
Summary of submissions – March 2013

The following is a summary of the submissions that were made on *An Accessible City* - the draft transport chapter for the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan. The consultation ran from 15 November 2012 to 1 February 2013. During that time a number of stakeholder, user group and community group engagement meetings were held, along with individual meetings as requested.

The submissions arrived either via an online form or via electronic or written submissions. All submissions have been summarised into a database for processing.

- 170 submissions recorded on the online submission form (three were found to be blank)
- 108 written submissions (received electronically or as a hard copy form – one was sent twice)

Notes were also recorded at around 20 engagement meetings and the questions and comments captured as part of the feedback, with around 10 further individual meetings.

The major themes that came out of the submissions were:

- Accessibility
- Detailed design and shared space
- Speed zones
- Walking
- Cycling
- Main streets
- Public transport
- Car travel
- Parking
- Service delivery
- Way finding
- Other actions

The following does not purport to be a comprehensive or detailed account of all comments made but rather an overview of the main themes.

Accessibility

Generally the feedback is that people like the vision and what the transport chapter is seeking to achieve.

“It looks like a good vision overall. It is great to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport into the central city. The more people who travel by these means, the fewer vehicles will enter the central city, and the more pleasant the city will be for everyone, drivers and pedestrians alike.”

However, not all submitters liked the overall direction.

“ (Dislike) the plan’s backward looking view that vehicle dependence is and will remain the dominant transport mode well past mid-century.”

There is a desire amongst submitters to ensure that the good features in the draft transport chapter are implemented and questions about how to ensure the intended outcomes are achieved were raised, and whose role it would be to implement.

Disability sector queries in relation to overall transport planning have focused on how accessibility will be demonstrated and delivered to meet their needs to be part of community life in the central city. The view of sector representatives is that in order to achieve the vision the NZ Building Standard NZS 4121:2001 Design for Access and Mobility - Buildings and Associated Facilities needs to be mandatory rather than optional.

A number of submitters commented that there is an opportunity to make Christchurch an example of best practise design for accessibility, and this will future proof the city for an aging population and for a growing older tourist market.

Detailed design and shared space

Many submitters expressed an interest in seeing and being able to comment on the detailed design proposals for streetscapes and transport related infrastructure. Of particular interest was the design of both on road and off-road cycle lanes and shared space. A number of submitters wanted to know what the width of cycle lanes will be, and where these will be separated or two-way. A common query related to how shared spaces will look and work, noting that there appeared to be different types of shared space. Ensuring the safety of all users was a common theme in the comments on the design of shared space. Examples of good and bad practice in the design of shared space facilities nationally and internationally were given.

There were queries about how and when the transport projects will be delivered. Of particular interest was opportunities for further input from the community and users, such as workshops on design details.

Speed zones

There was general support for the 30km/hr inner zone. However some submitters wanted the 30km/h extended to include the one-ways streets passing through the inner zone, some to the Five Avenues, and in some cases to the rest of Christchurch City.

"I would like to see the 30km/hr speed zone extended over the entire inner zone, including the one way streets. The travel time difference between 30km/hr and 50km/hr will be minimal for the vehicles travelling this short distance, but it could make a big difference for pedestrians and cyclists in the area."

A number of inner city residents requested 30 km/hr for those streets around residential areas including urban villages. Some requested even slower speeds in the shared space zones.

The legibility of the speed zones was considered important along with on-going management and enforcement.

Walking

Strong support was received for the provision of an enhanced walking environment, with a request for more key walking routes. There was broad support for the pedestrian focused areas, including retail areas like Cashel and New Regent Street. One submission to the contrary requested vehicle access to the Cashel St retail area. There were wider questions about safety and how much vehicle or cycle access would be allowed to pedestrian and shared spaces like Cathedral Square.

Some questions were asked about how potential pedestrian and cycling conflicts would be dealt with. Some asked for unimpeded cycling to be allowed through the Square.

Clarification was requested on how the shared spaces would work and the need to protect the safety of those with impaired mobility.

A number of submitters wanted to ensure quality walk connections, particularly from the bus interchange to the new stadium.

Better pedestrian and cycle access to the Polytechnic was requested.

Cycling

Support for the provision of the key cycle routes especially for separated cycle lanes. There was a request for additional clarification of the precise configuration of cycle routes. For example, which routes are to be on carriageway, separated, two-way cycle lanes, and off carriageway.

“I feel like there could have been more detail into the way cycling will be integrated into the street.”

Some submitters want more cycle lanes (especially separated) and there was a strong demand for ensuring the central city cycle-lanes are connected with the cycle routes to other parts of the city. A common comment was that people would not access the central city by bike if there were not good routes from the outer suburbs.

“I feel that Christchurch being a flat city is perfect to make greater use of bicycles as a means of transport. I would like to see the development of cycle only cycleways from the surrounding neighbourhoods to the down town area.”

Supporting cycle infrastructure such as public cycle parking and lockers (and showers) was requested by submitters. Including a request for statutory requirement for building owners to provide a minimum number of cycle parks was also suggested. Some developers questioned the high number of spaces required in the district plan rules.

A number of people supported the enhanced facilities for the novice and recreational cyclists but also wanted better provision made for the commuter cyclists who are comfortable using busier roads.

Public Transport

There was support for the bus interchange, Manchester Boulevard and super-stops. A counter view requested greater level of vehicle provision on Manchester Street to serve eastern businesses.

Disability submitters wanted to limit the number of bus transfers and to ensure that the bus interchange and bus stop design considered the needs of those who have some form of impairment. Affordability of public transport was also of concern to disability submitters.

Submitters requested safe crossings and clear way finding to enable safe pedestrian navigation around “new” types of streets that people with disabilities are not familiar with and need to understand/avoid.

There was broad support for reducing the number of bus movements through the central city but concern that some areas within the Avenues may not be adequately served by bus services. Clarification was sought on the location of other bus stops.

There was support for the re-instatement of the heritage tram, and some questions about whether this service could be integrated with bus services. Similarly, people were supportive of the former shuttle bus service and would like it reinstated in the future. Suggestions were made about the shuttle providing a service from car parking buildings located on the periphery of the central city into the centre.

A number of submitters requested the introduction of light rail or commuter rail services, with a call to protect land for future infrastructure such as stations and corridors.

“I would like to see a central rail station or light rail in the transport infrastructure to encourage public transport. i.e. railcar or light rail allowing local and people from greater Christchurch, together with new tourists access the new key building without have to use a car or bus”

Car travel

Some submitters commented that they felt that the draft transport chapter is too car focused.

“It's good to see a lot of thought has gone into making the city accommodating for progressive transport modes such as cycling, walking and public transport. It's disappointing to see so much of the focus is still set on cars and parking.”

Others felt a lack of parking will deter shoppers, business and visitor access.

Some supported the retaining of the one-way streets.

“I especially like that you're keeping the majority of the one way streets running at 50km/hr.”

Others were strongly opposed the retention of one-ways.

“The one-way systems must be removed. They only serve the needs of fast traffic movement - not pedestrians and not the retailers.”

Speed of traffic, safety, congestion, legibility and environment impact were typically arguments used to support or oppose one-way retention or removal.

There were queries about design detail in relation to routes where both car travel and cycling are shown as priority modes.

There was general support for encouraging through traffic onto the five avenues and other routes, with requests to implement this early to support the introduction of the slow core.

Emergency services identified the need for resilient networks, with sufficient width to enable them to pass other vehicles in order to meet their 8 minute response time targets. They requested careful design for roadways and adjacent parking spaces to enable access to buildings.

Parking

There was general support for reducing the amount of long-term on-street parking within the inner zone.

Some submitters thought that there is too much provision made for car parking buildings within the Core and these should be located on the periphery of the inner zone or five avenues. This seemed to be on the presumption that these would be for long term commuter parking (which is not the intent).

“Too many car parking buildings and on-street parking. Driving in the central city needs to be strongly discouraged if the pedestrian core is to be successful”.

Others thought there wasn't enough parking. *“It really doesn't look like parking will be easy. This may make it difficult for businesses to return to the central city, as they will need their customers to be able to visit. Not everyone has a lot of time spare to catch a bus in and out.”*

A small number of submitters suggested that park and ride facilities be provided in different locations such as Belfast.

Provision for mobility parking, passenger pick up and drop off, taxis and coaches, and services vehicle delivery spaces were supported. Service trucks identified the need for adequate design to enable efficient access to buildings.

Reference was made to the need to consider central city parking with city wide parking policy was raised.

Tour operators requested a place for tour coaches and minibuses/vans to pick up and drop off passengers outside of hotels, places of interest and the bus interchange. They also require somewhere for the coaches/mini-buses to lay-over.

Way-finding

There was general support for way finding. There were differing views on which language or languages should be used as part of way finding. English, Maori, braille and other languages were given as options. The use of new technology is seen as providing exciting opportunities.