

Living Streets Aotearoa



www.livingstreets.org.nz

Submission to Wellington City Council on Traffic Resolutions TR75-17 to TR 117-17

Contact person: **Mike Mellor**
Email: wellington@livingstreets.org.nz, mmellor1@gmail.com
Phone: **027 684 1213**
Date: **11 August 2017**

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on these important topics.

We have the following comments, and if there is an opportunity we would like to be heard in support of our submission.

General issues

1. We are concerned that there appears to be no overall plan for the cycle lane proposals – they are a bunch of disconnected initiatives with no indication about how they will work together. We suggest that individual unlinked Traffic Resolutions are an inappropriate way to handle what should be treated as a wider strategic issue.
2. Related to point 1 above, some of the Traffic Resolutions leave questions hanging in the air: for instance, in TR 80-17 issues connected with accessing Willeston St when the only legal access is via congested Willis St, crossing the busy southbound bus lane; and in TR 77-17, how cyclists will leave the southern end of lower Cuba St when the only legal cycling route is back down Cuba St – all other routes are barred to cyclists.
3. In general, Traffic Resolution discussions are light on issues other than those related to motor vehicles. For instance, it is not uncommon for drivers to park partly on the footpath where there are broken yellow lines, apparently thinking that this makes parking on such lines acceptable, but this is not recognised as a potential outcome. Another example is TR 106-17 Wakely Rd (which actually refers to Centennial Highway, the resolution itself not affecting Wakely Rd directly), which makes no mention that everyone walking along Centennial Highway between the Glover Rd commercial area and Hutt Rd, with its bus stops and Ngauranga railway station, is likely to be affected adversely by the proposal.
4. Again in general, Traffic Resolutions appear to not explicitly take account of relevant rules, standards and guidelines. TR 106-17 is again an example, where the relevant footpath is already of substandard width, and the proposal to turn it into a shared path would make it grossly substandard.

5. We suggest that inclusion of the relevant suburb name in the Traffic Resolution title would help make the information more accessible.

Specific Resolutions

TR 75-17 (Part of) Russell Terrace, Pedestrian Crossing, No Stopping At All Times

We support the proposal.

This is an important walking route to Newtown shops, and many of those walking are elderly and will benefit from the crossing. It will also help break up traffic, making crossing in other parts of Russell Terrace easier. And it will help slow traffic, which will have benefits to other users of the street.

However, it is important to realise that zebra crossings do not in themselves make people safe. A lot of pedestrians are hit on crossings, partly because they assume they will be safe and lower their vigilance.

That can be solved in this case by:

1. Putting in kerb extensions, so that pedestrians are visible to motorists before they step out.
2. Doing other amenity work around the crossing to make the area look less like a street, and to increase the amount people presence in the area.

There is already a seat there (according to Google Maps), and space on the school side (the agapanthus bank) to put more seating.

TR 77-17 (Part of) Cuba Street (between Wakefield St & Manners St), Cycle Connection

We support the proposal. This is logical.

However, it is important that steps are taken to make lower Cuba Street an effective shared street. There are some things that might help, like painting a design on the road surface (as in Bond St), or moving the large concrete seating blocks that are halfway down so that they create a chicane for vehicles. We would like to see a clear timetable for a cheap re-design. And for future ones (like the proposals below), please do as David Engwicht recommended for lower Cuba and first test out designs with cheap, movable fixtures.

There is a significant issue at the Cuba St/Manners St intersection, where there is no legal onward cycle route: to left and right Manners St is bus only, straight ahead is pedestrian only Cuba Mall (it is great to see the recognition that the mall is a pedestrian-only area, with cycling not allowed). How is it intended that cyclists safely move from the top of lower Cuba to e.g. Eva or Victoria Sts if they want to go further south? Experience indicates that expecting them to dismount is unrealistic.

We are concerned that there is no overall plan for this and the other cycle lane proposals – they are a bunch of disconnected initiatives with no indication about how they will work together. We suggest that individual unlinked Traffic Resolutions are an inappropriate way to handle what should be treated as a wider strategic issue.

TR 78-17 (Part of) Bunny Street (between Lambton Quay & Featherston St), Shared Zone

We support the proposal.

But as discussed for the previous one, you need to actually make an effective shared street. The existing sculptures, plantings and raised lawns should be added to in such a way that the entire area looks like a small park with cars and bikes allowed to go through at a slow pace. It must not look like a road.

The design needs to allow fast walking from the Old Government Buildings gates to the underpass for commuters running to their train. It also needs to recognise that this is an important route for people with luggage going to the station (lifts to the underpass are invisible, and this can be shorter route unless you get off a bus at platform D).

No mention is made of the existing bus stop at the western end, within the proposed shared space: buses and shared spaces don't generally mix.

TR 79-17 (Part of) Grey Street & Featherston Street, Relocation of Motorbike Parking and New Bicycle Parking

We support the proposal.

It is important that cyclists have adequate parking, for two reasons:

1. To encourage cycling
2. To stop them parking on footpaths, or attaching their bikes to trees that have delicate bark.

We also welcome the fact that you are providing it by re-allocating vehicle space, not taking footpath space. That should be the normal approach.

TR 80-17 (Part of) Willeston Street, Contraflow Cycle Lane

We do not oppose the proposal, but would like you to explore the idea of making this a shared street instead. More of the central city should be attractive shared streets rather than ugly, grubby little roads that are dominated by cars even when there are few of them. Bond St is a good example.

If it does proceed, careful thought needs to be given as to how cyclists will access it, with the only legal access being by turning right from the very congested Willis St, across the busy southbound bus lane.

We also question the need for this to not be a dead-end service street, given that all cars should be taken out of the Golden Mile to make it a bus/pedestrian space. We would like to see the timetable for achieving that – it is an obvious need, long overdue, and something even the AA supports.

We are concerned that there is no overall plan for this and the other cycle lane proposals – they are a bunch of disconnected initiatives with no indication about how they will work together. We suggest that individual unlinked Traffic Resolutions are an inappropriate way to handle what should be treated as a wider strategic issue.

TR 81-17 (Part of) Rugby Street, Cycle Lane

We do not oppose the proposal, but again, why not a properly designed shared space for the section west of Sussex St?

We are concerned that there is no overall plan for this and the other cycle lane proposals – they are a bunch of disconnected initiatives with no indication about how they will work together. We

suggest that individual unlinked Traffic Resolutions are an inappropriate way to handle what should be treated as a wider strategic issue.

TR 82-17 (Part of) Cuba Street (between Vivian St & Ghuznee St), Contraflow Cycle Lane

We support the proposal. But as with TR 77-17 it is vital to ensure that cyclists are actively prevented/discouraged from using Cuba Mall.

We are concerned that there is no overall plan for this and the other cycle lane proposals – they are a bunch of disconnected initiatives with no indication about how they will work together. We suggest that individual unlinked Traffic Resolutions are an inappropriate way to handle what should be treated as a wider strategic issue.

TR 85-17 (Part of) Mairangi Road, No Stopping At All Times

We support the proposal.

We note on Google Maps that there are bollards on part of the footpath, presumably to stop illegal parking. We would like to know:

1. Why they are in footpath space, further narrowing an already narrow footpath, not in car space?
2. What will be done to ensure that the new broken yellow lines are respected, and people do not just park on the footpath?

TR 86-17 (Part of) Box Hill, No Stopping At All Times

We have no comment on the proposal, but note that Google Maps indicates that this is one of those places where WCC has put a strange white line along the shoulder. It doesn't create a cycling route, nor carparks that are the right size. These sorts of lines appear to make drivers feel that their car will be safe only if partly parked on the grass verge or footpath (Ohiro Rd being a particularly bad example). What are they in fact for? We suggest that all these lines be reviewed, and removed if they could be seen to be encouraging parking on the footpath.

TR 89-17 (Part of) Wadestown Road, No Stopping At All Times

We have no objection to the proposal, but would request that you ensure adequate enforcement to stop displaced cars parking on the footpath, particularly in locations like this that have a footpath on just one side.

TR 90-17 (Part of) Salamanca Road, No Stopping At All Times

We support this proposal.

But this is a very difficult place to cross the road to one of the entrances to the university. The space opened up by removing the parks should be used to create at least a kerb extension to make the crossing easier. An island would be ideal, but may be difficult given that this is a bus route. We note that the other walking entrance to that part of the University is on a blind corner and also very difficult to use for walking. This is an important issue, as this is a logical direct route between the Aro Valley and the Botanic Garden area via the University: from Aro Street to The Terrace, then through Boyd Wilson, the cemetery, the back of the student union, back of the Hunter, and then to Salamanca Road – where the crossing is a nightmare.

TR 91-17 (Part of) Bankot Crescent, No Stopping At All Times

We have no objection to this proposal.

Consideration should be given to revegetating the bank so that it is not in need of continual cutting back, for instance a lizard garden, with low plantings, rocks to help achieve bank stability and provide basking surfaces, and a mix of native plants. This could have CPTED benefits for the footpath above the bank.

TR 94-17 (Part of) Lincoln Avenue, Time Limited Parking Change

We oppose this on the basis that it isn't explained or justified. Making parking unlimited doesn't free it up. It's an invitation to clog it up.

TR 95-17 (Part of) Strathmore Avenue, Pedestrian Crossing, No Stopping At All Times

We support this proposal. It is important that pedestrians have clear priority along routes such as this, and can easily and safely cross.

TR 96-17 (Part of) Mark Avenue, New Bus Stop

We support this proposal.

It is good to see that the proposed shelter will not be intruding into the footpath space.

TR 97-17 (Part of) The Terrace, Coach Stop Monday to Sunday, 8am-9am & 5pm-6.30pm, P10 Time Limited Parking At Other Times

TR 98-17 (Part of) Daniell Street, No Stopping At All Times

We support these proposals.

TR 100-17 (Part of) Salamanca Road (Kelburn Park), Mobility Park, P120 Monday-Friday, 8am-6pm

We would like to see an explanation of why this would be only weekdays. Are disabled people not supposed to be out at the weekends?

TR 101-17 (Part of) Riddiford Street, P60 Monday-Saturday 8am-6pm

We oppose the proposal: this is an excellent opportunity to provide shorter-term parks that will turn over faster. P60 seems far too long for that space; P10 would be more appropriate.

TR 102-17 (Part of) Stewart Drive, Removal of Mobility Park to P120

We support the proposal to create a usable mobility park, but no explanation or justification is given for the P120 time limit for the converted park. Why not turn this into a shorter-term park, or a bookable tradesperson park?

TR 105-17 (Part of) Molesworth Street, Metered Parking (P120, Monday-Thursday 8am-6pm, Friday 8am-8pm, Saturday & Sunday 8am-6pm)

We oppose the proposal on the grounds that you have not justified the P120 choice. Why not a shorter period to encourage turnover, or a bookable space for tradespeople, to discourage parking on footpaths?

TR 106-17 (Part of) Wakely Road, New Shared Path

We oppose the proposal, on the following grounds.

1. There is no assessment of its effects on walkers.
2. It appears to assume that bikes on the uphill direction will not be a problem for walkers. With e-bikes, that assumption is simply not true.
3. The effect of paving the road is not assessed. We would argue that it should have a gravel rather than sealed surface to reduce bike speeds and make it clear that it is a recreational, not just commuting, route. A surfaced path would facilitate fast speeds downhill, to the detriment of walkers.
4. The current footpath on Centennial Highway south of Glover St, proposed to be a shared path, is the only pedestrian link between the commercial area and Hutt Rd, including its bus stops and Ngauranga railway station. This footpath is about 1.2m wide, which is already much narrower than NZTA's 3m width guideline for collector road footpaths, and narrower than the 1.65m "absolute minimum" width for local road footpaths (NZTA Pedestrian Planning & Design Guide p14-3). For commuter shared paths, as proposed, the desirable width is 3m, with a minimum of 2m (p14-20).
5. There appears to have been no consideration given to the risks of pedestrians/cyclists trying to pass each other on a path that is too narrow for this to be achieved easily, adjacent to a busy main road. A small mistake here could easily have significant consequences.
6. The current footpath on Centennial Highway north of Glover St is also narrow, and is proposed to be shared with uphill cyclists, while their existing downhill cycle lane will remain. Again this is a degradation of pedestrian space, and e-bikes and fitter cyclists could well be moving at a significant pace on what is currently the footpath.
7. We strongly oppose this significant degradation of the existing substandard pedestrian facility. If such a facility is required it should use vehicle space, not pedestrian space. North of Glover St there should be a two-way cycleway and a dedicated footpath, not the arrangement proposed.
8. The title of this Traffic Resolution is very misleading, giving no indication that the Centennial Highway is affected: users of that footpath will be those most affected by the proposal.

TR 107-17 (Part of) Rugby Street, Removal of Carpark, No Stopping At All Times

We support this, particularly if it reduces illegal biking on footpaths.

TR 108-17 (Part of) Dixon St, Car Share Vehicle Parking Space
TR 109-17 (Part of) Tennyson Street, Car Share Vehicle Parking Space
TR 110-17 (Part of) Oriental Parade, Car Share Vehicle Parking Space
TR 111-17 (Part of) Roxburgh Street, Car Share Vehicle Parking Space
TR 112-17 (Part of) Tasman Street, Car Share Vehicle Parking Space
TR 113-17 (Part of) Tinakori Road, Car Share Vehicle Parking Space
TR 114-17 (Part of) Kelburn Parade, Car Share Vehicle Parking Space
TR 115-17 (Part of) Aro Street, Car Share Vehicle Parking Space

We support these proposals.

TR 116-17 (Part of) Phillip Street, No Stopping At All Times

We support this proposal. Bus movements must always take precedence over parking.

TR 117-17 Lombard Lane & Bond Street, New Shared Zone

We support the proposal, but note that the information provided is inadequate. To be successful a shared space has to look more like a public park than a road. We don't get the feeling that this is what is proposed.

Cars coming out of the parking building are a serious hazard at the moment. There needs to be a way to slow them down as they exit.

About Living Streets

Living Streets Aotearoa is New Zealand's national walking and pedestrian organisation, providing a positive voice for people on foot and working to promote walking friendly planning and development around the country. Our vision is "More people choosing to walk more often and enjoying public places".

The objectives of Living Streets Aotearoa are:

- to promote walking as a healthy, environmentally-friendly and universal means of transport and recreation
- to promote the social and economic benefits of pedestrian-friendly communities
- to work for improved access and conditions for walkers, pedestrians and runners including walking surfaces, traffic flows, speed and safety
- to advocate for greater representation of pedestrian concerns in national, regional and urban land use and transport planning.

For more information, please see www.livingstreets.org.nz.