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APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Community Street Reviews (CSR) were undertaken as part of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Neighbourhood Accessibility Plan Investigation (KAPTI). The purpose of the CSR was to assess the current environment for walking in the central area of Kaiapoi and to suggest possible solutions to improve access by foot into the town centre.

The reviews were carried out over two days, 10 November 2008 and 20 February 2009. The total route was 3.5 km long and included Williams Street from Carew Street in the south to Sewell Street in the north. The roads feeding into Williams Street were also reviewed including Fuller Street, Hilton Street, Raven Quay, Charles Street and Sewell Street. The methodology followed the CSR approved by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to indicate a ‘level of service’ for the sections and route overall. On both occasions Abley Transportation Consultants Limited staff provided advice regarding the route and undertook engineering variable readings on the day.

The CSR found the quality of the path lengths over the entire route were good. There were two notable exceptions but overall 20 of the 22 path lengths were rated as ‘good’ to ‘very good’ or ‘neutral’. Two path lengths were rated ‘bad’ with the main concerns being path maintenance, over grown vegetation and parked vehicles encroaching onto the footpath. The quality of the road crossings was more variable with five of the eight crossings being rated as ‘slightly bad’, or ‘bad’, two ‘neutral’ and one ‘good’. The main reason for the low rating for these five road crossings is either the lack of a formal crossing or the type of crossing where there is no clear guide as to who has right of way.

There is room for improvement over all path lengths in particular monitoring the use of advertising boards and other obstructions, improved maintenance of path surfaces and landscaping, installing tactile and directional pavers, providing sheltered seating and the marking of vehicle crossings giving pedestrians priority. Similarly the road crossings can be improved by ensuring pedestrians have a good view of approaching traffic, educating drivers and pedestrians about raised crossings and who has ‘right of way’, installing directional indicators and better tactile and visual aids and slowing traffic at these intersections.
1 Introduction

As part of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Neighbourhood Accessibility Plan Investigation (KAPTI), two Community Street Reviews (CSR) were undertaken of the central business area of Kaiapoi. The purpose of the CSR was to assess the current environment for walking in the central area and to suggest possible solutions to improve access to the town centre on foot.

The results will contribute to the KAPTI which is currently being developed with the purpose of encouraging pedestrians and cyclists in the town centre.

2 Survey Methodology

The review took place on two separate days, led on both occasions by Lynley Beckingsale, Neighbourhood Accessibility Plan Co-ordinator, for the Waimakariri District Council.

Twelve people participated in both reviews, including Kaiapoi Community Board Members, Waimakariri District Council staff and representatives from Crippled Children Society (CCS) and the Blind Foundation. The ages of participants ranged between 20 and 65+. All had good or very good mobility and vision. The participants would normally walk between five minutes and two hours a day. On both days a participant could not complete the review because of other commitments. Recruitment was via the Kaiapoi Community Board and by personal approach.

The first review was undertaken on 10 November 2008 and involved a 1.336 km route of Williams Street. There were nine path lengths and eight road crossings. Abley Transportation Consultants Limited staff provided advice regarding the route and undertook engineering readings on the day. The weather was sunny and warm throughout the review.

This route started at Raven Quay outside the Kaiapoi Service Centre and proceeded south to the pedestrian crossing outside Rivertown Villas. Williams Street was crossed and the review continued from Carew Street, walking north to Sewell Street before crossing back to the eastern side of the road and returning in the southerly direction to the Council Service Centre on Raven Quay. At this point the participants walked back to the pedestrian crossing and reviewed this as a road crossing to complete the CSR.

The second CSR was undertaken on 20 February 2009 and involved the roads leading into Williams Street, a 2.171 km route. There were 13 path lengths. Again Abley Transportation Consultants Limited staff provided advice regarding the route and undertook engineering readings on the day. The weather on this occasion was cool and windy.

This route started at Fuller Street on the north side of the road through to Peraki Street, it then proceeded through to Hilton Street west (north side of the road). The next section was Hilton Street east (south side of the road) and then Raven Quay east (south side of the road) through to Raven Quay west (south side of the road). Participants then proceeded north across the footbridge to Charles Street west (south side of the road) and then through to Charles Street east (south side of the road) to Jones Street. The review moved north again to Sewell Street east (north side of the road) and finally Sewell Street west (south side of the road) which completed the 13 sections of the CSR. Some path lengths are short because of the change in environment from residential to reserve to suburban shopping/commercial.

The methodology for the CSR was that outlined in the Community Street Review, How to Guide, June 2006, which can be viewed at www.levelofservice.com.
3 Level of Service

Level of service ratings were calculated by Abley Transportation Engineers (Michelle Abley and Nicole Rudin). Further information about the rating system can be found at www.levelofservice.com.

Level of service is represented by a score of ‘A’ to ‘F’, where ‘A’ is the best of operating conditions and ‘F’ the worst. Level of service determination is a numerical process and this is the ‘rating’ part of the Community Street Review methodology.

A Level of service represents a numerical score as a grade, in a similar manner as a student might be marked on an exam i.e. a C or above signifies a pass of varying quality, and a D or below signifies a fail of varying quality. Typically Level of Service is defined in detail for each grade. For Walkability this is not possible given the differences between Participant's perceptions of "very good", "good", "slightly good", "bad", "slightly bad" or "very bad". For simplicity an ‘A’ is considered "very good" and similarly, ‘F’ is “very bad". Similar to the student grade example, “neutral” represents the bound between ‘C’ and ‘D’ and neither represents a pass or a fail. The conversion between the participant the Level of Service is shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Pass/Fail</th>
<th>Numerical Grade #</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Represented by Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>&gt;=6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;=5 and &lt;=6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;4 and &lt;5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Bad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>&gt;=3 and &lt;4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;=2 and &lt;3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of service is only one part of the process and should not be taken in isolation from the improvement variables and participant commentary.
4 Findings

4.1 Community Street Review - 10 November 2008

Section numbers can be identified using the map in Appendix 1.

4.1.1 Section 1: Path Length - Williams Street (Raven Quay to Hilton Street)
Environment: Suburban Shopping

Williams Street looking south to Hilton Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This path length has an overall rating of C with participants main concern being the advertising boards, especially those placed outside the café where there were also tables and chairs on the footpath. The slope of the footpath outside Subway was also commented on as was the drain cover at the Hilton Street end of the path length. One participant also mentioned the fat residue on the footpath outside the fish and chip shop.

Opportunities:

- Improve surface quality and clean regularly
- Widen path to allow for more seating, landscaping etc.
- Check use of advertising boards.
- Connect verandas – continuity important for bad weather.
- Make it a more pleasant pedestrian environment with priority over motor vehicles.
4.1.2 Section 2: Road Crossing – Hilton/Williams Street Intersection
Environment: Suburban Shopping

![Williams/Hilton Street intersection looking south](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Crossing Level of Service</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This intersection has an overall rating of D because the participants felt unsafe when crossing the road. They felt at risk from traffic turning into Hilton Street from Williams Street because of the lack of visibility to the right, the speed of the vehicles, and the proximity of the roundabout. These crossings are not designated pedestrian crossings and both motorists and pedestrians are confused about ‘right of way’. The design of this crossing would be difficult for pedestrians who are sight impaired because of the lack of directional tiles to assist location, the trip hazard in the refuge with the low kerbing which blends with the road.

**Opportunities:**

- Give pedestrians a better view of approaching traffic
- Educate drivers and pedestrians about these particular type of crossings, “who has right of way?”
- Slow traffic
- Crossing links two shopping areas, a zebra crossing could be better or perhaps remove roundabout and install traffic lights and signals
- Install directional indicators from the corner, more and better tactile and visual aids
- Reduce entry/exit gradients
4.1.3 Section 3: Path Length - Williams Street (Hilton Street to Carew, east side of road)
Environment: Suburban Shopping – Residential

Williams Street looking south from Hilton Street

Railway Crossing  Advertising Board – Theme Bar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The walkable rating for this path length is C. The main issue was with the uneven surface at the railway crossing. There was also a large advertising board outside the Theme Bar that crossed a third of the footpath. The bus shelter is set back out of the continuous path of travel and the path is generally reported positively.
Opportunities:

- More or better tactile and visual aids for the railway crossing, grab bar for older person waiting for access to crossing
- Repair/upgrade footpath over railway tracks and colour contrast obstacles
- Fewer footpath obstructions
- Landscaping, seating to create a more relaxed and safer environment
4.1.4 Section 4: Path Length – Williams Street (Carew Street to Fuller Street)
Environment: Residential – Suburban Shopping

Williams Street – Carew Street to Fuller Street (western side of road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This path length has an overall rating of B and participants perceived it as a good walkable footpath. The main issue are the vehicle crossings at the petrol station, and the close proximity to the footpath of advertising signs and flags at the bakery and car sales. A comment was made about the number of vehicle crossings in this path length which made for an ‘up and down’ walk. There is no physical barrier to traffic at this corner with no safe area to wait to cross.

Opportunities:

- Service station entrance/exit needs some thought – priority should be given to pedestrians with signage to remind motorists to give way
- More and better visual and tactile aids
- Seat at bus stop
- Change planting types, or trim regularly, to ensure they do not encroach over footpath
- Move rubbish bin back at bakery
- Extend cycle lane to include area outside service station
4.1.5 Section 5: Road Crossing – Fuller/Williams Street Intersection
Environment: Suburban Shopping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Crossing</th>
<th>Walkable from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This intersection was perceived to be very unsafe for pedestrians and had an overall rating of E. The main concern was the lack of a clearly defined footpath at the rear of the service station. A hazard at the LPG fill area was also identified with no barrier between this area and the footpath. The intersection is very busy at peak times especially when school is starting and finishing. There is nowhere to stand in the middle of the road especially with a baby buggy. The straight path of travel leads to obstacles in the middle of the road and lines up with a garden on the opposite corner coming north. Crossing from the north there is no indication on the south side of the road to indicate a footpath or directional information to locate the continuous access path, it ends up in the service centre forecourt. The road is wide with relatively high speed curves and participants felt they needed to look in all directions at once to get across safely.

Opportunities:

- Pedestrian priority over motor traffic, pedestrian crossing
- Traffic island/pedestrian refuge
- Slow traffic
- Create physical barrier at service station to separate LPG fill from footpath
- Entrance/Exit to service station redesign to improve safety
4.1.6 Section 6: Path Length – Williams Street (Fuller Street to Hilton Street)
Environment: Suburban Shopping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This path length had an overall rating of C. The signs for the railway crossing are good and the street gardens separate the traffic nicely. The driveway to the hardware shop is difficult to detect and visibility for vehicles exiting is blocked by the building line. The cycle shop has bikes outside at least 1.5 m from the building line and this could be a hazard for vision impaired pedestrians.
Opportunities:

- Landscaping and resting areas would enhance
- Address path outside bike shop to minimise hazards including shifting the bike stand and pump hose from the middle of the footpath to the side
- Art on the large white wall would enhance
- Mark driveway exit from hardware shop to remind motorists they are crossing a footpath
4.1.7 Section 7: Road Crossing – Hilton/Williams Street Intersection
Environment: Suburban Shopping

![Williams/Hilton Street intersection looking north](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Crossing</th>
<th>Walkable from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This road crossing is graded as D with participants feeling unsafe with the proximity of the roundabout and no clear guide as to who has right of way. The central island was difficult for one participant to negotiate with a baby buggy and would also be difficult to negotiate on a mobility scooter and too narrow for some wheelchairs. The bricks in the refuge were sunken in places and contributed to a potential trip hazard. Visibility to the right (towards Williams Street) was difficult.

**Opportunities:**

- Change refuge island design to a straight line crossing further from the corner
- Mark crossing to give priority to pedestrians
- Ensure a better view of approaching traffic
- Slower or less traffic
- Make driveway turns from businesses left hand turns only
4.1.8 Section 8: Path Length – Williams Street (Hilton Street to Raven Quay)
Environment: Suburban Shopping

Williams Street looking south from Raven Quay

Drainage/Inspection grates

Seat outside dairy west side of Williams Street
This path length is graded as C with most participants commenting on the various obstacles along the footpath including advertising boards, rubbish bins and shop displays. Drainage grates were also identified as potential trip hazards. Seat has been hit by a vehicle and is uninviting to use, no arm rests to assist getting in or out of the seat and is next to a smelly rubbish bin and has no shelter from the elements.

**Opportunities:**

- Fewer footpath obstructions
- Remove some car parks and put in seats and planters for outside dining etc
- Remove advertising boards
- Introduce another pedestrian crossing from Blackwells to Council Service Centre
- Level Telecom and drainage covers to avoid trip hazard
4.1.9 Section 9: Road Crossing – Raven Quay/Williams Street Intersection
Environment: Suburban Shopping – Reserve

Raven Quay/Williams Street intersection looking south

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Crossing</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This intersection is graded as N with participants commenting on the speed of traffic approaching the corner and turning down Raven Quay. There is also a poor view back down Williams Street when moving north because of parked vehicles. Equally vehicles turning left into Raven Quay cannot see pedestrians easily. The crossing does not line up across the street with the exit from the cut-down impeded by a post. The pedestrian refuge was not wide enough to accommodate a person pushing a baby buggy.

Opportunities:

- Less and slower traffic
- Move crossing further down Raven Quay and give pedestrians priority over vehicles
- Complete plantings
- Add tactile pavers
4.1.10 Section 10: Path Length – Williams Street (Raven Quay across bridge to Charles Street)

Environment: Bridge - Suburban Shopping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This path length is graded as C with participants being concerned about the width of the footpath and the height of the kerb across the bridge in particular. The surface across the bridge is very uneven and the new crossing opposite the Bridge Tavern has created a dangerous cross-fall for those with mobility aids. There are no tactile pavers at this crossing point.

Opportunities:

- Sheltered, attractive seating
- No parking on bridge and widen pathway to create seating/plantings looking out over river
- Tactile pavers at crossing point
- Improve entrance at bridge approach
4.1.11 Section 11: Road Crossing – Williams Street/Charles Intersection
Environment: Suburban Shopping

This intersection was graded as N with the concerns of the participants being the same as previous intersections of this design namely the lack of a clear guide as to who has right of way. The break in the centre of the refuge would be difficult to manoeuvre with a mobility scooter and one participant found it difficult to negotiate with her baby buggy. The speed of the traffic coming around the corner was also commented on and it was suggested that the crossing is too close to the intersection. The warning tiles have been incorrectly laid and some of the plantings have become head-height obstacles.

Opportunities:

- Move crossing to opposite Riverside Christian Fellowship building and make it a raised platform and direct, straight crossing
- Chains and posts on corner to give more separation from traffic
- Maintenance of planting
4.1.12 Section 12: Path Length – Williams Street (Charles Street to Sewell Street)
Environment: Commercial including Police Station

This path length has an A grade, participants commented that the width of the footpath is excellent although the slope could be challenging for older and less mobile pedestrians. The seat could be painted a contrasting colour as it blends in with the environment and is also quite exposed. This section incorporates the vehicle crossing for the Police Station.

Opportunities:

- More seats in shelter with good contrast and design, include arm rests to facilitate seating and standing
- Footpath marking to alert pedestrians to vehicle crossing at Police Station and similarly markings to alert Police to footpath
4.1.13 Section 13: Path Length – Williams Street (Sewell Street to Charles Street)
Environment: Suburban Shopping

This section of path length was graded as C. The main concerns of participants were regarding the advertising signs on the footpath including where there is café dining opposite. The parking area driveway has no markings to remind motorists to give way to pedestrians. Warning tiles have been incorrectly laid at crossing point.

Opportunities:

- Remove footpath obstructions
- Visual aids for pedestrians and vehicles at car park entry
- Clean drain running to intersection which is uneven with plants growing in it
- More seats designed with arm rests and shelter
4.1.14 Section 14: Road Crossing – Williams Street/Charles Intersection
Environment: Suburban Shopping

![Williams Street/Charles Street intersection looking south](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Crossing</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This intersection was graded D with participants again being concerned by the design of the crossing and the difficulty of knowing who has right of way. It was also difficult to negotiate the refuge with the baby buggy. They found that although the crossing was closer to the intersection they were still out of the visibility and hearing for parallel traffic. There were no directional markings and the warning tiles have been incorrectly installed and are worn. This is a busy traffic area and participants noted the smell of vehicle exhausts and noise.

**Opportunities:**

- Improve refuge design and make crossing more prominent
- Improve planting behind seat and under tree
- Improve gradient from road to footpath
4.1.15 Section 15: Path Length – Williams Street (Charles Street to Raven Quay)
Environment: Suburban Shopping - Bridge

[Image]

Williams Street looking south from Charles Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This path length had an overall grade of C. Participants found the path across the bridge to be narrow and although the rest of the path was wider, this width was compromised with advertising boards. The vehicle crossing outside the shops came as a surprise to the participants and they were concerned about the speed of vehicles coming into the car park across the traffic. The participants found that they had to step out onto the road to allow other pedestrians to pass on the bridge which highlighted the depth of the kerb here.

Opportunities:
- More separation from road
- Removing carparks from bridge and widen footpath
- Enhance river crossing with seats and planting on bridge
- Warning for motorists at carpark to remind them that they are crossing a footpath
4.1.16 Section 16: Road Crossing – Williams Street/Charles Intersection
Environment: Suburban Shopping

Williams Street/Raven Quay road crossing looking north

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Crossing</th>
<th>Walkable from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This intersection had an overall grading of D with participants being concerned at the lack of a clearly defined crossing point. The planting and bill board on the corner made it very difficult for pedestrians, crossing from the north side of the intersection, to see traffic coming across the bridge behind them. The road crossing is wide with no pedestrian refuge. There is a significant difference in the width of the entry and exit points.

Opportunities:

- Improve view of traffic by removing flaxes and bill board
- Provide a designated pedestrian crossing
- Landscape planted area
4.1.17 Section 17: Road Crossing – Williams Street pedestrian crossing
Environment: Suburban Shopping

![Williams Street pedestrian crossing (east to west)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Crossing</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This road crossing is a formal pedestrian crossing and graded as B. Participants found the waiting areas on both sides of the road are good and thought that although traffic volumes were high motorists were prepared to stop for pedestrians and generally stopped at the white lines and did not crowd the crossing. There is a raised slope on the east side with no tactiles to locate the crossing. Advertising boards created a hazard on the western side of the crossing.

**Opportunities:**

- Install larger sign to alert motorists to pedestrian crossing
- Prune tree outside book shop to improve visibility
- Raised platform to further slow traffic
4.2 Walkability Level of Service Map (1)
4.3 Community Street Review - 20 February 2009

Section numbers can be identified using the map in Appendix 2.

4.3.1 Section 1: Path Length – Fuller Street (north side of road)
Environment: Reserve, vacant section

![Fuller Street looking east to Williams Street](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This path length was graded as C by the participants who expressed concern regarding the vegetation encroaching onto the footpath on one side and parked cars encroaching on the other which significantly narrowed the footpath in this area. The property adjacent to the recreation reserve is unkept and detracts from the walking experience. The vehicle crossing for this property slopes significantly half way across the footpath which could be a tripping hazard for pedestrians with mobility/balance issues. There is no street lighting in this section, on either side of the road. There is not a lot of natural surveillance with the businesses not being open 24 hours.

Opportunities:

- Lighting and landscaping in reserve to enhance pathway
- Introduce street lighting
- Install seating
4.3.2 Section 2: Path Length – Fuller Street (north side of road)
Environment: Residential

Fuller Street west, north side of road – residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grading for this path length is B with the main problem identified by participants being the cars angle parked and encroaching across the footpath. There are high fences at the front boundaries of the properties which would severely restrict drivers’ vision of pedestrians when backing out of the drive ways. There was a small pot hole half way along this path which could be a trip hazard. It was rubbish collection day and pedestrian progress was impeded by rubbish/recycling bins scattered along the footpath. There is a sign outside the school “please cross at crossing” but no formal pedestrian crossing is marked anywhere along Fuller Street. The vehicle crossings have quite a steep cross-fall which could be a trip hazard for balance/mobility impaired pedestrians. It is noted that there is good contrast with vehicle crossings to footpaths.

Opportunities:

- Improve visibility at driveways for both pedestrians and vehicles
- Designate formal crossing point for school, include tactile pavers in design
- Park vehicles parallel to footpath rather than angle parking or put a barrier across the parks so vehicles do not encroach across the footpath
4.3.3  Section 3: Path Length – Hilton Street west (north side of road)
Environment: Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This path length is graded as C and participants commented that the business vehicle crossings did not have the requirement for vehicles to give way to pedestrians. The surface of the footpath was uneven in places, with potholes and loose gravel. The area around the pool hall was “seedy” and was not really an area the participants would choose to walk at night.

Opportunities:

- Install seating and improve landscaping/greenery
- Install signs to alert motorists to pedestrians on footpath
- Maintenance of footpath surface and regular cleaning
4.3.4 Section 4: Path Length – Hilton Street east (south side of road)
Environment: Commercial – Suburban Shopping

Hilton Street looking east – south side of road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This path length was graded by the participants as E. Their main concerns were the cars that were angle parked encroaching over the footpath. It is also suggested that the landscape plantings could do with being cut back from the footpath. The footpath was found to be narrow and the surface uneven.

Opportunities:

- Repair and clean footpath surface and improve crossing points
- Tidy up landscaping, trim plants and refurbish where necessary
- Mark exits onto footpath from business entrances and car parks giving pedestrians priority
- Introduce car parking barriers to stop angle parked cars encroaching across the footpath
- Increase width of footpath to make it consistent along path length
4.3.5 Section 5: Path Length – Raven Quay east (south side of road)
Environment: Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section of path length was graded as E, the participants being very concerned about the surface of the footpath which was uneven, full of holes and had a heavy growth of lichen, particularly at the top end near Bowler Street. Trees and planting alongside the footpath require cutting back. Many of the drive ways had limited visibility because of the high fences or hedges or trees obscuring the view.

Opportunities:

- Upgrade footpath by resurfacing and widening, opportunity for stronger relationship with river
- Improve lighting on opposite side of road
- Maintenance of vegetation over-growth
4.3.6 Section 6: Path Length – Raven Quay east (south side of road)
Environment: Commercial

Raven Quay outside service centre looking east

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This short section of path leads from the Doctor’s Surgery to Williams Street including the area outside the Kaiapoi Service Centre and was graded as C. The participants suggested that parts of the foot path need to be upgraded with the vehicle crossing into the car park being marked and upgraded. The cars that are angle parked were encroaching onto the footpath.

Opportunities:

- Better landscaping and more greenery
- Improve lighting on both sides of road
- Reseal path and mark vehicle crossing to alert motorists to pedestrians
- Enhance entrance to Council Service Centre
4.3.7  Section 7: Path Length – Raven Quay west (south side of road)
Environment: Suburban shopping - Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section of path was graded N with participants commenting on the slope and uneven surface of the footpath. The slope was particularly noticeable outside the Mandeville Tavern. They would also like to see warnings for motorists crossing the footpath to the Working Men’s Club car park to alert them to pedestrians.

Opportunities:

- Improve lighting and landscaping
- Repair path where needed and mark vehicle crossing to alert motorists to pedestrians
4.3.8 Section 8: Path Length – Charles Street west (south side of road)
Environment: Reserve

![Charles Street looking east from Davie Street (south side of road)](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section of path was graded A by participants who found it to be a good walking footpath - wide, even and straight. Suggestions were made to have the birch trees pruned to ensure good head room and weeding of the paved areas to avoid trip hazards. The trees were also obscuring some of the lighting and this would be improved by pruning.

**Opportunities:**

- More seating in the shade and drinking fountains
- Maintenance of plantings to ensure light and head space
4.3.9  Section 9: Path Length – Raven Quay west (south side of road)
Environment: Suburban shopping – Commercial

Charles Street looking west (south side of road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section of path was graded B with most participants enjoying the wide, clean and tidy path and good walking conditions. The only concern expressed was the vehicle crossing outside the Riverside Church where there were no warning signs for motorists to give way to pedestrians.

Opportunities:

- Install more seating
- Install tactiles at crossing point and improve lighting
4.3.10 Section 10: Path Length – Charles Street east (south side of road)
Environment: Suburban shopping – Commercial

Charles Street looking east (south side of road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section of path was given a C grading with participants being concerned about the obstructions across the footpath including planter boxes and vehicles angle parked encroaching across the footpath. The vehicle exits over the footpath do not give priority to pedestrians. The vehicle crossing to car park needs warning markings for both pedestrians and motorists.

**Opportunities:**

- Improve landscaping to avoid funnel effect of planters and trim back plantings
- Mark vehicle crossings for both pedestrians and motorists
- Install barriers to stop parallel parked cars encroaching onto footpath
- Install more street lighting between Ray White and park
4.3.11 Section 11: Path Length – Charles Street east (south side of road)
Environment: Reserve and Information Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section of path, which included a grassed area of reserve land, was graded as C. Participants found that the path was very uneven at the beginning of the section, possibly caused by the tree roots. The playground was obscured from the road by high plantings and it was felt that the grassed area would not be suitable for heavy foot traffic. The vehicle crossing to the information centre and wharf area could use some warning signs for motorists to alert them to pedestrians.
Opportunities:

- Extend footpath the length of this area to include the reserve area
- Lower hedge around playground area for visibility for users and pedestrians
- Improve street lighting
- Install warning signs at vehicle crossing to alert motorists to pedestrians
4.3.12 Section 12: Path Length – Sewell Street east (north side of road)
Environment: Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section of path was graded as B. Participants commented that some of the driveways had limited visibility of pedestrians because of vegetation and fencing but generally they found the path clean and straight with no obstructions.

Opportunities:

- Install new seating
4.3.13 Section 13: Path Length – Sewell Street west (south side of road)
Environment: Residential

![Sewell Street looking west (south side of road)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Length</th>
<th>Walkable</th>
<th>Safe from Traffic</th>
<th>Safe from Falling</th>
<th>Obstacle Free</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This path length was graded as C. Participants commented on the uneven surface of the footpath with the significant drop-off to the gutter. There is chip stone encroaching onto the footpath at the Williams Street end. A vehicle at the flat is parked across the footpath and there is no clear separation from the parking area to the footpath.

**Opportunities:**

- Reseal footpath
- Improve maintenance to remove loose gravel at Williams Street end
4.4 Walkability Level of Service Map (2)

Walkability Level of Service Map
Location: Side Streets off Williams, Kaiapoi
Environment: Residential
Date: 2009-02-26

Level of Service Key
A B C D E F