

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
43306	<p>I was thinking about the proposed plans for Harewood road,</p> <p>Before going to the huge expense and disruption, why not use cones to create the new road to trial it. Block off the road meant for bikes and walking and see how it works.</p> <p>I can see so much more traffic being put on other side roads, like I use mostly.</p>	Diane	Wilson		
43118	<p>I have lived on Harewood Road for 34 years also worked in the area for 29 years. Major cycleway on Harewood Rd is the wrong location. No survey has been done on cyclists and CCC is spending over \$25 million. As I have lived and worked in Harewood we have been asking for lights at Breens &amp; Gardiners Rd (not a major cycleway) always promised but it never happens over a period of 30 years. Is it correct Breen's Rd lights won't go ahead if cycleway does not go ahead. It is tie the Council listened to the residents &amp; not a few cyclists who will benefit from this very expensive debacle.</p>	Dianne Marie	Lawrence		
43063	<p>Sandy Bragg – [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>I am re-submitting my first 4 page document, dated 13 March 2021, as many of my comments and observations remain valid and significantly important to me. I was not contacted or requested to speak at a hearing after lodging that submission.</p> <p>I attended the information session on 27 October 2021 and posed a few questions for which I needed clarification.</p> <p>Ann Tomlinson, with agreement from other Council staff present that evening, confirmed that the Wheels to Wings Cycleway will cost \$19 million NZ dollars. This takes into account, she advised, all related costs, e.g. publicity, original and design change plans, consultant (CCC and private individuals), disestablishing overhead power-lines and laying them underground and rental for non-CCC owned venues for the information sessions.</p> <p>Sam MacDonald, a current CCC Councillor told us at a previous meeting that the cost would be in the region of \$30 million NZD. We were told, at that meeting, that NZTA would be paying half of the quoted \$19 million but, on 27 October 2021, Ann Tomlinson advised that application for the NZTA contribution had still not been submitted!</p> <p>Removal of a bus stop outside of Wesly Care, the difficulty of exit from Cotswold Avenue, and access for huge delivery trucks and so many serious implications, especially for elderly residents are of great concern to me.</p> <p>WHEELS TO WINGS CYCLEWAY AIRPORT-HAREWOOD-BISHOPDALE-PAPANUI</p> <p>Submission lodged by: Sandy Bragg</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>I make my submission after attending 2 Information Sessions in respect of the proposed plan.</p>	Sandy	Bragg		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	<p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p> <p>1. I do not consider that the Christchurch City Council has complied with the 6 Guiding Principles set out in the Local Government Act 2002, Section 14 (copy attached).</p> <p>For this reason, I request the full proposal, costs incurred prior to the submissions closing date 15 March 2021, budget information, all sources from which the final cost for the Cycleway will be derived, All Council Meetings Minutes, in which the Cycleway is mentioned, and related information be referred to the Office of the Chief Ombudsman for NZ, (Mr Peter Boshier) and the Office of the Auditor General (Mr John Ryan).</p> <p>2. On the January 2021 (STR 3930) fold out "HAVE YOUR SAY" publication the inference is a "Safe Cycleway Coming to Your Area" – Hardly inviting public to express their views to Council, rather Fait Accompli!</p> <p>3. I understood there had been \$1,400 expended on the abovementioned publication and information sessions? On 11 March 2021, a figure of \$5 million was mentioned as the cost of this exercise to date by a current CCC Councillor (Finance). If this is correct, does this mean that \$14 million remains to pay for the Cycleway? As a ratepayer of this city, I am extremely concerned regarding the costings despite being assured no CCC rates would be expended on the Cycleway.</p> <p>SAFETY ISSUES</p> <p>1. Emergency Services attending to events, crashes, fire call-outs, calls to assist at the Christchurch Airport or at private properties on the route simply could not pass vehicles if only one lane is available. This could result in a life or death situation.</p> <p>2. Installation of traffic lights Gardiners/Harewood, Breens/Harewood after years of waiting (apparently approved by Council in 2017) with many accidents and even a few deaths to date. I absolutely support the traffic lights (a cost of \$1.3 million was quoted at a meeting I attended). It is shameful that it is an ongoing delayed project. A CCC Planner told me that only if the Cycleway proposal is adopted, will the traffic lights (included in the plan – a sweetener I wonder?) be installed. THIS IS AN ONGOING SIGNIFICANT SAFETY ISSUE.</p> <p>3. The claim on the January 2021 publication "Safe Cycleway Coming to Your Area" is unsubstantiated, untested and could prove to be untrue. It in no way accounts for vehicles, members of the public, cyclists or straying animals traversing the Cycleway.</p> <p>4. Richards Osborne, Head of Transport at CCC, claimed in a newspaper article that the Cycleway would make it safer for people to cross the road and for turning drivers. Also the removal of on-street parking should reduce speeding and safety concerns. I do believe that driving speeds will be reduced but the build-up of traffic may be considerable. In my opinion, drivers will be delayed, become frustrated and I cannot understand his view that it will be safer to cross the road.</p> <p>PUBLIC TRANSPORT (BUSES) &amp; RENTAL VEHICLES</p> <p>A major concern to me is in respect of passengers who use walking sticks, walkers, electric wheelchairs and crutches (as many do on this route as I use the bus 7 days a week and can vouch for this statement). How some of them will get from the footpath, across the Cycleway, to the bus stop I cannot imagine.</p>				

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	<p>The bus driver has to stop, fold down the ramp (which necessitates him/her getting off the bus), see the passenger safely on/off the bus, then refold the ramp and re-board the bus before driving off. The following traffic (in the one lane configuration) will have to wait until this has been done. Visually impaired or blind passengers – how will they navigate the distance to/from the bus?</p> <p>Out of town and overseas visitors (often driving rented motorhomes only collected within an hour from the rental company located close to the airport) will find the one lane/Cycleway street reconfigurations confusing and become nervous when they are in the middle of that confusion. I often get stopped as I walk along Harewood Road by a driver of a rental vehicle asking for directions and often their English is limited so I wonder how they will understand the various signs erected as part of the proposal.</p> <p>I wonder what Disability Services and the frustrated car driver waiting behind would have to say about these comments?</p> <p><b>PARKING – SPORTS EVENTS/COMMUNITY EVENTS</b></p> <p>Outside of Bishopdale and Nunweek Parks the current on-road parking at weekends is bumper to bumper, the same in adjoining streets. Sport coaches carry in equipment, families carry in their babies and children, chairs, picnic items, buggies and safely gather their dogs from the car parked on the roadside. Where will these people park if the Cycleway proposal goes ahead?</p> <p><b>GENERAL ON ROAD PARKING</b></p> <p>I have spoken to a number of the Stakeholders who are reliant on on-road parking. A few of them only became aware of the proposal days before the CCC Consultation dates/times were advertised and a couple had no awareness of it. Losing 41% of the on-road parking spaces will have a significant impact on a number of these stakeholders. For example, the retirement homes have very limited off-street parking at their premises and these are specifically for the use of visitors, GP's, Ambulances, couriers and deliveries. Two Managers advised a very real concern when mentioning that their carers and nurses always park on the road and for those leaving at 11pm in the dark and sometimes in poor weather conditions where would they expect their cars to be?</p> <p><b>TRAFFIC LIGHTS ON THE GARDINERS/HAREWOOD, BREENS/HAREWOOD ROADS</b></p> <p>I ABSOLUTELY SUPPORT THE INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC LIGHTS (A \$1.3 MILLION DOLLAR COST WAS QUOTED BY A CCC COUNCILLOR). IT IS SHAMEFUL THAT THIS IS NA ONGOING DELAYED PROJECT. TWO THINGS OF INTEREST TO ME – I AM LEAD TO BELIEVE THE COUNCIL APPROVED THE TRAFFIC LIGHTS IN 2017, THE OTHER THAT A PLANNER FOR THE CYCLEWAY PROJECT TOLD ME THAT ONLY IF THE CYCLEWAY PROPOSAL IS ADOPTED AND ACTUALLY HAPPENS, WILL THE LIGHTS BE INSTALLED, OTHERWISE NOT. THIS IS A VERY SERIOUS ISSUE.</p> <p><b>ACCESS TO BISHOPDALE COURT</b></p> <p>Has careful consideration been given to the huge (both in length and weight) number of trucks which are required to access/exit the Mall complex. Seven days a week, twice daily, trucks make deliveries form Foodstuffs in Hornby. Others I have observed, and there are sure to be more, are Coca Cola, Pie Companies, Bread and Milk companies, Liquor Store deliveries, Chemist deliveries, couriers, etc. They all need to drive in/out from Harewood Road (no access form the far end of the Mall due to the Library and other buildings). Unless the Cycleway will not be immediately in front of Bishopdale Court how will they manage?</p>				

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	<p><b>STREETS ENTRANCE/EXIT</b></p> <p>The impact of changing Sails Street, Chapel Street, and Wilmot Street from the current situation will be significantly impactful on a large number of people. Not least Palmer Funeral Service, Time Dental, the church on Chapel Street. Many of the public who use the companies, worship at the church, attend all manner of community meetings and social events are elderly. They can only manage to attend provided they can park a car outside and then (often using walkers or walking aids) get into the facilities. Will the Companies involved be compensated for loss of business and goodwill? The little Dairy on Harewood Road will obviously struggle with a Cycleway and lack of parking for customers outside.</p> <p>Mega Mitre Ten have voiced concern over freight and other deliveries being unable to use their existing route in/out of their premises.</p> <p><b>CANTERBURY CHARITY HOSPITAL</b></p> <p>Many clients currently park on Harewood Road. Gas cylinders, laundry service vehicles, Medical couriers and other deliveries need easy access to the hospital – how will this be possible with a Cycleway outside of the premises?</p> <p><b>COPENHAGEN BAKERY</b></p> <p>Established in 2012 on the Harewood Road site. The location chosen carefully due to the availability of on-street parking. There are only 12 off-street parking spaces on site and the plan shows only a few limited time on-street parking spaces.</p> <p>A very popular venue for friends/business meetings/social gatherings and customers who collect orders, buy coffees and food. Catering for numerous functions, having all kinds of deliveries which essentially have to get close to the entry doors, this business could be annihilated due to the parking situation. Certainly travelling cyclists, say, en-route to/from work, appointments, or time poor would not be stopping to purchase items from Copenhagen Bakery.</p> <p><b>REFUSE COLLECTION</b></p> <p>Where will residents place their CCC weekly wheelie bins for collection and other bins supplied by private companies?</p> <p><b>TREE PRUNING ALONG THE CYCLEWAY ROUTE</b></p> <p>The company TREE TECH currently are contracted to prune the trees and, on site, feed the branches into a chipper. When I have observed this being done their large red vehicles use one lane on Harewood Road and more than one of their trucks operates at the same time. How will this work in the Cycleway proposal?</p> <p><b>GENERAL</b></p> <p>I was made aware that the CCC first made a decision to construct this Cycleway in 2017. Now, 4 years later, minimal advertising, lack of</p>				

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	<p>community input pre-consultation sessions, difficulty getting supplies of the "Have Your Say" publication and the 17 sheet sets of plans for this over engineered extravagant project leaves me having little to no confidence in the Council or the majority of sitting Councillors.</p> <p>A CCC Councillor is reported to have stated that a survey had not been conducted regarding how many cyclists use Harewood Road. This is shameful.</p> <p>Richard Osborne (CCC Head of Transport) reported that modelling suggested 1200 cyclists per day would use the Cycleway by 2031 (The Press 27.01/2021). How can I have faith in this suggestion given the previous statement (above)?</p> <p>IN CONCLUSION</p> <p>I am concerned that the number of bus stops along Harewood Road, apart from some of them being re-positioned, will not be reduced in number by only the amount suggested in the plans. I have recorded the number of current bus stops on each side of Harewood Road and my tally does not match the number in the plans. By moving some of the bus stops the public (especially the less mobile passengers) will be very inconvenienced and some of them chose their residential retirement homes because a bus stop is either outside or very close by.</p> <p>It has been reported (The Press 12/02/2021) that about half the cost of the Cycleway is expected to be funded by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency. This sounds unconvincing to me and without any firm commitment from that Agency. As so often happens (refer to many of our major CBD projects) the initial expected expenditure significantly increases and sometimes it has been necessary to lengthily delay the project or abandon it altogether. My burning question is – WHERE WILL THE BALANCE OF THE FINAL COST BE DRIVED FROM???</p> <p>My earnest appeal, and fervent hope, is for the Wheels to Wings Cycleway Plan to be abandoned in the meantime. When the submissions and other valuable input has been carefully considered and to the best possible way researched/costed/partially trialled to get a feel of the effectiveness and both cyclists, drivers, pedestrians, those with disability issues and all of the stakeholders with their individual needs best met, then, and only then, could it be re-introduced.</p> <p>Thank you for inviting me to make a submission.</p> <p>Sandy Bragg (4 page attachment for the W to W submission, copy of the Local Government Act 2002, Section 14.</p> <p>13 March 2021</p>				

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42838	<p>A. I do not support many aspects of the plan presented and having a history of the community regarding safety and reasons why certain pedestrian crossings and bus stops were originally installed.</p> <p>B. The plan as presented has truly little consideration for the mature residents who will be socially isolated, unsafe, limited access for outings, crossing Harewood Road, catching buses, and visiting neighbours and friends.</p> <p>C. Harewood Road drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians have huge issues with sunstrike especially about 3pm, on certain times of the year when traveling towards the airport.</p> <p>D. Do not support the removal of parking for essential workers who need parking 7 days a week 24 hours a day. Some of these facilities have been established on Harewood Road for over 60 years. Staff at these facilities are not locals they come from all over Canterbury.</p> <p>E. Council should purchase and provide land for parking for these essential workers it is not only the rest homes, but there are also other medical staff, Police, Public Servants etc. Since the Langdons Link has been built there are cars parked on all streets between Greers Rd, Langdons, and Harewood Rd. Hoani St, Sails St, Chapel St, Wilmot St, Morrison Avenue, Harris Crescent, St James Ave, and Matsons Rd from 8am till 6pm.</p> <p>F. Interesting that housing development has been developed in Wilmot St, and beautification in Hoani St, is to be a cul de sac. Emergency access will be an issue and currently there is not enough room for the Fire Emergency vehicles to enter since parking is on both sides and full by 10am till late in the day.</p> <p>G. It is important that the entry and exit be investigated and installation of lights at the intersections of Langdons Rd/Chapel St, or Langdons Rd/Sails St. Langdons Rd/Greers Rd, LangdonsRd/Langdons Linked in need. There are many minor crashes, and these are not often reported.</p> <p>H. Double cycleway from the Railway line to Chapel Street is a danger and the vehicles that are turning into Mitre 10 all hours of the day and weekends will see fatalities happening. Research shows that a lot of crashes happen with cyclists when a vehicle is turning left. Even though the rule is a vehicle must give way to a cyclist when turning left, a speed of a cyclist will reach the vehicle when it is negotiating the turn on the centre of the car/truck.</p> <p>Would recommend that Council commences this plan at the end of Harewood Road Airport end. This would see Harewood School traffic issues decrease and this provide most important safety for the pupils, parents, and cyclists. Linking cyclists to use the underpass on Johns Road for the cyclists that would use it.</p> <p>The following issues be considered.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Speed on Waimakariri Road be 40 km important for drivers.</li> <li>2. 40km speed always outside Harewood School like many other countries rather than limited times.</li> <li>3. Watsons Road have Stop signs on it and the design be narrower so that drivers do not develop a left hand turn.</li> <li>4. Council monitor and enforce hedges to be kept pruned to always provide excellent vision for safe intersections, especially Watsons Rd.</li> <li>5. Bus shelter be provided at 598 Harewood Road opposite Nunweek Park.</li> <li>6. Crossings be provided so that pedestrians can access the buses on Harewood Rd.</li> </ol>	Yvonne	Palmer		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	<p>7. Do not support concrete separators rather have plastic coloured like many other communities and cities. Concerned about injuries resulting from falls.</p> <p>8. Do not support the removal of the bus stop from outside of Wesley Care Hospital 91 &amp; 93 Harewood Rd due to safety of bus patrons. Huge issues of crime will occur again in this area for patrons waiting for or leaving buses if this bus is at the entrance of Harris Crescent.</p> <p>9. The installation of the bus stops outside of both Retirement facilities was for the residents being able to access the buses as most of the residents no longer have cars.</p> <p>10. Retaining the bus stop is safe for the residents vehicles of Marblewood Place waiting for the bus to go before entering Harewood Rd.</p> <p>11. Do support the vehicles turning in to Sails Street as the previous plan had a history of crashes since the Langdon Link had opened.</p> <p>12. Would support turns into Sails Street from Harewood Road.</p> <p>13 Do support the turning from Chapel Street into Harewood Rd only due to the number of vehicles that use this intersection as a U Turn. The visibility of entering Harewood Road is safer rather than turning right out of Harewood Rd into Langdons Rd.</p> <p>14. Lack of lighting and safety with moving the bus stop further along Harewood Rd towards Harris Crescent.</p> <p>15. Have issues about the vehicles that are entering Harewood Road Bishopdale Roundabout as the rules of driving are that you must enter the closest Lane and then indicate to move into the next lane, and again into the right-hand turn lane. Police do enforce this road rule and carry out education regularly.</p> <p>16. Support parking for Copenhagen Café as this is an important community café where social connections occur daily.</p> <p>17. Mitre 10 is another social connection for residents and friends as there has never been a community Centre in the Papanui Community.</p> <p>18. Chapel Street Methodist Chapel needs total support as they have become a facility that supports and provides community meetings, training facilities and a large funeral facility that needs council support. Since the earthquakes this is one and the other facility Papanui RSA who have been open for community use of their facilities.</p> <p>19. The consent given for traffic turning from Harewood Rd new housing development is going to be a crash area immediately the complex is built. Restell St was a danger for vehicles, and this will occur at the Harewood Railway line with right hand turners coming out of the housing development. This should be left hand turns in and out immediately the development is opened. I am amazed that there is no mention of scooter users and mobility scooters as they are now often on the road and not on the footpath. Another issue will be trucks trying to access this area for deliveries. Harewood Railway Crossing had many fatal crashes there until the establishment of the Community Board along with the Local MP and Council staff saw barrier arms installed at Harewood, Langdons, Sawyers Arms, and Northcote Road. The cost of fatal crashes is huge but why do these have to happen, because lack of consultation does not provide community knowledge and history.</p>				
42809	<p>Thank very much. In general pretty happy with the design. A few improvements recommended, see attached document.</p> <p>Look forward to biking on this in future.</p>	Allan	Taunt		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42807	Pls see detailed submission - overall this is a significant improvement, but we suggest many refinements, both big and small.	Chris	Abbott	Spokes Canterbury	Secretary and Submissions Convenor
42774	<p>It is very clear that you have not addressed many of the issues that myself and many other residents brought up in the initial round of feedback.</p> <p>The addition of more traffic lights will not create gaps in the flow of traffic as you seem to think it will. Rather, at peak times, it will result in the entirety of Harewood road being backed up, and no one being able to go anywhere.</p> <p>Another critical issue that has been completely ignored is motorists' safety when entering their driveways. While waiting to turn into a shared driveway, we will have to now sit in the middle of the road. This will undoubtedly lead to rear endings and possibly even fatalities.</p> <p>The only way this design could be made safe would be to reduce the width of the cycleways on each side of the road, which should be no problem as neither are two ways, and both are more than wide enough to be 2 ways. I would like to reinforce a point from my last submission that clearly showed that the cycleways could be dramatically reduced in width: "I do not understand the need for a 2.2m wide cycleway on both sides of the road. This is far wider than required for two bicycles to ride side by side. If we say that a bike has handlebars of approximately 750mm, then there is more than enough room for one to pass another if the cycleway is 1.8m wide, which is the minimum requirement. As it is proposed that there will be a cycleway on each side of the road, I do not see that either one needs to be wider than 1.8m. If cyclists had a 1.8m dedicated cycle lane then a concrete kerb should not be required. Cars are legally required to stay out of cycle lanes when they are simply painted on the road. Surely it would be cheaper and easier to simply enforce this." The safety of all road users would also require the removal of the excess traffic lights that are only going to serve to create congestion, especially at peak times.</p> <p>I spend a lot of time in the Ilam area near the University of Canterbury which has a dedicated cycleway that is separated by dividers. This is far narrower and seems to successfully handle the far larger cycle traffic than we will ever see down Harewood road (I doubt all the University students on bicycles will suddenly come this way). In addition to this, it is very common down Ilam road to see cyclists that still insist on riding either on the road itself or up the footpath, and I have no doubt that we will see the exact same here. This results in cars not being able to get past, due to the reduced width of their lane, the same as is being proposed down Harewood road. This leads to congestion and dangerous driving.</p> <p>I do not understand why there has been a strong bias given towards cyclists from outside of this area, most of whom likely never even come over this side of town. By catering to them, you are messing with the daily lives of the majority of residents of the Bishopdale/Harewood area.</p> <p>Your argument for the safety of drivers has conveniently focused on those who want to reduce traffic flow because they believe that this will increase safety. In reality, reducing Harewood road from two lanes to one will not encourage people to reduce their speed, but rather encourage dangerous driving which will undoubtedly lead to many accidents.</p> <p>Once again, you are putting the needs of the minority ahead of everyone else. You keep going on about how these cycleways will be easy for everyone to use, yet many people are not able to cycle for their daily commute. This is for many reasons, such as the amount of gear required for certain jobs (like mine), and the simple fact that a large proportion of the population in this area are elderly, many of which are physically incapable of riding a bicycle.</p> <p>I still fail to see the cyclists that keep being mentioned that are using alternative roads whilst avoiding Harewood road. I spend a lot of</p>	Andrew	McCabe		



ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	<p>time walking and driving though the Bishopdale and Harewood area, both at peak and off-peak times, and I am still yet to see all of these cyclists that are supposedly in this area waiting for this new cycleway.</p> <p>The data that have been produced about cycle counts are mainly from early 2021 and are therefore not a statistically significant sample on which to base any conclusions. It was well known that usage was being monitored at these times, so the cycling population had the ability to increase in numbers in this area. This will have led to overinflation of your counts. This is also only 2 months of one year (excluding June 2017 and March 2020 which both appear as random data points and therefore should not have been included anyway), this is not a fair sample on which to base any long-term conclusions. There is no fluctuation for seasonality or year and therefore this cannot be used to claim that there are a high number of cyclists present in these areas. The March 2020 data point would be alright if it were backed up by a February 2020 data point, or any data from the February/March time in 2019, however this is not the case, so no yearly changes can be seen. When looking at the data, we are only seeing one small sample from each location at each time point. None of these have been repeated and are therefore not sufficient to be used to draw conclusions. It would take at least 3 consecutive measures in each location at each time point to even begin to have useful data. The data is also presented in a misleading way. As all the 24-hour counts are actually extrapolated from 5 or 6 hours, they should not be included as 24-hour data points. The raw data should be provided as it would give a far truer picture.</p> <p>By making this route supposedly safer for cyclists, who are the minority of the users, you are making it astronomically more dangerous for everyone else who uses Harewood road.</p> <p>The majority of taxpayers are likely not cyclists, yet the vast majority of the money you want to pump into this project is only going to benefit the small proportion that are. The money coming from the rate payers which is going to be put towards this project would be better spent on things that are beneficial to everyone. I used to use public transport, however after many years finally got sick of putting up with a sub-par bus service. To reduce the number of motorists, the Christchurch City Council should investigate an alternative that works for more people including those that are unable to ride a bicycle. If the Christchurch City Council put some more time and money into improving the bus service, then we would end up with less cars on the road which would make it safer for cyclists. I know I would use the bus service again if it functioned better.</p> <p>Harewood road is a main thoroughfare for many motorists, and this will not change overnight. We will not see a reduction in numbers of cars on the road, just a reduction of space for them all. It takes a generation to change habits this well ingrained, therefore it will likely be about 20 years before the use of motor vehicles decreases significantly.</p> <p>The addition of cycle lanes is not going to change the fact that Christchurch is not a city that is set up for cyclists or pedestrians. It is a very spread-out city and motor vehicles are a requirement for many people, such as myself, who work a long way from where they live.</p> <p>Why waste our money and our time if you have no intention whatsoever to help us in any way.</p>				
42765	Please refer to my attached notes	Fiona	Bennetts		
42752	Looks better but the point is we can't afford it. It is like having a pool it's nice to have but not essential. In these COVID times it is better to put money into the essential things required for the council. ie clean drinking water. This is also not good on harewood road. Please seriously consider not building this as many people who use harewood road everyday do not want it. I support putting traffic lights on breens road as that is essential.	Gavin	Blackwell		
42741	Please refer to attached cover letter and 3 pages of diagrams/plans	Philip	Clarke		
42733	See attached. Thank you.	S	Croft		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42726	<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>Thank you for putting on the information afternoon at Bishopdale Ara about "Wheels to Wings" cycleway. The visual displays were very clear, and it was interesting to read the public comments, both positive and negative, and your responses to them.</p> <p>PLEASE END THE CYCLEWAY BARRIER ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF HAREWOOD ROAD EAST OF MATSONS AVENUE AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE TO MATSONS AVENUE.</p> <p>We live at [redacted] Harewood Road, [redacted]. We cannot back in to our drive; to do so would mean blocking Harewood Road, as there are nearly always cars travelling west on Harewood Road, attempting to turn right into the Mitre 10 entrance, but stationary because they are unable to do so because of the cars travelling east on Harewood Road. It is a very busy road, and that part opposite the Mitre 10 entrance is particularly dangerous. Our brick front fence suffered extensive damage some weeks ago, when it was hit by a car coming out of Mitre 10. It is still unrepaired, and we are grappling with the insurance company.</p> <p>We therefore have to reverse out of our driveway. Now, to do so, we have to watch out for two lots of traffic travelling west on Harewood Road; first, those coming from the railway line, and secondly, those turning left from St James Avenue, a well-known "rat run". In addition, we have to give way to cars turning right out of Mitre 10. When Mitre 10 applied for their many approvals, we asked that traffic out of Mitre 10 onto Harewood Road be "left turn only"; unfortunately, that was not done. There are also very often cars stationary in the middle of the road, attempting to turn right into Mitre 10, but unable to do so. None of these vehicles featured in the diagrams. Fortunately, we can currently back out of our property using only the left-hand lane of Harewood Road, as we can drive forward over the bus stop outside our house. We never try to travel east on Harewood Road from our drive. It's hard enough reversing out and travelling west.</p> <p>With the proposed cycleway, the bus stop disappears, and the raised barrier on the road for the cycleway will prevent our current practice. Our neighbours nearer St James Avenue aren't affected; they have a three-driveway space with no cycleway barrier on the road. Initially, the cycleway barrier stopped in line with our drive. After consultation, you agreed to move the barrier some distance west on Harewood Road, but we are concerned that the suggested modification may not be enough.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Deirdre and John Walsh</p>	JOHN	WALSH		
42722	Still disagree with concept	Carole	Evans		
42705	<p>I support the provision of safe and convenient cycleways such as the proposal offers.</p> <p>We need to get really serious about reducing the number of journeys made by car (reasons include carbon emissions, obesity, general safety etc), so a combination of carrot and stick is required. I.e. make cycling better, and car use less attractive.</p>	David	Moorhouse		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42693	<p>I feel encouraged that CCC has shown an effort to take feedback and make suggested changes. I enjoyed the walk in session to see the entire plan in full and speak with reps. There is too much of a negative attitude online (FB community groups), that's causing a lot of "noise" to fully appreciate this proposal.</p> <p>I think the proposed changes are positive and I hope it goes ahead. I think the shared path is less imposing and I appreciate that on street parking is needed but keeping the path clear from these cars (and doors opening) and people crossing the path will be interesting. Also making sure there are clear markings. I notice pedestrians using a marked shared path are likely to stick to their side, while others without markings (like the trail by the railway line) walk everywhere! This increases the chance of cyclists colliding with pedestrians etc. there needs to be sufficient space to overtake safely. Also let's make the crossings of roads clear for both path users and cars. They can be very complicated in central city. Greers Rd/Harewood Rd is currently hazardous to those crossing so this would be one area where clear signals are desperately needed.</p> <p>I despair with the number of negative comments online for this proposal. I think CCC need to invest some resources to try change the attitudes. I know this is a big job. I sense the negative characters in my area are older people who think cycling is a utopian view but it needs to happen! How do we get them on bikes? E bikes make it easier for this demographic to cycle. They just don't know it and are stuck with the car mentality. It's too easy to get in a car in Chch. How do we promote the advocates who already do this and the public health benefits for this group? Especially for locally trips. Open their eyes to the use of e bikes (how do you make it affordable?) and cool network that can be navigated safely (group rides?).</p> <p>Also for kids, it's clear that many kids don't cycle due to safety. Let's showcase this. The trail by the railway is one example of heavy use for school kids. What would be the impact if that trail wasn't there? I suspect that many more cars would be chocking up the roads. I'm hoping that this path will offer an alternative to our school journey as we currently try to cross Greers Rd (Island by condell Ave) and avoiding condell Ave to get to rail trail. Condell Ave has too many parked cars that narrows the road and it's busy.</p> <p>I use Harewood Rd to cycle to the airport (when I don't have a lot of luggage). Love the tunnel! However the bike lane disappears on Orchard rd and the roundabout it a bit tricky. I always struggle to know where to go on my bike after the roundabout. The bike racks are a bit hidden and not very secure. I know that's an airport issue but it's a part of a bigger picture.</p> <p>Happy to speak if you need a supporter and a parent who currently bikes with a child to school (Bryndwr) and airport. Big advocate on cycling!</p> <p>Good luck team!</p>	Lucy	Rivas		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42688	<p>Papanui ki Waiwhetu Wings to Wheels Cycleway (W2W)</p> <p>Enliven Bishopdale Group submission:</p> <p>By Bill Greenwood, assisted by Brian Neill on behalf of the local business and ratepayer community.</p> <p>Purpose:</p> <p>The purpose of this submission is to inform the local Community Boards and the Christchurch City Council Hearings Panel of ongoing support for the proposed Major Papanui ki Waiwhetu Wings to Wheels Cycleway (W2W) within our community.</p> <p>WE, the local business community; Copenhagen Bakery, Charity Hospital, Bishopdale Mall Business Association, Mitre 10 and Foodstuff and</p> <p>WE, our wider residential community (Enliven Bishopdale Group + petitioners), strongly submit that the Council Consultants Option 3 is the preferred W2W Cycleway design. With minor improvement this alternative incorporating a regional cycleway on the south side the length of Harewood Road can provide the safest, best connected, lower financial cost and environmentally sustainable transport network improvement.</p> <p>WE, in conclusion, strongly request the W2W Cycleway Option 3 with minor improvements be implemented as soon as practicable.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>Christchurch City Council is developing 13 major cycleways across the city. The major cycleways are specifically intended for cyclist who 'don't feel comfortable riding on road.'</p> <p>After 50 years of local, national and international experience specialising in Urban Design and Road Safety Management Bill Greenwood retired as a Principal Engineer Planning and Policy with the NZTA. Significant community concerns regarding the initial design W2W Cycleway has brought him out of retirement.</p> <p>In conjunction with Brian Neill, another experienced Transport and Traffic Engineer, we have undertaken a robust investigation of all the consultation proposals. The significant commitment of time and support provided by Council staff and consultants was appreciated.</p> <p>On balance, it is our professional opinion a best practice lower environmental and funding cost design can be achieved based on Option 3. This alternative with minor improvements, has been identified in conjunction with local businesses and the wider community as the preferred option. Such a "One Network" design will better share the road environment between the needs of cyclists (current and intended), motorists, businesses and ratepayers/residents.</p> <p>This submission is supported by major businesses in the area and has resulted in a further petition from interested residents.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>1/ Advantages of Option 3: This has the following advantages over the current recommended option;</p>	Bill	Greenwood	Enliven Bishopdale Group	Member

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	<p>A/ Connectivity;</p> <p>This is very important for intended cyclist who don't feel comfortable riding on road. This is achieved by continuing a dual cycleway on the south side of Harewood Road along its full length.</p> <p>B/ Safety;</p> <p>This option specifically avoids installing isolated traffic signals west of Nunweek Boulevard and Matsons Ave. Low use isolated traffic signals have a recognised poor safety record.</p> <p>This option includes traffic signals at the well-used Bishopdale Mall Harewood Road access. This is used by a significant number of large vehicles turning across the proposed cycleway, including those servicing the supermarket.</p> <p>Reducing Harwood Road to 2-lane will reduce the average speed of vehicles by around 5 km/h. This, combined with more consistent flow (lower standard deviation), can be expected to increase safety for all road users.</p> <p>C/ Comfort;</p> <p>This option involves turning the 4-lane portion of Harewood Road on the north side to a 2-lane Minor Arterial route. This reduction from 4 to 2 traffic lanes was the most significant concern of most of the 1,200 submitters. Recent information provided to the community details how this will have little effect on traffic route capacity. Much of the dual cycleway length will be on a low speed, low volume (&lt;1,000 vpd) local road.</p> <p>2/ Option 3 Issues: Improvements can be made to the consultants preferred option to overcome issues they raised.</p> <p>A/ Traffic noise;</p> <p>Reducing Harwood Road to 2-lanes will reduce the average speed of vehicles by around 5 km/h. This, combined with more consistent flow, can be expected to, at most, result in a 3 dBL increase in noise when aligned closer to north side building frontages. This increase is unlikely to exceed a normal (64 dBL) level. Replacing the existing chip seal with an asphalt overlay will reduce traffic noise below current levels.</p> <p>B/ Costs - Parking replacement;</p> <p>A higher cost associated with the circulated option 3 is a consequence of widening the carriageway by 2m on the majority of the north side. To provide this parking lane requires removal of some trees, extensive concrete construction and undergrounding overhead services. Parking use surveys show a very low level of demand (&lt; 7 west of roundabout &lt; 4 east) from adjacent properties. Recessed parking (where requested by adjacent property owners) can easily be provide at a significantly lower cost without the need to underground services or remove all trees.</p> <p>C/ Costs - Cycleway separators;</p> <p>The Cycleway separators used throughout the consultants' proposals involve a considerable length of raised concrete kerbs separated by a flat slab of concrete. An identified safety hazard disliked by both motorists and cyclists. They are however a current requirement on arterial roads. Manufacture of concrete is a significant producer of greenhouse gasses and is best avoided. The replacement of the</p>				

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	<p>concrete separator with recycled rubber "alligators" along the local road portion of the route will significantly reduce both the economic and environmental cost of this option.</p> <p>D/ Costs – New kerb and channel;</p> <p>The current option shows new kerb and channel with associated storm water systems between Harewood School and Woodridges Road. Replacing this concrete work with timber battens shall significantly reduce both the economic and environmental cost of this option.</p> <p>E/ Costs – New traffic signals;</p> <p>Low use traffic signals can increase intersection delays for all users. Therefore pedestrian and cyclist often cross before their phase is triggered. Low use traffic signals have a poor safety record.</p> <p>Until the traffic signal warrant is met, it is recommended that the isolated traffic signals at Harewood School be relocated to the Railway Crossing. The signals at the Railway Crossing are warranted and approved, but not yet funded.</p> <p>Traffic signals at Woolridges Road will reduce delays, especially during morning and evening peak traffic periods. They will also reduce vehicle speeds on Harewood Road. To keep within budget, it may be appropriate to defer provision of these signals until the planned connection to the Northwood development occurs. Funds saved could be better used to bring forward the installation of traffic signals at the Sawyers Arms/Greers/Northcote intersection.</p> <p>F/ Loss of Trees;</p> <p>A significant concern of our community is the proposed loss of street trees. The increased green space will provide area for all to be replaced. The opportunity could also be taken to plant additional trees to make construction of the cycleway carbon neutral in recognition of our Climate Emergency.</p> <p>3/ Further improvements</p> <p>Option 3 could be further enhanced by including the following additional improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The shared use Cyclelane widths along Harewood Road can be reduced in places and still comply with the AustRoads guidelines (AustRoads Part 6A 11 Feb 2021).</li> <li>• Provide the Breens/Gardeners, traffic signals with two through lane approaches on both Harewood road legs at the intersection This will increase capacity, reduce delays at minimal extra cost.</li> <li>• Provide the Farrington Ave and Highstead Rd with two lane approaches at the Harewood Rd intersection. This will increase capacity and reduce delays at minor cost.</li> <li>• Provide Harewood/Greers traffic signals with two through lane approaches on all legs by removal of the median island and grass berms on the Greers Rd south approach.</li> </ul> <p>This will significantly increase capacity, reduce delays and allow the right turn arrow on Harewood Rd to operate each cycle. This right</p>				

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	<p>turn phase only operates weekdays 7am to 9am due to current capacity constraints from 3pm weekdays when north bound traffic on Greers Rd queue back into Grahams Rd. This right turn movement is involved in a majority of the crashes at this intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Breens/Harewood Intersection signals will result in increased crashes at the Wairakei/Breens intersection due to its poor intervisibility. Signalising this intersection will assist north bound road users and reduce traffic volumes on parallel routes.</li> <li>• Provide the Featherstone Dairy and Awatapu Preschool with angle parking on adjacent side roads in conjunction with standard offset threshold treatments. This will allow the properties to be serviced clear of the arterial traffic.</li> <li>• A Signalised Intersection is required at Sawyers Arms/ Northcote/Greers intersection to support the transport network, assist west bound traffic and reduce 'rat running' on adjacent local streets. The computer modelling of traffic patterns in the Harewood Rd route are based on this occurring.</li> <li>• Signalised Intersections are also desirable at (Greers/Langdons, Condell/Greers to reduce 'rat running' on adjacent local streets</li> </ul> <p>Conclusion;</p> <p>WE thank you for the chance to provide detailed feedback on the proposed Wheels to Wings Cycleway Option 3 and are very keen for it to happen. The Business and resident Community has identified continuing the cycleway on the south side of Harewood Road for its full length as both desirable and achievable.</p> <p>Following discussions with consultant staff around the preferred 'typical' cross section for the north side of the existing median portions of Harewood Road, we recommend two (3.2m) traffic lanes, a flush median width 2m and 2m recessed parking bays where required by residents.</p> <p>To provide this, especially parking bays, an issue of significant services in the norther berm was identified. The use of 'dropdown kerbing' and recessed parking can achieve this clear of existing services and tree at a considerably lower economic and environmental cost.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to fully participate in our Council's consultation on the W2W Cycleway. It has been enjoyable working together to find the best solutions for our community needs while addressing the current Climate Emergency.</p> <p>WE wish to attend and present at Council hearings on this important regional cycle route.</p> <p>Recommendation;</p> <p>WE recommend the W2W Option 3 incorporating improvements detailed above proceed using the identified cost savings.</p> <p>Warm regards  Bill Greenwood  Principal Engineer Road Safety Planning and Policy (Retired)</p> <p>Assisted by Brian Neill  Transportation and Traffic Engineer (Retired)</p> <p>For Enliven Bishopdale Group</p>				

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42682	<p>I am in favour of the proposal, because;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It will make transportation safer for all road users.</li> <li>2. It will enable and encourage more people to walk and cycle.</li> <li>3. Linking up to existing and proposed cycle paths creates a system that provides a more versatile network that creates more route options for cyclists.</li> <li>5. It will not cause major inconvenience to motorists.</li> </ol>	Tony	Judd		
42681	<p>I have considered the options of cycleway designs, criteria performance details.</p> <p>I still maintain that this cycleway is not necessary and my main concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access and safety of pedestrians, vehicles, and home and retail business owners, residential. These are the main priority and users of the population use of this roadway.</li> <li>• I am most concerned about the length of time, cost and inconvenience to home owners and business users.</li> </ul> <p>If a cycleway of this magnitude is to progress, then my preferred option would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concept 3. Which is safest for all users of this road along the four lane carriageway.</li> <li>• Less inconvenience to the road user.</li> <li>• Less impact on parking outside residences and businesses and safer for ALL users.</li> </ul> <p>Cut out the berms and make more available for cycleway which are a huge waste of space.</p>	Craig	Shirley		
42680	<p>As a regular client at Copenhagen, I would have difficulty shopping there if the street parking was removed for cycle lanes. I am 91 years old and have difficulty walking any distance. Instead of all this disruption and financial cost, why not use the cycle lanes already provided in Sawyers Arms Road?</p>	Anna	Stegehuis		
42673	<p>We live at [REDACTED] Harewood Road and the only concerns we have that as our driveway is offset and you are putting raised separators will make it very difficult to enter in and out with our large boat which we need to be able to back up our drive.</p> <p>Our request is that the separators each side of our drive entrance can be lowered or spaced further apart or painted to allow us to be able to back our boat up the drive without having to try to maneuver around the raised separators and holding up traffic.</p> <p>Kind Regards Phillip Cohen</p>	Phill	Cohen		
42672	Attached	Nick	Atkins		



ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42662	This cycle lanes look great.	Greg	Hughey		
42660	<p>As a resident living for many years at Hoani Street, I would like to bring the following concerns to your attention:</p> <p>1) Making Wilmot Street a cul de sac</p> <p>Hoani Street has only one four way intersection (Hoani Street and Sails Street) and I have seen several accidents at that intersection over the years. My builder had an accident with a car coming from Harewood Road, his car had to be written off.</p> <p>Some cars are speeding between Harewood and Langdons Road and an accident is waiting to happen with pedestrians involved, as some people park right at the bend of the intersection that makes visibility of oncoming traffic very hard to impossible.</p> <p>I strongly suggest to make Sails street towards Harewood Road to a cul de sac instead of Wilmot Street.</p>	Reinhard	Jagau		
42659	<p>I live on Harewood Road, almost opposite the Copenhagen Bakery and I went to a meeting held late in October.</p> <p>I walk around Harewood a few times a week and I am still concerned about the parking (or lack of) both on Harewood Road and Gardiners Road.</p> <p>There are a lot of units on Harewood Road and the owners of these units are not allowed to park on a shared driveway, so kerbside is their only option. Taking 40% parking away means they are going to have to park some distance from their properties if they can find one.</p> <p>Coming home from work, I turn left into Harewood Road coming off Breens Road then turn at the layby opposite Trafford Road. In rush hour, the traffic is constant and sometimes I'm sitting there for up to 5 minutes now trying to turn. This is on a 4 lane road. When it reduces to two, I know I'm going to be sitting there for longer creating a lot more carbon emissions than now.</p> <p>Saying that a lot more people will cycle to the airport is a very broad statement. Yes, there may be a few who work there that wish to bike but picking up or dropping off passengers/freight or flying out/in yourself etc I'm 100 percent sure a vehicle will be used in these instances.</p> <p>I was quoted that there are 100 bike movements daily in the underpass under Johns Road and by 2031 there will be 1000. What are these figures based on?</p> <p>I'm still not happy with the design. What is wrong with painted bike lines similar to Wairakei Road? Much more cost effective and works well. I drive along Wairakei Road twice daily during the week and I've never seen more than a half dozen cyclists. When the weather is cold and wet I don't see any.</p> <p>Thank you for giving me the opportunity to voice my concerns once again.</p>	Bernadette	Bowe		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42657	<p>This concerns Harewood Road between Nunweek Park and Greers Road. I am fully aware that there is no easy way to change the traffic layout on an established built-up road, but would ask you to give some further consideration to the section between Crofton Road and Gardiners/Breens Roads. There are enough problems with this section without increasing them by taking out two lanes of traffic.</p> <p>*Recently I have encountered a build up of traffic when two cars wanted to use the slot to make a U-turn. As there was a steady flow of traffic in both directions, the cars wanting to turn could not get out of the slot, so blocked the right traffic lane and it was not possible for the cars behind to merge into the left lane until the the two cars managed to complete their U-turn.</p> <p>* I was also held up for several minutes when driving down Papanui Road recently when a refuse truck had stopped right by the small traffic island near Paparoa Street and no vehicles could pass. There would not have been a problem if the island had not been there. This made me wonder if this sort of thing is going to happen every time a large vehicle (delivery trucks, emergency vehicles etc) stops in the Crofton/Gardiners section of Harewood Road.</p> <p>*There seems to be only one solution - REMOVE THE CENTRAL SECTION WITH THE TREES. There could be one traffic lane in each direction, and the cycle lanes and parking areas as planned, but there would be room for traffic to ease past and get clear of any obstruction or hold-up. The central trees look nice when there are double traffic lanes each side, but they are not practicable on major roads with single lanes. Wairakei Road functions well enough with two lanes, but it does not have a built up median strip.</p> <p>OR DIVERT CYCLISTS THROUGH SIDE STREETS FROM CROFTON ROAD TO HIGHSTED (eg Pasadena Place from Crofton Road through to Gardiners down Colesbury Street etc).</p> <p>The comments I made on my original submission still stand, but I would like you to give some thought to Crofton Road. With an increasing number of vehicles entering from Sawyers Arms Road particularly in the morning, it is getting increasingly difficult to get out onto Harewood Road, especially vehicles wishing to turn right, that quite often do not leave enough space for left turning traffic to get through.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Audrey	Jackson		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42644	<p>Unfortunately, I missed making a submission on the first round of this project due to ill health. Thank you for providing a second submission round.</p> <p>In general, I do not support this cycleway. I do not believe that Harewood Road is the right place for it, due to the volume of vehicle traffic - particularly at peak times that it receives. Harewood Road is one of the main roads into Christchurch and I believe a cycleway should at minimum be constructed completely separate to the road, similar to how the cycleway on Linwood Ave was added to the centre for part of it. Unfortunately, the centre of Harewood Road is not wide enough to support this.</p> <p>When I decided to move to Bishopdale, one of the key factors was the amount of mature trees and somewhat 'natural' look of the streets with minimal visual disturbances. There are minimal traffic lights in the suburb and I really appreciated this, for the colours of light they produce are unnatural and detract from the beauty of the area. From the changes, I'm counting 8? new sets of traffic lights. I do not support this many. I support lights at Gardiners Road intersection, as this can be dangerous to navigate. I support lights outside of Harewood School, as this is a school. And I support lights at the railway crossing near the Mitre 10 as there are already already traffic lights nearby, and this intersection is a crossway for the cycle lane already beside the railway.</p> <p>I do not support traffic lights at all on the Bishopdale roundabout, as this will destroy the natural beauty of the area. The beauty of the mature trees in this roundabout was one of the reasons I chose to live here. I also do not support cutting down any trees for the path through the roundabout.</p> <p>Narrowing Harewood Road from 4 to 2 lanes.</p> <p>I cannot find the original consultation documents on the website. I do vividly remember that the study done on impacts of reducing lanes from 2 to 4 was performed BEFORE the Christchurch earthquakes. Unfortunately I cannot find it, as it appears you have removed it. Please email it to me, I would like to read it again. Traffic patterns have changed since the earthquakes, as more people commute from north.</p> <p>One aspect of reducing Harewood Road to 2 lanes that I don't think you have considered, is safety on entering the road. Currently, in peak traffic times, there are 2 lanes. This disperses the traffic out, and creates bigger gaps in traffic that are able to be taken. Reducing the road to 1 lane each way will bunch up traffic more, creating less gaps. This will mean traffic waits longer to join, due to less gaps and people will take more risk trying to take smaller gaps.</p> <p>There are some particular issues with the roading layouts that I think have not been considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- at intersections with side roads, eg Cotswold, Leacroft - I do not believe that reducing the width of the exit from these is a good idea. If a vehicle is waiting to turn right, it will block the exit, meaning a vehicle turning left is stuck until the vehicle turning right is able. Currently, some vehicles turning right can wait a minute or two to make their turn. Combine this with the lane reduction from 4 to 2 and there will be more vehicles stuck turning as there are less opportunities to turn into the planned non-existent inside lane.</li> <li>- subsequently, adding a hump and narrowing the entrance to these side roads will mean it is more dangerous to turn right into them from Harewood Road, as they will have entered slowly meaning the vehicle will be in the oncoming lane of Harewood for longer.</li> <li>- at Greers Road intersection, the widening of the east bound lanes in order to fit the dedicated left turn lane will affect traffic heading south on Greers and turning west (right) into Harewood. The widening of the eastbound lanes pushes the 'centre' of the road further south into the current westbound inside lane. The turning traffic from the north side of Greers (turning right into Harewood to go west)</li> </ul>	Thomas	Beck		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	<p>loses the 'turning bay' in the middle of the intersection, as it pushes them closer to the opposing traffic also turning their respective right. This will mean it is more dangerous to turn this way, as right turning traffic will have to drive in the oncoming lane in order to reach the westbound lane of Harewood Road.</p> <p>- again at the Greers Road intersection, I do not support the removal of the three trees. Please refer to my above statement about why I do not support removal of trees.</p> <p>- I do not support the general removal of carparking down Harewood Road. A lot of this is due to a sort of funnel effect, where the entrance artificially gets wider the further out it is from the actual driveway, due to the cycle lane pushing it further out. Areas where you may have been able to fit 2 cars now appear to only fit 1, or 3 now appear to only fit 2. I believe this is now wasted space.</p> <p>- related to the above point, I do not appreciate the amount of yellow dashed no parking lines that will be added. Please see my above point about beauty of the area. Yellow lines are a visual eyesore and I despise all but the most necessary of them (e.g. fire hydrant markers, yellow unsafe to pass centre lines, intersection stop lines) because of this.</p> <p>- the raised curbing? that separates the cycle lane from the road is an eyesore, if it is going to be anything like the other cycleways that have been built. It is not a continuous curb, and it drops back down again into the cycleway, unlike the curbing at the edge of the road that steps up and stays up for the berm/footpath. If the curb separating the cycleway from the road were like this, or it did not have any gaps for driveways it would be better, but it needs the gaps for the driveways for access. Please see my point above about visual disturbances and natural beauty. I dislike most of the layouts of the currently built cycleways as they look hideous.</p> <p>- I do not believe the raised safety platform of the crossing outside Harewood School and Nunweek Blvd are a good idea, if these continue to be lights. There is no need for them, as it will slow traffic down more and create more noise for the residents who live next to them due to vehicles travelling over them slower and re-accelerating, or vehicles that don't care and go fast anyway. If this was a reduced speed road, e.g. like in Woolston village, then raised platforms would be fine as vehicles have to go slower through here to start with.</p> <p>Some aspects that I think are good design areas:</p> <p>- entrances to streets e.g. Chapel St where there is a space for a turning vehicle to sit and the cycleway passes behind it. I think this will create less instances where a passing cyclist is held up by a car that has moved forward to enter the road but can't and has had to stop.</p> <p>- traffic lights at Breens Road, I think are a good idea. My way home from work, I would use this intersection if it had lights. It is almost impossible to cross during peak traffic and out of peak times can still be dangerous. I currently take side roads to bypass this as entering Harewood from them is safer. Residents of these streets would appreciate less traffic.</p> <p>- pedestrian refuge islands. I can't tell from the plans which ones are proposed and which currently existent, but I support more refuge islands as this makes it easier to cross the road and make pedestrians more visible</p>				

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42609	<p>I would have preferred to see more prioritisation of cyclists in the design. I feel more effort has been put into making the design user-friendly for vehicles (particularly regarding carparking) which inherently has a negative outcome for cyclists.</p> <p>I have a number of concerns with the design however the following are my main ones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Removal of physical protection of cycleways in the lead up to intersections leaves cyclists vulnerable to left turning drivers forgetting/neglecting to check blind spots. It also encourages vehicles to turn the corner faster due to a shallower curve. Many of these side streets will not see regular truck traffic which would allow tighter corners to slow cars.</li> <li>- Cyclists travelling on a priority route should have priority over vehicles accessing side streets. Not doing this may encourage cycling on the road as that would save time and effort on behalf of the cyclist. On a side note I support the design changes to the intersection at Stanleys Rd, this would be one area where cyclist priority could improve user-friendliness further.</li> <li>- I worry that the proposed route through the Bishopdale Roundabout is convoluted and makes it more complicated to cycle through the intersection than to drive. Cyclists must cross the road four times to travel city bound, whereas vehicles only need to cross two traffic lights. This encourages cycling on the road as it would be easier and importantly faster to cycle through the intersection and re-join the cycleway after the roundabout.</li> <li>- The cycleways end at major intersections and merge onto the footpath. Improving this could be done by making the two (cycleway and footpath) clearly discernible from each other, which could also enhance continuity of the cycleway typologies.</li> </ul> <p>As detailed in the above concerns I would be appreciative of design tweaks that improve general user-friendliness for cyclists. The recent increases of cyclist numbers in Christchurch are a justification for improving cycle infrastructure and to continue in making Christchurch a national leader in the field.</p>	Josh	Campbell-Tie		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42572	<p>Submission number 37698.</p> <p>I could honestly not see any real changes to items I had concerns with expressed in my 1st submission, except that the lovely large trees are being retained in the Bishopdale round about.</p> <p>That being however, the Bishopdale "oval-a-bout" is still the most glaring issue. When I approached a representative at the Community information day with my serious reservations concerning the impracticality of actually using this quite absurd cycle-way system that has still been maintain in the plan, I got the most astounding answer: "Oh well yes it will take a bit of time to get thru, but you don't have to use it, you can still use the normal road &amp; join in with the traffic if you want to get thru quicker" Gosh really??? How hazardous is that going to be with all the road side "impediments" being proposed for all the cars? Flabbergasted is all I can say. For your planners to actually know how useless the proposed round-about layout is for a regular cyclist and still promote going ahead &amp; wrecking the place for everybody local is truly sad.</p> <p>The issue of cycle ways crossing from single to share (ie having to cross the road) - no change. Awful for a cyclist.</p> <p>The issue of the cycle way size and intrusion on 'other' users of Harewood - no real change. Not listening to the locals. Still embarrassingly wide for a cyclist. Continuing on the money wasting path that a very small number of people want.</p> <p>The question of how many cyclists actually bike from the City to the Airport (or visa versa)? Largely unanswered, just some counts done at some intersections with no indication of when/what time the sample was done. And even with this sketchy data 4 cyclist per hour would be the rate. FOUR cyclists per hour!!! That's not actually that much "usage" for all these millions of \$\$\$\$ is it. Reality could actually be even worse. One rate payer on Harewood rd just down from the round-about sat outside their place and did a count for the day. FOUR cyclists during the whole DAY! I cycle most days on the round-about but not down there and I would be very surprised at 4 cyclist/hour...maybe at 4:30-5:30pm maybe at 7:30-8:30am but I'm guessing that resident would be pretty right for the rest of the day...I can't believe the "150 per day" quoted to me by a representative at the Info session...&amp; I bike with my eyes open!</p> <p>The Wheels to Wings Cycle way part of this project plan with respect to my 1st submission, continues to be a disgraceful misuse of public money, pandering to a pet project dreamed up in stylist's dreamworld, impacting a local community area where the locals largely either don't want it or don't like it or both.</p> <p>Well place, practically sized-to-needs cycle lanes can be great; but not this fanciful, residential property intimidating/degrading monster...&amp; I don't live on Harewood Rd...I just feel for them.</p>	Gerrit	Venema		
42498	<p>Foodstuffs South Island Limited and Bishopdale New World support proposed Concept Option 3. This is by far the safest and most practical option for tens of thousands of customers who utilise this accessway every week as well as the large amount of heavy vehicles delivering to the New World and surrounding retail precinct and community areas. The installation of traffic lights ensures that the cycleway remains safe, provides greater visual distancing and ensures safety risks are reduced. Foodstuffs seeks that Concept 3 form part of the overall design and is the only concept for this accessway. All other concept options are unsafe and unsupported.</p>	Rebecca	Parish	Foodstuffs SI Ltd	Property Development Manager
42486	<p>I do not support the cycleway and the costs involved</p>	Evelyn	Slape		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42389	<p>While there are compromises, overall this new version is a significant improvement from the first iteration. I support the Spokes submission which contains a lot of small suggested changes that will improve the outcome. The video of the roundabout was very helpful to visualise what will happen. It is a pity you have not removed the gum trees as branches can fall in high winds making it less safe.</p> <p>There are two areas outside Copenhagen Bakery and the Charity Hospital where the proposed compromise does not work for the wide range of cyclists and other active transport users. There is no need to reduce the width and safety of the cycleway to 1.5M as there is plenty of space (unlike behind bus stops). The car parking can be pushed out closer to the road allowing more space for the cycleway. The raising of the height of the cycleway is a good move to remove trip hazards for pedestrians. The cycleway should be painted green particularly across the entrance ways. If the cycleways looks too narrow and too close to car doors then people will take the perceived safer option of the footpath, particularly families with children, which defeats the purpose of safe separated cycleways. There is doorway width between the cars and the cycleway but people step out of cars without looking, particularly in P10 parks when they are in a hurry, and there needs to be room to take evasive action safely. This kind of compromise makes no one happy.</p>	Anne	Scott		
42203	<p>My concern is that we will have to do a right hand turn onto Langdons Rd out of sails St to get to northlands mall. Cars parked on the right hand side of Langdons Rd block the view. Also Langdons road get extremely busy. I am still waiting to see a crossing Island be put in as it is unsafe trying to get across with walking. As we get older we were told to try and avoid making right hand turns. Means also having to either go round the block down Hoani St left hand turn, Wilmot street Harewood left hand turn. Or into Hoani St trying to do a right hand turn. It was easier to have done a left hand turn on to Harewood from sails. We are right on the corner so how will that affect us with having to back out onto the road with cars belting round with only the one choice.</p>	Karen	Couch		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42202	<p>I see little change to remediate the obvious flaws in the entire plan.</p> <p>The fundamental absurdities remain (and these are just some):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It makes no sense to reduce a road that carries a lot of traffic (safely) from four lanes to two.</li> <li>2. Traffic lights on a roundabout are unnecessary, confusing and potentially disastrous. Drivers behave a certain way when encountering traffic lights, and another way with roundabouts. One require prescribed stopping/going with no driver discretion; the other giving way and judging the need to do with absolute discretion. Mixing the two will lead to confusion, delays and probable incidents/accidents.</li> <li>3. Constructing a 2 metre + wide cycleway, when (West of Greers) cycle traffic flow is a measly 100 in 24 hours is the epitome of overkill. In the dubious case of a cycleway being 'required' (see below), 1 metre width is absolutely sufficient.</li> <li>4. Studies suggest a cycle flow of 100/24 hours, west of Greers. This, of course, is barely 4/hour, or ONE cyclist every 15 minutes (in daytime, maybe two?) Compare this to cars/buses etc: conservatively 500/hour, carrying perhaps 1200 people; 28,000 in 24 hours? (280, maybe more, for every cyclist?) They will be massively inconvenienced for a tiny sub-group, truly the tail wagging the dog. To insist on this suggests a massive bias and ideological stubbornness in the CCC's planners. Incidentally, the argument "build it and they will come" is deeply flawed; it is a cognitive bias driven by wishful thinking...</li> <li>5. If the council is hell-bent on 'driving this through' (ideological stubbornness?), a 1m-wide track is more than sufficient. This can be built over current berms/footpaths. Parking would not be reduced, footpaths are little-utilised by pedestrians, and most significantly, an efficient FOUR-laned road will not be 'enfeebled' to a two-laned one. Should it need to 'cross the road', a pedestrian crossing (or 2) would work, and traffic flow not ruined.</li> <li>6. On a personal level, I am resident on Harewood Road. I regularly reverse a trailer into my driveway, grateful that oncoming vehicles can move around me on a second lane while I do so. One lane means far fewer gaps in traffic, little opportunity to manoeuvre, more driver anger and a hugely greater potential for accidents.</li> </ol>	Peter	Fletcher		



ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42177	<p>I have had the opportunity to visit the Offices in Bishopdale set up to display the various plans regarding the so-called `upgrade` to the traffic plan in the above area. I have also taken the opportunity to discuss this whole matter with several members of the team associated with this plan as well as many residents of this area.</p> <p>I am deeply disturbed at the way this whole so-called plan has evolved. The residents of this whole area were only consulted when the plan was well advanced - certainly well past the `discussion` stage. We were not being invited to `discuss` anything. We were invited to be informed and persuaded that this plan was going to somehow improve the flow of traffic and would benefit the whole community. It will be an absolute nightmare. The vast majority of road users travel in cars, yet we are staring at a `plan` which will undoubtedly make driving, parking, turning etc far more hazardous than it is at present. I fear there will be accidents, injuries and deaths. God forbid - but in all conscience I can see no other outcome.</p> <p>The many thousands of cars which travel along Harewood Road daily are now to be forced into one lane. Proportionately the minute number of cyclists will also have their own lane. We were told at one of the `information evenings` that a person had been stationed at the intersection of Harewood Road and the roundabout on Johns Road. Apparently 200 cyclists passed that point - during what period? How many of these cyclists turned off at say Wooldridge Road? How many cars also passed this point - we were not informed on that issue. How many buses; how many trucks - they don't figure at all in the fancy drawings we have been shown.</p> <p>My overall impression of this whole debacle of a plan is that it is a benefit scheme for cyclists. Let me make something abundantly clear. I have been a cyclist most of my life, until quite recently. I have cycled round the UK and France. I have also cycled in Christchurch for many years. However there are a multitude of reasons shy people (including me) prefer to drive a car.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. People frequently need to convey a great number of objects - far more than can be carried safely on a bicycle.</li> <li>2. People frequently need to carry other people in their car - particular children and infants.</li> <li>3. People who have disabilities of one kind or another are often safer in a car than on a bicycle - indeed some physically disabled people would be quite unable to cycle.</li> <li>4. Many elderly people choose to drive a car - indeed some would be quite unable to use a cycle.</li> </ol> <p>I deeply resent the way that those of us who drive a car are being made to feel as if we are somehow creating hazards; polluting the atmosphere, blocking the roads. We are being made to feel as if we are the pariahs of the road congestion and all the pollution. At the age of 84 I will continue to take other elderly or sick people to hospital, shops, Church etc. - try doing that on a bicycle.</p>	Marianne (also called Marie)	Gunn		
42171	<p>As a cyclist, I am both relieved and disappointed by these changes. It appears that the cycle lanes have been squashed in order to fit in more parking, and safety features such as the cycle separators have been made shorter or mountable, both of which increase the risk of cyclist collisions, which is disappointing. However, I am also relieved that the project is going ahead and despite these shortcomings and compromises, this will be a significant improvement for cycling along this key route.</p> <p>I commend the council for making changes based upon the feedback received, whilst sticking to their priorities to deliver this key piece of cycle infrastructure which will bring long term benefits to Christchurch.</p>	Arthur	McGregor		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42167	Some changes that have been made better than original proposal, but still have doubts. Removal of on street parking at Copenhagen Bakery will adversely affect their business, also because their clientele is mainly aged walking to have a coffee and chat will be a thing of the past. Also at golden age home no parking will cause visitors all told problems as there is no parking in Chapel, Sails, Hoani streets now.	Paul	Amtman		
42156	<p>The cycle crossing at the rail line on Harewood Road, from beside St James Park &amp; St Pauls church crossing to Restell Street is particularly fraught. Almost as much as the next intersection (heading generally North) at Langdon's Road, although I understand this is a separate piece of work and I shall not comment on it further here.</p> <p>If the proposal is not to have a controlled cycle crossing at this intersection, perhaps instead 'encouraging' cyclists North-west on Harewood to some point further away before crossing, then I encourage the Council to reconsider. There are people in cars in a hurry so looking for any small gap in traffic (always) coming out of Matsons Ave and St James Ave, people in cars (similarly in a hurry and looking to fill small gaps in traffic) coming out of Mitre 10's entrance, and the odd idiot managing a right turn out of Restell Street to head north-west on Harewood Rd. The cyclist trying to cross Harewood road has to allow for all of this and, much of the time at weekends especially, it is virtually impossible until some kindly motorist allows a gap (causing issues getting right across because it requires a similarly minded motorist going in the opposite direction!). Straightening out the dog-leg required travelling across Harewood at the rail line to get into Restell St would be very helpful. Human nature means that people will be less likely to cycle out of their way (even for short distances) despite that a crossing may be "safer". Remember too that this is a route used by school children from Papanui High - who are less likely to judge distance/speed well and take more risks. A controlled cycle intersection as close as possible to the existing cycle route from Merivale to Northcote is the safest option by a significant margin.</p>	Paul	Duke		
42153	<p>Not impressed at all.</p> <p>Please do not reduce a main arterial road from 2 lanes down to one.</p> <p>Worst idea ever.</p>	Aaron	Keogh		
42150	<p>The cycleway is an absolute no brainer to make happen ASAP, without compromising separation from people driving on Harewood Road. It will hugely improve accessibility as safety and travel choice in the North-West. Improving the connection to the Northern Line on Harewood Road as it's going to be popular from day 1 and that'll be a bottleneck and isn't set up for kids to cross safely.</p> <p>I will personally use it to travel from Strowan to Bishopdale regularly. Can't happen soon enough and I hope that following up the climate change emergency that the Council has already declared is enough motivation to ensure that this project starts to progress with the momentum it deserves.</p>	Thomas	McNaughton		
42146	Great to see that people's opinion has been genuinely considered and positive changes made. As a cyclist, I'm excited about the changes and think this will make positive improvements to the area and reduce car domination down Harewood road. It would be interesting to understand projections of how many people may take up biking to town because of these improvements. Let's get building!	Jamie	Irvine		
42143	We've viewed your proposed changes but are unclear whether with roadside parking now to be concentrated on the south side of Harewood Rd (east of Greers Rd), you are going to meet our request for a five minute parking restriction outside the Harewood Medical Centre for the use of commercial vehicles and Couriers servicing the Medical Centre, and frequently obstructing exit and entry to our adjacent property at [REDACTED] Harewood Rd.	Graham	Mee		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42140	Much improved and we fully support the changes. Only issue we still have is Crofton/ Harewood Road intersection. Ideally we would prefer a left-out left-in configuration. Many vehicles use Crofton road from Sawyers to Harewood to avoid Gardiners/ Harewood. However with the careful timing of the lights this may alleviate the problem.	Stuart	Taylor		
42136	Generally supportive of most of the changes in the hope that the concerns of residents and businesses have been reasonably addressed without excessive compromise to the safety and user experience for those riding bikes, scootering or other devices using the cycleway. Particularly hope that the safety for school aged children has continued to be been prioritised throughout the process. I generally support the comments made in Spokes Canterbury's submission. It's pleasing to see the design for passage through the roundabout has come through the consultation intact. Bold for Christchurch but I think it will work and look forward to using it. I am hopeful that the legislation requiring cyclists to give way to traffic crossing the cycle lane to access minor side streets will be revoked in time for this anachronism not to require such yielding of inconvenience and confusion experienced along Collins Street on the Little River Link cycleway. I support the slight narrowing of the single lane cycleways alongside bus stops to mitigate the risk for bus passengers when alighting from the bus. I query the need for this lane narrowing treatment outside of the entrance and exit of the Copenhagen Bakery and would prefer to see that if safety is indeed a concern at this location, that the vehicle lanes are narrowed. This is proven to slow vehicle traffic down and as a consequence will improve safety. I support the proposal that a single lane cycleway on each side of the road is built at the eastern end of the cycleway to the railway line. However I think there needs to be serious consideration of the risk from vehicles entering and exiting Mitre 10 Mega. Flashing warnings for turning motorists (cf Tuam Street entrance and exit to the Justice Precinct) and cyclists proceeding across the entrance/exits (cf bus interchange) would reduce the risk of conflict. Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments.	Robert	Fleming		
42135	<p>Our major gripe has been the parking, often of large vehicles either side of our gateway which inhibits our ability to exit our property even as we "come out forward". By the time we can see round the parked vehicles our bonnet is half across the active lane that was bad enough with two lanes but by reducing it to one lane in increases the problems with:</p> <p>(a) two lanes into one increases the frequency &amp; whereas now if we emerge from behind a parked vehicle people often will swerve into the other lane to avoid us - if there is no other lane they will hit us &amp; WE cop the blame &amp; have NO RECOURSE. Having a totally clean record for near on 70 years (ten of those years I drove buses full time with no accidents ) I am appalled to be put in that position.</p> <p>(b) similarly if we stop to back-in I need enough room to come off the active lane, stop then back. With low profile tyres if they hit kerbs (especially on an angle) the tyres can rupture &amp; become dangerous &amp; the rims would likely be damaged too! In backing as you, no doubt are aware, the front of the "car swings out" as one makes a tight turn into the drive. That is highly likely to send the right front into the active lane. To avoid that it means the curbs need to be low &amp; rounded so I can do the turn in quickly especially if I have a bus coming "at me"!</p> <p>(c) we care also about potential loss of trees too - too often they are felled when at their best &amp; replaced with new stock which take years to mature.</p> <p>(d) as mentioned to several of your staff at the last meeting we have no aversion to a bus stop of reasonable length across our driveway - my experience tells me the buses would only be stopping for a minute or two if they had to stop at all. The current 'out stop" at the end of Crofton Road would be better placed outside our drive &amp; it would give far better visibility for those exiting Trafford St because buses would seldom stop there &amp; then for less than a minute or so.</p> <p>Excuse this really hurried communication but you needed an early response &amp; we have some family health issues taking my time.</p> <p>Ironically I did mention to Donna (Copenhagen) when she approached us before they started that we were concerned with parking issues</p>	Shirl & Colin	Fussell		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	<p>so they were fore-warned. They are delightful people &amp; have a great business but their popularity has really caused major issues for us which have been heightened by the cycleway. In principal we are not against that but believe there were better options - like using the grass berms which most people find as a chore to keep mown at a time when no cars are parked there which we could damage from pebbles being thrown by the mower.</p> <p>So, to repeat, I gave up trying to really examine those tiny maps in your communication - &amp; I couldn't do a click enlarge.</p> <p>I meant also to react in my earlier, most recent, hurried email to a comment made at our earlier meeting with your staff &amp; that was to a statement made to the effect that lights at Breens Rd would create "breaks in the traffic &amp; relieve our problem". That, frankly, was a badly flawed response in that it assumes I could "bowl on out " from my drive ASSUMING there would be a clear space for me to exit safely - WRONG!!! One cannot assume a vehicle hasn't crept into that possible traffic break, say, after they have exited Copenhagen or wherever. When I was training new recruits in bus driving, which I was regularly asked to do on the basis of my clean driving record, I insisted they never ASSUMED anything, That's tantamount to "flying blind". Frankly, I was shocked that was brought up &amp; that it may enter Council logic. It certainly must not - we can only safely exit only in the knowledge of what we can see, by the time I creep out to ensure the way is clear that "break" could have disappeared. That is the essence of my deep concern. I would be "shot down in flames" if an accident occurred &amp; I explained it away with that logic. A very important point worth making.</p>				
42134	<p>We are very annoyed that the council attitude is that this cycleway will go ahead regardless of opposition from the residence.</p> <p>The cost is absolutely exorbitant, where this money should be used for repairs of infrastructure which has not all been repaired since the Earthquake.</p> <p>We feel the design of this cycleway is over the top considering the number of cyclist using it.</p>	Graeme & Josie	Clyde		
42133	<p>Reducing the car lanes from 2 to 1 is thoughtless and will make the road too busy. Having no parking is ridiculous. Where is Nurse Maud going to park?</p> <p>Lack of parking for Charity Hospital</p> <p>Lack of parking for trades people</p> <p>Lack of parking for Copenhagen</p> <p>Lack of parking for people visiting friends</p> <p>Lack of parking for sports events at the elephant park</p> <p>It is going to be very dangerous for people backing out from their driveway.</p> <p>I use Harewood Road a lot and SELDOM SEE A BICYCLE.</p> <p>Please take notice of what the residents want! We pay the rates.</p>	Brenda	Ferguson		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42126	As someone who regularly cycles to work along Harewood Rd from approx. the New World Supermarket down to Mitre10 Mega before continuing along the railway cycle path I'm in support of the proposed Wheels to Wings cycle way. It will make my journey to and from work far safer and provide a safer space for my young family who also enjoy biking. My son has expressed an interest in cycling from our home to the city, but at 7 years old we are not comfortable with him cycling along the road amongst traffic. So we are looking forward to using the cycle way as a family as soon as it has been completed. I'm hopeful that it will also encourage others to cycle to work, reducing the number of cars on the road and easing congestion.	James	Sturman		
42121	Looks great Time to get the project started well overdue for cycle lanes in this part of town	Jeremy	Burke		
42112	Not much has changed, it's too expensive. Please don't build this, my family is really struggling to pay the high rates as it is.	Peter	Robinson		
42093	separate cycle lanes a good idea  separate from vehicles  separate in two directions  footpaths as well to allow for wandering dogs on extender leashes	Brigid	Buckenham		
42091	No, don't make any changes. Leave as 4 lanes -- there aren't many people cycling from town to airport and back.  Traffic light - go for it but in don't take away 2 lanes and less parking all for a cycle lane that would not be well utilized.  Harewood Road needs 4 lanes for cars.	Hayley	Kubiak		
42085	They are rubbish. From your own analysis of cycle usage of the road, you intend on impeding the flow of massive numbers of vehicles for just a few cyclists. Give it up and leave it as it is.  I drive this road everyday, I will not be on a bike on this road ever. It is interesting you tell us about the things liked, but ignore the issues raised in your pamphlets. This plan and process is just a waste of money. The fact you will not let it go shows a dogged determination to get what you want, and ignore the community.	Andrew	McKay		
42084	Absolute waist of time and money. Leave the road as is.	Carl	Gray		
42080	Your designs are rubbish. They restrict traffic flow on one of the busiest roads in Christchurch. PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS. Why don't you listen to the people who live in this area...widen the footpaths and have them as foot and cycleways? That is a much better plan. There is very wide berm along Papanui Road, so widening the footpaths would be very easy to do; would minimise traffic disruption, and would save the RATE PAYERS millions of dollars that will be wasted on a project that the vast majority of RATE PAYERS do not want.  LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE WHO PAY YOU! Stop this ridiculous plan.	Deidre (Dee)	Morgan		
42076	There is no demand for this cycle way. Leave Harewood road 4 lanes. Add the light crossing at breezes/gardeners road. Your just building and spending our money for the sake of it with no evidence of demand for it. Could you imagine if we built motorways like this, where ever we like with no demand evidence.	Ryan	Wood		
42075	Over engineered and unnecessary. This is a ridiculous idea and deserves to be scrapped.	Claire	Brown		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42073	<p>I think the whole cycleway is a nightmare! You have not listened to the thousands of people who submitted! Yes there were some people wanting this cycleway, but they are the minority. Your cyclist count was done in summer and was somewhere between 100 and 200 cyclists over a 12 hour period. In winter I would say this would be down to 20-50 cyclists per day, but you never counted in winter. In any case the amount of cyclists is fairly low for the population of the area. Is this extra cycleway really needed for such a small minority?</p> <p>In my first submission, I was keen to have at least a bit of a cycleway but after thinking more and more about it, I just think you are clogging up a super busy road which at the moment, flows quite well. The whole cycleway is a terrible idea due to the amount of bollards and obstacles.</p> <p>When I drive home from work, I come down Papanui Road which is now quite wiggly and slow with bus lanes. Papanui road is slow but then I get onto Harewood Road and feel like I can breathe again. The road is straight and easy to navigate and I'm home in a very short time. At the moment the traffic flows well. Which is more than can be said for most roads in Christchurch these days. This plan will slow the traffic down by epic proportions. I suspect it could be way worse than Papanui Road to navigate if you build this cycleway.</p> <p>Wairakei road is a wiggly road that is already fairly loaded with obstacles, but it has a very good cycle lane. I have used this cycle lane and felt very safe on it. This lane could easily be joined onto the airport underpass via Stanleys Road or Wooldridge road, hereby saving the council millions of dollars. You could promote it as "Wheels to Wings" and maybe add a few extra safety features. You would save millions!!!</p> <p>I also notice that you have narrowed the end of our street and reduced parking. Trafford Street has now been narrowed so that only one car at a time can leave the road - either turning right or left. You can no longer have two cars sitting next to each other. In the morning it is hard to get out of our road, especially turning right, but also turning left. You risk having traffic backing up on our road. You have not taken into account that we have a road that joins onto us from Nunweek park, Le Roi Place. A lot of Nunweek subdivision traffic actually comes down Trafford street to get onto Harewood Road as they are having a lot of trouble getting out of Nunweek Boulevard onto Harewood Road. Our road is easier as it is closer to the two lane area of Harewood Road (which helps traffic to flow and which you are going to reduce with the cycle lane). I'm guessing you have not looked at where the traffic is coming from and taking into account that it is not just Trafford Street cars that are leaving the street onto Harewood Road in the morning and other times of day. A large proportion of the Nunweek subdivision leaves for work and comes down our street, Trafford Street. I have been in queues of up to 4 cars in the morning trying to get out of the street. Now, those turning right will block anyone trying to turn left, which is an option I often take to make my life easier, even though I should be turning right to work. The other problem I see is the reduced parking outside the Trafford Street dairy and fish and chip shop as well as other shops. The parking is greatly reduced on your plan. Parking here increases around 5-6pm for the fish and chip shop and will now have to extend further down the road. The dairy will be adversely affected due to people having trouble finding an instant carpark - now it will just be too hard to stop and get something quickly so they will continue on.</p> <p>In conclusion - I just feel like the council are not listening to the majority and making this whole cycleway so complex and difficult - why can't cyclists use normal cycleways with marks on the ground? I find these cycleways fine for my safety on Wairakei Road. Why do they have to be protected by bollards and obstacles which make it harder for motorists? How are large buses meant to navigate all these things? My sister has seen two cars side swiped by buses she was on board. This was on narrow Manchester Street and the accidents happened due to lack of space for the poor bus drivers. This is the result of roads being super narrow.</p> <p>Instead of making yet more cycleways I think the council has to promote their buses more - public transport is the way forward. Most people biking to the airport are taking luggage, so promoting the airport bus makes more sense than a cycle lane. How are they meant to carry their luggage on a bike?</p>	Belinda	Lansley		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
	The council can make good cycle lanes with lines on the ground, not bollards. We are a cycling family with children cycling to school so I'm not anti-cycling, just anti-bollards. Sometimes you have to step back and look at how to make things simple and cheap and more practical, instead of complex plans which adversely affect the majority and are costly to build. Please look at a more simple and practical way to get people to the airport - either use your existing cycle lane on Wairakei Road or improve your buses.				
42069	I am thoroughly disappointed in the results. More emphasis is placed on cycles than pedestrians. This community is used by a large number of pedestrians, not cycles. I do not want the road narrowed at Cotswold Harewood intersection, and others, to allow for road humps and forked paths. You try living with this road hump using it everyday, it's not necessary and more dangerous than beneficial. I have lived in this area for over 30 years and do not see this benefiting the local community with how we use our facilities. We will be forced to live within the confines of a very busy and confusing design. I am distressed that vehicles parked beside the cycleway will open doors directly onto the cycle lane, not safe for cycles nor for elderly or young car passengers exiting on this side of the vehicle, it's ludicrous and unsafe. The same applies to bus stops. This plan discriminates against the elderly and our aged population is growing. Our sense of community is extinguished with this plan and it will be unbearable to use on a daily basis as a resident. Once again the designers dream up ideas they don't have to live with and locals suffer the consequences. We want to have good walking paths, easy access to parks and shops and to live comfortably and safely in our surroundings while enjoying them. The plan and its changes have not met the mark for its local residents.	Fiona	Judson		
42066	I am in favour of these well considered changes and am impressed by the robust process to implement these.  My personal preference is for separated bike lanes on either side of the street. For the Harewood Road section East of Greers Rd this would be my preference as it gives best cycle safety. However I can see the reasoning to widen the existing lane.	Robert	Cole		
42064	The concerns I had with the previous design have been addressed. Thank you for listening to feedback, I think the new proposed designs look great!  I'm likely to purchase a bike after these changes, having thought it too risky to bike around much of Bishopdale previously.	Sean	Clifford		
42062	It still looks good and is positive option for the cyclists to use.	Jamie	Lewis		
42060	Too much pandering to cars. In particular I'm concerned about the narrowing of the cycleway to allow more on street parking at Copenhagen bakery. The cycleway should be maintained at full width, if that causes a problem for car parking then other things need to be done. In general, free on street parking should be lowest priority and pedestrian and cycle safety the highest.	John	Ascroft		
42058	I support the building of the cycleway and the process of consultation that has been followed.	Digby	Symons		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
42056	<p>While the design changes go a very small way to address concerns of the people who actually live along the route - the cost of the works and the concession to a small volume of cyclists who will use the cycle lanes - especially in winter - is highly disproportionate to the utility created. In fact utility is lessened for the higher volume of car users, again, especially in winter.</p> <p>Taking away a large number of car parks does no service to anyone wanting to conduct their business in a quick and convenient fashion - this effect flows on to businesses in the area, reducing turnover, and leads to competition for parking spaces between people traveling from afar to see friends and relatives and people attending local commerce.</p> <p>A very simple and cost effective solution is to colour the outside lanes blue for example, and have them prioritised for cyclists - thus allowing the blue lanes for car capacity at peak times.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Colin Tuck B.E. - engineer. Harewood Rd. Chch, 8051</p>	Colin	Tuck		
42055	Remove the 2 stand alone carparking spaces on Chapel st. Langdons rd corner!	Dave	Hall		
42033	I find it incredible that when I went to the public session showing the different designs none had a Safety audit. When I queried the staff on how can you present designs to the public if you don' know they are safe. Answer we don't do it that way. How mind numbingly stupid that the basic fundamentals off these plans the staff cannot tell you if they are safe design!	John	Allen		
42025	I have worked at the airport for 30 years. Please leave Harewood road alone. I am a keen cyclist but this is going too far.	Robert	Forward		
41915	<p>Having attended the recent information day at Bishopdale I am further convinced that this proposal should be abandoned.</p> <p>From the information presented there is merit in the proposed changed between Papanui and Greers Road, but it STOPS RIGHT THERE.</p> <p>The Bishopdale roundabout is still "fit for purpose". Additional lanes and multiple traffic lights would only add confusion to an already free-flowing intersection.</p> <p>As for the cycle lanes (kerbed) on Harewood Road, this is not a good idea. Cyclists using the current painted lanes are very easily observed by motorists, and their intentions are immediately recognised, turning left or right etc. Should they wish to exit to the 'next right' they have ample opportunity to position themselves to the right of the right hand lane, sheltered by the median strip. A kerbed cycle lane would channel the cyclists to the next intersection where they have to negotiate their crossing with vehicles approaching them from up to FOUR directions. They are also in a 'Blind Spot' (LH) for motorists coming from the same direction that the cyclist would be coming from.</p> <p>The proposed cycle lanes would add further complexity to the proposed traffic lights on the Breens Road intersection. This proposal (cycle lanes) will require up to 6 Adult Monitors, twice a day to assist Isleworth Primary and Breens Intermediate children navigate and understand the phasing of the traffic lights.</p> <p>This is in addition to my submission 13.2.2021</p>	Bruce	Adams		



ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
41909	I approve of the preferred options. It will make traveling to and from mitre10 safer. It will also make it safer to cross the road at the railway tracks and will also encourage more students to travel in ways other than car to Papanui High School	Dave	Gardner		
41902	It's going to be too narrow in front of Copenhagen Bakery, people will be moving around that area, if it's too narrow cyclist may not have room to take evasive action.	Davinia	Bruce		
41895	<p>I fully support the preferred option of separated bike ways with the design changes. I am not sure if I submitted before. I went to view the changes in Bishopdale and talk with the traffic engineers. My support of this project is stronger than ever.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NZ's relatively poor commitments at COP26 means we have to work harder at the local level to reduce transport emissions. This proposal can lead to more cycling less driving and less emissions</li> <li>2. Your good design is actually adding parking spaces for those who care about that.</li> <li>3. The original design for Harewood rd was over engineered and the expected traffic on that road never materialised. 1 lane each way is sufficient for the traffic. And the freed up space for trees and cycle ways leads to a road that is environmentally better and nice for people. 1 lane each way should also calm the traffic</li> <li>4. I run a bike ride "Bike to Ice" as part of Biketober and Days of Ice from Scott's statue to Antarctic Centre. My preferred route is Harewood road. After I trialed that route, I found it was way too dangerous for a community bike ride (parked cars, fast traffic, unsafe intersections for bikes. I look forward to being able to run this ride each year on a separated, safe, quite bike path.</li> <li>5. This bikeway will encourage more people to cycle both to the airport (instead of dangerous Memorial Drive) and McLeans Island.</li> </ol>	Ian	Wells		
41873	The changes made dont go far enough and show the design team and council staff fail to understand the effects of the intended route. It shows those involved dont understand things from a cyclists perspective. There is alternate routes and lower impact designs that can be done to achieve better results and bring useful infrastructure to the city.	Dominic	McKeown		
41818	<p>Still disappointed that there are no bus stop laybys between Chapel St and Papanui Rd. This will mean the stopped buses will force all traffic to halt while the bus is stationary thereby causing significant traffic delays especially at peak hours.</p> <p>Endorse retention of car parks by Nunweek Park.</p>	Robert	Upton		
41810	<p>I would like concept 6 to be considered a/ safer for cyclists from cars coming out from driveways b/ we need two lanes both ways for emergencies. (Cannot believe that in 10 years time there won't be traffic banked up all the way up Harewood Road. Have you seen what it is like now at 4pm?) c/ Parking both sides of the road for hospitals, Copenhagen, sport's fields and residents visitors having to cross a busy road to visit the North side - also gives pull in space for buses d/ Remove trees in middle lane seems more practical and put residents and rate payers first. Although we all love nature there can be problems with tree roots and the mess in autumn when the leaves fall. Maybe plant shrubs beside foot path to beautify Harewood Road</p> <p>Concept 6 accommodates everyone safely - residents (rate payers) are not badly affected and one can forfeit the trees. Nature versus people? Our properties will be taking a big hit value wise - as we are the ones living here particularly on the North side. The North side needs car parking spaces. Concept 6 ticks all our boxes but I know your minds are not going to change!!!!</p>	Ann and Peter	North		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
41807	<p>Hi - thanks for the opportunity to see the plans &amp; roundabout video and meet with the very engaging design staff.</p> <p>I have suggested this to staff but want to formally submit.</p> <p>1. Current plan is when going north (for example from Farrington Ave) and intending to go right at the roundabout or left into Highsted Rd. Two lane options. The inner lane is right turn only. The outer lane is either straight ahead (into Highsted Rd) OR right turn. That is potentially confusing for traffic coming south on Highsted Rd and waiting to get into the roundabout. Strongly recommend ONE only right turn lane and the outer lane is STRAIGHT ahead only. Please contact me if confused!</p> <p>2. The driveways onto private property which open onto the roadway are a hazard. OK if the car has come into the roundabout from Highsted Rd or going south on Harewood Rd. The hazard arises when the car comes round (from for example Farrington Ave) then changes lanes unexpectedly cutting in front of traffic coming into the roundabout from Highsted Rd. Solution? - I don't know. In principle you expect cars to stick to the inside lane as they come round the roundabout &amp; therefore Highsted Rd cars feed into the left lane. (Assuming Highsted cars are exiting south into Harewood Rd, not Farrington Ave.)</p>	Dennis	Wilkes		
41787	<p>Leave Harewood Road as it is. There needs to be two lanes each way for traffic flow. Businesses need parking spaces. I think the CCC's obsession with cycleways is a waste of ratepayers money. There are enough of them now.</p>	Fiona	Barnes		
41785	<p>After viewing the changes, all I can say is that they are all aimed at business'. Our main concern of the bus stop being relocated to outside our house at ■ Harewood Rd has been ignored. So much for our safety as retirees leaving &amp; entering our premises &amp; all the other issues associated with bus stops as previously mentioned. Property devalued, graffiti, damage, broken glass etc etc</p> <p>Additional feedback (#42077)</p> <p>Residents parking. What an absolute joke!! You say in the revised plan that 18 parks have been added along the route. WOW!!! As long as you keep the business' happy, that's all that seems to matter.</p>	Murray	Cooper		
41778	<p>I think the changes have been well thought out and a good compromise for the main objectors (Copenhagen bakery and the charity hospital). I was happy with the original design but these changes are good as well as retaining the majority of the trees on the roundabout. I'm hoping the work will start soon so we can enjoy the benefits as soon as possible. Will be great to have a safe road to cycle down and more aesthetically pleasing roadway.</p>	Richard	Gray		

ID	What are your thoughts on the design changes we've made following consultation, the design options we've looked at and any other comments you may have	First name	Last name	Name of organisation	Your role
41776	<p>The proposed cycle way needs more than design changes. It needs scrapping. The name in English or te reo is incorrect. At the SH1 end there are still 2km or so to actually get to the wings (airport). I haven't yet seen a direct connecting cycleway between the Sawyer Arms roundabout and the airport. Do you think people are going to eagerly bike from Papanui, Casebrook, Bishopdale etc to watch planes taking off and landing? People should not be fooled by the fancy maps and images posted on the Internet. It's a total waste of money for the small minority of cycle enthusiasts in our 400,000 citizens. Electric cars will eventually be far more popular than bikes to take on the prevailing easterly and westerly winds on Harewood Road.</p> <p>FYI I have lived in this area since 1959 and I'm a regular user of Harewood Road. I have also observed traffic behaviour which is not always good on the part of some drivers. I have also noted the fact that cyclists are not commonly seen on Harewood Road and you can actually travel from Papanui to SH1 and back without seeing one. It would be more sensible to upgrade the existing footpaths to a standard width on both sides to allow for low density pedestrian and cycle sharing. Narrowing down the split road section of Harewood Rd to a single lane won't fix the traffic problem - more likely it will be exacerbated.</p> <p>Re the pear shaped Bishopdale roundabout, all the trees should be felled and it should be replaced by a well engineered intersection with synchronised lights. The gum trees on the roundabout are too large and hazardous and need to go, just like the ones which were formerly around the mall car park. They're not even natives.</p> <p>I am against this project.</p> <p>I give you permission to read it out.</p> <p>Don Hutton</p>	Don	Hutton		
41772	good luck with the hundreds of people who will use the cycle lanes as a way of getting to work, do their shopping and for pleasure. Do cyclists have the same road rules as other road users or are there a different set for them only?	Shona	Mcdonald		
41771	We think design 6 best	Graeme	Beveridge		
41770	Still have concerns of the safety of going in and out of my driveway. I live at [REDACTED] Harewood road, having lights at the Woolridge and Harewood Road intersection will cause difficulty accessing the driveway. The parking is also been removed on the Northside of the road between the winery and the some properties due to a short cycle way on the Northside of the side even though the plan is to have a two way cycle way on the Southside. This removal of on street parking seems completely unnecessary for the length of the cycleway on the Northside of the road planned. I would also like some clarification on the footpath that would be right outside my property. Are you planning to remove the storm water drain that is there?	Lauren	Jones		
41769	<p>I am very pleased to see that Chapel Street is still being open both ways at the Harewood intersection.</p> <p>I am very upset that the intersection at Harewood Road and Matsons Avenue remains very narrow and will not accommodate 2 lanes either way allowing for left turning traffic to turn independently.</p>	Noelene	Hodder		
41763	You have listened well.	Marette	Wells		