

Submitter ID#	Support the plan	Do not support the plan	Neither	Comments	Project Team Response
1	✓			<p>We support the proposal. The current situation, where the Rail Trail ends at a corner where cars are likely to be still going 100 km/h, is pretty bad. It's a good idea for the rail trail to cross the road along the straight. A shared footpath will also add to the area. We're sceptical about the flashing lights crossing - if there's evidence that these things slow traffic down, then that's good, but our guess is that the only successful way to slow vehicles down is through traffic calming alterations to the road, e.g. through a slightly raised crossing. We'd like to see a wider plan for the mixed modes of traffic (walkers, cyclists, horse riders, cars and trucks) in Little River, including separating cars and trucks from the rest, and slowing traffic down through areas where children walk to school. The township has grown to a point where the lack of footpaths is becoming a problem for movement. Can you please advise us on what's being done there? We'd rather spend money on improving the wider area than on expensive flashing signs, and to integrate traffic planning. Thanks for the chance to give feedback.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission.</p> <p>Flashing lights crossing, raised platform on SH75 Speed surveys conducted indicate the current 70km/h speed limit is generally adhered to. The main purpose of the flashing cyclist warning cyclist is to alert approaching drivers of cyclists crossing. The current design has adequate sight distances for the current vehicle speeds. An active sign was chosen over a normal sign at this location as a normal sign would have less impact on drivers as the active sign activates only when cyclists are crossing. The active signage are reasonably cost effective. Installing a raised platform is inappropriate for the current 70km/h speed limit, as it cannot be guaranteed that drivers will approach at an appropriate speed. This would require a speed limit reduction currently not supported by NZTA.</p> <p>There is currently no wider plan for mixed modes of traffic. On Council controlled roads the Traffic Operations Team investigates issues and improvements, both reactively and proactively. Staff are happy to discuss these with you further.</p>
2			✓	<p>I have perused the recently circulated to the local community. I am a local resident living in Okuti Valley and frequent the township regularly and use the rail trail.</p> <p>I think the proposed plan offers increased safety albeit at an expense to the council. I would argue that as significant increase in safety could be achieved if not even bigger increase by reducing the speed limit through this area to 50km/hr. Not only is this a relatively cost effective measure (few speed limit signs) it clearly benefits all locals and people using the rail station site, cafes shops etc, not just cyclists. Of course doing both is even better but why not start with the simple option first which can easily be implemented before this summer's peak use of the rail trail? As a local I would strongly support the reduction of the speed limit and this could be implemented in a very short time frame. I know this option would be</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission.</p> <p>The setting of speed limits is outside the scope of this project, and the responses will be sent to NZTA as the road controlling authority for consideration</p>

Submitter ID#	Support the plan	Do not support the plan	Neither	Comments	Project Team Response
				welcomed by business owners and most residents alike. While changing speed limits probably is not directly under the jurisdiction of local council, rather I assume NZTA, surely Council can have a strong influencing power.	
3	✓				Thank you for your submission.
4	✓				Thank you for your submission.
5					Thank you for your submission.
6	✓			Greetings-I am the Catholic Priest of St Patricks Akaroa and also of St. John Evangelist Church-Little River. I endorse the scheme of completing the rail trail cycle track, but have an issue with the precise placement of the proposed electronic cyclist warning sign. It would impact on the visual appearance of the church. It is a building of significance. The parish (?) insurance and heritage help has spent just on \$100,000.00 stabilising all Church and the new \$10,000 fence has enhanced the corner. Our property committee have considered the plan and respectfully suggest the sign be placed elsewhere- perhaps 50 or 100 metres back toward Christchurch.	Thank you for your submission. The location of the sign is determined by NZTA guidelines, and is dependent on the distance to the crossing location. We have investigated this further and have confirmed with NZTA that we can locate the sign closer to the township, on the north side of the Morrisons/Kinloch/SH75 intersection.
7	✓			I support this proposal to extend the rail trail into Little River.	Thank you for your submission.
8	✓			I access my property via Barclays Rd (no access via Council Hill Rd) to work on my property and look after my livestock. I do not want to lose access to my land via Barclays Rd at any time during construction or post completion.	Thank you for your submission. Access to all properties will be maintained during construction and this project will not impact on ongoing access to Barclays Road once complete.

Submitter ID#	Support the plan	Do not support the plan	Neither	Comments	Project Team Response
9		✓		To be safe the speed limit need to be reduced to 50 km in LR.	<p>Thank you for your submission.</p> <p>The setting of speed limits is outside the scope of this project, and the responses will be sent to NZTA as the road controlling authority for consideration</p>
10		✓		<p>The speed limit needs to be reduced to 50 km through little River for safe crossing. Entering Little River via the back road (off Barclays Rd) to LR railway station is unattractive and not a good look for part of the attraction (Rail Trail). i.e. disused cars, bonfire piles, chickens, iron shed and recycle build in disrepair, the recycle area (dump). Views of back service area for houses and business on the main road. The previous railway is not evident back there at all anyway. The existing gravel road off Barclays Rd to the railway station is unsuitable surface for riding bikes on. Culvert pipes take less water than the drains. Extending them will risk drains overflowing more than they do now in flood (Barclays culverts and culvert under SHWAY 75). Culvert under shingle road block now in floods and the culvert under Barclays Rd is in disrepair and need renewing. Why not drop the speed limit to 50 km in Little River from before the Church, put the crossing in and send them down the main road to the LR railway station. Safer, more attractive, cheaper and more comfortable ride. A lot will probably do that if your plan is done anyway.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission.</p> <p>The setting of speed limits is outside the scope of this project, and the responses will be sent to NZTA as the road controlling authority for consideration</p> <p>Your concerns regarding the views along the back road off Barclays Road will be raised with the Rail Trail Trust, although this is related to private property not Council land.</p> <p>The existing gravel road will be reviewed as part of the detailed design.</p> <p>As part of the design of this scheme, a route assessment was completed which included options to bring the cycleway on the western or eastern side of SH75.</p> <p>The route option to bring the cycleway on the western side of SH75 was discarded due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was considered to be less safe for cyclists as they would be required to cross several private accesses; • The cycleway could not be contained within the existing shoulder without widening the carriageway and moving the fence line back with potential land acquisition. • Would have required the removal of on-street parking on SH75 • Would require the relocation of the petrol pumps at the Little River Garage to create safe cycle facilities <p>The route option to bring the cycleway on the eastern side of SH75 was</p>

Submitter ID#	Support the plan	Do not support the plan	Neither	Comments	Project Team Response
					<p>discarded for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The presence of the large ditch on the eastern boundary would require either a large culvert or footbridge that would have resulted in significantly increased costs; This option would require the removal of on-street parking. <p>The new culverts will be designed in consultation with the Council stormwater team. The existing stormwater issues will be considered as part of detailed design and will be discussed with the Council stormwater team. At a minimum, new culverts will be designed to maintain the existing level of service for stormwater.</p>
11	✓			Generally happy with the concept plan. Very pleased that something is at last happening. We notice that this work is being/has been officially sanctioned with an article in the Press acknowledging that decisions as to where and how the last section of the track was to enter Little River, began with "Public Consultation" prior to 2011 earthquake,....and before someone gets severely injured (or worse) could this project be pushed through ASAP.	<p>Thank you for your submission.</p> <p>Once we have received approval to proceed we aim to get the project completed as quickly as possible.</p>
12	✓				Thank you for your submission.
13	✓			<p>I commend you on this plan for Little River Township.</p> <p>As you mention in your Project Objectives to create safe passage and install a safe crossing for all users of the Rail Trail in the interests of safety I would make two requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. lower the travel rate from the Little River Hotel to 70kph 2. lower the travel rate through Little River Township to 50kph <p>Motorists need to be aware and prepare for pedestrian/cyclist traffic.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission.</p> <p>The setting of speed limits is outside the scope of this project, and the responses will be sent to NZTA as the road controlling authority for consideration.</p>
14	✓			<p>I have 5 changes: 1) 5mins toilet park next to disabled park. 2. Change 5 min park to 120 minute. 3. Allow one park next to station with no time limit. This park can be use by craft station staff who arrive before customers. 4. Place directional sign on pole by service centre for Rail Trail Parking. 5. Place Rail Trail parking sign in</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission.</p> <p>The proposed 5 minute parking space is located to serve a variety of purposes. It is preferable in this situation to have a high turnover parking space as parallel parking rather than angle parking as this reduces the number of</p>

Submitter ID#	Support the plan	Do not support the plan	Neither	Comments	Project Team Response
				parking area behind shops.	reversing movements occurring. Longer term parking by Rail Trail users and staff is intended to occur behind the Railway Station and shops. Additional directional signage providing parking information will be investigated.
15		✓		<p>There is an increasing ground swell of opinion that the speed limit through Little River should be reduced (refer recent paper cuttings). The land on the eastern side of the Highway is designated Papakainga (instead of rural) in the proposed District Plan. This means that development on the eastern side of the Highway is imminent. This renders as redundant, the LTSA position of not lowering the speed limit due to lack of population on both sides of the road. Increasing the culvert length beside our property without a corresponding increase in cross-section area will reduce the hydraulic efficiency of the culvert, which is clearly a backward step in flood hazard mitigation in what is already zoned a flood hazard area. Suggestion: Revisiting the Speed Zone to 50km/hr means an instant reduction in required Sight Distance, This could very well permit the head walls and the culvert length to remain as is. We believe that the above would reduce costs to the ratepayer, not increase the very real risk of flooding to our house during storm/Lake events and mitigate the risk to general public that the current speed limit is causing, especially since the highway has been realigned and faster traffic entry into Little River is occurring (delayed deceleration past Morrisons Road).</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission.</p> <p>The setting of speed limits is outside the scope of this project, and the responses will be sent to NZTA as the road controlling authority for consideration.</p> <p>The new culverts will be designed in consultation with the CCC stormwater team. The existing stormwater issues will be considered as part of detailed design and will be discussed with the CCC stormwater team. At a minimum, new culverts will be designed to maintain the existing level of service for stormwater.</p>
16	✓			<p>END OF RAIL TRAIL CROSSING</p> <p>Traffic needs to be travelling at a 50K Speed. Maybe make 70k's from Hotel (tricky corner- not only bend but traffic entering and exiting hotel car park and rail trail cyclists crossing to Hotel and back. Then 50k's before bend by Church, then cyclists warning sign. Suggestion there could be stop lights at the proposed Cyclists crossing - manually activated by cyclists and pedestrians (makes safe for the whole community including school children coming and going to/from School Bus, walkers and bikers to local Primary</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission.</p> <p>The setting of speed limits is outside the scope of this project, and the responses will be sent to NZTA as the road controlling authority for consideration.</p> <p>Longer term parking by Rail Trail users and staff is intended to occur behind the Railway Station and shops. Additional directional signage providing parking information will be investigated.</p>

Submitter ID#	Support the plan	Do not support the plan	Neither	Comments	Project Team Response
				<p>School. Pedestrians, dog walkers, walkers on the Heritage Trail Pa Road Circuit). Takes poor crossing decisions out of the equation. From other end of town make 50k's from the Bridge at Pa Road. PARKING BEHIND STATION</p> <p>Need to encourage long term parking ie for people leaving their cars for the day to go walking, cycling, etc. This could be behind the goods shed with appropriate signage on the main road.</p>	<p>The use of signals at this point would be inappropriate, as it would be the only set of signals on SH75 outside of Christchurch. Combined with the current speed limit and rural feel of the town, drivers are unlikely to be expecting signals at this location. This design does not preclude the use of signals in the future as the Little River township develops.</p> <p>Speed surveys conducted indicate the current 70km/h speed limit is generally adhered to with the main purpose of the flashing cyclist warning cyclist is to alert approaching drivers of cyclists crossing. The current design has adequate sight distances for the current vehicle speeds.</p>
17		✓		<p>"Rail Trail" an ill-conceived botch up from year one! Driven only by the financial interest of a few and supported heavily by rate payer/tax payer money it good idea to use the railway line for the purpose, but this was doomed by planners inability to traverse it through the rail head thus creating this whole mess. As for the current plan, it would be unbelievably stupid to have cyclists crossing the Kinloch Road at the end of a half blind one way bridge with "No" speed restriction and in the path of give way traffic who have enough to watch out for without gormless cyclists crossing over only to further congest the space available as well as the culvert end at the Main Road corner, To this end the compulsory stop now used, has to be safer for all.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission.</p> <p>The speeds around the proposed crossing across Kinloch Road are likely to be low due to the presence of the nearby intersection and the single lane bridge. The sightlines for cyclists crossing Kinloch Road meet the standards.</p>