
- A greater focus on environmental outcomes
- Improved balance across different transport investment areas in the activity class “funding bands”, in particular increased funding for public and active transport.

Travel Demand Management is referenced in GPS 2018 as an investment option “to change people’s behaviour and optimise the system’s efficiency, for example travel demand management initiatives and technologies can provide people with choices about how to access and move easily between modes”.

**Greater Christchurch context**

Over the past three years the agencies responsible for transport provision in Greater Christchurch have been working together to develop an aligned strategic approach to the development of the Greater Christchurch transport system over the next 30 years.

In 2017, a recommended strategic approach was agreed by NZ Transport Agency and Christchurch City Council and summarised in the Greater Christchurch Transport Investment Story and other regional planning frameworks. This framework is based on three integrated components as shown in Figure 14.

**Figure 14 Greater Christchurch transport systems investment story**

As shown in Figure 14 managing demand and delivering behaviour change forms a key part of the integrated strategic response for Greater Christchurch.
Project context

The draft Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC identified three key problems and benefits, and outlines five key Investment Objectives as shown in Figure 15.

Figure 15 Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC problems, benefits and Investment Objectives

Subsequent to the development of the Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC, the Investment Objectives and performance measures have been reviewed and refined collaboratively with the partners. The refined Investment Objectives are shown in Table 4.

Table 4 Refined Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC Investment Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAIMAKARIIN CONNECTIVITY SSBC INVESTMENT OBJECTIVES (AS AT DECEMBER 2018)</th>
<th>REFINED INVESTMENT OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment Objective 1: Increase people moving capacity across the Waimakariri River by 33%</td>
<td>Investment Objective 1: Increase the people moving capacity when the HOV lane is operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Objective 2: Trip reliability for vehicles is within 10% of current reliability</td>
<td>Investment Objective 2: Trip reliability for non-SOV vehicles on the Northern Corridor between Tram Road and Bealey Avenue when the HOV lane is operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Objective 3: Improve the relative attractiveness and travel time reliability of non SOV travel by 13%</td>
<td>Investment Objective 3: Improve the attractiveness of high occupancy vehicle travel when the HOV lane is operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Objective 4: Minimise downstream social and transport impacts of the project on Christchurch City</td>
<td>Investment Objective 4: Minimise downstream impacts consistent with the draft DEMP requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Objective 5: Provide safe crossing of the Waimakariri for active modes</td>
<td>Investment Objective 5: Improve safety outcomes for all customers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To align with the Investment Objectives, the investment partners have further refined the draft Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC key performance indicators and performance measures. These performance measures have been informed by the assessment undertaken for this investment case as shown in Figure 16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>KP/Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI Measure 1.1:</strong> Increase in percentage of SOV mode split in All peak.</td>
<td></td>
<td>60% SOV mode split from Wainuiototo District</td>
<td>65% SOV mode split from Wainuiototo District</td>
<td>70% SOV mode split from Wainuiototo District</td>
<td>75% SOV mode split from Wainuiototo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI Measure 1.2:</strong> Increase in percentage of HOV mode split in AM peak.</td>
<td></td>
<td>15% HOV mode split from Wainuiototo District</td>
<td>20% HOV mode split from Wainuiototo District</td>
<td>25% HOV mode split from Wainuiototo District</td>
<td>30% HOV mode split from Wainuiototo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI Measure 1.3:</strong> Increase in average vehicle occupancy in AM peak.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 average vehicle occupancy</td>
<td>1.6 average vehicle occupancy</td>
<td>1.7 average vehicle occupancy</td>
<td>1.8 average vehicle occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI Measure 2.1:</strong> Reduce pedestrian peak travel time variability between Takanini and Bridge Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual average travel time variability of 60 seconds</td>
<td>Annual average travel time variability of 50 seconds</td>
<td>Annual average travel time variability of 40 seconds</td>
<td>Annual average travel time variability of 30 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI Measure 3.1:</strong> Reduce the travel time of HOV in a comparison of SOV’s in the All peak for trips between Takanini and Bridge Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOV travel time is currently the same as SOV</td>
<td>HOV travel time is currently the same as SOV</td>
<td>HOV travel time is currently the same as SOV</td>
<td>HOV travel time is currently the same as SOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI Measure 3.2:</strong> Reduce the travel time of public transport and SOV’s in the AM peak for trips between Takanini and Bridge Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500 vehicles per hour on Bridge Ave (prior to Torres Rd intersection)</td>
<td>2,000 vehicles per hour on Bridge Ave (prior to Torres Rd intersection)</td>
<td>2,500 vehicles per hour on Bridge Ave (prior to Torres Rd intersection)</td>
<td>3,000 vehicles per hour on Bridge Ave (prior to Torres Rd intersection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI Measure 4.1:</strong> Increase the average vehicle safety and overall safety rating of the northern corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-star safety rating and a personal risk rating of low on the northern corridor</td>
<td>5-star safety rating and a personal risk rating of low on the northern corridor</td>
<td>5-star safety rating and a personal risk rating of low on the northern corridor</td>
<td>5-star safety rating and a personal risk rating of low on the northern corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI Measure 5.1:</strong> Reduce the number of active motorcyclists between Takanini and Bridge Ave as a proportion of mode share (6% by 2028).</td>
<td></td>
<td>No more than 5 active motorcyclists accidents between Takanini and Bridge Ave</td>
<td>No more than 5 active motorcyclists accidents between Takanini and Bridge Ave</td>
<td>No more than 5 active motorcyclists accidents between Takanini and Bridge Ave</td>
<td>No more than 5 active motorcyclists accidents between Takanini and Bridge Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI Measure 5.3:</strong> Increase the proportion of respondents who travel using non-SDV modes (at least 50%) in the survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No more than 5 active mode injuries accidents between Takanini and Bridge Ave by March 2020</td>
<td>No more than 5 active mode injuries accidents between Takanini and Bridge Ave by March 2020</td>
<td>No more than 5 active mode injuries accidents between Takanini and Bridge Ave by March 2020</td>
<td>No more than 5 active mode injuries accidents between Takanini and Bridge Ave by March 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USER DEMAND ON THE CHRISTCHURCH NORTHERN CORRIDOR

The design of the TDM interventions will rely heavily on the existing and future user demand along the Christchurch Northern Corridor and the potential or propensity for customers to change their travel behaviours. As such, a transport assessment has been undertaken to better understand the existing and future travel movements and the potential for change.

Transport models

Travel demand forecasts have been developed by Flow Transportation Specialists utilising the latest version of the Christchurch Transport Model (CTM) and the Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic (CAST) model. The CTM is a strategic transport model which develops travel demand forecasts by mode. The CAST model is a more detailed traffic model that takes initial inputs of traffic demands from the CTM, and it assigns those vehicles to the road network.

The study has used the latest versions of these models (V18), reflecting the latest land use forecasts. It is acknowledged that this is a recently updated version which has yet to be subject to peer review. The model uses 2013 as the base year, and forecast demands for this study have been assessed for 2028 and 2048. It is noted that 2038 forecasts are also available.

Transport models growth assumptions

Figure 17 and Figure 18 outline the land use forecasts inputs from the CTM model.

![Figure 17 Population forecast](image)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>15,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>17,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data for 2028 and 2048 is provided for reference and may not be the most current.
The figures above indicate an increase in the total population from around 40,000 in 2013 to over 72,000 in 2048, an increase of about 80%. Employment is predicted to increase from over 10,000 to almost 17,000, an increase of 65%. The result of a disproportionate number of population to employment growth indicates there will be increased people movement demand into Christchurch City faster than population growth.

**Transport model: origin – destination patterns**

Demands from the CTM are regularly aggregated into 27 sectors as shown in Figure 19. This study focuses on travel movements of residents living in the Waimakariri District (sectors 24 to 27).
The two largest destinations from Waimakariri District by 2048 will be the Northern Sector and the City Centre Sector as shown in Figure 20 below. These two destinations also attract the greatest growth in demand from Waimakariri District. By 2048 over 50% of all Waimakariri District southbound trips will be to the North and City Centre Sectors indicating a need for the Christchurch Northern Corridor improvements and supporting TDM measures.

7 See Appendix C for detailed origin - destination data

---
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It is noted that the majority of trips still start and end within the Waimakariri District itself. Rangiora is the number one destination for residents originating from Woodend and Mandeville and is the second key destination (after the city centre) for residents of Kaiapoi\(^a\).

This indicates that of the 27 sectors modelled, the City Centre and Rangiora are the two most popular destinations for people living in the Waimakariri District. The northern sectors also prove to be a key destination for residents travelling south.

The HOV lane over the Waimakariri River and encouraging greater uptake of non-single occupant vehicles is essential given the forecast growth in the Waimakariri District and demand for travel to Christchurch areas. Without greater uptake of non-single occupant vehicles it is expected that the corridor will exceed capacity at the Waimakariri Bridge a couple of years after opening. The growth projections also mean that the capacity shortfall will get significantly worse over time without a shift away from SOV’s.

In order to better inform the design and implementation of the supporting TDM measures, the following analysis provides an overview of the primary destinations for people travelling south from Waimakariri District to three key destination areas in 2048, based on the CTM forecasts:

- North of QE2 Drive
- South of QE2 Drive
- Christchurch City and sectors immediately to the north and south of Christchurch City

By 2048, 15,030 people are predicted to travel south over the Waimakariri Bridge during the AM (2 hour) peak period. Over one third of these trips (5,475) are predicted to continue south of QE2 Drive and into the Central City (see Figure 21).

\(^a\) This excludes trips which start and end in the same sector
Figure 21 and Figure 22 below outlines the total number of AM peak person trips predicted to travel to each designated area for 2028 and 2048 (note that 2028 values are the closest predicted values to the time of opening based on CTM modelling forecasts). The figure highlights that Rangiora has the largest number of trips heading to the Central City. Kaiapoi, however, has the largest number of total trips heading south, with a more even distribution of trips heading to each of the three destinations.

This data supports the proposal to retain the existing Blue Line and 95 services from Waimakariri District as they will likely continue to serve the existing demand for destinations within the northern sector (Main North Road, Belfast, Northlands, and Papanui Road).

Figure 21 Origin – destination maps (2028 AM peak person trips, 0700–0900)\(^9\)

---

\(^9\) Note the city centre figures shown include CTM sector 1 (Christchurch Central) as well as CTM sector 6 immediately north of the city centre and CTM sectors 14 and 15 immediately south of the city centre.

---
Figure 22 Origin – destination maps (2048 AM peak person trips, 0700–0900)\textsuperscript{15}

**Origin – destination patterns and behaviour change opportunities**

Traffic flow predictions have been analysed for the morning peak hour in 2028 and 2048, from the CAST model. Forecast flows have been provided for three time periods within the morning peak period: 0700–0730, 0730–0800, and for 0800–0900.

Information collated during the preparation of the Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC demonstrated that the highest flows occur at the early part of the morning peak period. The CAST model reflects this situation, meaning that this report has focussed on the period 0700–0730 although all flows are provided in terms of vehicles/hour and persons/hour (i.e. not over 30 minutes).

\textsuperscript{15} Note the city centre figures shown include CTM sector 1 (Christchurch Central) as well as CTM sector 6 immediately north of the city centre and CTM sectors 14 and 15 immediately south of the city centre.
2021 Forecasts

To better understand the potential for behaviour change in the short term, traffic demands have been analysed for the year 2021 after the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor in mid-2020. The 2028 forecasts have been reduced back to approximate 2021 value on the basis of a factor of 0.93 (i.e. reflecting 1% growth per year). This has been the growth rate over the Waimakariri Bridge over the last few years, according to data on the NZ Transport Agency website. This method was considered preferable to the option of extrapolating a 2018 base model to 2021 values, as the 2018 models do not include the Christchurch Northern Corridor project.

The CAST model currently codes the lanes along the Northern Corridor as general traffic lanes, without the provision of an HOV lane. In order to assess the likely traffic conditions along the route with HOV lanes, 15% of the vehicles in the 2021 forecasts have been assumed to be HOV’s (based on existing vehicle occupancy rates identified in the Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC).

The SOV flows have then been compared against the capacity of the general traffic lanes, on the basis of a capacity of 1,800 vehicles per hour, per lane along the State highway. A capacity of 2,000 vehicles/hour is often assumed for the capacity of a motorway lane, but the lower value of 1,800 vehicles/hour is considered to be more appropriate for an area with merging and weaving manoeuvres.

The analysis indicates that congestion for SOV’s is anticipated at a number of locations along the route. It is recognised that the first (northernmost) “pinch point” will likely limit the rate of flow that can reach subsequent “pinch points” downstream. Taking this into consideration and adjusting the traffic flows to take account of the proportion of vehicles joining and exiting the route (for example exiting to reach the Western Bypass), the following reduced arrival flows have been forecasted and are summarised in Figure 23.

It is noted that the SOV flow south of the Belfast on ramp is predicted to be the same as that to the north of the on ramp. This assumes that if the SOV lane to the north of the on ramp is running at 100% capacity, then no additional traffic will be able to pass through the section to the south of the on ramp.

In addition the congestion further north will “shield” congestion on Cranford Street. In particular, we note that the CAST model is predicting quite low flows on Cranford Street, south of Innes Road. The model includes the proposed additional lane for through traffic, at the Innes Road intersection, but Cranford Street then narrows back to one southbound through lane south of the intersection (in the model, as is currently proposed, without the supporting TDM measures).

It appears that the model is reassigning traffic away from this route, as significant volumes of southbound traffic on Cranford Street are predicted to turn left or right at Innes Road. This reasonably reflects the scenario tested in the CAST model, with general traffic lanes along the Christchurch Northern Corridor able to deliver higher volumes of traffic to Cranford Street.

However, if the HOV lane is provided along the Christchurch Northern Corridor next to a general traffic lane, then the arrival flow reaching Cranford Street will be reduced. As such, some traffic would probably reassign back onto Cranford Street, south of Innes Road, under

---

1 As per lane configuration shown in Figure 6 (Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC Recommended Option)
the HOV scenario. As such the flows currently forecast for Cranford Street, south of Innes Road should be viewed with caution.

Figure 23 Traffic forecasts 2021 AM peak (vehicles per hour, arrival flows)

2028 and 2048 Forecasts

The same methodology used for 2021 has also been used for the years 2028 and 2048, with forecast demands converted to arrival flows. The volume to capacity (v/c) ratios are quite high at some locations, and the analysis was re-run on the basis that some mode change may occur in response to the anticipated levels of congestion for SOV’s. This has been undertaken using an assumption that the v/c ratios will not exceed 1.1 (110%).
A v/c ratio of 100% represents the theoretical capacity of a lane, and a v/c of 110% indicates quite severe congestion. With the HOV lane likely to be operating well within capacity, it is likely that some of the excess demand will transfer to other modes. Without the project this transfer is assumed be to HOV’s, while with the project the transfer is assumed to be to bus and HOVs, with some change to cycle. A detailed summary of the methodology applied to allocate demand is summarised at Appendix C.

Figure 24 set out the traffic flows and person trips forecast across the Waimakariri Bridge, without TDM measures in place, noting that this is the point where the highest volumes are observed in both the 2028 and 2048 scenarios.

Figure 24 Traffic and person allocation across the Waimakariri Bridge AM peak (one hour) without supporting TDM measures

The people movements summarised in Figure 24 have been converted to mode share proportions as shown in Table 5.

Table 5 Mode share across the Waimakariri Bridge AM peak, without supporting TDM measures (one hour, rounded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare (T2/T3)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 HOV vehicle numbers have been derived on the assumption that two thirds of the vehicles will have two occupants, with one third having three occupants. This gives an average occupancy of 2.33.
TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT MEASURES

The Waimakariri Connections SS8C recognises that the provision of a southbound HOV lane alone will not result in the level of behaviour change required to achieve the Investment Objectives and outcomes outlined in the previous section. It also identifies critical TDM elements considered necessary for the success of the HOV lane project includes:

- Marketing and communications
- Park and Ride facilities
- Mobility as a Service (MaaS) software
- Express public transport services
- Ongoing customer insights to refine the TDM measures over time
- Education campaign
- Travel planning
- Training and education

Recommended programme

The recommended TDM supporting measures have been developed based on an understanding of the customer insights and technical analysis of forecast demand. The programme incorporates a mix of both infrastructure and non-infrastructure improvements. It is proposed that the integrated and complementary supporting TDM measures will be delivered using a phased approach. An assessment of the relative contribution of the recommended programme towards the Investment Objectives is provided in Table 10 in the Recommended Option Assessment section of this report.

Immediately prior to the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor education and travel planning initiatives will be delivered to northern commuters (early 2020), followed by the launch of improved public transport services and interim Park and Ride sites upon opening of the corridor (mid-2020). This project has also investigated longer term measures such as more permanent and larger scale Park and Ride facilities (up to 2048). The phased approach is summarised in Figure 25.

Figure 25 Overview of phased implementation of TDM measures

1. Travel behaviour change, education and promotion prior to opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor
2. Public transport and active mode improvements in place by opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor
3. Longer term improvements to public transport including expanded Park and Ride sites at both Rangiora and Kaiapoi as demand increases over time. As demand builds, further introduce dedicated mass transit option when justified.
Prior to opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor (early 2020)

Immediately prior to the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor several travel planning initiatives will be undertaken to promote, educate and incentivise use of non-single occupant modes of transport. These are summarised in Figure 26.

Figure 26 Stage 1 TDM Measures (prior to opening)
Upon opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor (mid 2020)

Upon opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor an improved public transport service offering will be provided, two interim Park and Ride sites will become operational and a personalised journey planning project will be launched targeting northern commuters. Given the forecast demands it is proposed that there is an express bus every 10 minutes from opening (6 buses per hour or 12 in each two hour peak period). A summary of the TDM measures upon opening is summarised in Figure 27.

Figure 27 Stage 2 TDM Measures (upon opening of HOV lane mid-2020)
A community-based personalised journey planning programme that encourages residents who currently commute by SOV from Rangiora or Kaiapoi to Christchurch City will be undertaken. The initiative will engage with households (door to door) in the targeted communities, and commuters will be encouraged to sign up to participate in the behaviour-changing programme that includes advice, incentives and follow-up. Auckland Transport currently have a similar programme that is successful at promoting new service offerings and increase the mode share of non-SOV modes.

It is also proposed that the partners increase the number of employees and students engaged through workplace and school travel planning activities. Each workplace and school is offered a range of incentives and supporting materials to encourage alternative modes of transport, and the option to develop a tailored site-specific travel plan.

An improved public transport service offering is proposed to be provided targeting peak hour commuters who travel between Rangiora and Kaiapoi to the Central City, including the frequency and number of buses. A new express service is proposed to operate from opening (mid 2020) and will run every 10 minutes between 7am and 9am, and 4pm and 6pm, between Rangiora and Kaiapoi offering a non-stop service to the Central City. This service route is proposed to operate via the HOV lane and Cranford Street, Sherborne Street, Bealey Avenue and Manchester Street terminating/originating at the Central City Bus Interchange.

It is proposed that these 24 additional peak services will be in addition to the existing Blue Line and 95 service provision that will continue to operate to service destinations in the northern suburbs of Christchurch City. The existing all day services (Blue Line and 95 service) will provide off peak connections to the Park and Ride sites (detailed below) outside of the AM and PM two hour peak periods (7-9am and 4-6pm).

In recognition of the rural nature of the Waimakariri District and to target the highest amount of SOV commuters, it is proposed that two interim Park and Ride sites are delivered to maximise the catchment of the public transport enhancements. Park and Ride in appropriate locations is an important part of increasing the use of public transport. Park and Ride facilities are most suitable in outer urban areas where access to public transport via walking, cycling or feeder bus services is less viable, and land is less cost compared to inner urban areas.

Interim Park and Ride facilities are proposed at Rangiora and Kaiapoi that could be constructed in a relatively short timeframe and could be operational by mid-2020. An initial concept of potential Park and Ride sites has been developed to inform the feasibility and cost assumptions in this report.

An interim Park and Ride site could consist of a sealed carpark with lighting and provision of approximately 120 carparks. The facility could include a sheltered waiting area to accommodate approximately 20 people, plus potential secure bike parking enabling people to bike to the Park and Ride facility and then utilise public transport services. Where possible interim sites would be chosen that allow for the utilisation of existing infrastructure.

Prior to identification and confirmation of preferred locations, further investigation is required to determine access, convenience and functionality, in order to optimise their potential. Poor site selection has the potential to reduce the uptake of the Park and Ride

---

23 Further consultation on hours of express service operation to be undertaken in the pre-implementation phase
24 Regional Public Transport Plan service types can be viewed here: https://ecan.govt.nz/your-region/plans-strategies-and-laws/Central-transport-plans/ (pages 38 and 39)
provision. Further investigations could include negotiating with land owners and assessing ground conditions, and other planning and construction considerations.

**Interim Park and Ride sites at Rangiora and Kaiapoi**

This investment case recommends that two interim 120 space Park and Ride facilities proceed to pre-implementation; one in Rangiora and a second in Kaiapoi. These would service passengers of the Blue Line and the proposed new peak hour express services to Christchurch. These sites would also facilitate rideshare users.

The Park and Ride facilities are proposed to provide access to a high frequency public transport service every 10 mins from opening year. A feasibility design has been developed for an interim site and is shown in Appendix D.

**Longer term TDM measures (up to 2048)**

To respond to the growth forecast in the Waimakariri District over the next 30 years, future public transport service upgrades are likely to be required enabling higher frequency bus services in the peak hour\(^\text{19}\). Further improvements are also likely to be required to meet demand for the two Park and Ride sites at Rangiora and Kaiapoi making these sites more permanent. The long term TDM measures have been summarise in Figure 28.
For the purpose of allocating demand to public transport a range of scenarios have been considered. Public transport will need to take up an increasing share of demand as the capacity available for SOV’s is constrained. The following bus frequencies have been assumed on the Waimakariri Bridge:

- 10 minute frequency in 2021
- 5 minute frequency in 2028
- 2.5 minute frequency by 2048.

It has been assumed that each bus would carry on average 45 people (noting that Greater Christchurch is currently served by a mix of 40 and 50 seat buses). Should demand for
public transport near capacity then higher frequency services may be required ahead of the assumed frequencies outlined in this report.

Should the level of public transport demand reach the need for a bus every 2.5 minutes then it may be more appropriate for this demand to be serviced by a form of mass rapid transit as opposed to bus services. With a frequency of equal or greater than a bus every 2.5 minutes, dedicated corridors would be required due to the number of services operating. A parallel business case is currently investigating mass rapid transit options for Greater Christchurch, including servicing the Waimakariri District and northern suburbs of Christchurch City over the next 30 years.

The proposed HOV lane is considered to be compatible with the plans for mass rapid transit in Greater Christchurch as outlined in the Future Public Transport Business Case. The HOV lane will facilitate the movement of express (limited stop) public transport services in the short to medium term, whilst mass rapid transit is more likely to connect the communities between Waimakariri District and Christchurch City with frequent stops in the longer term.

Mass rapid transit is also a way to stimulate land use around public transport hubs, whereas the HOV lane acts more as a measure to mitigate the effects of land use growth in outer urban areas.

Increased frequencies and/or larger buses could be an alternative response to meet future increases in public transport demand over time.
DOWNSTREAM TDM MEASURES

Cranford Street and Sherborne Street

The Downstream Effect Management Plan (DEMP) has identified peak hour clearways on Cranford Street as part of the recommended option to mitigate additional vehicles in the area once the Christchurch Northern Corridor becomes operational. The DEMP also recommends that HOV lanes be investigated on Cranford Street and Sherborne Street to Bealey Avenue.

At the time of drafting this report Christchurch City Council is currently seeking public feedback on the recommendations detailed in the draft DEMP. Consultation is due to close on 15th April 2019.

This TDM funding application has not undertaken a detailed assessment of potential HOV lanes on these downstream arterial routes. However in calculating the likely benefits of the TDM measures it has been assumed that a southbound HOV lane would be in place from the Tram Road southbound on ramp to Bealey Avenue to provide the maximum benefits for end to end customers travelling between Waimakariri District and the Central City.

A preliminary investigation suggests that it would be feasible to operate a southbound HOV lane on these corridors based on the cross-section provided in Figure 29.39

Figure 29 Potential cross section of Cranford Street with HOV lanes

Cranford St / Sherbourne St Facility Option 1 - Clearway both sides

The corridor from Innes Road to Bealey Avenue has a typical boundary width of 20 metres, which with the indicative cross-section of 14 metre, does not allow for off-line bus stops or on road cycle lanes. There is also no allowance in the cross-section, or available space, for the provision of separate right turn facilities, meaning the through movements (SOV) lane will be held back by vehicles turning right from the through lane.

To date there has been minimal investigation or design in to a clearway/HOV lane, with indicative only estimates developed as follows:

---

39 Concept option developed by Christchurch City Council as at April 2019

---
Low estimate: $5.2m – assumes approximately 10% kerb and channel replacement, minor improvements to the side road intersections and signalised intersections, plus a reconfiguration of the Edgeware Road signalised intersection.

High estimate $21.5m – assumes reconstruction from boundary to boundary, including more substantial intersection upgrades to side roads and reconfiguration of signalised intersections. Assumes reshaping of and surfacing of the existing pavement only.

It is recognised that there are several “pinch points” along the route that would likely require widening and upgrades, particularly at the following intersections:

- Cranford Street / Westminster Street
- Cranford Street / Warrington Street
- Cranford Street / Edgeware Road
- Sherborne Street / Bealey Avenue

These “pinch points” are caused by the need to accommodate multiple turning movements at these intersections which would be constrained with the addition of an HOV lane. The predominant issue being the absence of a separate right turn lane, assuming SOV’s are unable to utilise the HOV at intersection approaches unless turning left. The implications of providing inline bus stops to service local bus services also needs to be considered as it would not be possible to pick up and drop off passengers without impeding either the HOV or SOV lane.

Further detailed assessments would be required to understand the likely demand for the HOV lanes on Cranford Street and Sherborne Street, to consider the optimal design solution (HOV lane allocation – near side or far side), and to mitigate or minimise any negative safety implications.

**Central City**

Central City parking provision is a key factor when considering travel behaviour change. It is important to recognise that Christchurch is currently transitioning from recovery to regeneration following the Canterbury earthquake sequence. It is therefore important that any measures related to the management of parking in the Central City reflect wider social and economic benefits as well as potential transport and travel behaviour change benefits.

Investigation of a potential incentive based parking approach to encourage the use of HOV’s could be undertaken by Christchurch City Council. This could include providing dedicated parking for HOV’s in Council owned parking buildings. A similar approach has been adopted in Auckland where priority parking is available for vehicles with two or more occupants at several Council owned car parks.

**Northbound HOV lane provision**

This report has recommended TDM measures to support the proposed southbound HOV lane on the Christchurch Northern Corridor. Given the lower levels of demand for northbound trips in the AM peak a northbound HOV lane has not been investigated through this project.

During the PM peak period there could be additional benefits to HOV users if a northbound HOV lane was provided for the return trip from the Central City to Waimakariri District.
It has been identified that further detailed assessment is required for HOV lane provision for northbound travel from Bealey Avenue to Tram Road. An addendum to this TDM funding application is to be prepared incorporating the outputs from the model update which includes the proposed clearway/HOV lanes. It is proposed the following technical work streams are progressed within this addendum:

- A transport assessment of end-to-end journeys northbound in the PM peak
- Assess the provision of a northbound HOV lane from Bealey Avenue to Tram Road and its intersection impacts
- Concept design and safety considerations
- Assess against the investment objectives and performance measures to ensure alignment
- Economic assessment

It is also proposed this addendum, subject to partner agreement, will provide further drawings which shows a level of detail regarding the Park & Ride sites proposed for Rangirola and Kaiapoi.

Several HOV lanes have been introduced in Auckland in recent years and many operate in both the AM and PM peak period to improve travel time reliability for HOV’s and public transport and to constrain SOV capacity. This indicates that further investigation of a northbound HOV should be undertaken to understand if the demand levels forecast would result in benefits to HOV users in both the morning and afternoon commute.

**Cycling**

For the purpose of this study cycling mode share has been assumed to be a nominal 4%. However it is recognised that the mode share of cycling could be higher depending on uptake of the new cycleway being constructed alongside the Christchurch Northern Corridor and the use of e-bikes which increase the average distances travelled by bike.

The cycleway will connect to local cycle routes in Waimakariri District and with the Papanui Parallel in Christchurch City, providing a connection to the Central City for cycle commuters. Advances in technology and the recent uptake in e-bikes could also contribute to a higher mode share for cycling, due to the increased range for cycle trips and the provision of dedicated cycle infrastructure.

In developing the concept Park and Ride sites, both the interim and expanded sites have been designed to facilitate park and cycle trips. The sites will provide good access to the cycle network. Commuters could also drive and place their bike on a bus to reach a wider range of destination and to provide first/last mile connections.

The travel planning initiatives and marketing and education campaign will promote the new Christchurch Northern Corridor and the use of multi-modal travel options, including cycling for part or all of the journey.
RECOMMENDED OPTION ASSESSMENT

Performance

Due to the increased population growth in the Waimakariri District and northern areas of Christchurch, travel demands are forecast to increase over time. The traffic assessment shows that without supporting TDM measures the additional capacity at the Waimakariri Bridge will be exceeded within a few years of opening.

Table 6 and Table 7 demonstrate how the proposed HOV lane and TDM measures are expected to reduce the number of vehicles that will be entering the Central City from the north. The tables also show how the recommended programme meets expected future demands by moving more people in fewer vehicles. This aligns with the policy direction as outlined in An Accessible City of reducing car dependency and increasing the use of non-SOV modes.

Table 6 Total trips from Waimakariri District to Central City (AM peak period) without and with TDM measures - person trips by mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without TDM</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With TDM</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Number of cars entering the Central City from Waimakariri District (AM peak period) with and without TDM measures - number of cars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without the HOV lane and supporting TDM</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>3,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the HOV lane and supporting TDM</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 30 provides a detailed comparison of traffic volumes and the resulting mode share for each of the modelled timeframes (2021, 2028 and 2048) at the Waimakariri Bridge. The figure highlights that by 2048, the TDM measures are likely to encourage a 15% public transport mode share, a 17% reduction in SOV’s and a slight increase in cycling.

Furthermore, by 2048 the single HOV/bus lane is predicted to take around 3,100 people per hour, which is substantial and well in excess of either a general traffic lane (with a capacity of approximately 2,150 people per hour), or a lane for SOV’s (approximately 1,800 people per hour).
Figure 30 Traffic volumes and mode share with and without TDM measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without TDM measures</th>
<th>With TDM measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3900 veh/hr</td>
<td>3900 veh/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685 veh/hr or 1600 pers/hr</td>
<td>550 veh/hr or 1280 pers/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 pers/hr</td>
<td>270 pers/hr or 6 buses/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 pers/hr</td>
<td>220 pers/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4190 veh/hr</td>
<td>3960 veh/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740 veh/hr or 1730 pers/hr</td>
<td>580 veh/hr or 1360 pers/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 pers/hr</td>
<td>540 pers/hr or 12 buses/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 pers/hr</td>
<td>240 pers/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4780 veh/hr</td>
<td>3960 veh/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840 veh/hr or 1970 pers/hr</td>
<td>870 veh/hr or 2030 pers/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 pers/hr</td>
<td>1080 pers/hr or 24 buses/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 pers/hr</td>
<td>290 pers/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOV  Bus  HOV  Cycle
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Travel time savings

The user demand data suggests that without any mode change there will be congestion at several points along the corridor in the future. This is expected to lead to travel time savings along the route for HOV’s as follows:

- The Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC indicates that the HOV lane proposed in that study will offer savings of up to 4.7 minutes (relative to SOV’s)

- It is currently assumed that two southbound general traffic lanes will be provided through the Cranford Street/Innes Road intersection. SIDRA tests have been carried out, considering one of these lanes as HOV only. This indicates additional travel time of two minutes for SOV’s, but a benefit of almost one minute for HOV’s based on the 2028 CAST forecast flows.

- The CAST model generally assumes one mid-block lane per direction along Cranford Street south of Innes Road. Forecast travel times have been taken from the 2028 model for each time period, indicating that the southbound travel time in the single lane in the morning peak is around 2.5 minutes longer that the minimum forecast time in either direction (in any modelled period).

This could be considered to be the travel time difference between a congested SOV lane and an uncongested HOV lane. However, it is noted that the SATURN model indicates that the route will be operating very close to capacity and SATURN tends to give satisfactory travel times until conditions reach full capacity, so we expect the above comparison to be overly conservative (i.e., underestimating congested travel times). As a result an additional two minutes of travel time savings have been assumed.

The above gives a total travel time saving for HOV’s (over SOV’s) of approximately 12 minutes (i.e. 4.7 + 3 + 2.5 + 2 minutes).

To encourage behaviour change away from SOV’s it will be important that alternative modes are more attractive in terms of relative travel time and travel time reliability. An assessment of forecast travel time and costs (converted to time\(^2\)) has been undertaken to consider the relative attractiveness of the various travel modes. Two scenarios have been considered:

- A short-term scenario with no parking costs within the Central City, although a reasonable walk time to the final destination is assumed for those without on-site parking at their destination. A bus frequency of a bus every 10 minutes is assumed.

- A longer term scenario with the introduction of nominal parking costs, along with greater bus frequencies of a bus every 2.5 minutes. Additional congestion is assumed for SOVs, due to traffic growth, with this then giving greater time savings for (free flowing) HOVs and buses. It is noted that the forecast growth in total car trips between 2021 and 2048 is close to 25%, without mode change, but the volume of SOVs is assumed then to be capped, due the significant congestion for SOVs that would be encountered if mode change does not happen.

\(^2\) Assumptions provided in Technical Note at Appendix C.
The results of this analysis are provided in Table 8 and Table 9.

### Table 8 Short term scenario (with all times and costs in minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOV (park)</th>
<th>SOV (off-site park)</th>
<th>HOV from home</th>
<th>Rideshare</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Park and Ride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel time SOV’s</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel time HOV’s</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First leg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final leg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer penalty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT fare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle operating cost</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking cost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel time increase (stops)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9 Long term scenario (with all times and costs in minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOV (park)</th>
<th>SOV (off-site park)</th>
<th>HOV from home</th>
<th>Rideshare</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Park and Ride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel time SOV’s</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel time HOV’s</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First leg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final leg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer penalty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT fare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle operating cost</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking cost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel time increase (stops)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tables above indicates that, in the short term, HOV and ride share trips will be attractive, as they are quicker than travel by SOV if the SOV driver does not have on-site parking at the destination. However it indicates that bus travel (including park and ride) may not be attractive for many people, in the short term, due to the adverse effects of transfers and stops.
Table 9 indicates that, in the longer term, HOV and ride share trips will be very attractive, being significantly quicker than travel by SOV particularly if the SOV driver does not have on-site parking at the destination. It also indicates that with higher bus frequencies and greater travel time benefits (relative to SOVs), bus travel (including park and ride) will also be attractive for many people.

The above analysis considers only two scenarios. Clearly there could be a wide range of other scenarios, different permutations of trip types, or different times for persons with differing origins or destinations. Furthermore, differing levels of mode change (leading to changes in vehicles in the HOV lane and in the SOV lane) will change the relative travel time benefit. However, the above analysis is deemed to be considered in explaining the relative attraction of the various mode combinations.

**Outcomes**

The implementation of the TDM supporting measures will deliver wider improvements to the Greater Christchurch transport system including:

- Enabling and supporting growth
- Improving travel choice
- Travel time reliability and access by non-SOV modes
- Safety, health and the environment
- Value for money

Increasing the uptake of walking, cycling, public transport and ridesharing will help provide a more balanced transport system, and provides opportunities to optimise and extend the lifecycle of current and future assets and services.

If the Greater Christchurch partners can extract more value from existing investments and services through TDM, then it is expected the partners will be able to achieve the following benefits:

**One connected transport system**

- A balanced solution to support and enable significant future growth within urban areas that maximises return on investment in significant transport projects such as the Christchurch Northern Corridor. Optimal operation of the transport system that benefits all users, including the movement of freight and also provides an opportunity to improve asset utilisation.

**People-centred services**

- Improve knowledge and uptake of alternative modes of transport and drive the change from a reliance on SOV’s to other forms of mobility, improving amenity, reducing travel times, increasing vehicle occupancy and reducing the negative externalities of high SOV use.
- Overcome the information disconnect and perceptions between customers and service providers, improving accessibility for communities including the elderly, mobility impaired and tourists.

Based on the assessments undertaken to date and the assumptions detailed in this report, the recommended TDM measures (from opening) are forecast to deliver the following transport outcomes as in Table 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Objective 1: Increase the people moving capacity when the HOV lane is operational</th>
<th>KPI / Measure 1.1: Decrease in percentage of SOV mode split in AM peak:</th>
<th>Across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound)</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>69% SOV mode split by March 2021 across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound) 62% SOV mode split by March 2021 south of QE2 (southbound)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At Cranford/Innes intersection (southbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI / Measure 1.2: Increase in percentage of HOV mode split in AM peak:</td>
<td>Across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27% HOV mode split by March 2021 across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound)* 34% HOV mode split by March 2021 at Cranford/Innes intersection (southbound)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At Cranford/Innes intersection (southbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI / Measure 1.3: Increase in average vehicle occupancy in AM peak:</td>
<td>Across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.3 average vehicle occupancy by March 2021 across the Waimakariri River (SH1 Bridge southbound) 1.4 average vehicle occupancy by March 2021 at Cranford/Innes intersection (southbound)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At Cranford/Innes intersection (southbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Objective 2: Trip reliability for non-SOV vehicles between Tram Road and Bealey Avenue when the HOV lane is operational</th>
<th>KPI / Measure 2.1: Reduce/ maintain peak travel time variability between Tram Rd and Bealey Ave for each priority mode:</th>
<th>HOV – reduce annual avg. travel time variability</th>
<th>80 seconds</th>
<th>Achieve annual average travel time variability within 1 minute for HOV’s (along extent of priority lane) by March 2021 Achieve annual average travel time variability within 1 minute for PT by March 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PT – reduce annual avg. travel time variability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Investment Objective 3: Improve the attractiveness of high occupancy | KPI / Measure 3.1: Reduce the travel time of HOV’s comparable to SOV’s in the AM | Tram Rd and Bealey Av | Same as SOV | HOV 10 minutes quicker by March 2021 for AM peak trips between Tram Rd and Bealey Ave |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Objective 4: Minimise downstream impact consistent with the draft DMP requirements</th>
<th>KPI / Measure 3.2: Reduce the travel time difference between public transport and SOV’s in the AM peak for trips between:</th>
<th>Tram Rd and Cranford/Innes intersection</th>
<th>HOV 6 minutes quicker by March 2021 for AM peak trips between Tram Rd and Cranford/Innes intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tram Road and Bealey Avenue</td>
<td>Same as SOV</td>
<td>PT trips between Tram Road and Bealey Avenue to be at least 8 minutes quicker than SOV by March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tram Road to Cranford/Innes</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT trips between Tram Road and Cranford/Innes to be at least 6 minutes quicker than SOV by March 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Investment Objective 5: Improve safety outcomes for all customers | KPI / Measure 4.1: Limit the number of additional vehicles on Cranford St prior to the Innes Rd intersection | 1,000 | No more than 1,800 vehicles per hour on Cranford St (prior to Innes Rd intersection) by March 2021 |
| KPI / Measure 5.1: Minimise the severity and number of accidents on the northern corridor by maintaining the KwiRAP star rating and the personal risk rating | 5 star rating, personal risk rating low | Maintain 5 star safety rating and a personal risk rating of low on the northern corridor |
| KPI / Measure 5.2: Reduce the number of active mode accidents between Tram Rd and Bealey Ave as a proportion of mode share (5 year) | 9 (last 5 years) | No more than 9 active mode accidents between Tram Rd and Bealey Ave by March 2026 |
| KPI / Measure 5.3: Increase the proportion of respondents to an annual survey who perceive non-SOV modes to be safe | 96% for PT, 96% for carpooling, and 77% for cycling | The proportion of respondents who feel safe using non-SOV travel modes by 2021 to be equal or better than 96% for PT, 96% for carpooling, and 77% for cycling |

Table 10 demonstrates how the recommended TDM measures deliver well against the Investment Objectives and target outcomes identified for this project. The measures provide for the forecast growth north of the Waimakariri Bridge and allow for a phased approach to scale the TDM measures over time.
**Next steps**

It is recognised that additional transport assessments, technical investigations and design work is required prior to the implementation of the supporting TDM measures identified in this report.

If the recommended TDM measures required by mid-2020 are approved and the funding secured, the next steps for the implementation of the TDM measures includes:

- NZ Transport Agency, Waimakariri District Council, Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury (supporting TDM measures)
  - Work collaboratively to consider the ‘end to end’ journey experience for customers through the design and development of the TDM measures
  - Implement the TDM measures required prior to and upon opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.
Assumptions

This report identifies the TDM measures required to support the proposed HOV response for this corridor and has been considered alongside the wider Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC and DEMP south of the corridor to provide an integrated transport system response.

This report has been developed on the basis that the preferred solution for this part of the transport system includes a southbound HOV lane as shown in the recommended option of the Waimakariri Connectivity SSBC.

It is also important to note that consideration has been given to mitigating the potential downstream effects of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and to increase the impact of the HOV solution. This includes identifying potential downstream TDM measures that might be required to achieve the wider project outcomes.

The project has also been cognisant of parallel work streams that are currently underway in the Greater Christchurch area that may have an impact of the ability to achieve the target outcomes proposed for travel demand. This includes the Public Transport Futures Programme Business Case which identifies the need to investigate potential mass transit connecting the northern areas of Christchurch with the Central City in the next 30 years and the Draft Our Space (2018: Settlement Pattern Update) that outlines the agreed spatial plan for the Greater Christchurch area up to 2048.

It is recognised that additional transport assessments, technical investigations and design work is required prior to the implementation of the supporting TDM measures identified and assessed in this report.
change.org

Recipient: Christchurch City Council

Letter:

Greetings,

We are opposed to the "Proposed changes to Cranford Street and the surrounding area", specifically the changes to Berwick and Warrington Streets, Barbadoes and Madras Streets, and demand other options are explored.

Why are Christchurch residents having to be disadvantaged by traffic from North Canterbury being forced down our roads? These are people from a different district that don't pay rates here, but the residents and business' in St Albans, Mairehau and Edgeware are paying the costs socially and financially to accommodate these people so they can get to or from the City a few minutes faster.

Some of our concerns are:

1. Lack of consultation by CCC with the community.
2. No other route options apparent or offered.
3. Lack of public transport or ride-sharing initiatives to reduce single car commuting thereby reducing traffic volumes.
4. An increase of traffic originating from districts outside of the city, yet our community residents will pay the costs socially and financially for this urban sprawl/satellite city trend.
5. Various area specific problems along the proposed routes to name just a few:
   3 sets of traffic lights within 3 residential blocks (Cranford /Berwick, Warrington/Madras, Warrington/Barbadoes)
   The loss of street parking for all people using St Albans park and club facilities thereon (Bowling and Croquet Clubs).
   The unspecified loss of street parking in the future. (Berwick, Warrington, Barbadoes and Madras)
   The increased danger of our local roads for children, and older residents to access shops, schools and parks.
   The already voiced concerns of local businesses in the area.

We are opposed to these proposed road changes and demand other options be explored and presented for consultation.
Cranford Street – Downstream Effects Management Plan

Consultation Analysis

May 2019

Comment was sought on the Cranford Street Downstream Effects Management Plan between Monday 11 March 2019 and Monday 15 April 2019.

Council Staff delivered the consultation document to 6350 properties and posted to 1880 absentee landowners. An email was sent to 101 key stakeholders and all submitters from the previous engagement in 2018 were also advised we were now seeking feedback on the draft plan.

Information was available on the Have Your Say web site, Council Staff ran a Newsline story and three Facebook posts were shared with the St Albans Community Group. The Facebook posts generated very little engagement. However, we had 1823 views on our Have Your Say web page and 185 views of the Newsline article.

Four drop-in sessions for the community to discuss the plan and ask the project team any questions prior to providing their feedback were held. Representatives of the St Albans Residents Association also set up an information stand at these sessions and spoke to the residents about their alternative Community Plan. Overall these sessions were attended by approximately 60 people.

We received 227 submissions from this engagement including feedback from the following organisations and businesses:

- Board of Trustees - St Albans School
- Governors Bay Community Association
- Businesses – corner Edgware Road/Barbados Street
- St Albans Residents Association
- Go Cycle Christchurch
- Generation Zero Christchurch
- Environment Canterbury Public Transport
- Duncan Webb, MP for Christchurch Central
- Our Vets – St Albans (National Veterinary Care Ltd)
- Board of Trustees – Paparoa Street School
- SPOKES Canterbury
- Kiwione Investment Trust
- Rutland Street Church
- Kids Cakes and Bakery
- Ministry of Awesome
- Board of Trustees – Mairehau Primary School
- Belfast Area Residents Association
- Edgware Croquet Club
- Environmental Noise Analysis & Advice Service
- Shirley Optometrists
- Peter Timbs Meats Ltd
- A Graeme Grafton Property Trust

Where our submitters are from

The analysis has been divided into six categories:
- Feedback on community impacts
- Support for non-car transport
- Plan specific feedback
- Community plan
- Working with strategic partners
- General feedback
1. Feedback on community impacts

We received the largest number of submissions in this category (46 submissions) related to concerns about the increase in air pollution, noise and vibration and the detrimental impact this will have on residents while also reducing their quality of life.

“Is premised on outdated (20th thinking around transport planning with its car-centric approach. Such an approach is no longer feasible or sustainable given the need to consider environmental factors and climate change in any socially responsible urban planning for the future.” (Submission #23483)

The underlying theme that was evident throughout a large number of submissions was the strong sense of community, the ability to move safely around their community and concerns that this project will create a division in the community. This sense of community led to “protection of the existing community” being the basis of many comments and themes throughout the analysis.

“The plan should not focus on cars it should focus on moving people through an established community where residents make their homes and conduct their lives, go shopping, play, exercise and meet up together.”

The DEMP does not deliver on the CCC’s community outcomes. It does not contribute to a strong St Albans community, it severs it. It does not contribute to a healthy community, it pollutes and disturbs it. It does not contribute to a liveable community; it disconnects us and it doesn’t contribute to a prosperous city as it is not a modern solution to building the city’s infrastructure.” (Submission #23479)

Safe access to local parks, especially St Albans Park and Malvern Park, and the key shopping areas (Edgware Village, Cranford/Wesminster shops, Barbadoes/Warrington shops, and Barbadoes/Edgware shops) was also considered a key important issue. All these facilities are key community focal areas and the proposed increase in traffic puts safe access to these areas at risk.
Many submitters wanted the ability for all of the community to be able to continue to access these areas safely, whether as a pedestrian, cyclist or driving.

Both the local business owners and residents say that parking around the commercial areas is very important. Submitters told us that any changes made need to ensure minimum on-street parking loss.

Safe access to parks was also considered to be of high importance and this needs to be addressed prior to the opening of the CNC as the majority of the community using the parks are children.

Other concerns raised were related to the potential for a negative impact on property values and safety of residents living on Cranford Street entering and exiting their driveways.

2. Support for non-car transport

![Bar chart showing support for non-car transport]

We received overwhelming feedback regarding this project being an opportunity for Council/ECAN/Waimakariri District Council/NZTA to work together to improve the public transport network between North Canterbury and Christchurch CBD (52 submissions). Support for bus lanes featured strongly in the comments (41 submissions) and bus lanes were also a key element of the alternative plan proposed by Axel Wilke (submissions related to the alternative plan are discussed separately). Submitters recognised that in order for bus lanes to work there needs to be improved bus services, including reliability and increased frequency.

"The plan fails to attract people to use public transport. Funding needs to be redirected to regional council to increase the frequency and number of buses. There needs to be permanent bus lanes on the Northern Arterial. If the free central city shuttles are reinstated this would further encourage people to leave cars behind while promoting economic activity within the CBD". (Submission #23356)
Cycle safety and the support for a local cycleway network also generated a large amount of feedback (64 submissions), including cycle safety on Cranford Street. Connections to Papanui Parallel Major Cycle Route was also an important consideration when developing secondary cycle routes. To support the use of the new cycleway connections, many submitters suggested investigating opportunities for “park ‘n’ pedal” to provide an alternative option for commuters from the north of the city.

“We also request consideration be given to the provision of shared paths in other local streets, in particular Thomas St and/or Paparoa St, to connect to the Papanui Parallel and support our desire to provide safe travel routes for our children and their families” (Submission #23449).

· Build local cycle networks in the north east from Cranford St to the coast

· Create a major north south cycle priority route to serve the north east

· Create more cycle access points along the N Motorway Ext cycle way” (Submission #23444)

Many submitters raised concerns about the ability for cyclists, even confident cyclists, to travel safely on Cranford Street due to the width of the road and the possibility of an additional lane whether it be clearways, HOV lanes or bus lanes. While other cycle routes would be developed, a number of submissions indicated that the ability to travel by bike on Cranford Street would be so unsafe that cyclists would not use it.

“The introduction of peak period clearways along Cranford Street down to Berwick Street and possibly other clearways further south makes such routes less safe for cycling, especially during the peak periods. It is not possible to rectify this without widening the road designation and purchasing additional land. Hence the recommended option is to direct cyclists onto other routes.

This is completely unacceptable. Cyclists have a legal right to use Cranford St. Council either legally bans them or provides safe cycling facilities for them. In the days and age of Vision Zero and a climbing NZ road toll it is intolerable for Council to consider implementing measures which are unsafe.” (Submission #22498)

Feedback on pedestrian safety was similar to that relating to cycle safety. Both these themes supported the community concerns regarding the ability of the community to move through their community safely. With a number of schools, local commercial centres, and parks which generate high pedestrian movements for a wide sector of the community, the ability to walk to these places was considered very important.

The ability for local children to access their school safely was another key issue, whether it was by cycle, or walking. There are a number of major intersections and busy roads for young children to navigate. We received feedback from St Albans School, Paparoa Street School and Mairehau Primary School, all highlighting the safety of their children getting to and from school. Many submitters said that pedestrian and cycle safety should be addressed and mitigated before the CNC opens to ensure that the children are safe travelling to school with the proposed increased traffic.

“The safety of our St Albans children is in jeopardy. An increase in traffic WILL lead to a pedestrian crossing the road to be seriously injured. The Cranford/Westminster Street intersection is already a dangerous intersection with people running red lights through being in a rush and not paying
attention. This will only be more dangerous with an increase in congestion, impatience and inattention that comes with congestion”. (Submission #23311)

“We would like to see specific details around safe crossing options for Cranford Street including but not limited to, the consideration of an elevated pedestrian crossing, pedestrian refuges in the centre of the road and longer pedestrian cross signals that are further separated from red light runners during peak school commute times. These crossing options should be regularly spread along Cranford Street to reduce the temptation to cross at uncontrolled points and yet work in concert with traffic flows to help ensure compliance and limit frustration.

All pedestrian crossing points should also take into account the current prevalence of scooters as a primary means of transport for school ege children and that many accompanying whanau push toddlers and babies in push chairs and buggies”. (Submission #24054)

To support the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, and to assist with the ability for the community to move around their neighbourhood, submitters feedback wanted the team to investigate options that can be implemented to support car sharing, eg HOV lanes to help reduce the number of vehicles that will travel on the CNC. This also would assist with the significant concern within the community of the increase in noise, vibration and pollution by helping to keep vehicles numbers down.

“The Plan seems to be concentrating on getting cars through St. Albans/Mairehau/Edgware rather than looking at how larger volumes of people (rather than the cars, most of which will be single occupancy) can be moved from the motorway to the CBD at minimal impact to these suburbs. It seems unfair for these suburbs to be taking the impact of the extra congestion when the additional people moving through are not residents of those suburbs; rather they are from satellite towns outside of the main Christchurch area.”. (Submission #23129)
3. Plan specific feedback

Feedback received regarding traffic calming tended to be street specific. Many residents wanted traffic calming measures to be implemented prior to the opening of the CNC. Motorists taking short cuts is already happening on a number of streets around the Cranford Street area and submitters anticipate that this will only get worse if not mitigated before CNC opens. Residents of the side streets were concerned that their current amenity and environment will be compromised and it is important that there is consistent and ongoing monitoring and any impacts are mitigated. Again safety of the community was raised with increased traffic and the speed of vehicles short cutting through the residential areas. Cul-de-sacs were seen as an option for some of the side streets adjoining Cranford Street to stop any traffic short cutting off Cranford Street.

“I strongly support the proposed arterial / distributor / collector improvements and local street traffic calming projects to manage the downstream effects of the northern corridor. Based on the traffic report I understand that some local roads (including Malvern and Roosevelt Streets) are expected to see a traffic increase in excess of 30% without the measures proposed in the transport management plan - this is unacceptable. Although alternative modes and more car-pooling can reduce traffic volumes, the traffic report states that volumes coming off the CNC from these, at least initially, are likely to be relatively small (effective measures might result in up to 10% reduction in traffic volumes). As such, I consider that other measures such as those proposed in the transport management plan will still be required”. (Submission #23410)

A small number of submitters did not support traffic calming as this could impact on local residents moving throughout the area.
• “Traffic calming measures don’t always work.
• Traffic calming measures are a hindrance to residents access to properties.
• More obstacles on the roads, makes the roads more dangerous people become more aggressive, frustrated, agitated on community streets” (Submission #23446)

There was general support for a 30 km/h speed reduction within the community (19 submissions) to support the traffic calming options. The speed reduction will improve safety and discourage drivers from selecting alternative short cut routes.

“I support the reduction of the speed limit to 30km/hr as outlined in the DEMP. Council should be reducing the speed limit to 30km/hr across all local roads and neighbourhoods in Christchurch, as this fits with the aspirations for more liveable neighbourhoods as outlined in the Greater Christchurch Partnership Our Space plan, the central Government’s Vision Zero policy and the desire to encourage mode shifts from private vehicles to public and active transport.” (Submission #23425)

A number of submitters did not support the clearway option on Cranford Street through to Bealey Avenue, or as an option for Barbadoes Street or Madras Street. The main concerns raised in relation to this option was the loss of on-street parking and the introduction of right hand turn restrictions. There is high density housing on Sherborne Street, Barbadoes Street and Madras Street and these streets are heavily parked out with residents parking as there is very little, if any, available off-street parking. Clearways would also impact on parking for businesses, although clearways normally operate only during am and pm peak periods (2-3 hours).

“Clearway cause issues because a lot of resident’s park on the streets as the majority of St Albans is either Medium Density or Transitional to Medium Density and thus we have a lot of people whom have to park on the street. The business need parking outside the place of their business else they will lose all their customer. We have already seen the impact on a business in Barbadoes Street as a result of just a bus stop going in, just imagine the impact on all the business around this area if all on street parking is lost.” (Submission #23401)

Cranford Street/Westminster Street intersection was identified as dangerous. This intersection is also used as a pedestrian route through to St Albans School for a number of their students and there is currently a full-time crossing worker located here both before and after school. For a number of years this intersection has caused concerns in regards to student safety and this needs to be addressed before the CNC opens, according to submitters. Vehicle turning manoeuvres and space for parking for the local businesses is also of high concern at this intersection.

The other major intersection that received specific feedback was Barbadoes Street/Warrington Street/Flockton Street intersection. Submitters identified that traffic lights at this intersection would make it safer but needed to work in with vehicle movements into and out of Flockton Street.
4. Community Plan

A community plan was produced by Axel Wilke on behalf of the St Albans Residents Association. [https://talkingtransport.com/2019/03/17/can-the-plan/](https://talkingtransport.com/2019/03/17/can-the-plan/)

The plan focuses on three components:

1. High frequency bus route from Rangiara and Kaiapoi to the city via the Northern Arterial and Manchester Street, complementing the much slower bus route from Pegasus that uses Main North and Papanui Roads.

2. Provision of bus priority measures. Permanent (24/7) bus lanes are proposed north of the Waimakariri to Edgeware Road rather than the proposed short high-occupancy morning peak lane on the existing Northern Motorway. A further priority component is for restricting north-south movement on Manchester Street across Bealey Avenue to buses only; this is so that other traffic is deterred from using this corridor and there would thus be no further need for any priority measures on this corridor.

3. ... 

The plan was shared throughout the community by the St Albans Residents Association through their Facebook page, web page, newsletter, public meeting and representatives also had an information stand at each of our drop in sessions. Signage and information flyers were also displayed throughout the neighbourhood.
We received 55 submissions from the community who either contributed via an email link set up by St Albans Residents Association, specifically mentioned the Community Plan in their submission or who provided the link to the plan within their comments. There was strong support from the community for us to “Can the Plan” and to start again with a new plan and put the community first.

The project team met with representatives of the Residents Association several times throughout the consultation process to discuss their proposal and share information.

5. Working with strategic partners

We received 13 submissions regarding Council needing to work collaboratively with its partners, ECAN, NZTA and Waimakariri District Council. This also was strongly reflected in the Community Plan presented by St Albans Residents Association. For the downstream public transport options, park & ride, car share and to help with the overall reduction in single occupancy vehicles travelling into the CBD, it is imperative that these organisations work collaboratively towards a positive solution.

6. General feedback

We received general feedback that did not fit into the scope of this project but has been taken into consideration by the project team. The three major issues that we received comments on were:
- Support of light rail (20 submissions)
- Reduction in free parking within the CBD (14 submissions) – this was also a key component of the Community Plan (55 submissions)
- Put a toll at the city boundary (7 submissions)

Other issues raised were around speeding vehicles, look at upgrading Hills Road and Marshland Road and concerns around the timing of works with necessary infrastructure being in place before the opening of the CNC.

7. Summary of matters raised as a result of community engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strong emphasis on reducing single occupancy vehicle trips and overall number of vehicle trips from the north travelling through St Albans. | - The Downstream Effects Management Plan recommends that Council should investigate adding additional peak hour capacity to the main arterial roads south of Innes Road to reduce rat-running through the local road network.  
  - This additional capacity could include additional lanes at traffic signals, peak hour tidal clearways and clearways that are restricted to buses and other high occupancy vehicles.  
  - However, High Occupancy Vehicle lanes will not increase capacity of general traffic on main arterial roads and can lead to:  
    - Rot-running on local streets.  
    - Vehicles diverting to Main North/Papanui Road and Rutland Street, which are principal bus and cycling corridors. |
| More emphasis needs to go on getting people onto buses (public transport) rather than using private motor vehicles. Request for 24/7 bus lanes on Cranford Street. | - The Downstream Effects Management Plan supports wider Travel Demand Management measures.  
  - Traffic analysis completed as part of the plan shows the Christchurch Northern Corridor, along with proposed peak hour clearways, will likely reduce traffic levels on Main North Road/Papanui Road corridor and supports public transport improvements.  
  - Through monitoring, the proposed clearway can be adjusted as a managed lane to encourage more car sharing per vehicle (High Occupancy Vehicles) along with express buses and eventually this managed lane could be re-designated as a bus lane.  
  - There are concerns that the immediate installation of permanent bus lanes on Cranford Street will:  
    - Push traffic back onto Main North Road and Rutland Street impacting on safe and efficient bus and cycle usage of these routes. |
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- Lead to increased rat-running on local streets in St Albans.
- The negative impacts associated with bus lanes would be considerably greater than with High Occupancy Vehicle lanes.
- Compared to permanent bus lanes on Cranford Street, the managed lane allows a flexibility to timely implement other Travel Demand Management measures and encourage mode shift.

Transport partners (e.g. Christchurch City Council and New Zealand Transport Agency) need to do work together to change travel behaviour (e.g. look at parking controls in Central City and allocating road space to buses). The focus should be on moving people not vehicles.
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- Since September 2018, a Programme Steering Group comprising members from Christchurch City Council, New Zealand Transport Agency, Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council has been established to lead the following key studies along the Northern Corridor:
  - Christchurch Northern Corridor High Occupancy Vehicle Lane Business Case (New Zealand Transport Agency lead).
  - Travel Demand Management (Northern Package) Study (New Zealand Transport Agency lead).
  - Public Transport Business Case (Environment Canterbury lead).
  - Downstream Effects Management Plan (Christchurch City Council lead).

- Measures that are being investigated include:
  - A peak-hour southbound High Occupancy Vehicle lane on the Christchurch Northern Corridor.
  - Interim Park ‘n’ Ride sites in Kaiapoi and Rangiora.
  - Investigations into measures which incentivise greater use of High Occupancy Vehicle lane such as parking incentives.
  - New express bus service between Rangiora, Kaiapoi and the central city along the new High Occupancy Vehicle lane.
  - A marketing and promotional campaign to raise the awareness and understanding of the High Occupancy Vehicle lane and the improved public transport offering.
  - Launch/development of an app based tool that combines public transport, carpooling/car-sharing and micro-mobility options.
  - Training and education – cycle training courses & bus information.
  - Personalised travel planning.
- However, the Greater Christchurch Partners need to consider the impacts these measures could have in the Central City, on
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| Not enough measures around walking, cycling and public transport to be introduced before the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens. Most of the changes appear to come later after traffic volumes have increased and should be in place before Christchurch Northern Corridor opens (Stage 1 improvements). | - The Stage 1 proposals improve safety and access for these modes. For example:  
  - The implementation of a High Occupancy Vehicle lane will assist less congestion on Public Transport and MCR (Major Cycle Route) corridors which will ultimately improve safety, journey times and trip reliability for buses and cycling.  
  - The traffic signals at Warrington/Forfar Streets and Warrington/Barbadoes Streets intersections will improve access and safety for pedestrians and cyclists crossing Warrington Street and using St Albans Park.  
  - Signage and marking of an alternative north-south cycling route through quiet local streets to the east of Cranford Street. This could be done relatively quickly and be in place before the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens. |

| Confusion around the type of cycling facilities to be installed as part of secondary cycle routes network. Are they to be separated cycle lanes? | - The Downstream Effects Management Plan recommends the installation of secondary cycleways.  
  - These cycleways will not include separators like those provided on the Major Cycle Routes (e.g. Papanui Parallel). These cycleways will consist of painted cycle lanes and bicycle greenways (i.e. use of quiet streets).  
  - Any proposed cycleway will be consulted on with the community. |

| Lack of safe cycling facilities on Cranford/Sherborne Streets during clearway operation. | - The Downstream Effects Management Plan encourages Council to investigate how a consistent level of service throughout the Cranford Street Corridor can be provided to cyclists during clearway operation.  
  - The Downstream Effects Management Plan includes a number of recommendations to encourage cyclists away from the Cranford/Sherborne street corridor and onto the |

| Concerns around staging of traffic calming on various streets and concerns on the time it might take to implement measures to address rat-running that does occur after the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens. | - Papanui Parallel and other quieter routes.  
  - The Downstream Effects Management Plan recommends that Council should carry out vehicle monitoring before the Christchurch Northern Corridor is opened.  
  - Vehicle monitoring will be collected to establish baseline data which will be used:  
    - To confirm the validity of the traffic modelling.  
    - As part of the ongoing monitoring of each street in relation to the impact of the Christchurch Northern Corridor. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Council**  
**13 June 2019** |
| **Attachment E** |
| **The Downstream Effects Management Plan** allows Council to implement traffic calming on streets that have not been identified in the plan that have been found to have 30% plus increase in traffic compared with pre-Christchurch Northern Corridor. **The Downstream Effects Management Plan** recommends that Council should look to implement improvements as early as possible on streets with a 30% plus increase compared with pre-Christchurch Northern Corridor. **Temporary measures** (or rapid implementation measures) are an option to reduce rat-running on some streets, especially if the effects are well over 30%. For example, use of temporary islands and hit posts to ban some turning movements. |
| **Right turn movements during clearway operation** (e.g. into new play-centres on Cranford Street) will impact on capacity of two-lane clearway operation. **Right turns on the proposed clearways can reduce the capacity of the road, however it has limited effect on the capacity of the road if opposing flow (non-peak direction) is low as the right turning vehicle can make this manoeuvre quickly. **The recommendations in the Downstream Effects Management Plan propose:**  
- Right turning restrictions at side-roads.  
- The provision of right turn bays at most traffic signals allowing traffic to turn right safely. |
| **Concerns around peak period prohibition of car parking for clearways on roads with high kerbside parking demand.** **As with all large-scale roading projects, Council will carry out parking surveys and look at managing parking demand by different users (e.g. local resident, commuters and short duration parking near shops).** |
| **Why the DEMP does not consider the downstream effects of Christchurch Northern Corridor on Innes Road and McFaddens/Mays/Normans corridors, given Innes Road is already heavily congested in peak periods.** **The traffic analysis completed as part of the Downstream Effects Management Plan indicates that traffic levels on Innes Road will not be affected due to the Christchurch Northern Corridor and is not considered as part of the study.**  
- Congestion can be addressed as part of the operational or capital improvements through the Council’s Long Term Plan. |
| **Will there be monitoring of air, noise and vibration from traffic before and after the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens.** **Council will monitor air, noise and vibration before the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens to establish baselines.**  
- It also recommends that Council monitors annually or biennially so that any impacts of the additional traffic can be assessed. |
- The recommended locations to carry out this monitoring are at:
  - Cranford Street north of McFaddens Road
  - Cranford Street north of Berwick Street
  - Berwick Street immediately east of Cranford Street
  - Madras Street north of Edgeware Road
  - Barbadoes Street north of Edgeware Road

**Concerns around pedestrian safety of children in the proximity of schools.**

- The Downstream Effects Management Plan has identified pedestrian safety concerns on Cranford Street between the Westminster and Berwick Street intersections. It recommends Council improve both intersections considering pedestrian safety. It also recommends to monitor and investigate an additional signalised crossing facility on Cranford Street, if required in front of English Park.
- The Downstream Effects Management Plan also suggests to lower the speed limit on Cranford Street at school peak hour to further improve pedestrian safety.
- It is currently proposed that these measures will be implemented as part of a package of works on Cranford Street.

**Requests to install tolls on the Waimakariri Bridge (SH1) to reduce number of cars travelling into Christchurch (as a traffic demand management measure).**

- **Tolls:**
  - Current New Zealand legislation does not permit existing roads to be tolled. Tolls can only be applied to new roads where suitable alternative routes are available. This option was not investigated as part of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and is not part of the existing Designation Conditions.
  - Changes would be required to the Designation Conditions and associated conditions for the Northern Arterial, Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street upgrade.
  - If Council were to implement tolling on the Northern Arterial Extension, then the alternative available transport route would be through the Christchurch Northern Corridor /Queen Elizabeth II Drive interchange. This interchange has not been designed to cater for the likely additional traffic and will require significant changes which is not part of the existing Alliance design.
  - Additionally, the likely re-routing will significantly impact the operation of Main North Road and Cranford Street north of the roundabout.
  - **Congestion Charging:**
    - Similar to the road tolling option, congestion charging has not been investigated as part of the
Christchurch Northern Corridor and does not form part of the existing Designation Conditions.

- Best practice recommends the following factors to be investigated prior to making a decision on congestion charging –
  - Political position.
  - Well planned public relations campaigns.
  - Single empowered agency.
  - Public recognition of need.
  - Ring fencing of revenues.
  - Proven technology.
  - Lengthy development.
  - Clear business case.

- This option is not currently considered as part of the northern package Travel Demand Management study that was recently completed by the New Zealand Transport Agency.

- While implementation of such a measure will require ministerial and wider public approval, there is limited information to evaluate the likely impact of such a significant Travel Demand Management measure.
STAGE 1

Stage 1A - Recommendations required in order to meet the designation conditions prior to the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor:

These recommendations are categorised as:
- Major Road Upgrades
- Traffic Calming
- Monitoring

Major Road (MR) Upgrades:

| MR1 (Cranford Street Clearways) | Peak Period Clearways along Cranford Street from Innes Road to Berwick Street. |
| MR2 (Westminster/ Cranford Intersection) | Upgrades to Westminster Street /Cranford Street Intersections. |
| MR3 (Berwick/ Warrington Upgrades) | Upgrading of Berwick Street /Cranford Street signalised intersection and signalisation of the Forfar Street /Warrington Street and Barbadoes Street /Warrington Street Intersections. |
| MR4 (South Berwick Upgrades) | Downstream of Berwick Street arterial upgrade option that comes out of the scoping study. |
| MR5 (high occupancy vehicle lanes on Cranford-Sherbome) | Investigate extending the southern high occupancy vehicle lanes on the Christchurch Northern Corridor through to Bealey Avenue and installing a northbound high occupancy vehicle lane. |

Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:

| TC1 | Mersey and Berwick Streets (Innes Road to Forfar Street) |
| TC2 | Knowles Street |
| TC 3 | Weston Road |
| TC 4 | McFaddens Road |
| TC7 | Malvern Street (left in left out at Cranford St intersection) |
| TC8 | Dee Street (left in left out at Cranford St intersection) |

Vehicle Monitoring:

Before the Christchurch Northern Corridor is opened, Vehicle Monitoring will be collected to establish baseline data which will be used:
- To confirm the validity of the traffic modelling.
- As part of the ongoing monitoring of each street in relation to the impact of the Christchurch Northern Corridor.

Main Roads

- Traffic counts be collected at over 50 locations with a high potential for rat-running prior to and within 3 months of Christchurch Northern Corridor opening.
- Ongoing annual or biannual monitoring of the streets that are expected to carry most of the additional traffic.
- Other streets to be monitored if adverse effects are reported (e.g. an increase in rat-running or speeding).
**Stage 1B - Further recommendations to be carried out prior to the opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor**
- Identify and implemented any quick wins where possible before the Christchurch Northern Corridor opens.
- Studies should commence in Stage 1 and be completed early on in Stage 2.

**Environmental Monitoring:**
- Vehicle emission
- Noise
- Vibration impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual or biennial measurements through to the end of the Commissioning Period at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cranford Street north of McFaddens Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cranford Street north of Berwick Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Berwick Street immediately east of Cranford Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Madras Street north of Edgware Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Barbadoes Street north of Edgware Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safe System Community Areas (SSCA):**

| SSA 1 to 9       | Introduce nine 30km/h (or 40km/h) reduced speed limit areas through the downstream local road network |

**Safe Access to Schools (AS):**

| AS1 – Safe Access Across Cranford Street | This study will look at a range of options, including a new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance. |
| AS2 – Interim Improvements on Cranford Street | Between Cranford/Westminster and Berwick/Cranford Intersections and recommended to be carried out with these intersection upgrades as a suite of works. Council to implement measures to increase the safety of pedestrians crossing Cranford Street. These could include lowering speed limits at school peak hour and improved pedestrian crossing facilities. |

**Safe Cycling Routes (SC):**

| SC1 (Cycle Wayfinding Signage) | Development of and implementation of a wayfinding signage plan that directs cyclists at the northern end of Cranford Street (at McFaddens Road) and southern end of Cranford Street to safer cycling routes. |
| SC2 (McFaddens Road Secondary Cycle Corridor) | Undertake a route study of a cycling route both west (towards the Papanui Parallel) and east (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road. |
| SC3 (Westminster/ Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor) | Undertake a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street. |
| SC4 (Edgware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor) | Undertake a route study of a cycling route both west and east of Cranford Street.* |
| SC5 (North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor) | Undertake a route study of an alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street. |
### STAGE 2

**Stage 2A - Recommendations to be carried out within the first three years of opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor in order to meet the designation conditions - subject to confirmation through traffic monitoring.**

**Vehicle Monitoring:**
- Traffic counts undertaken within 3 months of the CNC opening on:
  - All key local routes that are expected to be impacted by rat-running traffic.
  - Where there have been a number of public complaints about rat-running.
- Those streets that have a greater than 30% increase in traffic volumes will be included in the traffic calming street list for Stage 2 (even if not currently on the lists below).
- Where large increases occur, temporary works may be implemented ahead of more permanent upgrades.

**Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:**

Introduce traffic calming where expected increases in traffic volumes are validated by the monitoring data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC9</td>
<td>Roosevelt Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC12</td>
<td>Caledonian Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC13</td>
<td>Edgware Road (Village)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC14</td>
<td>Manchester Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC15</td>
<td>Westminster Street/ Courtenay Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 2B - Further recommendations to be carried out within the first three years of opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor**

**Safe Access to Schools (AS):**
- **AS1**
  - Safe Access Across Cranford Street: Implement any options identified in this study such as a new mid-block signalised crossing across Cranford Street near the English Park Carpark entrance.

**Safe Cycling Routes (SC):**

Implementation of Secondary Cycling Routes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC2</td>
<td>McFaddens Road Secondary Cycle Corridor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- West (towards the Papanui Parallel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- East (towards new north south route) on McFaddens Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC3</td>
<td>Westminster/Courtenay Secondary Cycle Corridor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Both west and east of Cranford Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC4</td>
<td>Edgware Road Secondary Cycle Corridor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Both west and east of Cranford Street.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC5</td>
<td>North-South Secondary Cycle Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alternative north-south cycle route through traffic calmed streets to the east of Cranford Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access to Parks (AP):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP1</td>
<td>(St Albans Park Access Plan) – Development of a plan that will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AP2  (Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan) – Development of a plan that will look at access to the park by pedestrians (of different abilities), cyclists, and motorists.

Implement any quick wins that come out of the plan within Stage 2.

**Access to Commercial Centres (AC):**

Undertake the following studies that will consider safe access to this activity centre by pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC1</th>
<th>Westminster/ Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC2</td>
<td>Barbadoes/ Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC3</td>
<td>Barbadoes/ Edgware Local Activity Centre Transport Study*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC4</td>
<td>Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undertake the following studies which will focus on safe access by pedestrians along the route and crossing the route especially for vulnerable road users:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC5</th>
<th>Westminster/ Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC6</td>
<td>Edgware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes) –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implement any quick wins that come out of the studies in Stage 2.

**Environmental Monitoring:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle emission</th>
<th>Annual or biennial measurements through to the end of the Commissioning Period at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>- Cranford Street north of McFaddens Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibration impacts</td>
<td>- Cranford Street north of Berwick Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Berwick Street immediately east of Cranford Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Madras Street north of Edgware Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Barbadoes Street north of Edgware Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAGE 3

Stage 3A – Recommendations to be carried out before the end of the Commissioning Period of the Christchurch Northern Corridor in order to meet the designation conditions - subject to confirmation through traffic monitoring.

Monitoring

Vehicle Monitoring:
- Traffic counts to be continued until the end of the commissioning period on:
  - All key local routes that are expected to be impacted by rat-running traffic.
  - Where there have been a number of public complaints about rat-running,
  - Where large increases occur, temporary works may be implemented ahead of more permanent upgrades.
  - Those streets that have a greater than 30% increase in traffic volumes will be included in the traffic calming street list for Stage 3 (even if not currently on the lists below).
  - An indication of Stage 3 improvement projects is provided below. This list will need to be reviewed and where necessary revised once the actual impacts of the Christchurch Northern Corridor traffic is known from the monitoring.

Traffic Calming (TC) Measures:
Introduce traffic calming only where monitoring indicates high levels of rat-running are occurring (may include additional streets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC5</td>
<td>McFaddens Road, Knowles Street, Weston Road (east Cranford)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC6</td>
<td>Jameson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC10</td>
<td>Forfar Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC11</td>
<td>Flockton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC16</td>
<td>Severn Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC17</td>
<td>Thames Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC18</td>
<td>Aylesford Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC19</td>
<td>Kensington Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC20</td>
<td>Philpotts Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC21</td>
<td>Francis Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 3B – Recommendations that could be undertaken any time between the opening of the CNC and the end of the Commissioning Period

Safe Cycling Routes (SC):
Monitor and upgrade routes as required.

Access to Parks (AP):
Implementation of the access plan as required to address access issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Access Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP1</td>
<td>St Albans Park Access Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP2</td>
<td>Malvern/Rugby Park Access Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to Commercial Centres (AC):
Implement study recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC</th>
<th>Study Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC1</td>
<td>Westminster/ Cranford Local Activity Centre Transport Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC2</td>
<td>Barbadoes/ Warrington Local Activity Centre Transport Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC3</td>
<td>Barbadoes/ Edgware Local Activity Centre Transport Study*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC4</td>
<td>Rutland Street Local Activity Centre Transport Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC5</td>
<td>Westminster/ Courtenay Corridor Study (Rutland to Forfar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC6</td>
<td>Edgware Corridor Study (Springfield to Barbadoes)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Monitoring:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle emission</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Vibration impacts</th>
<th>Annual or biennial measurements through to the end of the Commissioning Period at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cranford Street north of McFaddens Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cranford Street north of Berwick Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Berwick Street immediately east of Cranford Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Madras Street north of Edgware Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Barbadoes Street north of Edgware Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Council staff to work collaboratively with the Edgware Village Master Plan project team
16. Governance Partnership and Delegations

Reference: 19/414256
Presenter(s): John Filsell, Head of Community Support, Governance and Partnerships

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Council to endorse an approach to devolve greater decision making authority and responsibilities to community boards, including:

1.1.1 approving a Council-Community Board Governance Partnership Agreement (Attachment A); and

1.1.2 an increase in delegations to community boards (Attachment B).

2. Executive Summary

2.1 The Council has stated its intention to change, over time, the historical model of centralised decision making towards a more participatory, localised and collaborative approach to decision making. Additionally, community boards have, for some time, expressed a desire for changes that allow for more influence and involvement in the Council’s decision making process.

2.2 The partnership approach to governance is based on the clear devolution of decision making to be dealt with at the most local level (the principle of subsidiarity). The partnership approach that is reflected in the proposed Governance Partnership Agreement (Attachment A) involves a commitment by the Council to formally and consistently seek community board input prior to making significant governance decisions.

2.3 The Council and community boards have also asked that the delegations to community boards be reviewed. A number of new delegations to community boards are proposed (Attachment B). These new delegations reflect the Council’s view that issues specific to a community board should be dealt with and decided on in the affected locality.

2.4 Staff have workshopped the proposals with the community boards and councillors and staff since 2016 to finalise the wording of the Governance Partnership Agreement and possible new delegations to community boards.
3. **Staff Recommendations**

That the Council:

1. Endorse the proposed partnership approach to governance between the Council and community boards.
2. Approve the draft Council-Community Board Governance Partnership Agreement (Attachment A).
3. Delegate to the Mayor the authority to sign the Council-Community Board Governance Partnership Agreement (Attachment A) on behalf of the Council.
4. Relying on clause 32 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 and for the purposes of efficiency and effectiveness of the Council’s business, and relying on any other applicable statutory authority
   a. Revoke the delegations to community boards as set out in Sub-part 1 of Part D of the Delegations Register; and
   b. Delegate to community boards, the responsibilities, duties, and powers as set out in Attachment B; and
   c. Revoke the delegation to the Reserves Officer Subcommittee to approve or otherwise easements over land to be vested in the Council as reserve as a result of subdivision; and
   d. Amend the delegation to staff to make decisions on the siting of floodlights as set out in Attachment C, and delegate to the Parking Restrictions Subcommittee and the Council Hearings Panels the responsibilities, duties, and powers as set out in Attachment C.
5. Resolve that the agreed new delegations come into force on 1 August 2019.
6. Request that staff from each of the relevant teams to develop or amend processes to implement the governance partnership approach and delegations.

4. **Context/Background**

**Partnership approach to community governance**

4.1 Community governance refers to a collaborative approach to decision making which recognises the need to work in partnership, and the value that each partner brings to the process and outcomes. This approach is based on the clear devolution of decision making to be dealt with at the most local level (the principle of subsidiarity). Within the Christchurch City Council context, a key mechanism for shifting some governance responsibility closer to the community is through the seven community boards.

4.2 This type of governance framework is also consistent with Local Government New Zealand and the New Zealand Initiative Localism Project. The guiding principle of the Localism Project is that “public services should be provided by the sphere of government which is as close as possible to the people who use and benefit from the services...”.

4.3 Community boards can, and often do, work with their local communities in a facilitative way, enabling them to progress ideas and develop initiatives for the benefit of the wider community. Through a partnership approach to governance, community boards will continue to engage with local citizens and communities and represent those views to the Council.
4.1 Christchurch currently has 16 wards and seven community boards. The community boards are Banks Peninsula; Hornby-Halswell-Riccarton; Papanui-Innes; Central-Heathcote-Linwood; Spreydon-Cashmere; Coastal-Burwood; and Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood.

4.2 The main roles of the community boards are to:
- Represent and act as an advocate for the interests of its community.
- Consider and report on all matters referred to it by the Council, or any matter of interest or concern to the board.
- Maintain an overview of services provided by the Council within the community.
- Prepare an annual submission to the Council for expenditure within the community.
- Communicate with community organisations and special interest groups within the community.
- Undertake any other responsibilities that are delegated to them by the Council.

Issue or Opportunity

4.3 The Council has stated its intention to change, over time, the historical model of centralised decision making towards a more participatory, localised and collaborative approach to decision making. Additionally, community boards have, for some time, expressed a desire for changes that allow for more influence and involvement in the Council’s decision making process.

4.4 A decentralised approach to governance means that the Council as a whole can be more responsive to the diverse needs of the communities, as well as increasing the capacity to develop and ensure community boards have a well-defined and consistent role in the wider governance of the city. A partnership approach is a commitment by the Council to formally and consistently seek community board input prior to making significant governance decisions.

Strategic Alignment

4.5 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):  
4.5.1 Activity: Governance & Decision Making
- Level of Service: 4.1.22.0 Provide services that ensure all Council and Community Board decisions are held with full statutory compliance - 100% compliance Participation in and contribution to Council decision making.

4.6 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies. In particular:
- The overarching principle of the Council’s Strategic Framework is partnership – to work together to create a city where everyone can participate and be valued;
- It is a Council strategic priority to enable active citizenship and connected communities; and
- The Strengthening Communities Strategy (2007) includes a principle where the Council supports and encourages participation by all individuals and groups in community life and local decision making, and will work to remove any barriers which may prevent full community participation.
Decision Making Authority

4.1 Community boards are established under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). Section 52 of the LGA describes the role of community boards, including to represent their community’s interests and have oversight of territorial authority services delivered in their communities.

4.2 Community boards can undertake responsibilities delegated to them by the territorial authority. The LGA specifies that councils may delegate to community boards any responsibility, duty or powers except the power to:

- Make a rate;
- Make a bylaw;
- Borrow money, or purchase or dispose of assets, other than in accordance with the long-term plan;
- Adopt a long-term plan, annual plan or annual report;
- Appoint a Chief Executive;
- Adopt policies required to be adopted or consulted on under the Local Government Act 2002 in association with the long-term plan or developed for the purpose of the local governance statement;
- Adopt a remuneration and employment policy.

4.3 In addition, the LGA provides that a community board may not:

- Acquire, hold or dispose of property; or
- Appoint, suspend, or remove staff.

Previous Decisions

4.1 This report is being provided to fulfil Council resolution CNCL/2018/00266 and the Notice of Motion requesting:

4.1.1 staff to complete the community board delegations and partnership agreement project; and

4.1.2 report to Council by end of March 2019 to enable implementation in the second quarter of 2019.

4.2 This report was delayed as elected members asked for further workshops to discuss the detail of the delegations. The workshops were further rescheduled due to the events of 15 March.

Assessment of Significance and Engagement

4.3 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. This is primarily because there are no changes to levels of service or financial implications and this proposed change has been clearly signalled by Council and community boards over time.

4.4 The governance approach to partnership will encourage and enable better local decision making.
5. Option Analysis

Options Considered

5.1 The following option is considered and is assessed in this report:
   - Formalise the partnership approach to governance between the Council and community boards, and increase delegations to community boards.

5.2 Staff have considered a long list of options. The identification and analysis of these options is summarised in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain Status Quo</td>
<td>• No potential disruption from the implementation to changes in delegations.</td>
<td>• Will not progress the Council and Board joint goal of a more participatory, localised and collaborative approach to decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Progressed</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contrary to Council resolutions for the project to proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity lost for meaningful and beneficial change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contrary to Council and Board expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceed With Partnership Agreement Only</td>
<td>• Agreement effectively summarises the desired relationship between Council and Boards</td>
<td>• New Board delegations are essential to the success of the localised approach to decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Not progressed</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposed delegations will result in some efficiencies (less part A reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contrary to Council resolutions for the delegations to proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Departs from the partnership approach supported by Council and Boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceed With Delegations Only</td>
<td>• If there is an unforeseen issue with the Agreement the delegations can proceed.</td>
<td>• Contrary to Council resolutions for the project to proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Not progressed</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contrary to Council and Board expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The project will not cover the wider aspects of localised decision making that extend beyond delegations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Agreement has been extensively researched, workshopped and consulted upon and is ready to proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There will be no formalisation of the wider partnership approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defer Project Until the New Council Term</td>
<td>• Allows a new Council and Boards to further consider the matter.</td>
<td>• The partnership approach has been a live project since 2014 and a priority since 2016. There is no discernible appetite for further delay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Progressed</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Current momentum and good will may be lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contrary to Council resolutions for the project to proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contrary to Council and Board expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceed With Partnership Approach and</td>
<td>• Preferred option - see section 5.6.2 of this report</td>
<td>• Preferred option - see section 5.6.3 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Staff considered retaining the status quo or progressing with an increase in delegations but without the Agreement and vice versa. If the Council were to choose one of these options, there would be no formalisation of the partnership approach between the Council and community boards. If the Council decides to continue with the status quo, it is still possible to increase the delegations as discussed in the preferred option. However, staff consider it more effective to formalise the relationship as the framework to supporting community boards with increased delegations. The Governance Partnership Agreement will help to effect a culture change across the whole organisation, thereby addressing community board concerns that they are sometimes perceived as a stakeholder group that needs to be worked through or consulted, as opposed to a decision maker in their own right.

5.4 A number of processes are already in place that establish, and will continue to deliver, a more decentralised approach to decision making. These include but are not limited to:

- Existing delegations to community boards.
- The ongoing potential to increase delegations.
- The support of locally-based Community Governance teams.
- The introduction of formal monthly reporting and presentations to Council by the boards.
- The development and implementation of Community Board Plans.

**Option Description**

5.5 **Preferred Option:** Formalise the partnership approach to governance between the Council and community boards, and increase delegations to community boards.

5.5.1 **Option Description:** under this option the Council and Community Boards would sign a good faith agreement to work in partnership; and the Council would increase the delegations to community boards.

5.5.2 **Option Advantages**

- Encourages and enables better local decision making by increasing opportunities for citizens to be at the centre of decision making that affects their community.
- Community boards will have more influence and more involvement in decision making.
- Improves the efficiency and timeliness of decision making by reducing duplication of work for Council and staff.
- Clarifies expectations, roles and processes for elected members and staff.
- Aligns with Local Government New Zealand’s local governance directions for decisions to be made at the lowest level possible.

5.5.3 **Option Disadvantages**

- May take longer to make some decisions or develop policy when multiple community boards need to be consulted.
- Additional delegations could lead to a small increase in workload for community boards but this is offset by overall decision-making efficiencies (lass Part-A’s).
- There may be an increase in staff time at the early stages of a project to synthesise views of community boards earlier in a project but this should lead to, and be offset by, better decision-making and efficiencies in the latter stages of a project.
5.6 Staff have held workshops with elected members at various times since 2017 on the partnership approach and prioritisation of delegations. The feedback from these workshops confirmed the support for formalising the relationship between the Council and community boards, and informed the further development of the draft Governance Partnership Agreement (Attachment A). Elected members also requested delegations be reviewed in light of the joint intention to formalise the partnership approach to governance.

5.7 The components of the draft partnership agreement and delegations were identified and worked with each community board in August 2017. The findings of this process were shared with each community board in September 2017, and workshoped with councillors in February 2018.

5.8 Due to changes in staffing the project hibernated until October 2018 when the proposed draft agreement was workshoped with relevant Council staff that work more closely with community boards. This provided staff an opportunity to highlight any processes that could be delegated to community boards, and to ensure they were aware of the cultural change that would be expected once the Agreement is in place.

5.9 In November 2018 and February 2019 staff held seminars with the community boards to provide an update on the project and to seek any further views on the wording of the draft Governance Partnership Agreement. All the community boards were generally supportive of the governance approach, and supported delegations to community boards being increased. This was discussed with councillors at a workshop on 5 March 2019. The Council decided additional joint workshops with the community board members would be beneficial to finalise the documents. Unfortunately these workshops were delayed due to the events on 15 March.

5.10 At a combined community board seminar on 17 April 2019, community board members and councillors were encouraged to discuss the previously identified changes to the proposed agreement, the new delegations. They were also encouraged to identify any changes needed. All changes were recorded and circulated to councillors and board members ahead of a joint councillor-community board workshop on 7 May where final tweaks were discussed. The few recommended changes identified in the joint workshop were circulated to councillors and board members inviting final comment. No changes were received.

6. Governance Partnership Agreement

6.1 In order to achieve a decentralised approach to decision making, it is proposed that the Council and community boards adopt a Governance Partnership Agreement to be signed by the Mayor and chair of each community board. To be most effective, the agreement will be the same across all community boards. A draft Council-Community Board Governance Partnership Agreement is attached (Attachment A).

6.2 The draft Governance Partnership Agreement sets out partnership principles, protocols, roles and responsibilities. It also sets out the mechanisms by which decision making can be devolved, pursuant to the LGA, including:

- Defining the rationale behind (greater) delegation of decision making to community boards.

- Providing for Boards to be engaged earlier in:
  - Major Council strategic and policy processes;
  - New major projects and significant changes to existing major projects;
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- Metropolitan projects within the community board area;
- Annual Plan and Long Term Plan Processes.

- Recognising the Community Board Plan as a strategic document to be included in the preparation of Service Plans, Annual Plans and Long Term Plans.
- Conferring reciprocal responsibilities on Council and community boards to keep each other informed of consultative processes by third parties.

6.3 The proposed Agreement aims to capture the commitment of the Council and community boards to the governance partnership. It is a statement of intent, good will and partnership. It is not a legal document and does not replace other agreed protocols like Standing Orders, the Code of Conduct or the Significance and Engagement Policy. Of most importance is the fact that all parties see it as a living document that will evolve over time. The first proposed review date is six months into the new Council term.

7. Delegations

7.1 The Council and community boards have asked that the delegations to community boards be reviewed in light of the joint intention to move towards a more participatory, localised and collaborative approach to decision making.

7.2 The Council’s Register of Delegations lists the delegations made to boards, committees and officers, which are made in open meetings. The Delegations Policy supports the principle of delegating decision making to the lowest competent level.

7.3 Delegations by the Council to community boards are in Subpart 1 of Part D of the Register. Depending on the nature of the authority delegated to them, community boards either have the power to consider and recommend, or to consider and make decisions in respect of the matters they deal with. Community boards, like the Council, must comply with the decision-making requirements set out in part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002.

7.4 Decisions that can be made effectively by community boards should be made by them. Community boards should be responsible for as many of the non-regulatory functions of the Council taking place in their areas as practical, unless:

- the impact of the decision will extend beyond a single community board area; or
- effective decision-making will require alignment or integration with other decisions that are the responsibility of the Council; or
- the benefits of a consistent or co-ordinated approach across Christchurch will outweigh the benefits of reflecting the diverse needs and preferences of the communities within each community board area (e.g. arterial roads, wastewater disposal, solid waste management etc.).

Proposed new delegations

7.5 Under a localised approach to decision making, the proposed new delegations reflect the Council’s view that issues specific to a community board should be dealt with and decided on within the affected locality, rather than by the Council as a whole. These proposed new delegations are additional to the current delegations already delegated to community boards.

7.6 The proposed new delegations from the Council to community boards are detailed and analysed in Attachment D, which include:

- Approve site selection and final design of new local community facilities (excludes community facilities that have network or citizen hub implications);
• Approve alterations and additions to the design of existing local community facilities (excludes community facilities that have network or citizen hub implications);

• Name local cemeteries.

• Banks Peninsula appoint a member to Summit Road Protection Authority;

• Coastal Burwood to appoint a representative to Te Oranga Care and Protection Residence;

• Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton to appoint a representative to Te Poutama Arahi Rangatahi (Harmful Sexual behaviour programme);

• Authorise School Boards of Trustees to appoint school patrols;

• Resolve a discontinuance of a parking place;

• Installation of floodlights on sports parks;

• Classify a reserve;

• Decide on a reserve name;

• Grant lease or licence extensions on parks;

• Authorise variations to leases and licences on parks;

• Agree to assignments of leases or licences of parks;

• Agree to cancellation or surrender of leases and licences on parks and reserves;

• Administer and enforce leases and licences terms on parks and reserves;

• Give consent as landlord to various matters;

• Determine bans on model aircraft in parks and reserves.

**Other delegations considered**

7.7 A number of other possible delegations that could potentially be delegated to community boards were considered, however at this time further work is needed to understand any implications. When the Governance Partnership Agreement is reviewed six months into the new Council term, there will be an opportunity to discuss further delegations to community boards.

7.8 Future identified delegations from the Council to community boards could include:

• Location, design and alterations to larger community facilities with network implications (larger pools, libraries).

• Boards making submissions on notified resource consent applications where the application is of particular concern to the local community.

• Modification of Plan A – (the area of the central city that is considered metropolitan rather than local and so has Council delegation as opposed to the community board).

• Temporary alcohol bans.

• Private drains through adjoining premises.

• The delegation to make submissions to external bodies on matters that are open for public consultation, where the matter is of particular concern to the local community.

• Some minor delegations to staff in the parks and traffic sphere.

Potential delegations summarised in the top two bullet points were identified as having the highest priority.
8. Legal Implications

8.1 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision. This report has been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

8.2 The proposed Governance Partnership Agreement is a statement of intent, good will and partnership. It is not a legal document and does not replace other agreed protocols like Standing Orders, the Code of Conduct or the Significance and Engagement Policy.

8.3 In some circumstances it may not be clear whether an issue is inherently local or has implications beyond the boundaries of a community board. In this situation, the Council, taking into consideration the views of the community board, will determine allocation of decision making responsibilities in accordance with the following principles:

8.3.1 Decision-making responsibility for a non-regulatory activity of the Council within a community board area should be exercised by the community board; or

8.3.2 by the Council if the nature of the activity is such that decision-making on a district-wide basis will better promote the interests of all communities, having regard to the following factors:
   - the impact of the decision (for example, if it extends beyond the community board area); and/or
   - effective decision making (for example, if the decision requires alignment or integration with other decisions that are the responsibility of the Council); and/or
   - the benefits of a consistent or co-ordinated approach in the Council’s district (for example, if these outweigh the benefits of reflecting the particular needs and preferences of the communities within the community board area); and/or
   - the significance of the activity (as assessed in accordance with the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy).

8.4 Part 7 of this report sets out details relating to the proposed delegations. Delegations are generally authorised under clause 32 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002. The proposed new delegations have been reviewed for legal compliance. Some amendments are also proposed to the wording of existing delegations. This is shown as blue text in Attachment B. This does not make any substantive change to the nature or effect of the delegations and is for clarity only.

9. Financial Implications

9.1 This report has been reviewed by the Financial and Commercial Group who have identified no additional direct financial implications will be incurred by Council as a result of its adoption.

9.2 This is primarily because the staff infrastructure needed to support community boards is already in place and included in existing financial budgets. The majority of the new delegations involve community boards now being the decision maker as opposed to making a recommendation to Council via a Part A report. Community Board Plans and other planning tools are already in existence, proposed changes involve achieving greater alignment with Council’s levels of service and vice versa. Early engagement with community boards over major decision making process is largely happening now, (Annual Plan) or will avoid time delays further on in the decision making process resulting in cost neutrality.
10. Risks

10.1 There is a risk that not all community boards will agree to the wording of the draft Governance Partnership Agreement (Attachment A). While it is up to each community board to decide if it wants to sign up to the Agreement, for the partnership to be effective, the Agreement needs to be the same for all community boards. The proposed approach has been workshopped with elected members extensively through seminars, briefings and workshops. Elected member feedback was generally supportive of the approach and incorporated in the draft Governance Partnership Agreement. The overwhelming majority of changes suggested by board members have been adopted and incorporated into the draft agreement. Therefore, staff consider it is unlikely the community boards will object to the opportunity to formalise the partnership to enable them to have more influence in the community.

11. Next Steps

11.1 If the Council agrees to formalise the partnership approach through the Governance Partnership Agreement, each community board will need to consider adopting the agreement through a Community Board Report. It is anticipated that the Agreements could be signed by late-July 2019, with the new delegations taking effect on 1 August 2019.

11.2 Once the Governance Partnership Agreement is signed and new delegations are in place, staff will incorporate the changes into their processes. The cultural change to ensure staff involve community boards at appropriate stages of their projects will be communicated to staff through an internal communications plan.

11.3 Additionally, to ensure this approach is the standard way of operating for any incoming Council and community boards, the Agreement will need to be reviewed within six months of the new council and community boards being established.
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Christchurch City Council Community Board Governance Partnership Agreement

Vision statement

A partnership approach to local decision making in Christchurch.

Purpose

This Agreement documents the principles of a good faith\(^1\) partnership between the Christchurch City Council and its Community Boards.

It seeks to encourage communication, coordination and cooperation between the Council and the Community Boards to enable them to work together to:

- facilitate local decision making and action by, and on behalf of, communities;
- promote active citizenship;
- strengthen the connection to neighborhoods and citizens; and
- provide local input into Council strategies, plans and services.

Protocols

The partnership between the Council and Community Boards is based on the following protocols:

Governance, Communication and Coordination

- The Council and Community Boards have a joint responsibility for good governance: the best interests of our communities are served when we work cooperatively.
- The Council and Community Boards acknowledge that the Local Government Act 2002 provides that the Council has a city wide focus and the Community Boards have a community focus, and the Community Boards operate under the governance umbrella of the Council. Community Boards carry out the responsibilities, duties and functions that are given to them by statute or that are delegated to them by the Council\(^2\). Delegations are listed in the delegations register.

---

1 A definition of good faith taken from section 4(1A) of the Employment Relations Act 2000 is “the parties to the relationship are active and constructive in establishing and maintaining a productive relationship in which the parties are, amongst other things, responsive and communicative.”

2 The role of Community Boards is described on the Council Website under “Council – How the Council works.”
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Delegations to Community Boards are guided by the principle of subsidiarity in that issues specific to a Community Board should be dealt with and decided on within the affected locality (subject to metropolitan and network implications).\(^3\)

If a Community Board considers a particular decision is better made at the community board level, it may ask for a report to the Council regarding the delegation of that particular decision.

The Community Board may refer any decision it has been delegated to the Council for decision if it chooses to do so.

The Council is not entitled to rescind or amend a final decision made under a delegation to a Community Board.

When exercising powers (either mandated or delegated) to make decisions, the appropriate decision-making process must be used, as indicated by the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy and the Local Government Act 2002.

**Community Board participation in Council decision making**

The Council will engage the Community Board early in the planning and development phase, at a point where the Community Board feedback can be utilised in the decision making process.

The Council will have particular regard to Community Board feedback on relevant significant policy and planning documents before the policies or plans are adopted by the Council as draft documents and notified for public comment.

From time to time, the Council may appoint Community Board representatives to committees, hearings panels and working parties.

Community Boards are able to make submissions on any Council consultation document that has been publicly notified, including where they have provided feedback during the development process.

Decisions on metropolitan projects or matters with city-wide implications across multiple ward boundaries will be made by the Council or a Council Committee.

Community boards will be engaged on metropolitan projects within their community board area.

**Long Term Plans and Annual Plans**

Community Boards will be given the opportunity to have input into the development of Long Term Plans and Annual Plans before the policies or plans are adopted by the Council as draft documents and notified for public comment.

Community Boards will be given the opportunity to have input into the city-wide approach to community consultation on Long Term Plans and Annual Plans as

---

\(^3\) A process for determining whether an issue is local or metropolitan is attached as Appendix 1 of this Agreement.

15 May 2019 HPRE 19/532312
well as informing bespoke local consultation in their community board area.

Community Board Plans

- Acknowledging that the Community Board engages with its local communities to develop a Community Board Plan:
  - The Council will regard the Community Board Plan as a key strategic document to be included in the preparation of Council planning and budgeting processes, including the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan; and
  - Council officers will work with community boards to ensure the specific deliverables of Community Board Plans align with Council’s Service Plans detailing levels of service.

Community consultation by other organisations

- Both parties will use reasonable endeavors to advise the other party when they become aware of any consultation affecting a Community Board area by an external organisation (for example central government or other local government authorities).

Operations, Administration and Support

- The Chief Executive Officer will ensure that Community Boards are provided with timely and robust information, support and advice to enable the Community Boards to make decisions and provide feedback.
- The Council and Community Boards will engage with and receive advice from staff on all matters needing a decision.
- Community Board concerns regarding operational performance will be communicated to the relevant General Manager in the first instance and subsequently to the Council’s Chief Executive Officer if not resolved.
- Appropriate training and development will be provided for councillors and community board members, on an ongoing basis, to ensure they have the necessary skills to undertake their governance and policy making responsibilities.
- Community Board Chairs will present the community board reports to the Council on a monthly basis.
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- The Mayor may attend meetings of the Community Board Chairs, as appropriate.

**Review of Agreement**

- This Agreement and the Delegations Register will be reviewed within six months following the triennial local election.

**Administration**

- The Chief Executive Officer is responsible for the administration of this Agreement.

**Authority**

This Agreement is signed on this ______ day of _________ 2019 by the following:

Lianne Dalziel  
Mayor  
Christchurch City Council

[Chairperson’s Name]  
Chairperson  
[NAME] Community Board
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Appendix 1

Local and Metropolitan decisions (decision making process)

Issues specific to a Community Board should be dealt with and decided on within the affected locality, rather than by the Council as a whole (examples include, community facilities, community parks and board funding.)

However, a question may arise about whether an issue is inherently local or has implications beyond the boundaries of a Community Board, i.e. metropolitan. In this situation, the allocation of decision making responsibilities will be determined in accordance with the following principles (similar to those established for Local Boards in the Auckland Council district):

- decision making responsibility for a non-regulatory activity of the Council particular to a Community Board area should be exercised by the Community Board (local decisions); or
- by the Council (metropolitan decisions) if the nature of the activity is such that decision-making on a district-wide basis will better promote the interests of all communities, having regard to the following factors -
  - the impact of the decision (will it extend beyond the Community Board area); and/or
  - effective decision making (will the decision require alignment or integration with other decisions that are the responsibility of the Council); and/or
  - the benefits of a consistent or coordinated approach in the Council’s district (will these outweigh the benefits of reflecting the particular needs and preferences of the communities within the Community Board area); and/or
  - the significance of the activity (as assessed in accordance with the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy).

If the allocation of decision making responsibilities becomes an issue to be dealt with by application of the principles referred to above, it must first be raised with the General Manager responsible for the activity proposed. Any recommendations to be made will be approved by the Executive Leadership Team before being considered by the Council, which will decide whether or not a matter should be dealt with by the Council as a whole, rather than a Community Board.
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Attachment B

PART D – SUB-PART 1 - COMMUNITY BOARDS

The Council delegates to its Community Boards the responsibilities, duties, and powers set out below.

The ‘General Comments’ section at page 2 of this Register refers to those responsibilities, duties, and powers that cannot be delegated.

Any decisions made by a Community Board must be consistent with policies, procedures, standards or resolutions adopted or made by the Council (whether or not referred to in the delegations).

The delegations reflect the Council’s view that issues specific to a Community Board should be dealt with and decided on within the affected locality, rather than by the Council as a whole (examples include community facilities, community parks, and board funding).

However, a question may arise about whether an issue is inherently local or has implications beyond the boundaries of a Community Board (ie metropolitan). In this situation, the allocation of decision-making responsibilities will be determined in accordance with the following principles (similar to those established for Local Boards in the Auckland Council district):

1. decision-making responsibility for a non-regulatory activity of the Council within a Community Board area should be exercised by the Community Board (local decisions); or

2. by the Council (metropolitan decisions) if the nature of the activity is such that decision-making on a district-wide basis will better promote the interests of all communities, having regard to the following factors –

   • the impact of the decision (will it extend beyond the Community Board area); and/or

   • effective decision-making (will the decision require alignment or integration with other decisions that are the responsibility of the Council); and/or

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.  
New delegations are in red text.  
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.  
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• the benefits of a consistent or co-ordinated approach in the Council’s district (will these outweigh the benefits of reflecting the particular needs and preferences of the communities within the Community Board area); and/or

• the significance of the activity (as assessed in accordance with the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy).

If the allocation of decision-making responsibilities becomes an issue to be dealt with by application of the principles referred to above, it must first be raised with the General Manager responsible for the activity proposed. Any recommendations to be made will be approved by the Executive Leadership Team before being considered by the Council, which will decide whether or not a matter should be dealt with by the Council as a whole, rather than a Community Board.

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.

New delegations are in red text.

Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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1. COMMUNITY GRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Communities Fund</td>
<td>Determine the allocation of the local Strengthening Communities Fund (being an amount determined by the Council) for each community.</td>
<td>Allocations must be consistent with any policies, standards or criteria adopted by the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Response Fund</td>
<td>Determine the allocation of the local Discretionary Response Fund (being an amount determined by the Council) for each community.</td>
<td>Allocations must be consistent with any policies, standards or criteria adopted by the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Fund does not cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Legal challenges or Environment Court challenges against the Council, Council Controlled Organisations or Community Boards decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Projects or initiatives that change the scope of a Council project.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Projects or initiatives that will lead to ongoing operational costs to the Council.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Note: that Community Boards can recommend to the Council that it consider a grant for this purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Grants Funds</td>
<td>Determine the final funding decisions from the Small Grants Fund (being an amount determined by the Council) for each community.</td>
<td>Allocations must be consistent with any policies, standards or criteria adopted by the Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.
New delegations are in red text.
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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## 2. APPOINTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegate</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Banks Peninsula Community Board | Appoint a member of the Community Board, or other person, to the following bodies, as the Council’s representative (or one of the Council’s representatives) on that body, and in the case of the Orton Bradley Park Trust Board, three members of the Community Board, or other persons as the Council’s representatives:  
- Diamond Harbour and Districts’ Health Support Group  
- Lyttelton Museum  
- Halswell River Rating District Committee  
- Okains Bay Maori and Colonial Museum Trust  
- Orton Bradley Park Trust Board (3) being 1 person representing the Akaroa Subdivision, 1 person representing the Mt Herbert Subdivision, and 1 person representing the Lyttelton Subdivision. | |
| Banks Peninsula Community Board | Appoint a member to the Rural Canterbury Primary Health Organisation and the Banks Peninsula Pest Liaison Committee, as the Council’s representative on those bodies. | |
| Banks Peninsula Community Board | Appoint a member to the Summit Road Protection Authority as the Council’s representative under section 7(1)(b) of the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001. | |
| Banks Peninsula Community Board | To make a recommendation to the Minister of Conservation on an appointment of a representative on the Pohatu Marine Reserve Advisory Committee. | |

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.  
New delegations are in red text.  
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegate</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Halswell-Hornby-
  Riccarton
  Community
  Board and
  the
  Fendalton-
  Waimairi
  Community
  Board, jointly | To make one appointment to the Selwyn District Council Water Race Subcommittee. |  |
| Coastal-
  Burwood
  Community
  Board | To appoint the Council’s representatives(s) to the Community Liaison Committee under regulation 34(2)(b) of the Oranga Tamariki (Residential Care) Regulations 1996 to **Te Oranga Care and Protection Residence** in Christchurch. |  |
| Halswell-Hornby-
  Riccarton
  Community
  Board | To appoint the Council’s representatives(s) to the Community Liaison Committee under regulation 34(2)(b) of the Oranga Tamariki (Residential Care) Regulations 1996 to **Te Poutama Ārahi Rangatahi (Harmful Sexual Behavior programme)** in Christchurch. |  |

3. **AWARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Community Awards, and all awards initiated by Community Boards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.
New delegations are in red text.
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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4. SUBMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The power to make submissions on behalf of the Council, on applications for resource consents, to other territorial authorities or the Canterbury Regional Council, where the application is of particular concern to the local community.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. COMMUNITY FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To approve site selection and to approve the final design of new local community facilities (for example community halls, volunteer libraries, club rooms, public toilets).</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any financial decisions are subject to the maximum of what is approved in the current LTP/Annual Plan and associated cost centre budgets.</td>
<td>This delegation does not include community facilities that have network or citizen hub implications. For example swimming pools, libraries, and multi-use service centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To approve alterations and additions to the design of existing local community facilities (for example community halls, volunteer libraries, club rooms, public toilets).</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.
New delegations are in red text.
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To the Papanui-Innes Community Board authority to make decisions regarding the rebuild and future management of the Shirley Community Centre at either 10 Shirley Road or any other selected site.</td>
<td>Any financial decisions are subject to the maximum of what is approved in the current LTP/Annual Plan and associated cost centre budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board authority to make decisions regarding the rebuild of the Woolston Volunteer Library and Community Centre within the Annual Plan budget of $1.6 million and future management in accordance with the Council’s strategic approach.</td>
<td>This delegation does not include community facilities that have network or citizen hub implications. For example swimming pools, libraries, and multi-use service centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated future decision making for unfunded items within the QEII Park Master Plan, to the Coastal/Burwood Community Board, subject to funding becoming available in the 2021 Long Term Plan or any other funding source.</td>
<td>This delegation does not preclude the Community Board or the community from seeking external funds to support this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.  
New delegations are in red text.  
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.  
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6. PARKS AND RESERVES

Note that parks and reserves can be held and managed under different legal arrangements. The delegations for landscape development plans, and floodlights on sports parks cover both parks and reserves. There are specific delegations for reserves held under the Reserves Act 1977, and similar delegations for parks (ie a park has the meaning given to that term in section 138(2) of the Local Government Act 2002).

The Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board does not have delegated authority to determine the matters in this Part 6 for the area situated within the Central City Area marked on Plan A attached. Reports on these matters must come directly to the Council.

Landscape development plans for parks and reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve and adopt any new landscape development plans for parks and reserves provided the design is within the policy and budget set by the Council.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This delegation does not include replacement renewal projects or programmes that do not create material modifications to the park or reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve the location of, and construction of, or alteration or addition to, any structure or area on parks and reserves provided the matter is within the policy and budget set by the Council.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.
New delegations are in red text.
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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Installation of floodlights on sports parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To decide on the installation of floodlights on sports parks (whether the sports park is located on a park or reserve).</td>
<td>Subject to the Council obtaining the necessary resource consents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Burial and Cremation Act 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To name local cemeteries, and to change the name of local cemeteries in accordance with this section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reserves Act 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>To declare any land vested in the Christchurch City Council to be a reserve subject to any conditions specified in the resolution, to be held for any of the purposes specified in sections 17 to 23.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated. Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>To determine to exchange land comprised in any reserve or any part or parts thereof for any other land to be held for the purposes of that reserve.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.

New delegations are in red text.

Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>To classify any reserve according to its primary or principal purpose as defined in sections 17 to 23.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16(10)</td>
<td>To determine the name of any reserve, and to determine the change of name of any reserve.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>To determine to change the purpose for which a reserve is classified.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated. Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24A</td>
<td>To determine to change the purpose for which a reserve is classified.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated. Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>To exercise all the powers of the Council as administering body under section 41 with respect to reserve management plans.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated. Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text. 
New delegations are in red text. 
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>To determine to plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves within the policy set by the Council and in accordance with this section. This delegation does not include the removal of structurally unsound and unhealthy trees, trees causing damage to infrastructure or other safety concerns where there is no viable alternative other than to remove the tree.</td>
<td>Staff are delegated the power to remove on reserves, parks, and open spaces structurally unsound and unhealthy trees, trees causing damage to infrastructure or other safety concerns where there is no viable alternative other than to remove the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>To grant rights of way and other easements in accordance with this section.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated. Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels). Excludes the delegation given to staff in respect of proposed easements over land required to be vested in the Council as reserve on deposit of a subdivision plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48A</td>
<td>To grant licences, in accordance with this section, (a) to erect, maintain, and use buildings, dwellings, masts, and other structures, and plant and machinery; and (b) to construct, maintain, and use tracks and engage in other works. To exercise all the powers of the Council as administering body under section 48A.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated. Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.  
New delegations are in red text.  
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>To grant leases of recreation reserves in accordance with this section.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated. Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>To grant leases and licences of scenic reserves in accordance with this section.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated. Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58A</td>
<td>To grant leases and licences of historic reserves in accordance with this section.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated. Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>To grant leases of local purpose reserves in accordance with this section.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>To grant leases of recreation reserve (for farming, grazing, afforestation, and other purposes) in accordance with this section.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated. Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text. New delegations are in red text. Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>To grant licences of Council reserves in accordance with this section where the staff delegation does not apply.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated. Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>To afforest, or enter into a contract on behalf of the Council for the afforestation of a reserve or part of a reserve in accordance with this section.</td>
<td>Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>To agree to variations of leases and licences in accordance with this section, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>To agree to transfers, subleases and mortgages or other disposals of leases and licences in accordance with this section, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Authority to grant extensions of leases or licences of reserves to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Authority to agree to the cancellation or surrender of leases or licences of reserves to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Authority to administer and enforce the terms and conditions of leases or licences of reserves to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text. New delegations are in red text. Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Authority to give (or decline) consent as landlord to any matter or request made by tenants/licensees under leases or licences of reserves to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parks**

*The following delegations apply to parks. “Park” has the meaning given to that term in section 138(2) of the Local Government Act 2002.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopt, review and amend</strong> management plans.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excludes the hearing and determining of submissions/objections (refer Delegations Register Part D Sub-Part 4 Council Hearings Panels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To grant leases or licences for a maximum term of 35 years to any person or body over parks, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to grant extensions of leases or licences of parks to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.
New delegations are in red text.
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority to enter into variations of leases or licences of parks to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>The length of the term including extensions must be 35 years or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to give (or decline) consent to the assignment of leases or licences of parks to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to agree to the cancellation or surrender of leases or licences of parks to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to administer and enforce the terms and conditions of leases or licences of parks to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to give (or decline) consent as landlord to any matter or request made by tenants/licensees under leases or licences of parks to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine to plant, maintain and remove trees on parks within the policy set by the Council.</td>
<td>Staff are delegated the power to remove on reserves, parks, and open spaces structurally unsound and unhealthy trees, trees causing damage to infrastructure or other safety concerns where there is no viable alternative other than to remove the tree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.
New delegations are in red text.
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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### Christchurch City Council Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>The powers of the Council as it relates to restricted parking areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4 and 13.5</td>
<td>To determine any reserve where model aircraft which are radio-controlled and either battery or electric-powered may not be flown.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To subsequently amend or revoke any such resolution made under clause 13.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Christchurch City Council Marine, River, and Lake Facilities Bylaw 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15     | • To resolve a permanent no fishing zone to protect the facility from damage, to protect health and safety, or to protect against nuisance.  
• To amend or revoke any such resolution |             |

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.  
New delegations are in red text.  
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
7. ROADS AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CONTROLS

In this part 2, “road” has the meaning given to that term in section 315 of the Local Government Act 1974.

The Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board does not have delegated authority to determine the matters in this Part 7 for the area situated within the Central City Area marked on Plan A attached. Reports on these matters must come directly to the Council or the Parking Restrictions Subcommittee, as the case may be.

Local Government Act 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>319(1)(d)</td>
<td>To divert or alter the course of any road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319(1)(e)</td>
<td>To increase or diminish the width of any road subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the district plan, if any, and to the Local Government Act 1974 and any other Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319(1)(f)</td>
<td>To determine what part of a road shall be a carriageway, and what part a footpath or cycle track only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319(j)</td>
<td>To name and to alter the name of any road and to place on any building or erection on or abutting on any road a plate bearing the name of the road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>To approve concept/landscape plans for forming or upgrading footpaths, kerbs and channels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>To construct, remove, or alter- • pedestrian safety areas; • grass plots or flower beds or trees; • facilities for the safety, health, or convenience of the public, or for the control of traffic or the enforcement of traffic laws. For example, and without limitation includes, stop signs, give way signs, left and right turning</td>
<td>This power excludes the installation or removal of traffic lights (ie traffic signals). The Council makes decisions on the installation or removal of traffic lights. This power excludes the power to install, remove, or alter non-regulatory road markings, which are delegated to staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.
New delegations are in red text.
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>filters, one lane bridge traffic restrictions and one lane narrowing traffic restrictions, pedestrian crossings and associated infrastructure (including zebra pedestrian crossings, school patrol including kea crossings) roundabouts, traffic islands, buildouts, chicanes, and other traffic restraints. This power also includes street renewals.</td>
<td>Tree planting must be within the policy of the Council. Staff are delegated the power to remove structurally unsound and unhealthy trees, trees causing damage to infrastructure or other safety concerns where there is no viable alternative other than to remove the tree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335(3)</td>
<td>To enquire into and make a decision regarding objections relating to notices issued pursuant to section 335(1) (relates to vehicle crossings).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339(1)</td>
<td>To erect a shelter for use by intending public-transport passengers or taxi passengers.</td>
<td>Any objections will be heard by a hearings panel. The hearings panel will make recommendations to the Community Board and the Community Board will determine the outcome of the objections in accordance with section 339.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road stopping</td>
<td>1. That the Council’s power to accept or decline an application from either a Council business unit or from any other person to stop legal road which does not fall within the delegation given to the Corporate Support Unit Manager under paragraph (b) (of the Road Stopping Policy resolution of the Council dated 9 April 2009) shall be delegated to the Community Board for the ward within which the legal road proposed to be stopped is situated.</td>
<td>This delegation must be read in conjunction with the Christchurch City Council Road Stopping Policy and the Council resolution of 9 April 2009 relating to the Road Stopping Policy and associated delegations. The delegation to the Corporate Services Unit Manager is to be exercised by the Manager Property Consultancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. That where the Community Board’s delegated authority under paragraph 1 above applies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) That the Council’s powers under sections 116, 117 and 120 of the Public Works Act 1981 and Sections 319(h), 342(1)(a) and 345 of the Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text. New delegations are in red text. Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government Act 1974 (excluding the power to hear objections and recommend to the Council whether the Council should allow or otherwise any objections received to road stopping procedures pursuant to the Tenth Schedule of the Local Government Act 1974 and the Council’s powers under paragraph 5 of the Tenth Schedule) in relation to road stopping and the disposal of land that was previously stopped road be delegated to the Community Board for the Ward within which the proposed legal road is situated and to be exercised in accordance with the Council’s Road Stopping Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) That the power to determine (in compliance with the Council’s Road Stopping Policy) which statutory procedure should be employed to undertake a particular road stopping (either under the Local Government Act 1974 or under the Public Works Act 1981) be delegated to the Community Board for the Ward within which the proposed legal road is situated and to be exercised in accordance with the Council’s Road Stopping Policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Land Transport Rule- Traffic Control Devices 2004 (Rule 54002)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3(1)</td>
<td>To authorise the Board of Trustees of a school to appoint appropriately trained persons to act as school patrols.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.

*New delegations are in red text.*  
*Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.*
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### Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7      | • Prohibiting or restricting the stopping, standing or parking of vehicles, or any class of vehicles, on any road; or  
        • Limiting the stopping, standing or parking of vehicles on any road to any class of vehicles.  
        • Prescribing any conditions under clause 7.  
        Note Community Boards have the delegated authority to approve exemptions to the installation or maintenance of parking limit lines for private driveways where the proposed installation falls outside Council Policy – See the Kerbside Parking Limit Lines Policy. | Excludes the powers that have been given to the Parking Restrictions Subcommittee. |
| 8      | • Designating an area to be a zone parking area and the restrictions that apply in that zone parking area ("zone parking controls"); and  
        • Reserving any area of land or any road or any part of a road to be a parking place, subject to restrictions; and  
        • Specifying the vehicles or classes of vehicle that can use or must not use a parking place or zone parking area; and  
        • Prescribing the restrictions that apply including (without limitation) the times, manner and other conditions for the parking of vehicles or classes of vehicles in a parking place or zone parking area.  
        • Making provision for the efficient management and control of a parking place or zone parking area. | Excludes the powers that have been given to the Parking Restrictions Subcommittee. |
| 9(4)   | • Resolving a temporary discontinuance of a parking place. | Excludes the powers that have been given to the Parking Restrictions Subcommittee. |

1 Clause 6 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 applies to all resolutions of the community boards.

---

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.  
New delegations are in red text.  
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10      | • Reserving any specified parking place or places as -  
          (a) a residents’ only parking area for the exclusive use of persons who reside in the vicinity; or  
          (b) a residents’ exemption parking area for the use of persons who reside in the vicinity.  
          • Prescribing which parking, stopping and standing restrictions permit holders are exempt from within a residents’ exemption parking area.  
          Excludes the powers that have been given to the Parking Restrictions Subcommittee. |
| 11      | Allows motor vehicles to stop, stand, or park in that part of the road in contravention of clause 11(1) or 11(2).  
          Excludes the powers that have been given to the Parking Restrictions Subcommittee. |
| 17      | • Prohibiting or restricting turning movements, including -  
          (a) vehicles or classes of vehicles on any road from turning to the right, or to the left, or from proceeding in any other direction; and  
          (b) vehicles turning from facing or travelling in one direction to facing or travelling in the opposite direction (performing a U-turn) on specified roads.  
          • Specifying the hours or days of the week that a restricted turning movement may be made (if any). |
| 19      | • Prohibiting or restricting, subject to such conditions as the Board thinks fit, any specified class of traffic or any specified motor vehicles or class of vehicle that, by reason of its size or nature or the nature of the goods carried, is unsuitable for use on any road or roads. |
| 20      | • Specifying any road or part of a road to be a shared zone, and  
          (a) whether the shared zone may be used by specified classes of vehicles;  
          (b) the days and hours of operation of the shared zone (if they differ from 24 hours per day, 7 days per week); and |

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.  
New delegations are in red text.  
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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(c) any other restrictions on how the shared zone is to be used by the public, including how traffic and pedestrians will interact.

21
- Determining the length, route and/or location of a shared path; and
- Determining priority for users on a shared path.

22
- Restricting the use of motor vehicles on unformed legal roads for the purposes of protecting, or the road and adjoining land, or the safety of road users.

Christchurch City Council Stock on Roads Bylaw 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, and powers etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5(A)(1) and (2)</td>
<td>- To resolve any road, section of road, or category of road to be a Restricted Road for the movement of stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To amend or revoke any such resolution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.
New delegations are in red text.
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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8. SALE AND SUPPLY OF ALCOHOL

General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities, duties, powers etc.</th>
<th>Limits etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To appoint one or more members of each Community Board to appear and be heard under section 204(2)(b) of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012, for the purpose of providing community input.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.
New delegations are in red text.
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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Plan A

Note: Existing delegations are in black text.
New delegations are in red text.
Re-worded delegations are in blue text – NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.
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Attachment C

AMENDMENTS TO STAFF AND SUBCOMMITTEE DELEGATIONS AS SET OUT BELOW

Delegation to the CEO and staff

Page 74, Part B - Sub-Part 3
20. Parks / Trees etc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>CEO</th>
<th>GMCC</th>
<th>HOP</th>
<th>HOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These delegations may be sub-delegated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To approve intrusions or not allow intrusions through recession planes of buildings adjoining parks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To grant or decline permits (other than leases or licences) for activities on reserves.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To require bonds for any use on Council parks property.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make decisions on the siting of floodlights on sports parks, noting the appropriate community board would have decided on the installation of those floodlights.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Delegations to Other Council Committees and Subcommittees

Page 160, Part D, Sub-Part 3

3. Parking Restrictions Subcommittee

Delegate the following responsibilities, duties, and powers to the Parking Restrictions Subcommittee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With respect to that area of the Central Business District of Christchurch shown on Plan A (inclusive of both sides of the street marking the boundary), and whether it relates to “on-street” or “off-street”, under clause 9(4), resolving a temporary discontinuance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to that area of the Central Business District of Christchurch shown on Plan A (inclusive of both sides of the street marking the boundary), and whether it relates to “on-street” or “off-street”, under clause 10:

(a) Reserving any specified parking place or places as –
   (i) residents’ only parking area for the exclusive use of persons who reside in the vicinity; or
   (ii) a residents’ exemption parking area for the use of persons who reside in the vicinity.

(b) Prescribing:
   (i) any fees to be paid annually or in any other specified manner, for the use of a residents’ parking area or a residents’ exemption parking area; and
   (ii) the manner by which any such fees may be paid for the use of a residents’ parking area or a residents’ exemption area; and
   (iii) which parking, stopping and standing restrictions permit holders are exempt from within a residents’ exemption parking area.
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Delegations to Council Hearings Panels

Page 164-5, Part D, Sub-Part 4

7. Reserves Act 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Date Amended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>To hear and determine submissions and objections, <em>and to make recommendations</em> in relation to the declaration of land as a reserve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>To hear and determine submissions and objections, <em>and to make recommendations</em> in relation to the exchange of reserves for other land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 and 24A</td>
<td>To hear and determine submissions and objections, <em>and to make recommendations</em> in relation to the change of classification or purpose or revocation of a reserve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>To hear and determine submissions and objections, <em>and to make recommendations</em> in relation to the preparation, review and change of management plans for reserves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>To hear and determine submissions and objections, <em>and to make recommendations</em> in relation to the granting of rights of way and other easements over reserves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48A</td>
<td>To hear and determine submissions and objections, <em>and to make recommendations</em> in relation to the granting of licences on reserves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54, 56, 58A, 73, and 74</td>
<td>To hear and determine submissions and objections, <em>and to make recommendations</em> in relation to the granting of leases or licences of reserves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>To hear and determine submissions and objections, <em>and to make recommendations</em> in relation to the afforestation of reserves by the Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Delegations to Officer Subcommittees

Page 168, Part D Sub-Part 5

1. Reserves Officer Subcommittee

Members

Head of Parks
Manager Property Consultancy
Head of Three Waters and Waste

Quorum = any 2 members

5. Reserves Act 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Delegation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>The authority to approve or otherwise easements over land to be vested in the Council as reserve as a result of subdivision where section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977 does not require public notice to be given.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The power to enter into:

(a) Conservation covenants pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 for the protection or enhancement of riparian areas, wetlands and some other areas of actual or potential conservation values; and
(b) Voluntary esplanade strips for the protection or enhancement of natural values associated with riparian land.

These delegations are subject to the following conditions:

(a) The power be exercisable by any two of the three Subcommittee members signing the conservation covenant deed or instrument for esplanade strips;
(b) The Subcommittee report to the Council on a six-monthly basis with details of the number of conservation covenants and voluntary esplanade strips entered into in the previous six-month period and the key details of each covenant, and esplanade strip.

To appoint its own chairperson (if not already appointed by the Council).
## Analysis of Proposed Community Board Delegations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banks Peninsula Community Board</td>
<td>Clarifies some issues with the current delegation and the reference to subdivisions in the Banks Peninsula ward.</td>
<td>Clear up some confusion with the current delegation.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility over all CCC related appointments.</td>
<td>Only one report to the Community Board required so process could be more efficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orton Bradley Park Trust Board (3) being 1 person representing the Akaroa Subdivision, 1 person representing the Mt Herbert Subdivision, and 1 person representing the Lyttelton Subdivision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks Peninsula Community Board</td>
<td>Decision about appointment for “Banks Peninsula District Council” (as referred to in the statute) should rest with local representatives</td>
<td>Decision made at local level. (Council still appoints the member representing Christchurch City Council (as referred to in the statute).</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility over all CCC related appointments.</td>
<td>Requires a report to the Council as well as a report to Community Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint a member to the Summit Road Protection Authority as the Council’s representative under section 7(1)(b) of the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001.</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
<td>Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal-Burwood Community Board</td>
<td>Recently appointed by Council and suggestion that this should be decided by each Community Board as particular to each Community Board</td>
<td>Decision about appointment for a local service rests with local representatives.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility over all CCC related appointments.</td>
<td>Neutral in terms of process as either appointment made by Council (report required) or Community Board (report required).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board</td>
<td>Recently appointed by Council and suggestion that this should be decided by each Community Board as particular to each Community Board</td>
<td>Decision about appointment for a local service rests with local representatives.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility over all CCC related appointments.</td>
<td>Neutral in terms of process as either appointment made by Council (report required) or Community Board (report required).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To approve site selection and the final design of new local community facilities (for example community halls, volunteer libraries, club rooms, public toilets.)</td>
<td>Allow for decisions about new local community facilities to be made by each Community Board. Will not include community facilities that have network or citizen hub implications.</td>
<td>Allows local representatives to determine the site and design of new local community facilities.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility over new community facilities.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions are already referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To approve the alterations and additions to the design of existing local</td>
<td>Allow for decisions about changes to existing local community facilities to be made by each Community Board. Will not include community facilities that have network or citizen hub implications.</td>
<td>Allows local representatives to determine changes to any local community facilities.</td>
<td>Council does not have final say or visibility over alterations/additions to existing community facilities.</td>
<td>Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community facilities (for example community halls, volunteer libraries, club</td>
<td>rooms, public toilets.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions are already referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve and adopt any new landscape development plans for parks and reserves</td>
<td>Community Boards have a variety of delegations in relation to parks and reserves, and this includes: Power to approve the location of, and construction of, or alteration or addition to, any structure or area, and the design of landscape plans for the same, on reserves, parks and roads, provided the design is within the policy and budget set by the Council. The current delegation does not accurately capture the nature of the current documents presented to Community Boards.</td>
<td>Improves the wording of the current delegation to accurately reflect the documents presented to Community Boards.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility over landscape development plans.</td>
<td>Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This power may not be sub-delegated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should speed up the decision making process as there does not need to be a specific analysis about whether the Community Board has a delegation to decide on development plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To make decisions on the installation of floodlights on sports parks (subject to the necessary resource consents).</td>
<td>To provide that Community Boards are the sole decision-maker in respect of the siting of floodlights on sports parks.</td>
<td>Will speed up the decision-making process (Currently the decision is made by staff after consultation with community boards).</td>
<td>Council management will lose the final say on consent to the location of floodlights.</td>
<td>Currently staff must write a report to the Community Board for the Community Board to then make a recommendation for staff to act on. It will be simpler if the decision sits with the Community Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7, Burial and Cremation Act 1964</td>
<td>To provide community boards with the power to make decision about cemetery names.</td>
<td>Decision about cemetery names rests with local representatives.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on the names of city cemeteries.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance. Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time. Would not be a frequently used delegation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 16(2A) Reserves Act 1977</td>
<td>Provide that Community Boards will be the final decision-maker on the classification of reserves.</td>
<td>Will speed up the decision-making process.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on the classification of a reserve.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions are already referred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To classify any reserve according to its primary or principal purpose as defined in sections 17 to 23.</td>
<td>Note that Community Boards have a wide range of delegations in relation to reserves under the Reserves Act 1977 (for example changing a classification) but do not have the delegation to decide on the classification. The matter is considered by the Board first before being decided by the Council. For a recent example <a href="http://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2018/09/HHRB_2018_0925_AGN_2493_AT_WEB.htm">http://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2018/09/HHRB_2018_0925_AGN_2493_AT_WEB.htm</a> (Opouria Park)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance. Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Section 16(10) Reserves Act 1977 | To determine the name of any reserve, and to determine the change of name of any reserve. | Provide that Community Boards will be the final decision-maker on the naming of reserves. Staff recall the Mayor asking for this to be given to the Boards when considering a report for the naming of a reserve. The matter had been through the Board first. For a recent example [http://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2018/09/HHRB_2018_0925_AGN_2493_AT_WEB.htm](http://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2018/09/HHRB_2018_0925_AGN_2493_AT_WEB.htm) | Will speed up the decision-making process. Council does not have the final say or visibility on the naming of a reserve. | Little change in actual process because these decisions are already referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance. Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Opouria Park)</td>
<td>At present, the Community Boards have the delegation to grant leases of reserves but they do not have the authority to grant extensions of leases, and therefore these matters need to be determined by the Council, ordinarily after being considered by the relevant Board.</td>
<td>Will speed up the decision-making process.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on a lease extension.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance. Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority to agree to the cancellation or surrender of leases or licences of reserves to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</strong></td>
<td>As above. If Community Boards have the power to grant leases they should also have the power to determine lease related matters. For a recent example see South Brighton Surf Club Surrender and Granting of Lease and Licence <a href="http://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2018/11/CNCL_20181101_AGN_2385_AT_WEB.htm">http://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2018/11/CNCL_20181101_AGN_2385_AT_WEB.htm</a></td>
<td>Will speed up the decision-making process.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on a lease cancellation or surrender.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance. Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority to administer and enforce the terms and conditions of leases or licences of reserves to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</strong></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Will speed up the decision-making process.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on the enforcement of a lease.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
<td>Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to give (or decline) consent as landlord to any matter or request made by tenants/licensees under leases or licences of reserves to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>Will speed up the decision-making process.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on the giving of consent under a lease.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (as opposed to reserves)</td>
<td>Community boards currently have the delegation to grant leases for a maximum term of 20 years (less one day) to voluntary organisations over parks for the erection of pavilions and other buildings and structures associated with and necessary for the use of the land for outdoor sports games and other recreational activities. As well as the power to issue leases or licences for the carrying on of any trade, business or occupation on parks (excluding public road) for terms not exceeding five years and at rentals not exceeding $20,000.</td>
<td>Will speed up the decision-making process</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on longer terms of leases or leases of a higher value.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance. Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 May 2019 HPRE 19/188333
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks (as opposed to reserves) Authority to grant extensions of leases or licences of parks to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation</td>
<td>At present, the Community Boards have the delegation to grant leases of parks but they do not have the authority to grant extensions of leases, and therefore these matters need to be determined by the Council, ordinarily after being considered by the relevant Board.</td>
<td>Will speed up the decision-making process.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on a lease extension.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance. Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (as opposed to reserves) Authority to enter into variations of leases or licences of parks to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation</td>
<td>At present, the Community Boards have the delegation to grant leases of parks but the authority to grant variations of leases for parks is unclear.</td>
<td>Will speed up decision-making process and provide clarity as to the delegation.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say on or visibility of lease variations to parks.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (as opposed to reserves) Authority to give (or decline consent) to the assignment of leases or licences of parks to other parties and the authorise</td>
<td>At present Community Boards have the power to grant assignments of leases of reserves but not the corresponding delegation to</td>
<td>Will speed up decision-making process and provide clarity as to the delegation.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility of assignments of leases of parks.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>grant assignments of leases of parks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recommendation in the first instance. Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (as opposed to reserves) Authority to agree to the cancellation or surrender of leases or licences of parks to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation.</td>
<td>As above. If Community Boards have the power to grant leases they should also have the power to determine lease related matters such as cancellation or surrender</td>
<td>Will speed up the decision-making process.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on a lease cancellation or surrender.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance. Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (as opposed to reserves) Authority to administer and enforce the terms and conditions of leases or licences of parks to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Will speed up the decision-making process.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on the enforcement of a lease.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (as opposed to reserves) Authority to give (or decline) consent as landlord to any</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>Will speed up the decision-making process.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on the giving of consent under a lease.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>matter or request made by tenants/licensees under leases or licences of parks to other parties, and to authorise staff to sign all required documentation</td>
<td>To provide Community Boards with the power to make decisions about the use of model aircraft on Council parks and reserves.</td>
<td>Decision about use of parks and reserves rests with local representatives.</td>
<td>Council does not have the final say or visibility on use of parks and reserves</td>
<td>This matter is currently decided by Council. This would not be a frequently used delegation. Note that drones are covered by the Council’s Drones policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2016 (clauses 13.4 and 13.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine any reserve where model aircraft which are radio-controlled and either battery or electric-powered may not be flown. To subsequently amend or revoke any such resolution made under clause 13.4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 8.3(1) Land Transport Rule - Traffic Control Devices 2004 (Rule 54002)</td>
<td>To provide that Community boards will also resolve to authorise the Board of Trustees of a school to appoint appropriately trained persons to act as school patrols.</td>
<td>Community boards will be able to pass all required resolutions for the implementation of kea crossings.</td>
<td>None. From efficiency and effectiveness no real reason why Council should be deciding this matter.</td>
<td>Will mean a shorter decision-making process because will not need to go through a Board report. Community Boards currently decide the placement of kea crossings but the Land Transport Rules require an authorisation from the Council to appoint school patrols. A separate report is drafted for Council to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCC Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 (clause 9(4))</td>
<td>To resolve a temporary discontinuance of a parking place</td>
<td>Decisions about car-parking on streets rest with local representatives.</td>
<td>No perceived disadvantage. From efficiency and effectiveness no real reason why Council should be deciding this matter.</td>
<td>Little change in actual process because these decisions would already be referred to Community Boards for a recommendation in the first instance. Will mean a shorter decision-making process and incur less staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Restrictions Subcommittee will have delegated authority to decide this matter in Plan A Area</td>
<td>Corresponding exclusion for Plan A Area is consistent with other parking delegations to Parking Restrictions Subcommittee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify in the existing delegations to Council Hearings Panels under the Reserves Act 1977 that Hearings Panels make recommendations to the Community Boards</td>
<td>There has been some confusion about the meaning of the words “to hear and determine submissions and objections”. This change will clarify the matter.</td>
<td>This change will put the matter beyond doubt.</td>
<td>No perceived disadvantage. This change codifies the current practice.</td>
<td>There should be little change in actual practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 48 Reserves Act 1977</td>
<td>Revoke the delegation to the Reserves Officer Subcommittee about the authority to approve easements over land to be vested in Council as reserve as a</td>
<td>Will remove confusion about the decision-maker. Saves the need for writing reports to a subcommittee when a decision is already able to be made by staff.</td>
<td>No perceived disadvantages.</td>
<td>In reality there should be little change in actual practice as staff are already exercising their existing delegations in Part B of the Delegations Register.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 May 2019 HPRE 19/188333
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>result of a subdivision where section 48 does not require public notice to be given.</td>
<td>the Council as part of a subdivision takes place at the subdivision consenting stage (in consultation with the relevant professional staff in Three Waters and Parks);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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17. Community Organisation Loan Scheme - Burnside Rugby Club
Reference: 19/555993
Presenter(s): Sam Callander, Community Funding Team Leader

1. Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide relevant information and a recommendation to the Council on an application from Burnside Rugby Club Inc. to the Council’s Community Organisation Loans Scheme.

2. Executive Summary
2.1 Burnside Rugby Club is undertaking earthquake strengthening to their clubrooms and has requested a loan of $75,000 for this purpose. Based on financial analysis of the club, staff recommend the Council approving a 10 year loan of $75,000.

3. Staff Recommendations
That the Council:
1. Receive the information in this report and the attached Community Loans Scheme decision matrix.
2. Approve a loan of $75,000 at the rate of 4.5% interest per annum, over a 10 year repayment term to Burnside Rugby Club Incorporated to undertake earthquake strengthening on their changing rooms.
3. Delegate authority to the Team Leader Community Funding to require security from Burnside Rugby Club Incorporated for repayment of the loan, and to implement such security arrangements on behalf of the Council.

4. Context/Background
Issue or Opportunity
4.1 The total amount of funding available in the Community Organisation Loan Scheme for new applicants as at 24 May 2019 is $2,012,592.
4.2 The total loan pool is $3,140,454 with the balance of all current loans at $1,127,862.
4.3 A schedule of all current outstanding Community Loans is attached as Attachment B.
4.4 The Community Organisation Loan Scheme is a revolving fund and distributions from the fund are dependent on all loan recipients being able to meet and service their debts as they fall due.
4.5 The Community Organisation Loan Scheme is a low-interest finance scheme designed to assist not-for-profit community organisations to improve or develop new or existing sport, recreation or community facilities and major projects. The loan interest rate is currently set at 4.5% per annum. The Council has the ability to award loan terms up to a maximum of ten years.
4.6 Decision matrix for a community loan to Burnside Rugby Club Inc. is provided to assist the Council in its deliberations. The matrix details the loan funding request and provides information, commentary and recommendations from staff. The matrix is attached as Attachment A.

**Strategic Alignment**

4.7 The decisions in this report relate to the Council’s Strategic Framework in that the facilities this loan would assist to build help the people of Christchurch connected rugby to achieve a strong sense of community, celebrating their identity through sport.

4.8 This report supports the Council's Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

4.8.1 Activity: Community Development and Facilities

- Level of Service: 2.3.1.1 Effectively administer the grants schemes for Council.

**Assessment of Significance and Engagement**

4.9 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy as this is an existing level of service.

**Key Points:**

4.10 Burnside Rugby Club is a 622 member rugby club on whose clubrooms and grounds are on Avonhead Rd.

4.11 The club is looking to undertake earthquake strengthening to their changing rooms increasing from 33% NBS to 100% NBS.

4.12 The club originally requested a Community Organisation Loan of $75,000.

4.13 The club is seeking support from its members through a debenture and confirms that the $100,000 target is attainable. The club has received an additional $81,000 from a single member towards the total cost of the project.

4.14 The club’s main source of revenue is through its licensed premises covering both summer and winter sporting codes. Average income over the past three years was circa $360,575 and expenses circa $377,001. Expenses include circa $22,768 of non-cash depreciation.

4.15 This provides the club approximately $6,342 of free cash a year before loan repayments.

4.16 Financial analysis indicates that the maximum the club can service is a $75,000 loan over 10 years; at 4.5% this would require quarterly payments of $2,339 or $9,355 per annum.

5. **Options Analysis**

**Options Considered**

5.1 The following reasonably practicable options were considered and are assessed in this report:

5.1.1 Approve a $75,000 10 year loan (Preferred option).

5.1.2 Decline the application.

**Options Descriptions**

5.2 **Preferred Option:** Approve a $75,000 10 year loan

5.2.1 **Option Description:** Approve a $75,000 loan over 10 years at 4.5% interest

5.2.2 **Option Advantages**
• Financial analysis indicates that the maximum the club can service is a $75,000 loan over 10 years; at 4.5% this would require quarterly payments of $2,339 or $9,355 per annum.

5.2.3 **Option Disadvantages**

• Disadvantages are limited to the low risk of non-repayment

**Analysis Criteria**

5.3 In assessing this application, the following information has been taken into consideration.

5.3.1 The Council’s Community Grants funding outcomes and funding priorities.

5.3.2 Alignment with the primary intent of the loans fund to support immediate capital expenditure requests to undertake capital purchases, development and improvements.

5.3.3 Ability to meet all debt servicing commitments as they fall due without compromising the operational and financial stability of the applicant organisation and without recourse to Council grants funding.

5.3.4 Risk to the Council and also to the applicant organisation.

5.3.5 Ability to provide appropriate security in return for loan undertakings.

6. **Community Views and Preferences**

6.1 Burnside Rugby Club has 622 members as well as 2,697 social and non-playing members representing a diverse population all of whom will benefit from earthquake strengthened clubrooms.

7. **Legal Implications**

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

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

8. **Risks**

8.1 That the club defaults on its loan, decreasing the fund available for Community Organisation Loans.

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Community Loans Matrix - Burnside Rugby Club</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>All Current Community Loans - 23 May 2019</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Confirmation of Statutory Compliance**

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

(a) This report contains:

(i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
(ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

**Signatories**

| Authors          | Sam Callander - Team Leader Community Funding  
|                 | Len Van Hout - Manager External Reporting & Governance |
| Approved By     | John Filsell - Head of Community Support, Governance and Partnerships  
|                 | Mary Richardson - General Manager Citizen and Community |
COUNCIL MEETING
13 JUNE 2019

COMMUNITY LOANS SCHEME DECISION MATRIX

Item No.: 17

Priority Rating

1
Meets all eligibility and criteria, contributes significantly to Funding Outcomes and Priorities and strongly satisfies the risk, debt servicing, alignment and security considerations. Strongly recommended for funding.

2
Meets all eligibility and criteria, contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities and satisfies the risk, debt servicing, alignment and security considerations. Recommended for funding.

3
Meets all eligibility and criteria, has minimum contribution to Funding Outcomes and Priorities and/or has minimal or no satisfactory coverage relating to risk, debt servicing, alignment and security considerations. Not recommended for funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Burnside Rugby Football Club (BRFC)</td>
<td>Earthquake strengthening work on clubrooms to bring them up to 100% of the building code to provide enabling benefit to members and the community for 35-50 years.</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$421,460</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources:

- Insurance Settlement: $165,740
- BRFC Member Contributions: $20,023 (including donations)
- Subtotal: $185,763
- CCC Community Loan: $75,000
- Total Funding for Project: $260,763

Recommendation:

That Council:

1) Approve a loan of $75,000 at the rate of 4.5% interest per annum, over a 10 year repayment term to Burnside Rugby Football Club to contribute towards earthquake strengthening of their clubrooms.

2) Delegate authority to the Team Leader Community Funding to require security from Burnside Rugby Football Club for repayment of the loan, and to implement such security arrangements and to offer early repayment options on behalf of the Council.

Financial History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Surplus (Deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$314,663</td>
<td>$336,678</td>
<td>($22,015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$370,618</td>
<td>$429,672</td>
<td>($59,055)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add Back Non-Cash Items (Depreciation etc.): $19,225
Median Operating Surplus (A): $6,382
Cost of Loan Repayment (10 year term): 0.35%
Surplus Cash Flow: ($8,913)

5 year repayment cover calculation (Operating Surplus (A) / Annual Repayment): 0.36
7 year repayment cover calculation (Operating Surplus (A) / Annual Repayment): 0.57
10 year repayment cover calculation (Operating Surplus (A) / Annual Repayment): 0.66

Financial Position as at 31 August 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Assets</th>
<th>Fixed Assets</th>
<th>Total Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>278,474</td>
<td>533,735</td>
<td>812,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Liabilities: $289,909
Total Liabilities: $289,909
Retained Funds: $532,780

Loan Repayment:

- Amount to be Lent: $75,000
- Repayment Term: 10 years
- Annual Loan Re-Payment Amount: $9,356

Organisation Description:

As the boundaries of the city of Christchurch began to spread north and west in the 1950’s a Burnside, like many other new suburbs, was full of growing kids. However, there was no rugby club in the area.

One Sunday morning in 1957, in a garage in Burnside, some rugby loving parents got together and decided that a rugby club in the area was a desirable necessity. As a consequence, the Burnside Rugby Football Club was established at a meeting in the Hindley Hall on 28 August 1957. Since the club’s inception, it has strived to develop a club culture that is inclusive, welcoming and respectful irrespective of playing ability, as well as being family friendly. As a consequence it has families that have been involved in the club since day one – great grandfathers through to great grandchildren (4 generations).

BRFC has grown to provide three core activities that deliver year round options for residents in the north west of the city to enjoy and benefit from; Rugby, Touch Rugby and the Burnside Jugglers. The club has 365 junior members and 257 senior member, 622 players in total. The club also has 2,097 social and non-playing paying members, this includes 175 touch teams at $540 per team. The club employs 2.5 FTE for facility maintenance and player development. Supporting these are 150 volunteers putting in 25,700 hours per week into the community.

BRFC’s clubrooms are fundamental to facilitating the community connectedness valued by its many members. Furthermore, activities within the clubrooms generate important revenue for the functioning of the club. Gross profit from clubrooms trading including private function hire are between $70k per annum (less in FY19 due to anticipated earthquake strengthening affecting private bookings.)

The Club has on its agenda the desire to upgrade and refurbish its bar and kitchen areas with the aim of making it more attractive for hire, however the strengthening work must occur first.

The BRFC Clubrooms sustained damage as a result of the earthquakes. They were 33% of the Building Code at all time. The Board of BRFC made a decision in consultation with members and stakeholders to undertake the strengthening work to 100% code as the clubrooms are a vital asset to the members and community the board takes seriously its health and safety responsibility to the users. The strengthening work will make proud the clubrooms so the community asset will endure for 50+ years. The board held that this project would be for 2018 and the contractor chosen with work commencing in January 2019. The board knew that long term borrowing would be required, and considers it appropriate as it is not fair to impose such a significant cost on the current members when the strengthening work would ensure that members would still benefit for many, many years. As such it is the board’s preference for a 30 year loan term, however it is applying for 10 years in line with the Council’s Community Loan Scheme regulations.
### CCC Community Organisations Loan Scheme: Current Loans as at 24 May 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borrower</th>
<th>Purpose of Loan</th>
<th>Commencement Date</th>
<th>Final Payment date</th>
<th>Total Amount Borrowed</th>
<th>Balance @ 15/03/2018</th>
<th>Repayments to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Squash Canterbury Inc.</td>
<td>Opening Doors project</td>
<td>2008 April</td>
<td>2018 April</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Canterbury Softball Association Inc. (Loan 1)</td>
<td>Building extension at Cuthbert's Green</td>
<td>2006 November</td>
<td>2018 November</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Family Help Trust</td>
<td>Purchase of office premises</td>
<td>2011 October</td>
<td>2021 July</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$33,750</td>
<td>$116,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cashmere Tennis Club (Loan 1)</td>
<td>Alterations and improvements to clubhouse building</td>
<td>2014 April</td>
<td>2024 April</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$26,460</td>
<td>$23,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Canterbury Softball Association Inc. (Loan 2)</td>
<td>Refurbishment of change rooms into office space</td>
<td>2014 April</td>
<td>2019 April</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Shirley Tennis Club</td>
<td>Demolition and rebuild of clubhouse building</td>
<td>2014 November</td>
<td>2021 November</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$30,139</td>
<td>$39,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Community Law Canterbury</td>
<td>Building purchase</td>
<td>2014 November</td>
<td>2024 November</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$93,516</td>
<td>$206,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mt. Pleasant Community Centre</td>
<td>Building rebuild</td>
<td>2016 July</td>
<td>2026 April</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$311,656</td>
<td>$188,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Halswell Bowling Club</td>
<td>Pavilion extension</td>
<td>2016 September</td>
<td>2021 September</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$39,691</td>
<td>$6,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Canterbury Indoor Bowls</td>
<td>Building rebuild</td>
<td>2016 August</td>
<td>2026 August</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$67,714</td>
<td>$37,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kilmarnock Enterprises</td>
<td>Building purchase</td>
<td>2017 May</td>
<td>2022 May</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$202,542</td>
<td>$97,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Cashmere Tennis Club (Loan 2)</td>
<td>Alterations and improvements to clubhouse building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$62,394</td>
<td>$2,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Christchurch Squash Club</td>
<td>New Squash Facility</td>
<td>2019 May</td>
<td>2029 May</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Riccarton Leagues Club</td>
<td>Expansion of changing rooms</td>
<td>2019 May</td>
<td>2029 May</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | **$2,031,000** | **$1,127,862** | **$903,138**
18. Hearings Panel Report to the Council on the Targeted Rate Proposal for the Akaroa Community Health Trust

Reference: 19/434306
Presenter(s): Councillor Manji – Chair of Hearings Panel

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to present to the Council the Hearings Panel recommendations following the consultation and hearings process on the Targeted Rate Proposal for the Akaroa Community Health Trust.

Decision Making Authority

1.2 Only the Council can make a decision to set a new rate. The Hearings Panel has no decision-making powers but, in accordance with its delegation, has considered the written and oral submissions received on the proposal and is now making recommendations to the Council. The Council can then accept or reject those recommendations as it sees fit bearing in mind that the Local Government Act 2002 s.82(1)(e) requires that “the views presented to the local authority should be received by the local authority with an open mind and should be given by the local authority, in making a decision, due consideration”.

1.3 The Council, as the final decision-maker, should put itself in as good a position as the Hearings Panel having heard all the parties. It can do so by considering this report which includes a summary of the written and verbal submissions that were presented at the hearings, any additional information received and the Hearings Panel's considerations and deliberations. Links to the written submissions are also available should you want to review them.

https://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2019/04/BLHP_20190416_AGN_3736_AT.PDF
https://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2019/04/BLHP_20190416_ATT_3736_EXCLUDED.PDF

2. Hearings Panel Recommendations

That Hearings Panel recommends that the Council:

1. Agrees to the request from the Akaroa Community Health Trust for a one-off Council grant of up to $1.3 million to assist the Trust in meeting a funding commitment to the Canterbury District Health Board for the new Akaroa Community Health Centre.

2. Agrees the amount of the grant will be recovered through a fixed charge targeted rate over a four year period to be paid by the rate payers in the Akaroa Subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward.

3. Notes that the Hearings Panel in making this recommendation to the Council, was satisfied that the level of response to the consultation and support for the grant/targeted rate from the wider community and affected ratepayers was substantial and convincing.

4. Reminds the Trust that it is expected to continue using its best endeavours to raise the funds it requires from other sources, so that the grant/targeted rate mechanism is used as a last resort only.
3. **Background/Context**

**Akaroa Community Health Centre**

3.1 The Akaroa Hospital was damaged beyond economic repair in the 2010/11 earthquakes and was subsequently demolished. The Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB) worked with the affected community and health care providers to develop a new health model of care for the Akaroa and Bays communities that is based on agreed services to be provided largely from a new Health Centre facility. Services will include a General Practice, aged care, palliative care, in-patient serveries and associated services. The building will be owned by the CDHB and leased to, and run by, the Akaroa Health Limited, a charitable organisation set up by the Akaroa Community Health Trust (the Trust) which will manage the facility and the majority of services it will provide.

**Akaroa Community Health Trust**

3.2 The Trust has an agreement with the CDHB to provide $2.5 million in community funding towards the capital cost of the new Community Health Centre. The health care facility is forecast to cost $5,932,000.

3.3 As at March 2019 the Trust had raised $1.7 million through fundraising efforts. The Trust will incur additional costs estimated at $0.5 million associated with establishing the operation of the health centre. The Trust advised the Council that it engaged with the community over a number of years on a preferred health care facility and services for the area.

**Funding Request**

3.4 The Trust initially made a request to the Council’s draft Long Term Plan 2018-28 to provide the Trust with a grant of $1.3 million to be funded from the Akaroa and Bays communities through a Grants Targeted rate over a four year period. The Trust then made a formal request in writing to the Banks Peninsula Community Board (the Board) in September 2018. The revenue from the targeted rate would be used to fund a One-off Council grant to the Trust, to be paid in mid-2023 to complete the Trust’s capital commitment to the CDHB.

3.5 The Board considered the Council Officer report on the proposal on 17 December 2018 and recommended that the Council agree in principle, subject to community consultation, to provide the One-off Council grant to be recovered through a Targeted Rate.

3.6 The Finance and Performance Committee of the Whole (the Committee) considered the Board’s recommendations and Council Officer Report\(^1\) on 7 February 2019.

3.7 The Committee resolved as follows:

> The Finance and Performance Committee of the Whole noted the Banks Peninsula Community Board’s recommendations and resolved as follows:

*That the Finance and Performance Committee of the Whole:*

1. Agrees in principle to the request from the Akaroa Community Health Trust for a one-off Council grant of up to $1.3 million to assist the Trust meet a funding commitment to the Canterbury District Health Board for the new Akaroa Community Health Centre;

2. Agrees the amount of the grant, if made, will be recovered through a fixed charge targeted rate paid by rate payers in the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward;

3. Expects the Trust to continue using its best endeavours to raise the funds it requires from other sources, so that the grant/targeted rate mechanism is used as a last resort only;

---

\(^1\) 7 February 2019 Committee Agenda [https://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2019/02/FPCO_20190207_AGN_3471_AT_WEB.htm](https://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2019/02/FPCO_20190207_AGN_3471_AT_WEB.htm)
4. Requests that before the Council makes a final decision on the matter, staff undertake a consultation process that:
   a. ascertains the level of support of community support for the grant being made and recovered through a fixed charge targeted rate;
   b. ascertains the level of support from ratepayers in the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula Ward for paying a fixed charge targeted rate over a 4 year, 10 year, or other rating period;
   c. includes the appointment of a Hearings Panel to hear oral submissions, sitting in Akaroa as well as any other place determined by the Panel;
   d. will ensure the Panel’s recommendations are received and considered by the Council before the meeting at which the Council adopts its 2019/20 Annual Plan and sets rates for the 2019/20 year;

5. Requests the Hearings Panel, in its deliberations, to be satisfied the level of response to the consultation and support for the grant/targeted rate from the wider community and the affected ratepayers is substantial and convincing before the Panel makes a decision on its recommendations to the Council.

4. Consultation Process


4.2 Approximately 2,963 consultation leaflets and submission forms were posted to primary ratepayers located in the Akaroa subdivision of Banks Peninsula. The information was also emailed out to 126 key stakeholders and made available at Civic Offices and at the Akaroa and Little River service centres.

4.3 The proposal was posted on the Council’s “Have Your Say” website and a Newsline story was published on 25 February 2019 (this was also posted on the Council’s social media channels).

4.4 Council Officer’s and members of the Trust were available to discuss the proposal and answer questions at the Akaroa Farmers Market on 9 March 2019. The team spoke with approximately 10 people during this session and feedback was generally supportive of the proposal.

4.5 The consultation document sought feedback on the following key questions:

4.5.1 Do you support the proposal for Council to provide a grant of up to $1.3 million to the Akaroa Community Health Trust and for the cost of this grant to be recovered through a targeted rate on ratepayers in the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula Ward?

4.5.2 If the grant is made and the targeted rate set on properties in the proposed targeted rate area, which option do you prefer? $130.20 incl GST (fixed charge) per SUIP* year over 4 years, or, $58.63 incl GST (fixed charge) per SUIP* year over 10 years?

4.5.3 Submitters were also asked to specify their residential status and a box for further comments was provided.
5. Submissions

5.1 A total 813 submissions were received on the proposal, this includes two late submissions which were not included in the submission analysis.

5.2 Submissions on the grant and targeted rate:
- 602 submitters (74%) supported the proposal.
- 206 submitters (25%) did not support the proposal.
- 3 submitters (1%) did not indicate a preference.

5.3 Submissions on the timeframe for the targeted rate:
- 431 submitters (53%) supported the targeted rate being over 4 years.
- 280 submitters (35%) supported the targeted rate being over 10 years.
- 100 submitters (12%) did not indicate a preference. Of those, 12 supported the targeted rate, 87 did not support the targeted rate and 1 did not specify.

5.4 Submitter’s residential status:
- 414 submitters (51%) were ratepayers in Akaroa Subdivision of the Banks Peninsula Ward but not living in there permanently.
- 369 submitters (45%) were ratepayers living in the Akaroa Subdivision of the Banks Peninsula Ward.
- 17 submitters (2%) were non ratepayers living in the Akaroa Subdivision of the Banks Peninsula Ward.
- 6 submitters (1%) do not live or pay rates in the Akaroa Subdivision of the Banks Peninsula Ward.
- 5 submitters (1%) did not indicate.

5.5 Context for other submissions:
- The Committee requested that the Hearings Panel in its deliberations, be satisfied the level of response to the consultation and support for the grant/targeted rate from the wider community and the affected ratepayers is substantial and convincing before making a recommendation to the Council. The Hearings Panel requested further statistics regarding this which can be found in Attachment B.
- The submissions received are a 24.7% return compared with the number of leaflets and submission forms mailed out. It was noted by Council Officers that the return rate is significantly higher than most other Council consultations. Some factors to note regarding the return rate are:
  - A number of property owners own multiple properties and were sent leaflets for each property, particularly where each property is held by a different entity. Only one submission per resident was accepted.
  - Some properties have their rates handled by an agent making it problematic getting information leaflets to the owner.
  - The information leaflets were sent to the primary rate payer (as recorded on the Council rates data base). In situations with more than one property owner these people weren’t advised directly.
5.6 The Council Officer report to the Hearings Panel included a detailed submission analysis and provided comments and statistics on the key themes and issues raised through written submissions, refer to Attachment A. Key themes raised were:

5.6.1 The importance of the health care facility to the Community.

5.6.2 Targeted rate preferences such as how they would prefer to be charged, whether they can make a one off payment, that the targeted rate should only apply to occupied properties and whether tenants who do not pay rates can be changed.

5.6.3 A visitor levy on cruise ships as an alternative funding option.

5.6.4 Non-users of the health care facility having to pay.

5.6.5 The cost of a targeted rate for those who cannot afford it.

5.6.6 That the targeted rate should be a Christchurch city-wide rate.

5.6.7 The period of the targeted rate such as the impact of interest accrued over 10 years. There was also comment that spreading the payments out may make it more affordable for some ratepayers.

5.6.8 Comments relating to the running of the health care facility.

5.6.9 That the health care facility should be funded, by the CDHB/Central Government.

5.6.10 That some have already contributed to the health care facility through fundraising.

6. The Hearing

6.1 The Hearings Panel consisted of Councillor Raf Manji (Chair), Deputy Mayor Andrew Turner and Community Board Member Tori Peden. The Hearings Panel convened on Tuesday 16 April, Wednesday 17 April and Wednesday 8 May 2019 to hear verbal submissions and consider and deliberate on all submissions and information received. 15 submitters verbally presented to the Hearings Panel. A link to the meeting Minutes can be found at: https://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2019/04/BLHP_20190416_MIN_3736_AT.PDF.

6.2 At the beginning of the hearing Council Officers presented a brief overview of the proposal and submission analysis and answered questions arising from the Hearings Panel. The Hearings Panel then heard from those submitters who were available and wished to present.

Key points raised in through verbal submissions

6.3 The majority of verbal submissions were consistent with the points raised in their written submissions. Some points raised during verbal submissions included:

6.3.1 Supportive of the health care facility but opposes the proposal and process. If a targeted rate was set at the beginning they may not have already donated through fundraising.

6.3.2 Opposed that this is a targeted rate for just Akaroa, this should be a Christchurch city-wide targeted rate as per the Cathedral.

6.3.3 The health care facility should be fully funded by Central Government/CDHB.

6.3.4 The importance of having a health care and age care facility in the local area especially for those who are not able to travel to the city.

6.3.5 That the level of response (74%) supporting the targeted rate shows that the Community is happy with the proposal.

6.3.6 Supporting the targeted rate over the shortest period possible to avoid accruing additional interest charges.
6.3.7 The strain on the community and health care facility if the targeted rate is not approved.

6.3.8 The community has fundraising fatigue and other charities have been put on the hold. However it was also noted that fundraising would still continue. The Hearings Panel sought clarification from the Chair of the Trust if they have looked at other funding grants or mechanisms. The Trust advised that the fundraising committee will be discussing other options and opportunities and any other grants that might be applicable at a national level.

6.3.9 The Community and Trust has managed to generate $1.7 million which has been a good effort but needs extra help for the remaining sum.

6.3.10A question was raised regarding the process of how the Trust was set up, if they represent the Community and that the Trust did not provide enough details on reasons for the levy and the operating costs of the health care facility.

6.3.11Supportive of a household targeted rate not by titles/ blocks of land.

6.3.12That the Council should not be loaning to private businesses or individuals.

7. Consideration and Deliberation of Submissions

7.1 The Hearings Panel considered and deliberated on all submissions received and information provided by Council Officers.

7.2 The Hearings Panel requested the following further information and advice from Council Officers on some of the issues or questions raised through submissions:

- 7.2.1 The ability for the Council to rate on a “per household” basis.
- 7.2.2 The possible use of remissions to achieve something similar to a “per household” basis.
- 7.2.3 Advice on whether ratepayers can make lump sum payments.
- 7.2.4 Advice on how the targeted rate will be managed in the last year.
- 7.2.5 Advice on how the consultation response for this proposal compares to other consultation processes undertaken by the Council. This request was to provide further evidence for the Hearings Panel to be satisfied with the level of response to the consultation and support for the grant/targeted rate from the wider community and affected ratepayers is substantial and convincing.

7.3 A Memorandum was provided to the Hearings Panel addressing the information requested, refer to Attachment B. The Hearings Panel noted the information provided and had no further questions.

7.4 The Hearings Panel decided to recommend that the Council agree to the targeted rate of $1.3 million over a four year period. The Hearings Panel noted the following points which supported the recommendation:

- 7.4.1 The Hearings Panel was satisfied with the strong level of support and engagement from the Community for the proposal with 74% supporting the proposal and also noting the information provided in the Memorandum regarding other Council consultations statistics.
- 7.4.2 The grant will provide a good level of certainty for the community to secure the health care facility and health care services in the area.
- 7.4.3 The four year period would be a lower cost as it avoids any additional interest accrual.
7.4.4  This will be the first time the Council has used a targeted rate for a defined community catchment and a potential alternative funding method for other communities to help and support themselves in the future.

7.4.5  The Hearings Panel acknowledged the work and effort both the community and the Trust have put in to this project through fundraising.

Signatories

Author       Samantha Kelly - Hearings Advisor
Approved By  Councillor Manji - Chair of Hearings Panel
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4. Proposed Grant Targeted Rate - Akaroa Community Health Trust

Reference: 19/322834
Presenter(s): Gavin Thomas - Principal Advisor Economic Policy
Tara King – Senior Engagement Advisor

1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 This report provides a summary of all submissions made on the proposal to provide a grant of up to $1,300,000 to the Akaroa Community Health Trust and for the Council to recover the funding by setting a fixed charge targeted rate on properties in the Akaroa subdivision of the Bank Peninsula ward.
   1.2 The community consultation has been undertaken to fulfil the resolution (FPCO/2019/00009) from the meeting of the Finance and Performance Committee of the Whole held on February 7, 2019. That resolution is included for the Panel’s reference as Attachment C of this report.

2. Executive Summary
   2.1 The Akaroa Community Health Trust has an agreement with the Canterbury District Health Board (Canterbury DHB) to provide $2.5 million in community funding towards the capital cost of a new Community Health Centre in Akaroa.
   2.2 The Trust has asked the Council to raise $1.3 million from the Akaroa and Bays communities through a Grants Targeted Rate over a four year period.
   2.3 The revenue from the targeted rate would be used to fund a One-off Council Grant to the Trust which would assist the Trust to pay the Canterbury DHB its full capital funding commitment of $2.5 million. The grant would be paid in mid-2022.
   2.4 Consultation proposing a grant and fixed charge targeted rate option has been held, focussing on the affected Akaroa and Bays communities. 811 submissions have been received with the quantitative analysis of those submissions included in section 6 of this report. All written submissions received have been compiled into the following three volumes and are included in the Hearings Panel Agenda:
      2.4.1 Those that wish to be heard;
      2.4.2 Those that no longer wish to be heard; and
      2.4.3 Those that do not wish to be heard (as an Attachment Under Separate Cover).

3. Staff Recommendations
   That the Hearings Panel:
   1. Receives the information within and attached to this report and considers the submissions received during the public consultation process on the proposal to provide a grant of up to $1,300,000 to the Akaroa Community Health Trust and to recover those funds from a fixed charge targeted rate set on properties in the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward.
   2. Following consideration of all submissions makes recommendations to the Council on whether to:
4. Context/Background

Issue or Opportunity

4.1 Akaroa Hospital was damaged beyond economic repair in the 2010/11 earthquakes and was subsequently demolished. The Canterbury District Health Board (Canterbury DHB) has worked with the local community and primary health providers to develop a new Model of Care. As part of this model General Practice, aged care, palliative care, in-patient services and associated services will co-locate in a new building on the old hospital site.

4.2 The Akaroa Community Health Trust was formed as a representative community partner in the provision of a new Health Centre for Akaroa. The Trust has agreed to provide $2.5 million in community funding towards the capital cost of the new health centre. The facility is forecast to cost $5,932,000. The Trust has raised community funding of $1.7 million (as at March 2019) and is continuing its fundraising efforts. The Trust will also incur additional costs estimated at $0.5 million associated with establishing the health centre.

4.3 The Trust has asked the Council to raise $1.3 million from the Akaroa and Bays communities through a One-off Council Grant with the cost recovered through a Targeted Rate over a four year period. This would assist the Trust with meeting its capital funding commitment to the Canterbury DHB of $2.5 million.

4.4 In considering the Trust’s request the Council has two separate but interrelated issues to consider:

- Agree or not to provide a One-off Council Grant to the Trust, the grant would be paid in mid-2022;
- If the Council agrees to provide a One-off Council Grant, it then must decide on the way it will set a targeted rate to fund this.

Strategic Alignment

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

4.5.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy

- Level of Service: 17.0.20.2 Place-based policy and planning advice to support integrated urban regeneration and planning - Working collaboratively with Community Boards (and in light of Community Board plans), Development Christchurch Limited, Regenerate Christchurch and others, identify and address priority areas for Christchurch City.

4.6 The Council’s Revenue and Financing Policy provides for the Council to make one-off Council Grants to fund community facilities not owned by the Council and to set a Targeted Rate to pay for the Grant.

Decision Making Authority

4.7 Only the Council can make a decision to set a new rate. The Hearing Panel’s role is limited to consideration of all submissions received and making recommendations to the Council.
Previous Decisions

4.8 The Council has used the Grants Targeted Rate provision of its Revenue and Financing Policy once before, when it granted up to $10 million towards the Christ Church Cathedral restoration and set a fixed charge targeted rate on all properties in Christchurch District to fund the grant.

4.9 This is the first time the Council has considered setting a targeted rate on a defined community catchment to help fund a community facility the Council doesn’t own.

Assessment of Significance and Engagement

4.10 The matters dealt with in this report are of medium significance for the directly affected community in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

4.11 The assessment recognises the significance is higher for residents and ratepayers directly affected (in the Akaroa and Bays areas) than for others. The significance assessment is primarily driven by the potential financial impact on individual ratepayers from a new and additional targeted rate.

Associated Community Engagement

4.12 The Trust has advised the Council that it engaged with the community over a number of years on a preferred health facility and services for the area. The Trust says this engagement has informed decisions regarding the Health Centre facility and the services to be delivered.

4.13 The Canterbury DHB has consulted with the Akaroa and Bays community in developing a new Model of Care. These services are to be delivered through the Health Centre are part of the new Model of Care which was released in 2017.

4.14 The Council included a proposal to amend its Revenue and Financing Policy to enable this type of Grants Targeted Rate to be set in its draft Long Term Plan 2018-28. After considering submissions received the Council agreed to amend its Revenue and Financing Policy as it had proposed.

5. Options Analysis

Options for consideration

5.1 The following reasonably practicable options should be considered by the Hearings Panel in making a recommendation to the Council:

- To provide a grant of up to $1,300,000 to the Akaroa Community Health Trust and to recover the cost through a fixed charge targeted rate on all properties in the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward.

- To set a fixed charge targeted rate over a four year period, a 10 year period or an alternative period.

- To decline the Akaroa Community Health Trust’s request for funding.

5.2 The following options were considered but ruled out:

- To provide a grant of up to $1,300,000 to the Akaroa Community Health Trust and to recover the cost through a capital value based targeted rate on all properties in the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward. The Council’s Revenue and Financing Policy states that in using the Grant Targeted Rate provision the Council will “…usually be set as a fixed dollar charge per separately used or inhabited portion (SUIP) of rateable unit (property), because this provides the most readily-calculable revenue stream. Capital Value or other rating basis will only be used if this is considered to generate very significant
equity benefits.” It was decided there was unlikely to be very significant equity benefits achieved from a capital value rate.

- To provide a grant of up to $1,300,000 to the Akaroa Community Health Trust and to recover the cost through a fixed charge targeted rate on all properties in Christchurch District. This option did not have a clear link between the section of the community receiving the benefit (those in the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward) and those who would pay (all properties in the Christchurch District).

**Options Descriptions**

5.3 **Proposed Option:** Provide a grant and fund through a fixed charge targeted rate.

5.3.1 **Option Description:** The Council would provide a grant of up to $1,300,000 to the Akaroa Community Health Trust to enable it to meet its community funding commitment to the Canterbury District Health Board. The grant would be paid in mid-2022.

5.3.2 The rate would be set on all rateable properties in the relevant area, including businesses. The cost of the grant would be recovered through a fixed charge targeted rate on all SUlPs within the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward. It should be noted that there are a small number of properties that straddle the Akaroa ward boundary. These properties will be included in the targeted rate catchment if they are on a rating valuation roll that is within the Akaroa subdivision.

5.3.3 The targeted rate would be levied from 1 July 2019 for a period to be recommended by the Panel and determined by the Council. Options given on the feedback form provided were four years or 10 years. The Panel could, however, recommend an alternative period if it believed there are compelling reasons to do so.

5.3.4 **Option Advantages**

- Assists the Akaroa Community Health Trust to fulfil its funding obligations and to focus on managing the facility and provision of services.
- Will enable the health centre to open later in 2019 with no debt or doubts associated with the community’s contribution – the community can and should be very proud of its efforts.
- Will provide space in the Akaroa community for other fundraising initiatives to surface. In raising $1,700,000 to date the Trust has dominated community donations and sponsorship for some years.

5.3.5 **Option Disadvantages**

- The annual cost of the targeted rate may be more onerous for some residents than for others. This can to some extent be mitigated by the term of the rate if this is considered necessary.

5.4 **Decline the request for grant funding from the Akaroa Community Health Trust.**

5.4.1 **Option Description:** Do nothing.

5.4.2 **Option Advantages**

- No further administration and development costs incurred by the Council.
- No additional rate requirement in the affected area.

5.4.3 **Option Disadvantages**
The Akaroa Community Health Trust will have to continue fundraising until it fulfils its obligations.

The health centre will open in 2019 with debt and uncertainty hanging over its operation. The Trust may be distracted from its role as the Centre operator and service provider.

Submissions Context

5.5 The overall number of submissions received (811) from a relatively small community indicates this is an important issue for Akaroa and the Bays area. The submissions received is a 27.4 per cent return compared with the number of information leaflets and submission form mailed out (2,963). In considering the overall response the Hearings Panel may wish to consider the following:

- The Finance and Performance Committee resolution (Attachment C) agreeing to consult on this proposal included a request that the Hearings Panel, in its deliberations, be satisfied the level of response to the consultation and support for the grant/targeted rate from the wider community and the affected ratepayers is substantial and convincing before the Panel makes a decision on its recommendations to the Council.

- The return rate is significantly higher than for most other Council consultations. Consultation on the Akaroa wastewater project, which was quite contentious drew 244 submissions.

- There is a high proportion of absentee property owners (who own holiday homes in the area and live elsewhere). 51 per cent of submissions received were from absentee owners indicating the information provided through the consultation material was widely received.

- The proportion of submitters in support of the proposal is high at 74 per cent.

- A number of submitters who didn’t support the proposal support the facility and the work done by the Trust. A common reason for opposition is a belief the Government (or DHB) or some other party should be funding the facility. This is beyond the Council’s range of influence.

6. Community Views and Preferences

Consultation process

6.1 Consultation on the targeted rate proposal for the Akaroa Community Health Trust was undertaken from Monday 25 February 2019 to Wednesday 27 March 2019.

6.2 The submission form for the proposal asked submitters a number of questions including whether yes – I/We do support the grant and targeted rate or no – I/We do not support the grant and targeted rate, the length of time to pay the targeted rate (if approved) should apply for – 4 years at $130.20 including GST or 10 years at $58.63 including GST and a question on where submitters are located and which area they pay rates for. Space was also available on the submission form for any additional comments.

6.3 Approximately 2,963 consultation leaflets and submission forms (refer Attachments A and B) were posted to the primary ratepayers located in the Akaroa subdivision of Banks Peninsula. This information was also emailed out to 126 key stakeholders and made available at Civic offices and at the Akaroa and Little River service centres.
6.4 The project was also posted on the Council’s ‘Have Your Say’ website https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/consultations-and-submissions/haveyoursay/show/197 and a Newsline story was also produced on 25 February 2019 https://ccc.govt.nz/news-and-events/newsline/show/3372 this story was also posted on the Council social media channels.

6.5 The project team and members of the Akaroa Community Health Trust were available to discuss this project and answer any questions at the Akaroa Farmers Market on Saturday 9 March 2019 from 9.30 am to 11.30 am. The team spoke with approximately ten people during this time and feedback was generally supportive of the targeted rate.

6.6 During the consultation period the project team responded to 12 queries relating to this project. The majority of these were from residents who wanted to check how many of their properties would be affected by the rating increase.

Submissions received

Overall submissions on the grant and targeted rate

6.7 At the close of consultation 811 submissions were received with 602 submitters supporting the grant and targeted rate and 206 not supporting the grant and targeted rate and 3 who did not indicate a preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes – I/We do support the grant and targeted rate</th>
<th>No – I/We do not support the grant and targeted rate</th>
<th>Not indicated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>602 (74%)</td>
<td>206 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>811 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall submissions on the timeframe for targeted rate

6.8 In relation to the timeframe to pay the targeted rate (if approved) there were 431 submitters who supported the rate being over 4 years and 280 submitters who supported this being over 10 years and 100 who did not indicate a preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$130.20 incl GST per SUJP over 4 years</th>
<th>$58.63 incl GST per SUJP over 10 years</th>
<th>Not indicated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>431 (53%)</td>
<td>280 (35%)</td>
<td>100 (12%)</td>
<td>811 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.9 Of those who did not indicate a preference for the timeframe 87 (87%) of these submitters also did not support the grant and targeted rate, 12 (12%) did support the grant and targeted rate and 1 (1%) did not indicate a preference. It is reasonable to assume that not supporting the proposal was the reason why 87 submitters did not respond to this question.
Overall ratepayer information

6.10 In relation to where submitters were located and which area of the city they pay rates for, there were 369 submitters who live in the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward and are ratepayers, 17 submitters who live in the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward but are not ratepayers, 414 submitters who are ratepayers in the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward but do not live permanently in Akaroa, 6 submitters who do not live or pay rates in the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward and 5 submitters who did not indicate where they live or pay rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratepayer in the Akaroa subdivision but do not live in Akaroa permanently</th>
<th>Live in Akaroa subdivision and pay rates</th>
<th>Live in Akaroa subdivision but do not pay rates</th>
<th>Do not live or pay rates in the Akaroa subdivision</th>
<th>Not indicated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>414 (51%)</td>
<td>369 (45%)</td>
<td>17 (2%)</td>
<td>6 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
<td>811 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments from submitters relating to the Akaroa Community Health Centre

6.11 A number of submitters made comments and suggestions relating to the running of the Akaroa Community Health Centre and the services that will be provided. These comments are
outside the scope of the decision making powers of the Council in regard to approving a grant and setting a targeted rate, but will be passed on to the Akaroa Community Health Centre Trust to manage.

Ratepayers who do not live in Akaroa permanently

6.12 In relation to the consultation results and where submitters were located, for those who do not live in Akaroa permanently but pay rates in Akaroa (likely to be holiday homes) 414 submissions were received, with 298 submitters supporting the targeted rate, 115 not supporting the targeted rate and 1 submitter who did not indicate a preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support the grant and targeted rate</th>
<th>Do not support the grant and targeted rate</th>
<th>Not indicated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>298 (72%)</td>
<td>115 (27%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>414 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.13 In relation to the preferred period over which the targeted rate should be set for those who do not live in Akaroa permanently but pay rates in Akaroa (likely to be holiday homes) 203 submitters support a rate over 4 years, 156 support a rate over 10 years and 55 submitters did not indicate a preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$130.20 incl GST per SUIP over 4 years</th>
<th>$58.63 incl GST per SUIP over 10 years</th>
<th>Not indicated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203 (49%)</td>
<td>156 (38%)</td>
<td>55 (13%)</td>
<td>414 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submissions from Akaroa ratepayers who live in Akaroa

6.14 For submitters who live in the Akaroa subdivision and pay rates there (permanent residents) 369 submissions were received with 279 submitters support the targeted rate, 88 do not support the targeted rate and 2 submitters did not indicate a preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support the grant and targeted rate</th>
<th>Do not support the grant and targeted rate</th>
<th>Not indicated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>279 (76%)</td>
<td>88 (23%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>369 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.15 In relation to the period over which the targeted rate should be set, for submitters who live in Akaroa and pay rates in Akaroa 204 support a rate being set over 4 years, 122 support the rate being set over 10 years and 42 submitters did not indicate a preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$130.20 incl GST per SUIP over 4 years</th>
<th>$58.63 incl GST per SUIP over 10 years</th>
<th>Not indicated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204 (55%)</td>
<td>122 (33%)</td>
<td>42 (12%)</td>
<td>368 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submissions from those who live in Akaroa but do not pay rates

6.16 In relation to submitters who live in Akaroa but do not pay rates in Akaroa (this could be those who rent properties) 17 submissions were received with 15 supporting the targeted rate and 2 not supporting the targeted rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support the grant and targeted rate</th>
<th>Do not support the grant and targeted rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 (88%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>17 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.17 In relation to the period over which the targeted rate should be set for those who live in Akaroa but do not pay rates in Akaroa 6 submissions were received with 5 supporting a rate being set over 4 years and 1 supporting the rate being set over 10 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$130.20 incl GST per SUIP over 4 years</th>
<th>$58.63 incl GST per SUIP over 10 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submissions from those who do not live or pay rates in Akaroa

6.18 In relation to the consultation results and where submitters were located, for those who do not live in Akaroa or pay rates in Akaroa, 6 submissions were received with all 6 supporting the targeted rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support the grant and targeted rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.19 In relation to the period over which the targeted rate should be set for those who do not live in Akaroa or pay rates in Akaroa 6 submissions were received with 5 supporting a rate being set over 4 years and 1 submitter supporting the rate over 10 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$130.20 incl GST per SUIP over 4 years</th>
<th>$58.63 incl GST per SUIP over 10 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Combined results from consultation

6.20 In summary for each category relating to support for the grant and targeted rate the majority support the grant and targeted rate with a small majority supporting a 4 year term for the rate in preference to a 10 year rate.

Summary of comments from all submitters

6.21 The key reasons submitters supported the grant and targeted rate proposal for the Akaroa Community Health Trust were:

- The importance in providing this facility in Akaroa and a targeted rate being the fairest way to ensure that adequate services are provided in Akaroa.

“I consider $2.50 per week a very acceptable cost considering the benefit to both the community and my own family should the need ever arise. Additionally the targeted rate provides such peace of mind on the financing of the new health centre,”
irrespective as to how sustained or successful future fundraising efforts might be”.
Submitter #22610.

6.22 Other key concerns or comments raised across all of the submissions (811) in relation to the proposal for a grant and targeted rate for the Akaroa Community Health Trust related to how the health centre should be funded, targeted rate preferences, Council charging a visitor levy, donations, non-users of the health centre, affordability to pay the rate and suggestions to charge a targeted rate to all Christchurch ratepayers. Staff comments in relation to these are as follows (where relevant).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Submitter ID #</th>
<th>No. of comments made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health centre should be funded by central government/DHB</td>
<td>22377, 22196, 22192, 22190, 22188, 22378, 22377, 22196, 22192, 22190, 22188, 22180, 22179, 22122, 22082, 21829, 21799, 21767, 21765, 21755, 21644, 21635, 21634, 21631, 21621, 21603, 21596, 21593, 21583, 21553, 21523, 21435, 21402, 21394, 21336, 21335, 21353, 21293.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted rate preferences</td>
<td>23015, 23000, 22790, 22750, 22690, 22667, 22672, 22650, 22957, 22561, 22300, 22334, 21951, 21896, 21888, 21883, 21850, 21660, 21354, 21352, 21341, 22978, 22974, 22941, 22910, 22739, 22703, 22401, 21874, 21761, 21690, 21620, 21617, 21301, 21353.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council should charge a visitor levy in Akaroa to fund the health centre</td>
<td>23078, 23076, 22937, 22909, 22801, 22322, 22311, 22148, 22137, 21883, 21695, 21549, 21513, 21458, 22973, 22908, 22863, 22818, 22708, 22664, 22651, 22580, 22383, 22184, 21981, 21868, 21828, 21825, 21632, 21630, 21592, 21835, 21799.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations – would prefer to donate instead of pay rate or have already donated significantly</td>
<td>23012, 22945, 22757, 22705, 22249, 22186, 22145, 22125, 22123, 21864, 21857, 21852, 21827, 21799, 21766, 21704, 21648, 21638, 21632, 21630, 21981, 21501, 21434, 21301, 21730, 22739.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won’t use facility</td>
<td>22710, 22380, 2202, 21757, 21584, 21576, 21468, 21460, 21434, 21353, 21269.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to afford a targeted rate</td>
<td>22731, 22664, 22323, 22246, 22245, 22180, 21753, 21624.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of Christchurch City Council areas should pay targeted rate</td>
<td>21868, 21778, 21715, 21637, 21574, 21394, 22126, 22082.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding of health centre**

6.23 38 submitters made comments that central government (or the Canterbury DHB) should be fully funding the health centre.

“This is a government/health department responsibility not ratepayers”. Submitter #22192.

Staff response:
The community funding arrangements were agreed between the Canterbury DHB and the Akaroa Community Health Trust and are detailed in a Heads of Agreement between the organisations. In providing a community funding contribution the Akaroa Community Health Trust was able to have the centre built to provide services the Canterbury DHB would not have otherwise provided.

Targeted rate preferences

6.24 34 submitters made comments about how they would prefer the targeted rate was set up or collected. The most common comments related were:

- There should only be one charge per property (7 comments).
- A method to collect funds from tenants who don’t pay rates should be investigated (6 comments).
- There should be an option to make a one-off payment instead of a targeted rate (5 comments).
- The rate should only apply to inhabited properties (5 comments).

Staff responses to the issues above:

- A targeted rate would be levied on the same basis as the Uniform Annual General Charge (UAGC) which is levied on each separately used or inhabited portion (SUIP) of a rateable property. Most properties have only one SUIP, but a property with two flats for example, will have two SUIPs.
- Tenants pay rates indirectly through their rent.
- In this specific situation there is uncertainty regarding the eventual funding required to be generated from a targeted rate as the Trust is to continue fundraising. This makes it impossible to know how much to charge for one-off full payment. In addition, the Council would incur administration costs keeping track of which properties have made a one-off full payment for that rate, and amending the corresponding rates invoices accordingly.
- A targeted rate is applied to each separately used or inhabited portion of a rateable property. It is impracticable for the Council to monitor whether a property is inhabited or not, particularly as this may change throughout the year.

Visitor levy

6.25 32 submitters commented that the Council should collect a form of visitor levy to raise funds for the Akaroa Health Centre. The majority of these comments related to imposing a cruise ship levy to collect the funds.

“I would like to see a fee charged to all ships/tourists that visit Akaroa as they are a strain on the small township of Akaroa’s resources”. Submitter #22838.

Staff response:

The Council doesn’t have a legal mechanism by which to require payment of a visitor levy. This would require Parliament to pass enabling legislation.

Donations

6.26 25 submitters commented that they have already made significant donations towards the health centre and some would prefer to make a donation as it is tax deductible.

“I would prefer to make a further donation to the ACHT than to be forced to pay via rates”. Submitter #22739.
Staff response:

The Trust had hoped to meet its obligations by way of donations alone but this has not eventuated. However, the Trust will continue to fundraise and if the rate is set it will be reviewed annually and adjusted as additional funding is secured by the Trust.

**Non users of the facility**

6.27 There were 11 submitters who commented that they would not use the Health Centre, so did not feel that they should be required to pay the rate.

“We feel that we will never use the facility that the extra funds are being requested for. We only have a holiday house at Takamatua and would prefer to use Christchurch facilities”. Submitter #22380.

Staff response:

It is not practicable for the Council to make exceptions where a ratepayer considers they are unlikely to use the facility. Ratepayers must pay general rates for libraries and other services even though not every ratepayer necessarily uses all the services rated for.

**Ability to pay the targeted rate**

6.28 There were 8 submitters who commented that they would struggle to afford the increase in rates.

“As a family we are struggling to make ends meet and living from week to week this will just add more pressure, less food in cupboard”. Submitter #22323

Staff response:

Ratepayers who qualify for a Government funded rates rebate will be able to access that funding.

The Panel should consider affordability when it decides on a recommended rating period. The longer the period the rate is levied for, the less the annual cost to each ratepayer will be.

**City wide targeted rate option**

6.29 There were 8 submitters who commented that all Christchurch ratepayers should be included in the targeted rate.

“We, the local Akaroa Community, are required to pay rates towards facilities and services located in Christchurch that we either never use because of our isolation, I don’t think it’s a lot to ask that Christchurch City provides financial support for a community medical facility”. Submitter #21778.

Staff response:

This was an option considered in the first report to the Banks Peninsula community board. The option was not pursued as the funding mechanism didn’t reflect that almost all the benefit derived would go to residents able to access the health centre – those in the proposed targeted rate area.

**Period of targeted rate**

6.30 In relation to the period over which the targeted rate should be set, the key comments from those who prefer a 4 year payment term were:

- Added cost for property purchasers if the term is 10 years (1 comment).
- Do not want a longer term (1 comment).
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- Shorter term will reduce the interest (1 comment).
- If the term is longer it draws the process out (3 comments).
- Would only support if the targeted rate is set to properties with dwellings (1 comment).

6.31 The key comments from those who prefer the rate to be set over a 10 year period were:
- Ratepayers coming into the area after 4 years can then also contribute (2 comments).
- Makes sense in relation to the life of the health centre (2 comments).
- Makes it more affordable (3 comments).

7. Legal Implications

7.1 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.

7.2 This report has been reviewed and approved by the Council’s Legal Services Unit.

7.3 The legal considerations that need to be met are detailed in the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 (LGRA) and the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA).
- Sections 16-18 and Schedule 3 of the LGRA define a targeted rate and how it may be applied and calculated.
- Section 23 of the LGRA details requirements for setting a rate, which include that the rate must be in accordance with relevant provisions of the Council’s long term plan and funding impact statement for that financial year. Section 23 requires a new rate to be included in the Funding Impact Statement included in the Council’s Long Term Plan or Annual Plan.
- The LGA requires a Long Term Plan or Annual Plan to include a Funding Impact Statement.

8. Risks

8.1 Providing a grant and recovering the cost through a targeted rate transfers the financial risk from the Canterbury DHB and the Trust to the Council and the community. Given the agreement is between the Trust and the Canterbury DHB this may not seem appropriate to some.

Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk after the below treatment(s) is implemented will be low/medium.

Planned treatment(s) includes the setting of a Grants Targeted Rate to help fund the community share for the Centre.

8.2 Loan funding brings a risk that interest rates may rise over the repayment period. To mitigate this risk (for the community) it is recommended that the Council fixes the interest rate at 4.5 per cent for the full term.

9. Next Steps

9.1 The Hearings Panel recommendations will be considered by the Council at a meeting in June 2019 and as per the Finance and Performance Committee of the Whole resolution to “ensure the Panel’s recommendations are received and considered by the Council before the meeting at which the Council adopts its 2019/20 Annual Plan and sets rates for the 2019/20 year.”
## 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 - Provide grant and set rate</th>
<th>Option 2 - Do nothing</th>
<th>Option 3 - N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Implement</td>
<td>Within existing budgets</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Ongoing</td>
<td>Within existing budgets</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Within existing budgets</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Rates</td>
<td>Within existing budgets</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutory Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Mana Whenua</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Council Plans &amp; Policies</td>
<td>Strategic Priority - Enabling active citizenship and connected communities</td>
<td>Community Outcome - Safe and healthy communities</td>
<td>Community Outcome - Strong sense of community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request for further information

Hearings Panel – Proposed Akaroa targeted rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.05.2019</td>
<td>2:30 – 5:00</td>
<td>M2.03</td>
<td>Councillor Raf Manji (Chair), Councillor Andrew Turner, Community Board Member Tori Peden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information provided by:
Gavin Thomas, Tara King, Andrew Jefferies

The Hearings Panel heard submissions on the proposal to provide grant funding to the Akaroa Community Health Trust and to recover the cost through a targeted rate on all properties within the Akaroa subdivision of the Banks Peninsula ward.

After hearing all submissions the Panel requested further information from Council staff on the following:

Rates:
1. Can the targeted rate be levied on a per household basis rather than per separately used or inhabited portion of a rating unit?
2. Could a rates rebate be used to better align the levying of a rate to households?
3. Can a lump-sum payment option be included? If not, why not?
4. How will the rate be concluded to ensure the best alignment between funds required and funds received? What sort of wash-up process might be applied?

Consultation:
5. How does the submission response for this proposal compare to other consultation processes undertaken by the Council?

Staff responses:

Rates:
1. Targeted rate per household

1.1 Rates cannot be levied on a per household basis.

1.2 The Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 (LGRA) limits the methods that can be used for calculating and setting targeted rates. Sections 16 to 18 and schedule s 2 and 3 are most relevant. Clause 7 of Schedule 3 allows the Council to calculate liability for targeted rates using the number of separately used or inhabited parts (SUlPs) of the rating unit. Council currently sets all fixed charges on this “per SUlP” basis. The legislation does not empower the Council to rate on a “per household” basis.

1.3 In general, each piece of land that has a certificate of title is a rating unit and each rating unit has at least one SUlP. There are exceptions to this general rule. Quotable Value NZ (QV) defines the rating units. In some cases QV joins multiple certificates of title together into a single rating unit. QV will do this if the properties are owned by the
same person, are used jointly as a single unit, and are contiguous (next door to each other or separated only by a road, water race etc). In some cases Council treats multiple rating units as a single SUIP, but this is relatively rare (outside of the old CERA properties).

1.4 The Council’s remission policy provides (remission 4) for the uniform annual general charge (UAGC) to be remitted where parcels of land under different ownership are contiguous (i.e. sharing a boundary and in common usage, such that they should reasonably be treated as a single unit). No remissions are currently granted in this category.

2. Rates remission option

2.1 Yes, the Council could amend its Rates Remission Policy to allow remissions to be granted to reduce the number of fixed Akaroa Health Centre charges imposed on a ratepayer. The Council would need to consult on any change to the policy. The consultation could commence reasonably shortly, and even if the new policy was adopted by the Council part way through 2019/20, ratepayers could apply for the new remission at that point and receive a remission for the 2019/20 rates year.

2.2 Ratepayers must apply for rates remission each year by filling in a form and either mailing it or delivering it to a service centre. Forms can also be downloaded from the Council website, printed, manually filled in, scanned and emailed. Applications for rates remission can involve significant effort on the part of the ratepayer in providing evidence that they meet the qualification criteria. Many ratepayers who are eligible to apply for a remission do not apply.

2.3 If Council decided to consult on a new remission category, the remission could be designed as follows (this is an example). The remission could apply specifically to the Akaroa Health Centre rate (but not other rates). It could be available in respect of rating units that meet all the following criteria:
   a. Owned by the same person
   b. Have a rural use
   c. Are used as a single unit
   d. Do not have a dwelling.

2.4 There would be no requirement that the properties be contiguous. Council staff would expect some evidence to be provided of the rural use of the property and the use of the properties as a single unit.

2.5 There would be some costs associated with the introduction of a new remission. Some involvement from the Council’s IT unit would be required. We have not quantified the costs. We expect they would be relatively minor, but still potentially significant compared with the total remissions granted under the new remission category.

2.6 Arguments against a new remission category include:
   - **Implementation and administration costs**, including the costs of community consultation
   - **Inconsistency with UAGC** and other fixed rates. The Council’s policy and practice for the UAGC is that the two properties must be contiguous if relief is to be granted. This policy is also applied to other fixed rates; e.g. Active Travel and Cathedral rates. If a new Akaroa remission was allowed in some cases for non-contiguous properties, it might be difficult to justify why the UAGC and other fixed rates are not similarly remitted. It might be fairer and more defensible to have a single policy for all fixed rates, and to apply that consistently.
3. Lump-sum payment option

3.1 Under section 56 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 a local authority may adopt a policy for the payment of rates in advance for subsequent years. However, the Council does not have any such policy. In practice, if rates are paid in advance, a credit is applied to the ratepayer’s account. This credit would not be applied specifically to one rate (the Akaroa Health Centre rate). Rather it would be a credit on the subsequent rates invoice as a whole. There is no mechanism in the rates system to record lump sum payments of a particular rate.

4. Approach to concluding rating period

4.1 As the end of the rating period (e.g. four or ten years) approaches, Council will have a clear picture of how much has been collected towards the grant (including interest revenue earned). If appropriate, the rate can be reduced in the final year(s) to gather the correct overall amount. Any over- or under-rating is expected to be immaterial, so a wash-up process is unlikely. The rate would not be continued beyond the rating period initially set.

Consultation:

5. Comparative analysis

5.1 In comparison to the consultation on a number of other projects, the response rate (27.4 %) with 811 submissions for the Akaroa targeted rate project is significantly higher than for the majority of other Council consultations. Considering the relatively small size of the affected community this affected community, this represents a significant response.

5.2 Below is a list of other results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of project</th>
<th>No. of submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed changes to Denton Park</td>
<td>1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed $10 million grant for Christchurch Cathedral</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis skate park Sumner</td>
<td>1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to set a targeted rate to provide funding to the Akaroa Community Health Trust</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new Linwood-Woolston pool</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed changes to Cranford Street and the surrounding area</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft annual plan 2017-2018</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Road and Moorhouse Avenue bus priority improvements</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed limit review – Banks Peninsula</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akaroa wastewater project</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for baches at Taylors mistake and Bays</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestons subdivision – speed limit change</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future of heritage</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed landscape plan for Governors Bay</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Point development plan</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 It should also be noted that the Akaroa area opinion survey 2019 carried out by the Akaroa Ratepayers and Residents Association Incorporated (which targeted permanent residents in Akaroa) received feedback from 162 people, which is considerably less than the 811 submissions received on this project.

5.4 In general the more contentious a project the more motivated residents are to participate in the process, which is why the submission numbers in relation to Denton Park, the Christchurch Cathedral and Levi’s skate park in Sumner had high submission numbers. All of these projects were very contentious and gained a lot of media coverage.

5.5 Due to the extensive community interest in the Health Centre and the media attention it has received, and due to every ratepayer affected being posted out information on this project, we believe that the community has had every reasonable opportunity to have their say.

Reference: 19/349000
Presenter(s): Dr Karleen Edwards, Chief Executive

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 This report provides an update to Council on the actions taken following the report to Council on 1 November 2018 responding to the recommendations of Bruce Robertson’s Response to Review into Management of Bore Water Security.

2. Staff Recommendations

That the Council:

1. Receive the report.
2. Note the progress on actions as outlined in the attached table, refer appendix A.

3. Context/Background

Background to the Review

3.1 On 22 December 2017 Christchurch City Council was advised by the Drinking Water Assessor that the security status for the Christchurch and Brooklands/Kainga water supplies would be changed from ‘provisionally secure’ to ‘unsecure’.

3.2 Following reports presented to a meeting of the Council’s Recess Committee on 18 January 2018 and the Council on 25 January 2018, the Council resolved to ‘Ask the Chief Executive to undertake an overarching, independent, external review of this matter so the Council can provide assurance for the future of our unchlorinated water supply…’

3.3 The Chief Executive engaged former assistant auditor-general and director of Audit NZ, Bruce Robertson, of RBRobertson Ltd, to undertake a review. The Prime Objective of the review was “in providing assurance for the future for Christchurch’s unchlorinated water supply”.

3.4 While undertaking his review, Mr Robertson was updated on events and actions post 25 January 2018, and he has acknowledged that the actions implemented after that date address many of the recommendations.

3.5 Temporary chlorination of the city’s water supply was rolled out across 50 pump stations between March and May 2018.

3.6 The report was released to the public on 16 October 2018. Key events and findings from the report were reported to the Council on 1 November 2018.

The future position of the Council – Unchlorinated Water and the Government’s reviews

3.7 Considerable progress has been made in addressing the findings and conclusions of the review. The Council is now in a stronger position to meet the upcoming (and to an extent unknown) challenges from future drinking water standards and regulatory changes. The focus
and resourcing, combined with the investments approved, demonstrate the commitment by management and elected members to a safe and secure drinking water supply, without the need for residual chlorine.

3.8 Council is implementing major works to improve the security of its water supply network, despite the absence of specific guidance from central government regarding their approach to the findings of the Havelock North inquiry. A further Cabinet paper is due on the proposed regulatory framework for water supply. Its outcomes will help Council to better evaluate what is needed to continue to supply water, without chlorine disinfection, to its community. However, this may not yet provide certainty.

3.9 The new and upgrade works being undertaken focussed on the well heads are in anticipation of higher standards in the future for the security of the water supply network – including demonstrating the security of the source water, the bore heads and the distribution network. This is in recognition of the strong feedback and views of our community as to their desire to have unchlorinated water in the future, on a permanent basis. Whether this is achievable will depend on the content of any new regulatory standards.

3.10 Major works have been completed or are underway to improve the security of the Council’s water supply network. A programme to accelerate the upgrade of the well heads across the city commenced in February 2018. To date 55 out of 140 wells have been upgraded and made secure. Work is underway or timetabled at a further 65 wells.

3.11 Ultraviolet disinfection treatment at Main Pumps is planned to be operational in July/August 2019.

3.12 By the end of July 2019 the Council will be able to provide water to all people 100 per cent of the water will be delivered without chlorine treatment, except at times of high demand. By the end of September 100 per cent of the water would be able to be delivered without chlorine disinfection.

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Progress against recommendation of the Bruce Robertson report</td>
<td>448</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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### Progress against recommendation of the Bruce Robertson report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Reset Council’s approach to the management of drinking water given its high cultural value. The reset needs an ELT-led response in the medium term given the withdrawal of the secure status. The response needs to be driven by the Three Waters Unit. ELT also needs to set a longer-term approach if Council is to achieve its objective of continuing to supply untreated water to its community</td>
<td>The establishment of dedicated resources to the Water Supply Improvement Programme, including a programme manager reporting directly to the Chief Executive, has ensured a focus on both the urgent actions to regain secure status and consideration of the longer term approach to the delivery of community water supplies. These dedicated resources has included the reprioritisation of capital budgets. Progress and any issues are reported to the ELT at least fortnightly and to the Council every two months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Note that in resetting the approach, Council needs to ensure it takes a proactive response to managing its compliance with the Drinking-water Standards.</td>
<td>The work programme includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Temporary chlorination to mitigate risk where unsecure bores supply a pump station – maintaining effective disinfection against potential contamination with the lowest possible chlorine dose; maximising delivery of water from secure bores and pump stations without chlorine treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alternative disinfection – options have been assessed and work is underway to install ultraviolet light disinfection at Main Pumps in the Central Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Well head security improvements – raising well heads above ground and installing best practise infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Associated improvement works when identified as necessary for a particular site – such as sealing of suction tanks, backflow prevention, electrical upgrades, site drainage, removal and/or encapsulation of contaminated soil, and security enhancements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communications – dedicated web page with a map showing works in progress and chlorine dose by pump station (updated weekly); proactive newsletters and media releases on the programme and associated matters such water conservation/restrictions, hot water cylinders, taste and odour concerns; regular updates to Councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Status Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Monitor the risks to the bore water source based on the three criteria, rather than on over-reliance on the absence of E. coli (Criterion 3). | • Strategy and policy framework – the vision of the draft Integrated Water Strategy is Te wai ora o Tane – water for life: valuing water and water services for people and the environment and this is supported with a specific objective for a safe and sustainable drinking water supply without the need for residual disinfection. The implementation of this vision and objective will be through the Water Supply Strategic Plan, also in draft form, as submitted to Environment Canterbury in March 2019 to fulfil the requirements of our global water take consent. Work is underway to progress the Strategy, present the final draft to Council and carry out formal public consultation this year.  
  • Beyond well heads – next steps to get to a ‘demonstrably safe’ water supply and keep the water supply for urban Christchurch free of the need for residual disinfection (addressed in more detail in response to recommendation 4).  
  • Criterion 1 – bore water must not be affected by surface or climatic influences  
    o Except for the shallowest aquifer, in the west, of the city all aquifer source water is considered to be secure  
    o All shallow bores are being replaced or the water is to be treated using UV disinfection  
    o Source water security is being confirmed by a combination of groundwater modelling, groundwater dating, geological consideration and chemical composition – for each aquifer across the city (contract awarded and a peer review panel is in place)  
  • Criterion 2 – bore head must provide satisfactory protection  
    o This is being addressed by the well head security improvement programme |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Consider the broader risks to the drinking water supply and the potential of higher standards with any new drinking water safety regime.</td>
<td>o To date 47 out of 140 wells have been upgraded and made secure. Work is underway or timetabled at a further 54 wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Criterion 3 – E. coli must be absent from the bore water o We continue to monitor bacteria and demonstrate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Staff are working with central government officials to keep abreast of and to inform the regulatory policy development underway within the Department of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Health. It is clear that a stricter regime for community water supply will be enacted and it is likely that residual disinfection will be required unless the supplier can demonstrate the protection of public health through its management of the risks associated with that supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the Christchurch urban supply that means demonstrating the security of the source water; improving the integrity of the reticulation network and tightening the operations and maintenance procedures. Additional work is also required to demonstrate the quality of the water reaching the consumer through real time monitoring technology with response plans in place to counter any changes detected. The approach to our network security is changing from one of compliance and risk management to one of best practice and quality assurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To get to a ‘demonstrably safe’ water supply and avoid residual disinfection there are a number of significant improvements to be addressed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Distribution network pipe integrity – condition assessment, criticality and priorities for renewals across mains, sub-mains and cross-overs; cost estimates and implementation programme over next 3, 10 and 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Reservoirs and suction tanks – audit of condition against a Council standard for sanitary integrity; prioritising of remedial works; estimate of costs and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Testable backflow protection – desk top assessment of residential and commercial backflow; audit and compliance surveys; prioritisation of connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Status Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                | - Pump station resilience and continuity of supply – confirm ‘critical’ pump stations to maintain minimum water supply, identify critical spares for each pump station (cost and storage implications), review and update operations and maintenance manuals for each pump station.  
- Water supply zones – implementing smaller, more manageable zones across the city with consistent (and lower) pressures to reduce leaks and breaks in the mains; a trial is underway in the Rawhiti zone  
- Smart water network – quality assurance through real time monitoring of water quality (including bacterial contamination), alert systems and response plans; better network operation through smart meters for customers plus flow, pressure and acoustic monitors across each of the water supply zones (early leak detection, early warning of breaks, and identification of pressure spikes and vulnerable infrastructure)  

Each of these improvement areas will be incorporated into the Water Supply Strategic plan and will inform the Asset Management Plan and Infrastructure Strategy as part of next LTP. |
<p>| v. <strong>Align operational risk settings for water supply with community and political values</strong> | The political and community desire for a water supply without residual disinfection is reflected in the draft Integrated Water Strategy and Water Supply Strategic Plan. Given the increasing emphasis on demonstrating the safety of community water supplies, from central government, it is likely that the costs of a system without residual disinfection would be considerably greater than those for a system with residual chlorine. The options and costs could be explored with the community through the next Long Term Plan process. |
| vi. <strong>Recognise the importance of the roles of Citycore, the DWA and MOH and its independent experts and how to reset the existing working relationships</strong> | The Three Waters and Waste Unit recognises the importance of good working relationships with our contractors, Environment Canterbury, the Drinking Water Assessor, and the Medical Officer of Health in ensuring the security of our supply. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| vii. Strengthen risk management within the Three Waters Unit:  
  - Proactively follow up, investigate and plan to resolve risks, issues and concerns  
  - Recognise the value of risk management as a management tool, and as a communications tool within the team, across providers and contractors, and vertically within Council. | Regular monthly meetings are held between the Head of Three Waters and Waste, the Water Supply Programme Manager and Drinking Water Assessor.  
  The Drinking Water Assessor and Citycare staff are fully involved in the risk assessment workshops as part of the review of the Council's Water Safety Plans.  
  Documentation, quality assurance and better monitoring of key performance indicators have all been strengthened in contracts to ensure better visibility of performance and accountabilities. Best practice is being built into the new contract specification. Significant work is being undertaken building a fit for purpose B2B system.  
  Risks across the Three Waters Unit have been reviewed. They are also subject to regular reviews by the Council's City Services Group management team in conjunction with the Council's internal auditors. Actions are monitored and analysed to ensure they are fit for purpose.  
  Water Safety Plans provide the framework for risk management in terms of ensuring good public health outcomes through our community water supplies. The Council has eight approved Plans covering its 11 community supplies. These plans are audited every three years by the Drinking Water Assessor and completely reviewed every five years. Five plans for Banks Peninsula communities are due to be reviewed and updated in 2019.  
  The Ministry of Health released a new framework for these plans in December 2018 to align more closely with international best practice. This new framework strengthens the focus on preventative measures across the whole system, promotes a multi-barrier approach to managing risk, and supports continuous improvement.  
  Following discussions with the Drinking Water Assessor and officials from the Ministry of Health in January 2019, the Council has agreed to update its plans in accordance with the new framework. This includes five supplies on Banks Peninsula, which are due to be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September, and the urban Christchurch supply, which is due to be updated by July 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council staff report on the status of the Water Safety Plans, and the response to any non-conformance identified through audits, as part of the bimonthly report on the water supply to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee. An annual report is provided to the Audit and Risk Management Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Review how the role of quality assurance and compliance can be supported and enhanced within the Three Waters Unit.</td>
<td>Quality assurance and compliance along with the appropriate documentation is progressively being integrated across the unit. This includes not only issues regarding drinking water such as backflow prevention but also is looking at approaches that relate to the proposed comprehensive stormwater network discharge consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The integration and uniformity of approach along with the desire to have a one-stop reporting shop is challenging and will not be able to be finalised until after clarity is received on the stormwater discharge consent and the central government’s proposed regulatory approach. While the unit has two dedicated staff working on these matters we are looking at ways that we can integrate this across the unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant progress has been made in regard to the documentation required at the wastewater treatment plant, and also for stormwater consents. As time permits, staff are stepping up their game and moving beyond simple compliance. There is potentially however a step change required to improve our risk management and quality assurance approach so that it is fully integrated not only across the unit but across Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upon better clarification of the government’s regulatory regime and our new stormwater consent appropriate resources will be dedicated to this task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 This Chief Executive's Report provides a summary of the Council's organisational performance for March 2019.

2. Recommendation to Council
   That the Council:
   1. Receive the report.
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Chief Executive's Foreword

May has been a very mild autumn month in the city, thankfully avoiding the challenges we sometimes face through the combination of significant leaf fall and heavy rain. We’ve been able to admire the stunning autumn colours on many sunny days throughout the month.

However, on the last day of May 75mm of rain overnight which caused surface flooding in many parts of the city, forcing the temporary closure of a number of roads and sports events to be cancelled.

Life in Christchurch Central City Survey

This month we received some good news from the results of the latest Life in Christchurch Central City Survey conducted during January and February this year, with 2900 respondents sharing their views on various aspects relating to the central city.

Some key results from the survey were:

- Between 2017 and 2019 there’s been an increase in the proportion of people who agree that the central city provides a range of education facilities, recreation, shops, services, entertainment and hospitality opportunities.

- There’s been an increase in people travelling into the central city 2–4 times a week from 13% in 2018 to 20% in 2019. Travel by car continues to be the most common mode of transport to all activities, although cycling, walking and Lime e-scooters are also showing positive trends.

- People also think the central city is safe for pedestrians (70%, up from 61% in 2018) and for cyclists (51%, up from 37% in 2018). This demonstrates the positive impact the cycle lanes have on people’s perception of safety in the central city.

- The results also show improvement in satisfaction levels and positive perceptions of the central city environment. The most common word respondents used to describe the central city was “vibrant”.

- Participants’ satisfaction with central city buildings, streetscapes and open spaces are also improving. Although the number of participants who said the central city is clean and free of litter and vandalism is under half, it is an increase from 2018. This indicates that efforts such as Snap, Send, Solve and the Graffiti Programme are having a positive impact.

It’s really encouraging to see that our efforts on the revitalisation and promotion of the central city are making a difference.

Residents Survey

At the end of the month we also released the results for the 2018-2019 Residents’ Survey Programme, full results can be viewed here. The programme measures residents’ satisfaction with a wide range of Council services. It is used to assess the Council’s performance around the services delivered to the public, improve our services, facilities and customer experience, and inform Council decision-making.

The programme includes a series of Point of Contact Service Satisfaction Surveys conducted throughout the year, and the annual General Service Satisfaction Survey conducted in March/April.

Throughout 2018 and early 2019, we received a total of 7,537 responses across the General Service Satisfaction Survey (776 respondents) and the Point of Contact Surveys (total of 6761 respondents, although individual survey samples vary from 5 to 1500 respondents).

Overall satisfaction with the Council has risen in 2019 compared to 2018 – 62% in 2019, 55% in 2018. (23% were neutral and 15% dissatisfied in 2019). These results come from the General Service Satisfaction Survey.
Areas of high satisfaction (similar to previous years):

- Kerbside collections
- First point of contact – friendly helpful staff
- Libraries
- Gardens and Hagley Park
- Delivery of community events and supporting other organisations to deliver community events

The surveys also highlight areas where residents feel dissatisfied, including:

- Water supply: water quality - only 37% are satisfied with this (down from 79% in 2018). This is attributable to the work underway to upgrade the wells, resulting in chlorination of the water supply. However, 81% were satisfied with the reliability of the water supply and 61% satisfied with Council's responsiveness.
- Roads and footpaths: low satisfaction with the condition of roads (27% satisfied) and footpaths (41% satisfied) – although both have improved since 2018 (up from 20% and 34% satisfaction, respectively).
- Council decision-making: low levels of satisfaction around people understanding, having an influence, participating and contributing to Council decision-making

Areas for improvement:

- People think we could improve in areas such as maintenance and upkeep of facilities; communication, information and advice; more efficient and faster booking systems and processes.

Other areas for improvement also included:

- Wastewater – reliability and responsiveness
- Parking – ease of use of Council on-street facilities, vehicle/personal safety in Council off-street facilities
- Better upkeep and maintenance of community parks, cemeteries, marine structure facilities
- More timely, relevant and targeted communication and marketing across all channels

Climate Emergency

This month Christchurch City Council declared a climate and ecological emergency.

We join a growing number of cities worldwide who have declared climate change emergencies and pledged to take urgent action to reduce their carbon emissions. Christchurch City Council has already set itself the target of becoming carbon neutral by 2030. We are now working towards setting a carbon neutral target for the city as a whole in consultation with our communities. Christchurch and Banks Peninsula residents were encouraged to fill out a short online survey about climate change. The findings of the survey will help inform the Council’s Climate Change Strategy and the action plans that will support it. The survey closed on 31 May.

James Hay Theatre in the Town Hall

The James Hay Theatre reopened to the public for the first time since the February 2011 earthquake on 29 May. A raft of improvements have been made to bring it up to modern day standards and to make it a more flexible performance space, suitable for both musical events and stage productions. The James Hay Theatre now seats around 700 people and retractable seating has been installed on the lower level so that standing room is available for performances such as rock concerts. Along with many residents we are delighted to see the Town Hall and James Hay Theatre reinstated as major performance venues in Christchurch.

Birthday celebrations

Two of our popular recreation facilities celebrated significant birthdays this month.
We celebrated Pioneer Recreation and Sport Centre’s 20th anniversary (the pool and gym), and Taiora QEII’s very first birthday. As part of the celebrations, we organised events at both facilities suitable for all ages.

**E-scooters**

The bright green Lime scooters that have become so familiar buzzing around the city will soon be joined by other colourful scooters belonging to two new providers. Beam and Flamingo – are coming on board, filling the remaining 600 e-scooter allocation. Singapore-based company Beam will start offering 300 e-scooters from next month while Wellington firm Flamingo intend to begin in spring.

**Cemetery and sports park possible for Templeton**

We are investigating the possibility of using 100 hectares of Council-owned land in Templeton as a cemetery and sports park. The Burial and Cremation Act 1964 makes us legally required to provide for community burial needs. With our other cemeteries at, or nearing capacity, the land at Templeton could cater for the majority of the city’s burial requirements over the next 60-70 years. We’re also preparing an outdoor sports facilities network plan. As part of this process we have identified this land as a potential location for a possible future major sports park to serve the south west of the city. Public consultation will be carried out in the future regarding the site.

**Update on water**

On 9 May water restrictions were lifted for Christchurch and Lyttelton. The amount of chlorine in the water supply has markedly decreased. Last year, when we first began treating the city’s water supply with chlorine, 48 of our 53 pump stations were being dosed at 1 part per million (ppm). Today, only seven pump stations are being dosed at 1 ppm, 31 at 0.5 ppm, and 13 are completely chlorine free. So there is less than half the amount of chlorine being used today, and we are rapidly reducing this as upgrades are completed and secure wells come back into service. Most people should notice a marked improvement in the taste of their drinking water. Christchurch’s drinking water could be chlorine free as soon as the end of July.

**Annual Plan**

A great deal of effort is being invested by staff this month to provide information to the Councillors to support their decision making on the 2019-2020 Annual Plan. They are providing analysis of feedback, evaluation of options available to the Councillors including likely costings and any rating impacts. The Councillors will draw on this advice as well as Council’s Strategic Priorities and the results of the annual Residents Survey to inform their decision making before the final Plan is adopted in June.

**New Procurement Policy**

With a spend close to $1 billion annually, Council procurement not only has a budgetary impact, but can also have a significant impact on our local communities and the quality of life we have in Christchurch. We’re now rolling out our new Sustainable Procurement Programme, which guides how we select the products, services and works we purchase. A new Procurement Policy sits at the heart of the Programme. Alongside the usual procurement goals of value, quality, timeliness, and ethical behaviour and fair dealing, we are now focusing on the principles of sustainability:

- Enhancing the environment
- Fostering local business
- And promoting diversity, acceptance, inclusiveness and access for people of all abilities.

To support the organisation through this change a comprehensive training programme has been rolled out to staff this month and a toolkit developed to help staff make purchasing decisions in line with the guiding principles of the programme.
Draft Arts Strategy - Toi Ōtāutahi/Christchurch Arts

Councilors this month endorsed our draft Arts Strategy – Toi Ōtāutahi/Christchurch Arts. This is an exciting step for Christchurch because this is the first time an arts strategy of this kind has been developed in partnership and co-owned with the arts sector and major funding agencies.

The draft strategy outlines a number of ways our city can support the growth and development of the local arts sector and attract national and international artists to Christchurch. Public consultation on the draft strategy is now open for feedback until 17 June 2019.

New Community facilities

The concept design for the new $22 million Linwood Pool complex was approved by the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board on 22 May. The concept design includes a multi-use 25-metre lane pool boasting a deep-water area with a dedicated area for “bombing”, a family spa pool, learn to swim pool, and a pool for toddlers and water deck. The outdoor community space includes a gathering area, picnic tables, tennis and multi-use courts, cycle stands, parking and plenty of open areas for all ages to enjoy. The concept design reflects the extensive community engagement the team has put into the project. It’s a huge step forward in the delivery a stunning new pool and recreation facility, long-awaited by local residents.

In addition a final design for a new St Albans Community Centre has been decided and construction work is likely to start in a few months. The single-storey building will be on the same site as the old community centre – a block of land that runs between Colombo Street and Caledonian Road. It will have a modern timber and glass facade with clean, sleek lines. Inside, it will provide about 400 square metres of floor space including a hall, two meeting rooms and other facilities such as a kitchen and outdoor deck that will be available to various community groups. This much-needed facility which will become a comprehensive and welcoming community hub.

13-18 May marks Privacy Week in New Zealand

The Office of the Privacy Commissioner marks Privacy Week each year to promote privacy awareness and to inform people of their rights under the Privacy Act. It is also to help educate businesses, organisations and agencies of their responsibilities and obligations with personal information.

The theme for 2019 is Protecting privacy is everyone’s responsibility.

If you have any privacy-related questions or your team would like an introduction to privacy and working at the Council, do not hesitate to contact the Council’s Privacy Officer – Sean Rainey – 9418549 or sean.rainey@ccc.govt.nz

On a final note, congratulations to David Bailey and the team at Ngā Puna Wai. The sporting hub’s 12 new tennis courts have received the seal of approval from the International Tennis Federation. This means we can now host international tennis competitions which is fantastic news for the city.

Council scoops Awards

We’ve won a number of awards recently and I’d like to acknowledge our staff involved.

Congratulations to Blair Jackson and his team at Christchurch Art Gallery for their recent win in the Museums Australasia Multimedia and Publication Design Awards.


This is an excellent result and a real testament to the Gallery team. Well done. We’ve also written an article on Newsline about this great achievement – you can read it here.
Congratulations also to Alistair Pearson and his team who had more than one reason to celebrate at the New Zealand Commercial Project Awards on Friday night. Our central library Tūranga took out the top national award in the Civic category and won a gold award. Two more of our Council-owned facilities, Taiora QEII and the Woolston Community Library, which were finalists in the Civic category, won silver awards.

In addition to these, two recently restored Council-owned buildings – Rose Chapel and the Old Stone House – won gold awards in the Heritage and Restoration category of the New Zealand Commercial Projects Awards. You can read more about the awards on Newsline.

Christchurch’s new central library Tūranga has been short-listed for a prestigious international award.

Tūranga is one of four libraries from around the world selected as finalists for the 2019 International Federation of Library Associations/Systematic Public Library of the Year Award. IFLA represents 1400 members in more than 140 countries.

The Public Library of the Year Award is given annually to a public library that has been newly built or set up in premises not previously used for library purposes.

Tūranga is competing against the Green Square Library and Plaza in Sydney, Australia, Bibliotheek LocHal in Tilburg, Netherlands, and the Oodi Central Library in Helsinki, Finland.

The four finalists were selected from an initial field of 16 and the winner will be announced during the IFLA Annual Congress, which will take place in Athens, Greece, in August.

Strategy and Transformation

Urban Design, Regeneration and Heritage

Central City Activation

Funding has enabled the extension of the Central City Activation Coordinator role which will ensure proposed activations are seen through to completion as well as additional support for activations over winter 2020.

Enliven Places Programme

Participating in Placemaking (PIP) projects: Winners, from 20 submitted designs, have been determined for the Light up the City competition which aims to showcase what residents love about Christchurch.

The winning design from the specialist category is ‘Spire’ - an impressive light installation that changes colours when visitors walk around it. Spire will be delivered in Cathedral Square in early July.
Business Workshops

ChristchurchNZ, the Central City Business Association, Canterbury Employers Chamber of Commerce and the City Council are collaborating to deliver a Winter Series of events in June/July aimed at Central City businesses. The sessions offer information and practical measures to support and promote businesses during the tougher winter season and will help business leverage from marketing campaigns including the current one by Air New Zealand.

Central City Portal

The revamped Central City pages are now live on the CCC website. Features include: Explore Amazing Places, Travel Easy, Watch this Space, Things to do. Development of the "Living here" and "Develop here" webpages will follow in coming months.

Winter Events

The winter events guide has been delivered to city households. Approximately 95% of events listed are to be held in the Central City, and most make use of the city’s growing range of indoor venues.

The guide opens with the Cavell Leitch NZ International Jazz and Blues Festival, Armageddon Expo and the IRT Harness Jewels.

People can also celebrate Matariki in June or play away the school holidays with KidsFest in July.

From a night of Pulp Fiction at the Isaac Theatre Royal to an evening of award-winning comedy with Michael McIntyre, nearly 80 events will keep the city entertained during the colder months.

Enliven Places Projects Fund

Supported a range of twenty community projects in the central city, New Brighton and Phillipstown. The $150,000 contestable fund has been fully allocated this year. The fund supports projects that temporarily transform vacant spaces into spaces that are lively, that create a sense of place and support local economy. Project highlights this year:

- Hāngi pits. Installation of four temporary hāngi pits at the Commons, 70 Kilmore Street, led by Matapopore will be bookable by the community.
- Plain Sight. Development of a free smartphone app that will augment street art murals in central Christchurch:

https://www.facebook.com/evanstaylordigital/videos/2221520044627826/

- Arts Centre Mākete and Pop Up Art Exhibition. Two distinct summer projects at Market Square: Arts Centre Mākete (Sundays, October 2018 – October 2019) and the Pop Up Art Exhibition (October 2018 – January 2019) that exhibited 50 local artworks.
- Little Andromeda. A pop-up theatre from 4 October – 17 November 2018, brought together a diverse group of performers and 92+ performances, attracting nearly 7,000 attendees.
Citizens and Community

Capital Delivery

Awards

At the New Zealand Commercial Project Awards on 17 May Tūranga took out the top national award in the Civic Category, winning gold.

Taiora QEII and the Woolston Community Library were finalists in the Civic category and won silver awards.

Old Stone House Cracroft won a gold award in the Heritage/Restoration Category and the Rose

Chapel took out the National Category Winner and gold award in the Heritage Category.

- Kitchen facilities fit-out is completed
- CSO and landscaping works continue

Christchurch Town Hall

- The James Hay Theatre had a successful reopening last week with a lot of positive feedback and media coverage. The first ticketed event was the Celtic Tenors which went very well.

There is a lot of interest in future bookings to add to the existing calendar of events.
Hornby Library, Customer Services and South West Leisure Centre

The Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board approved the commencement of the process to make changes to the reserve classification Kyle Park and to the Kyle Park Management Plan, which are required for the facility to proceed on Kyle Park.

- Consultation regarding the changes closed on 15 April with 186 submissions received.
- A Hearings Panel will be convened in June to consider all the submissions and to make a recommendation to the Community Board in August.

Lancaster Park Demolition & Deconstruction

- Crane work on the Paul Kelly Stand continues
- Permission has been granted to the contractor and a developer to stockpile concrete with transfer started mid-May. The contractor has committed local resources to shifting the first 850 trackloads to mitigate this programme being behind schedule.
- Work on the Deans Stand is well advanced

- Prime Television has indicated a second series of the ‘Demolition NZ’ programme will feature the final stages of the stadium demolition.

Linwood Pool

- Final version of the Concept Design was approved at the Community Board meeting 22 May.
- The gifting of a Te Reo name for the facility has been requested via the Council’s Ngai Tahu Partnership team. The chosen name will complement the cultural design input Matapopore has provided.
- The Project Team has established ongoing liaison with the Parks team who are developing the Master Plan for Linwood Park.

Metro Sports Facility

- Ground remediation using stone columns is completed.
- Main Works contractor appointed and took position of site on 6 May.
- A Sod Turning Ceremony was celebrated on Friday 7 June.

Ngā Puna Wai

- The project remains within budget and is nearing completion with the handover of the Rugby League facilities planned for June 10. This includes some residual work to be done on the Rugby League Covered Seating CS1 and handover of the two Rugby League turfs.
- On 9 May the Tennis Courts received their ITF One Star Certification. Another milestone for this project.
- Remaining landscaping works are now taking shape with grass having struck and all gardens planted.

Performing Arts Precinct

- Following Council approval in March of the Business Case and Feasibility Study, staff are working with the Crown to confirm the land divestment process (the Crown has yet to obtain all land for the precinct).
- CCC and the Crown are working together to obtain an agreement to allow advancement of the car parking RFP.
- A development agreement has been written outlining how Council and the Court Theatre will work together.
- The Square & Surrounds
- The project team continues to engage with stakeholders including heritage groups, private developers and property owners.
- The Concept Design Proposal for S/SE quadrants was approved by Council March 28.
- Staff are now progressing the Detailed Design and preparing tender documents.

**Christchurch Art Gallery**

The Gallery recently celebrated a massive win at the Museums Australasia Publication Design Awards (MAPDAs) held in Alice Springs. Congratulations to the Gallery’s publishing team of David Simpson and Sarah Pepperle. The Gallery won best magazine (Bulletin), best book (Us v Them: Tony de Lautour), best children’s book (ART-TASTIC) and best in show (Us v Them)!

With a very competitive completion CAG was absolutely thrilled to take so many accolades, especially the best in show. It’s also particularly pleasing to receive these prestigious awards given that the design work for this magazine and ART-TASTIC were both undertaken by students and recent graduates from the Ilam School of Fine Arts. Blair and the Gallery shared their great appreciation and thanks for the partnership developed with SoFA.

An enormous thank you to senior lecturer in design at Ilam, Aaron Beehre, who made all of the publications happen.

The Gallery’s publications are a great way to share Christchurch’s Gallery collections and keep in touch with a wider audience and, in the case of ART-TASTIC, to really engage with young people and get them interested in the world of art. You can buy all of them in the Gallery’s design Store.

**Wheriko – Brilliant!**

Prepare to be dazzled with the Gallery’s beautiful new exhibition Wheriko – Brilliant! Running from 17 May to 16 February, 2020, artists play with shadow and light transforming the familiar into the extraordinary. In te reo Māori, ‘wheriko’ can mean to sparkle, flash or glisten. It can also mean to be resplendent, impressive or brilliant. This exhibition is an engaging contemporary art experience for all ages, full of sculptures, paintings, videos and more. Combining light-based works from the Gallery’s collection with several special loans, Wheriko – Brilliant! explores the many roles light can play in the making and experiencing of art.

**After Dark**

On Friday 24 May the Gallery hosted a free late night event called AFTER DARK in the Bayleys Knight Frank Foyer. With contemporary art, some of the hottest local bands and DJs, the 3400 attendees immersed themselves in the Gallery’s collection, tasted incredible food and beverages and partied with the four band line-up. A staircase special drag performance was a highlight for the audience.
Community Support, Governance & Partnerships

Opening of Basketball lights Hoon-Hay Park

Work was completed on Hoon Hay Park with the opening held Friday May 10. The project was initiated by ten Hillmorton High School students from Rowley made a deputation to the Spreydon-Cashmere Community Board asking for lights to be installed on their basketball court. To show how serious they had raised over $2,000 before attending the meeting.

The Spreydon-Cashmere Community Board were fully supportive. The boys attended an annual planning workshop with their parents and put forward the many ideas they had for their park.

The boys (now young men) opened the lights on their basketball court along with a BBQ, BBQ shelter, tiered seating, new picnic tables, extra bins and the court painted. They wanted the park to be an attractive inter-generational bumping space where people felt safe. This group of fantastic young men have been supported by two local community organisations (Cross Over Trust and Spreydon Youth Community Trust) who have mentored and encouraged them since they were primary aged children.

The young men also started Hoon Hay Hoops, a 3v3 informal basketball competition which is being duplicated in other areas of the city due its success. They would ultimately love for the city to have an overall suburb winner. This is a work in progress.

Belfast Baseline Play Insights

The Belfast baseline play insights research funded by Sport New Zealand has been completed.

The research, aimed to develop a baseline picture of Children’s transport modes to school and for play, how children are playing, where and how often and what the barriers are to play has yielded some interesting results. Similar research has been carried out in other parts of New Zealand allowing some comparisons.

The research specifically targeted children enrolled in the local primary school, Belfast School (year 0-8), along with their parents/caregivers. Some of the key findings of the research:

- Nearly one out of two (46%) children are not playing every day.
- Nearly two-thirds of parents and nearly three-quarters of grandparents surveyed agreed that children don’t create their own play or games as much as they used to in their own childhoods.
- Almost all parents and grandparents (97% and 98% respectively), along with children, agreed that play is not only important but essential for a child’s development, yet parents admitted that playtime was often not prioritised.
- Two out five (40%) children surveyed indicated that they want more play time outside and almost two-thirds of children (63%) wanted more time playing with their parents.

Parents and children both face similar barriers when it comes to play: finding the time, sourcing inspiration and over-reliance on technology.
Children in Belfast are more likely to be transported to school by car (62%) compared with Hutt City on (22%). The research is currently being shared with the school and the community.

New Brighton Boardroom Enhancements

The New Brighton Boardroom is the second Community Board meeting space to receive technology enhancements.

Enhancements include microphones at the meeting table, digital projectors and screens, internet fibre with improved WiFi and room speakers to enable clearer hearing of meetings. The changes have improved interaction with presenters and enhanced the experience for those in attendance at Community Board meetings.

Infocouncil Milestones

Recently the Governance Process Specialist trained its 1000th system user. Christchurch City Council has been using the Infocouncil application since late 2015 to manage elected member and ELT meeting reports, agendas, minutes and actions. Since then, Infocouncil users have generated 12,000 reports (and all the agendas and minutes for the meetings these reports relate to) as well as actively managed 7058 actions created from our meetings.

Strength, Balance & Good Yarn class in Lyttelton

The Banks Peninsula Community Governance Team has established a key partnership with Sport Canterbury, which has led to a ‘Strength, Balance and a Good Yarn’ class kicking off this term in Lyttelton.

ACC, who support this initiative, ensure that the class incorporates exercises which reduce falls and meet a set of nine assessment criteria. The class focuses on improving lower body and core strength as well as balance, which will lead to gains in movement confidence. Twenty one attendees in the first few weeks has been a fantastic result. The ultimate aim is to have a class run by people in the community for the people in the community. We are currently working on this next stage.

Libraries & Information

Finalists – IFLA Awards

Tūranga is one of four libraries from around the world selected as finalists for the 2019 International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA)/Systematic Public Library of the Year Award.

IFLA is the leading international body representing the interests of library and information services and their users.
Va Oceans Between

From 18 May to 21 July 2019, Va Oceans Between exhibition will show in Southbase Gallery, Te Ranga.

Va Oceans Between is an exploration of Pacific peoples living in Christchurch and their relationship to the Moana, Ōtautahi and each other through the use of never seen before Polynesian artefacts from Canterbury Museum.

Parks

During May the 242nd species of bird recorded in the Greater Christchurch area arrived in Christchurch.

An oceanic seabird, the Soft-plumaged Petrel (from the Sub-Antarctic Antipodes Islands) was found crash landed in Avonhead, was rescued by DoC and rehabilitated by the Hornby Veterinary Centre. CCC rangers then released the bird from a headland near Te Oka Reserve and watched as it headed out to sea.

Meanwhile the 241st bird species recorded in Christchurch, the Siberian-breeding Northern Shoveler, reappeared. Originally recorded in June 2018 near the Halswell River mouth at Lake Ellesmere, one bird was subsequently seen at Kaitorete Spit in November 2018, then a bird was found at the Bromley Oxidation Ponds in April 2019 while yet another was reported on the wetlands at Pegasus Town in the Waimakariri District. Below is a picture of the Bromley bird, a male inbreeding plumage, surrounded by its cousin, a New Zealand Shoveler (behind) and a pair of Grey Teal.

Vbase

ASB Christchurch Marathon

With almost 5,000 participants braving the cold winter weather, Vbase was honoured to host the return of the ASB Christchurch Marathon over Queens Birthday weekend. With 200 volunteers and thousands of spectators and competitors, it was a magnificent weekend filled with lots of energy and enthusiasm with the Christchurch Town Hall showcasing its beautiful renovation.

Cancer Society Ball 2019

On Saturday 25 May, Vbase proudly played host to over 400 guests at the 2019 Cancer Society Ball held in the Douglas Lilburn Auditorium at the Christchurch Town Hall, all for a very worthy cause.

Consenting and Compliance

BCA Accreditation Assessment:

Council’s accreditation assessment with IANZ was undertaken in two parts over the last six months, to allow us to manage the process, scope and reduce interruptions on staff. The split also required fewer IANZ staff and technical experts, as the assessment scopes were tailored to the business and quality management functions (quality management system vs technical and implementation). The first part of the assessment was undertaken in November 2018, and the second part was in March 2019. Two general non-compliances (GNCs) were identified and there were some minor inconsistencies identified. Action plans have been submitted to IANZ. Clearance of these will be completed by the due date of 19 July 2019.
The assessment team emphasised the positive feedback, discussion and involvement of staff during both assessments. The next assessment date is March 2021, returning to a two year cycle.

**Building Consenting Update**

**Building Consents**

Building Consent application numbers have remained relatively consistent across the last three months, with 355 building consent decisions issued in April. We are on track to achieve our target of 95% of building consent decisions issued within 19 days.

341 Code Compliance Certificates were issued in April, 99.1% of those were within the 20 day statutory timeframe.

**Earthquake Prone Buildings**

By the end of April 2019, there were 682 Christchurch buildings on the national earthquake prone building register. We added 45 buildings in April, and removed 11 due to structural strengthening being completed. The increase in buildings added to the register over March and April is largely due to one property containing 37 separately titled buildings.

Link to the register: [https://epbr-building.govt.nz/](https://epbr-building.govt.nz/)

Following council approval and completion of consultation on the city’s strategic routes, staff have so far identified 162 priority buildings where the previous time frame of 15 years to strengthen or demolish will be reduced to seven and a half years. We have sent updated information and notices to 51 of these buildings, the remaining 111 will be completed shortly. All of the 162 buildings fit within the following priority buildings criteria:

- unreinforced masonry buildings
- buildings located on strategic routes, high pedestrian areas and thoroughfares
- early childhood centres, registered schools, private training (occupied by at least 20 people)
- hospital buildings that will likely be needed in an emergency
- buildings that are used to provide emergency response


All buildings on the EPB register have received the previously ‘standard’ 15 year notice when they were identified as earthquake prone. Included with the notice was advice that the earthquake prone building legislation was going to change, and that these changes may result in reduced timeframes for owners to strengthen or demolish their buildings.

It is worth noting that at this point that there are approximately 5,882 pre 1976 (Category B) buildings to check. We have until 2022 to complete this task, but as we are well under way with this already, we expect to have this completed by early 2020.

**Eco-Design**

The eco design service workload was busy in March (28) and April (32) a total of 60 individual consultations for residential buildings over the two month period. We have already reached 314 for this financial year, which exceeds our yearly target of 300 assessments.

The EDA service was involved with a number of in-house groups, as well as not-for-profit associations and a public health group to promote healthier community housing. The advisor also made a submission to the Queenstown Lakes District Council annual plan, proposing that they employ an eco-design advisor, and recently consulted with MBIE for Amendments to Acceptable Solutions and Verification Methods 2019/1.

**Resource Consents: Application Numbers/Performance**

Applications received decreased from 277 in March to 230 in April. A decrease was expected due to the Easter/ANZAC period during April.
One Temporary Accommodation approval was issued in April. 18 District Plan certificates were issued in April.

Overall application numbers are tracking slightly below the 2017/18 year.

99% of non-notified applications were processed within the 20 day timeframe in April. YTD is still tracking at 99%. Notified applications were 100% within timeframe for April and YTD.

Customer Satisfaction

Included on the decision letter for every resource consent is a link to an electronic survey. This survey provides feedback on the service which is reviewed regularly and feeds into the continuous improvement programme. The April survey indicated 100% of respondents were satisfied with the quality of service received throughout the consent process, year to date satisfaction is tracking at 88%, the highest score to date. In addition, in the Council’s Residents Survey, resource consents achieved 74% customer satisfaction which was above the target of 70%.

Regulatory Compliance

Freedom Camping Season
A summary of the season is below:

- This year’s proactive freedom camping campaign came to an end on Monday 29 April 2019. The campaign consisted of an education, monitoring, and enforcement regime that took place throughout the Christchurch and Banks Peninsula area, seven days a week.

- We received $415,000 in additional funding from the Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment from the Responsible Camping Fund, which enabled us to improve and implement initiatives relating to freedom camping this season. This included education material, new and updated signage, road markings and a new toilet installation at Thomson Park New Brighton. This funding also enabled additional monitoring and enforcement officers to be employed across the Akaroa and Christchurch city areas.

- There was a large decrease in complaints this season, with Council receiving 133 complaints between 5 November 2018 and 29 April 2019. Compared to the 271 complaints received for the same period last year, this is a marked improvement on the previous season.

- To date, for the same period, 203 infringements were issued across the Christchurch district relating to breaches of the Freedom Camping Act. 104 infringements have been paid and 42 withdrawn.

City Services

Three Waters & Waste

Project Management
Lyttelton Harbour Wastewater Scheme

Work Package 3, commissioning of the Governors Bay pump station has ended routine discharges of treated waste water into Governors Bay. Unstable rock faces at Diamond Harbour treatment plant conversion have also been remediated. Simeon Quay terminal pump station works are progressing with pipe works on the Simeon Quay carriageway expected within the next two months.

Work Package 4, the contractor’s methodology has been incompatible with the encountered ground conditions for the green field section which will result in delays for completion of this section. The contractor has opened up other work fronts to continue work while the methodology is adjusted to ensure the project as a whole will be delivered on time.
Well Head Security Improvement Programme

Good progress is being made remediating the city’s well heads. In total 55 well heads have been upgraded and signed off as secure, which together contribute 33% of the city’s water supply. Construction contracts have been awarded to upgrade a further 65 well heads, which provide 50% of the city’s water. A further 12 wells (10% of the city’s water) are in the tendering stage and construction contracts for these will be awarded soon.

Asset Planning – Stormwater

Council delivered its response to matters arising from the resumed Comprehensive Stormwater Network Discharge Consent hearing on 26 April. A further submission from a Styx resident was responded to by Council on 3 May, with a final closing response to further Styx submissions by Council on 10 May. The decision on the application is expected by 4 June 2019.

Construction progress on key stormwater facilities and infrastructure projects has been good over recent weeks, assisted by favourable weather.

Water Supply Pump Stations projects

The Preliminary Design of the Jeffreys Suction Tank has been completed and a presentation was made to the Fendalton Community Board. Detailed design is expected to be completed in August 2019.

The construction works at the new Wrights Pump Station is progressing. Two wells are being drilled. The new pump station is expected to be online by end October 2019.

Location of the new suction tank at Sydenham Pump Station has been identified. Procurement of services for Detail Soil Investigation and geotechnical assessment works is in progress.

Asset Planning – Water and Wastewater

Rawhiti water supply zone pressure management trial – the operation of the zone at 600 kPa remains stable and planning is underway to proceed with the next 50 kPa pressure drop.

Aranui and Shirley vacuum sewer system monitoring – the Aranui and Shirley vacuum sewer system performance have improved after the systems were re-tuned early April. The operation of the system is closely monitored to confirm whether the improvement is maintained through wet weather.
Solid Waste

Battery collections trial started 13 April with positive feedback from the community and participating sites management. Encouraging uptake with collection containers filling fast at all six sites. Please see the website and TV 1 news article links below:
https://ccc.govt.nz/services/rubbish-and-recycling/disposal/batteryrecycling/

As of 13 May, 441,752 wheelie bins have been fitted with RFID tags representing a completion rate of 93% and on target for the three year project completion. 7079 additional bins have been removed from circulation as of this date.

Stormwater and Land Drainage

The 97 projects in the capital programme are progressing well. Good progress has been made on many sites with the recent fine weather.

Stabilisation of the emergency bund in Southshore and South New Brighton and the minor extension of the Avon River stopbank are programmed to start in the coming months. Heathcote dredging works are also soon to restart. Road works on Richardson Terrace, associated with the Bells Creek Pump Station are now complete and Wigram Basin earthworks and wetland planting are nearly complete.

Wastewater Treatment Plant

An update on the 2016/19 midge control programme was provided to the Burwood and Coastal Community Board. This was well received and also reflected positively in the media by way of front page news article of the local Pegasus Post.

The capital programme also stepped up a gear, with a large number of contractor onsite refurbishing offices, renewing sludge tanks and making infrastructure improvements on the oxidation ponds.

Transport

The feedback below was received on the Sumner Main Road Programme on their stakeholder engagement work.

"Hats off to JFC for organising the preschool visit this morning, there were some VERY happy people in Sumner today! I'm pretty sure you could have heard the squeals from the City! I have to say JFC are really knocking it out of the ball park with their community engagement.

Aerial image taken of the sludge tank renewal project.

Bells Creek Pump Station Site
Maintenance

The final reseal sites are being completed, footpath renewals are all done. Final minor repairs are being carried out, weather permitting, to make sure the roads are fit for winter (ie small patches, digouts etc).

Additional leaf sweeping has been underway since April; this is done when the kerb upstand is no longer visible. Regular scheduled sweeping is still carried out as per our usual schedule.

Pre-sweeping in flood prone areas will be carried out when major rain events are expected. Sump covers should be cleared in all of these operations.

Scheduled sweeping frequency was halved three years ago, i.e. weekly becoming fortnightly, fortnightly becoming monthly, etc. Hence leaves do lay in the gutter and are more visible to the public for longer.

Riccarton Road Project update

- Water main including laterals and testing is 90% complete.
- Waste water work is proceeding at 5 locations, each with dedicated resources.
- Work is currently tracking approximately 2 weeks ahead of the baseline programme.

- Stakeholder drop-in sessions are held fortnightly at different coffee shops on Riccarton Road. Feedback from the stakeholders is positive with satisfaction expressed on the work progress and the level of communications.

Asset Management

In preparation for the 2021 LTP the staff responsible for compiling the 14 asset management plans that provide the basis of asset information for the LTP are attending a series of workshops.

There are ten workshops planned to take place through this year. Each workshop focuses on a specific section of the Asset Management Plan. Subject matter experts from within the organisation present on the appropriate topic and the overall workshop is facilitated by an Asset Management consultant who brings a national perspective to the process.

To date the following workshop topics have been covered

- Strategic Context
- Lifecycle Management -representing Data as Information
- Demand for our Services - Growth projections for the city

The workshops have attracted good numbers averaging 50 attendees made up of the AMP writers and other stakeholders involved in the LTP process.

The next workshop on 26 June is focusing on Risk and Resilience.

By November 2019 we are aiming to have all 14 draft AMPs ready to be presented to ELT prior to sharing with the new council in the New Year.
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1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Mayor to report on external activities she undertakes in her city and community leadership role; and to report on outcomes and key decisions of the external bodies she attends on behalf of the Council.

1.2 This report is compiled by the Mayor's office.

2. Mayors Recommendations

That the Council:

1. Receive the information in this report.
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Mayor’s Report to Elected Members – May 2019

Foreword

May was a busy month with two conferences that took me out of the city for a total of 7 days. On both occasions, I was given the opportunity to reinforce the importance of enabling community leadership to come to the fore in post disaster environments.

Investiture Ceremony

The invitation to speak at the Investiture ceremony for Shaheed (martyr) Naeem Rashid was an incredible privilege. This was only the fourth award of ‘Nishan-e-Shuja’at’, Pakistan’s highest gallantry award for a civilian, and the first ever awarded outside Pakistan. HE Dr Abdul Malik, High Commissioner of Pakistan to NZ, presented the award to his widow and two sons. Listening to her and the older son speak with such conviction about the sacrifice made by their father reinforced the message of peace and love that has represented the grace and dignity of our Muslim brothers and sisters’ response to the atrocity of 15 March.

Courtesy call from US Ambassador

United States Ambassador Scott Brown and his wife Gail, visited Christchurch again to pay their respects. I took the opportunity to show him the flag that we had received from Orlando City that had been signed by people in City Hall. It was another powerful expression of solidarity between cities that had shared the pain of such an atrocity.

Tuia Wananga at Tuahiwi Marae

A visit to the local Tuahiwi Marae provided a wonderful occasion to meet up with two of the young people I have had the privilege to mentor, as part of the Tuia Mentoring programme. It is an excellent initiative that had its beginnings as part of the Mayors’ Taskforce for Jobs.

Wigram School Opening

Chair, Jay Geldard and Principal, Heather Walkinshaw, both spoke of their aspirations for the school and the diversity it represents. They have lived up to their ambition to be the place “where learning is at the HEART”, with Heart standing for: Hauora, Explore, Aspire, Respect, and Taonga. I love how the school’s logo, two kākāu facing a runway, reflects the aviation history of its new home, which is also reflected in the motto ‘learning together, soaring to new heights’. Te Piki Kahu is the new school’s name.

University of Canterbury Otakaro Avon River Corridor symposium on governance options

I was really pleased that the University has helped to begin a conversation on models of governance that could apply to this amazing corridor that stretches from the city to the sea. The opportunities contained within that incredible expanse represent the real legacy of the earthquakes. We need to take an inter-generational approach, taking into account the pros and cons of all governance models. We were fortunate to be joined by Laurie Johnson, who happened to be in New Zealand at the same time. Laurie has nearly 30 years of experience in urban planning and disaster-related consulting, management and research. She has written extensively about land use and risk, disaster recovery and reconstruction, and the economics of catastrophes. I took from her comments that there is no ‘one-size-fits-all’ solution but the community is always at the heart of successful governance models.

UCSA tour of Haere-roa

Sam Brosnanah, President, and members of UCSA, along with Chancellor, Sue McCormack, three of UC’s senior Management Team and Leigh’s Construction led a tour of the new UCSA building, Haere-Roa, which will open at the beginning of August.

It is an incredible facility, which will quickly become the heart of the UC student experience. The UCSA is still fundraising, however I think with all the alumni, there will be a real desire to pay it forward for a new generation of graduates, and the next legacy.

UN Secretary-General

It was a privilege to meet the UN Secretary-General, HE Antonio Guterres, who spent a few hours in Christchurch on his way to the Pacific Islands. His mission was focused on Climate Change, however, he took the time to visit both Al Noor Mosque and the Linwood Islamic Centre. He was very positive about the city and the nation’s response.

GoodWishes Scroll of Peace

The Scroll of Peace was the work of Shekhar Kumat, the founder of GoodWishes, a Melbourne based organisation. After the 15 March attacks, over 5000 good wishes and messages were collected from communities across Melbourne on the 100m long roll of paper and presented to us at the Council by Shekhar himself. The scroll has been made available to the Muslim communities and will be part of their archive.

Thank You Iftar Dinner

The Canterbury Muslim Community Trust invited a number of representatives from emergency services and the hospital to honour them for their response to the tragic events of March 15. Dr Sharif Tawfeek, a medical health professional at Christchurch Women’s Hospital, had made a short film with still shots of the events of the day and after, which was incredibly moving to watch.

Queenspark School

Cr David East and I were pleased to attend the school assembly at Queenspark School to present the Hillary Awards for leadership and community engagement. At the same time we received a cheque for $400 for the Our People, Our City Fund that the students had raised as part of a Colours Day. This was in addition to the $400 they raised for St John and $500 for children’s books for the hospital emergency department. It was an incredible effort.
WADEM Congress
I was invited to speak at the World Association of Disaster & Emergency Medicine (WADEM) Congress in Brisbane in a workshop that was focused on community resilience. I was also asked to join with some of the Sri Lankan delegates to talk about the impact of terrorism on our cities on March 15 and then Easter Sunday. I spoke in particular about the immediate response and the extraordinary efforts of the hospital teams. Both presentations had a powerful impact and the delegates who attended the special plenary session stood for a minute’s silence, marking the enormity of what had occurred. I also took the opportunity to reinforce the ‘nothing about us without us’ message in the WHO session. This served as a useful springboard for the discussions that would take place at the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in Tokyo the following week.

Visit to Lord Mayor of Brisbane
While at the WADEM Congress, I paid a courtesy call on the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Councillor Adrian Schrinner, who offered the city’s condolences and presented a condolence book filled with beautiful messages. He told me that the square below city hall was filled with people as a public vigil was held in the wake of the attacks.

James Hay Theatre tour
As elected members, returning to the James Hay Theatre was another highlight for us all. It is so much more than it was before the earthquakes. The acoustic challenges have been resolved with a new Constellation acoustic system—only the second in NZ—and the improvements to the existing fly tower and new fly system, as well as new retractable seating on the lower level, will enable the theatre to be a truly multi-use facility.

Welcome to Bob Mangan, new CEO of the ITR
We had the opportunity to welcome the new Chief Executive of the Isaac Theatre Royal, Bob Mangan, to hear of the challenges the Theatre faces and the opportunities that exist in this special place that has the soul of the region’s theatre experience. We mustn’t forget those who saved the theatre at the 11th hour: Malcolm Douglass, Stephen Erber, Malcolm Ott, Colin Robertson, David Stock, Sir Miles Warren & Noel Wescy.

Greater Christchurch Partnership Meeting with Phil Clearwater and Sara Templeton
At this meeting, further work was undertaken to finalise the ‘Our Space’ Future Development Strategy. The matter has been referred back to the Hearings Panel to clarify a couple of matters and returned to the GCP June meeting, before being referred to individual councils.

CDEM Joint Committee
At this month’s meeting we received an update on the National Disaster Resilience Strategy, which came into effect on 10 April this year. We agreed that workshops should be held at the local authority level to ensure there was buy in across the region, and as the basis for going out into the wider community. https://www.civildefence.govt.nz/cdem-sector/plans-and-strategies/national-disaster-resilience-strategy/

Urban Resilience Forum
I was invited to attend the 2019 Urban Resilience Forum in Tokyo, which took place in conjunction with the Urban 20 Mayors summit, a city-focused initiative linking to the G20, scheduled to take place in Osaka in July. The main output of the URF was to agree on the Tokyo Declaration on Enhancing Urban Resilience, which was signed by the participating cities on the last day. My focus was on the need to acknowledge and foster community leadership and involvement when planning for the future and in post disaster recovery. Given where the impacts of climate change will be felt the most, cities need to be prepared to lead the way on climate action, as well as committing to social cohesion to facilitate a just transition to a decarbonised future.

Meeting with Mayor of Rotterdam
The URF enabled me to again meet Rotterdam Mayor Ahmed Aboutaleb, who is also part of the 100 Resilient Cities Network, pioneered by the Rockefeller Foundation. He is an inspirational leader with a passion for the ‘We Society’—there are no ‘others’—just ‘we’. I intend to invite him to come to Christchurch next year.

College House fireside chat
It was asked to speak about the role Council played in the aftermath of the shootings. I talked about the less visible side of the work that went into supporting the burials, the Call to Prayer and the National Remembrance Service, as well as supporting the families at the Hub, as well as assisting with a number of community events.
22. Resolution to Exclude the Public


I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely items listed overleaf.

Reason for passing this resolution: good reason to withhold exists under section 7.
Specific grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution: Section 48(1)(a)

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

“(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

(a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and
(b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority.”

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>SUBCLAUSE AND REASON UNDER THE ACT</th>
<th>PLAIN ENGLISH REASON</th>
<th>WHEN REPORTS CAN BE RELEASED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>OLD MUNICIPAL CHAMBERS FUTURE USE AND FUNDING OPTIONS</td>
<td>S7(2)(B)(II), S7(2)(F)(II), S7(2)(H), S7(2)(I)</td>
<td>PREJUDICE COMMERCIAL POSITION, PROTECTION FROM IMPROPER PRESSURE OR HARASSMENT, COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES, CONDUCT NEGOTIATIONS</td>
<td>DUE TO THE INCLUSION OF SENSITIVE INFORMATION FROM THE EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST PROCESS AND COMMERCIAL SENSITIVITY THEREIN</td>
<td>AFTER A LONG TERM LEASE HAS BEEN SIGNED WITH A TENANT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ROBERT MCDUGALL GALLERY FUTURE USE AND FUNDING OPTIONS</td>
<td>S7(2)(B)(II), S7(2)(F)(II), S7(2)(H), S7(2)(I)</td>
<td>PREJUDICE COMMERCIAL POSITION, PROTECTION FROM IMPROPER PRESSURE OR HARASSMENT, COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES, CONDUCT NEGOTIATIONS</td>
<td>DUE TO THE INCLUSION OF SENSITIVE INFORMATION FROM THE EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST PROCESS AND COMMERCIAL SENSITIVITY THEREIN</td>
<td>ONCE A LEASE AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>(SC) RESULTS OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR SIGN OF THE TAKAHE AND LEASE AGREEMENT</td>
<td>S7(2)(B)(II), S7(2)(H), S7(2)(I)</td>
<td>PREJUDICE COMMERCIAL POSITION, COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES, CONDUCT NEGOTIATIONS</td>
<td>RELEASING THIS REPORT WOULD RELEASE COMMERCIAL SENSITIVE AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION BELONGING TO COUNCIL AND RFP RESPONDENT. THIS MAY RESULT IN EITHER PARTY’S COMMERCIAL POSITION BEING COMPROMISED</td>
<td>28 AUGUST 2020 WHEN LEASE AGREEMENTS ARE APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL AND FINALISED WITH THE SUCCESSFUL APPLICANT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFER OF ASSETS TO OTAUTAHI COMMUNITY HOUSING TRUST</td>
<td>S7(2)(B)(II), S7(2)(I)</td>
<td>PREJUDICE COMMERCIAL POSITION, CONDUCT NEGOTIATIONS</td>
<td>COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE UNTIL COUNCIL APPROVAL RECEIVED AND TENANT CONSULTATION HAS BEEN UNDERTAKEN</td>
<td>31 AUGUST 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>