



**Submission from Living Streets Aotearoa on
Island Bay Cycleway**

Contact person: **Mike Mellor**
Email: **wellington@livingstreets.org.nz**
Phone:
Date: **May 2017**

Submission

Living Streets Aotearoa appreciates the opportunity to submit on the Island Bay transport options.

We support the objectives of the Island Bay transport project to maintain or improve the level of service for pedestrians (August 2014). This should be the level of service from the original public road space not the as-developed cycleway.

Bus stops need to also provide at least as good a level of service as the original road design.

A. General comments

1. With many of the options the drawings and text do not agree with respect to which paths are shared and which are dedicated footpaths – the many shared paths are not marked as such in the drawings. This is misleading and confusing, and it is concerning that submitters may well not be clear on what the options actually entail.
2. Many of the options use terms such as “off road”, “road” and “vulnerable” cyclist, with the implication (explicit in some cases) that they will use different parts of the road width. This is problematic, because nowhere that we can see are these terms defined, and there is no legal ability to discriminate between different types of cyclists. This means that statement such as “off-road cyclists share path” and “road cyclists are required to use the road” have no validity, because all cyclists are entitled to use facilities that any cyclist may use, and are therefore misleading.
3. The term “shared path” is generally understood to mean a path shared by pedestrians and cyclists of all types, but the options confuse the issue by attempting to subdivide cyclists (see 2.

above) and also, but only in some cases, by referring to such things as “small wheeled vehicles like push scooters”. Again, this does not help clarity.

4. Permitting cyclists to use both cycle lanes and shared paths, as many options do, results in the removal of all dedicated pedestrian space and over-provision for cyclists.

B. Comments on the options

1. Shopping centre/business zone

General comment: all of these options, except those or the current and previous arrangements, involving converting dedicated pedestrian space to shared space. This would be a significant backward step for all those who walk in Island Bay, and we oppose those options.

Option 1A

The drawings show separate cycle lanes and dedicated footpaths, but the text says “off-road cyclists and pedestrians share path”. This is inconsistent: we support the cycle lane, but we strongly oppose turning either or both the footpaths into shared paths. This will present difficulties for all pedestrians but particularly those less able, and present significant risks to pedestrians entering and leaving the shops.

This option also narrows the footpath, exacerbating the above issues and reducing the space for other activities.

It is unclear what “off-road cyclists” means, and any cycle provision legally has to be available to all cyclists.

It is unclear why the cycle lanes are coloured red in the top drawing here while they are green in every other drawing. What is the significance of this?

This appears to us to be a very short-sighted option, and we oppose it.

Option 1B

Again the information presented is inconsistent, with separate cycle lanes and dedicated footpaths on the drawings while the text says “off-road cyclists and pedestrians share path”. In addition the footpaths are reduced, and so we oppose this option.

The text also says “road cyclists are required to use the road”, but since there is no legal definition of a “road cyclist” or an “off road cyclist” and all cycle facilities are legally open to all cyclists, we would like to know how this would be enforced.

Option 1C

This says “shared paths cater for small wheeled vehicles like push scooters” and “casual cyclists and pedestrians share the same space”. For the reasons given under option 1A we strongly oppose this.

Option 1D

Once again the drawings and text conflict, with the drawings showing separate cycle paths and dedicated footpaths, but the text saying “shared path caters for small wheeled users like push scooters” and “on one side of the footpath casual cyclists and pedestrians share same space”, and the latter is unclear – what does “one side of the footpath” mean? .

We oppose this for the same reasons as given in option 1A.

Option 1E (current/original layout)

This is the only layout that includes dedicated pedestrian space, and we strongly support it for that reason.

2. Carriageways/residential zone

Option 2A

The drawings show separate cycle lanes and dedicated footpaths, but the text says “casual cyclists and pedestrians share same place on same path” and “shared path on one side of the road caters for small wheeled users like push scooters”. This is inconsistent: we support the cycle lane, but we strongly oppose turning either or both the footpaths into shared paths. This will present difficulties for all pedestrians but particularly those less able, and present significant risks to cyclists from vehicles to/from the many driveways, often in reverse, and to pedestrians entering and leaving the many adjacent premises from cyclists on the shared path.

It is also unclear what “casual cyclists” means, and a shared path is legally open to all cyclists, and it is confusing that the term “shared path” appears to be used to describe two different types of path.

Option 2B

Again there is an inconsistency between the drawings, which show a cycle lane separate from the footpath, and the text, which says “off-road cyclists and pedestrians share path”. We have the same comments on this as for option 2A, and in addition we oppose the reduction in footpath width unless the full desirable footpath widths outlined in NZTA’s Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide are maintained.

Similarly to option 1A, it is unclear what “off-road cyclists” means, and any cycle provision legally has to be available to all cyclists.

Option 2C

This option says “pedestrians and casual and vulnerable cyclists share the same space”, and we have the same issues with this as with options 2A and 2B. In addition, it unclear what “casual and vulnerable cyclists” means, and the same remarks about cycle provision apply.

Option 2D

As with options 2A and 2B, the drawings and text are in conflict: the drawings show separate cycle lanes, but the text says “shared path on one side of the road” and “pedestrians, casual and vulnerable

cyclists share the path”, and the same comments as for options 2A and 2B apply, and the same comment about the proposal to narrow the footpath as in option 2B.

Option 2E (current layout)

This and option 2F are the only options that does not significantly reduce pedestrian provision, and also the only one that does not have either a conflict between words and pictures or the uses of undefined and legally unrecognised terms, or both.

We strongly support this option.

Option 2F (original layout)

We support this option.

3. Intersections

We do not support option 3A (cycle give way), as this would disadvantage cyclists on the cycle path with respect to vehicles on the road, and would therefore discourage use of the path.

We support options 3B (raised intersections) and 3C (raised table) as these both facilitate pedestrian and cyclist movements at intersections.

We support options 3D (continuous cycle lane) and 3E (cycle bypass) since they address the issues that we raise with respect to option 3A.

We support option 3F (traffic signals), and option 3G (shared lane) where there is insufficient room for cycle lanes.

4. Pedestrian crossings/mid block crossings)

We support all options in this section, with a preference for kerb build outs (option 4B) and zebra crossings (option 4D)

5. Bus stops

General comment: none of these options show what happens if there is parking in the same lane as the bus stop, as is commonly the case. In such cases it appears that the bus will have to give way to traffic in the general traffic lane in order to pull out into it, which disadvantages public transport.

We submit that buses should have priority pulling away from stops, and that should be incorporated in the options.

Option 5A

This option says it is typically considered suitable for up to 4-6 buses an hour. Under GWRC’s proposed route network in the peak this stretch of road is proposed to have stopping buses (GWRC Regional Public Transport Plan route A) every 5-10 minutes (I.e. 6-12 buses per hour) plus express buses (route A1), which stop at all stops along this section, every 5-20 minutes (i.e. 3-12 buses per

hour), giving a total of 9-24 buses per hour. (Another 2-4 buses per hour each way on route H will use The Parade near the shopping area.) This is well in excess of this option's capacity, and it is therefore unsuitable. However, we do support its strong delineation between cycle lane and footpath, providing legibility for all users, and footpath space being maintained.

Option 5B

This option involves bus passengers getting on and off from a space shared with cyclists, which presents significant risks, particularly to alighting passengers who will be concentrating on tagging off (failure to do so resulting in a financial penalty) and may also be coping with shopping, children, bags etc., or may have restricted mobility. Putting pedestrians and cyclists into conflict in this way represents very poor practice.

Option 5C

Provided there is adequate space on the bus stop island for all passenger facilities, that the cycle lane is clearly and effectively delineated and it is clear that pedestrians have priority over cyclists in entering/leaving the island, we support this option.

Option 5D

We do not oppose this option, but the need for buses to give way to cyclists may well reduce the effectiveness of public transport. If this concern can be addressed we do not oppose this option.

We would like to be heard in support of our submission.

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