

Linwood Village streetscape plan analysis of submissions



Overview

Between 2 February and 2 March 2022, 62 online submissions were received on the Linwood Village streetscape plan. We asked for feedback on all aspects of the plan; what submitters liked, what still needs improvement, and what we may have missed.

The consultation was promoted through:

- A [Newsline](#) article that was picked up by The Press and The Star newspapers
- The Newsline story shared on Christchurch City Council's Facebook page and local community group pages
- The consultation document distributed to approximately 1,000 residential and commercial properties neighbouring the road
- Signage advertising the consultation erected at two points on the road
- An email sent to 66 stakeholders and a second email one week before consultation closed
- Local outreach through the Community Governance Team
- A drop in session on Thursday 17 February at Linwood Arts and Eastside Gallery that 27 residents attended
- Approaching people on the street between 11:30am-1:00pm on Tuesday 15 February. Gathered feedback from 11 individuals and advised another ~10 of the consultation

Submitter profile

Just over 50% of submitters list their address as within Linwood. However, many of those who live outside of the area frequent the village for shopping, work, or as a thoroughfare.

Four submissions are from businesses, three from representative organisations, with the remainder being from individuals.

Consultation feedback

Overall 48% (30) of submissions are clearly in support of the plan, 11% (7) are clearly opposed, and the remaining 40% (23) are neither in support or opposed. While data has been collated below, many of the submissions raise unique issues such as suggestions of alternative designs for certain sections (these have been worked through and responded to by staff). As such, it is recommend that submissions are read in their entirety.

Safety

The key theme across all submissions is safety, with 50% (31) of all submitters commenting on this.

39% (24) of all submitters comment on pedestrian safety specifically, with positive comments relating to slowing down traffic on Stanmore Road. The majority of comments about pedestrian safety relate to anti-social behaviour on Stanmore Road and pedestrians not feeling safe until drug use and begging on the street decreases.

Comments on pedestrian safety:

Decreased speed limit to 30km/h	13% (8) of all submitters comment on this. Seven submitters are in favour of the speed limit decrease, while one questions the impact of a decrease in thoroughfare traffic on customer numbers at local businesses. One submitter requests further road treatment to assist in speed reductions.
Courtesy crossing	6% (4) of all submitters comment on this. Two submitters are supportive of this proposal citing safety reasons. Two submitters oppose this citing lack of

	necessity, as pedestrians could cross at the Worcester Street intersection traffic lights instead.
Widening of footpaths	3% (2) of all submitters comment on this. One submitter is supportive of the widening, while another questions whether it would just create more space for anti-social behaviour to occur.
Anti-social behaviour	34% (21) of all submitters comment on this. Many comments state that regardless of the proposed changes, people will not shop in the area while anti-social behaviour continues. The request for cameras and additional police monitoring is common, but some also comment on initiatives such as community gardens that could give these people a purpose.
Shared road	3% (2) of all submitters suggest this. These submitters say that, with the speed limit being changed to 30km, this would be safer for everyone, without losing parking.

21% (13) of all submitters comment specifically on cyclist safety. Overall these comments support the proposed plan to increase cyclist safety. Some offer ways that this could be improved further.

Comments on cyclist safety:

Separate cycleway	10% (6) of all submitters suggest this. Three of these submitters refer to the 2013 Cycle Design Guidelines, highlighting a “fantastic opportunity to dig once and deliver safe cycling for all users” (#45026) since this proposal involves kerb changes anyway. A further submitter says that being ‘doored’ is their biggest risk as a cyclist, and that a painted cycle lane next to high turnover parking is an issue.
Trees in Hereford Street roundabout	3% (2) of all submitters comment on this. These submitters state that the planting up of the centre of the roundabout will impede visibility and impact cyclist safety.

3% (2) of all submitters request more bike stands/lock ups to be added to the plan – particularly near the Gloucester Street shops. One submitter says not to install bike stands as there is a high chance that bikes parked there will be stolen.

Landscaping

27% (17) of all submitters comment on adding more trees to the street.

- 12 submitters are in favour, citing improved attractiveness of the area
- Five submitters are opposed, citing visibility issues for drivers, buses, cyclists and pedestrians

3% (2) of all submitters express concern about the removal of existing landscaping. One requests that any removed trees be replanted in the community garden.

A contentious aspect of the proposed landscaping is the additional cordyline australis/cabbage trees. 6% (4) of all submitters comment that they are opposed to any more being planted in the area because they are not suitable or historic to the area. Many submitters recommend alternate trees, which have been looked into by staff.

One submitter supports the planting of additional cordyline australis in the area.

Parking

13% (8) of submitters comment on parking.

- One submitter supports the changes to parking times, stating that it will encourage more people to stop and shop in the village.

- Four submitters oppose the changes to parking times. All state that P10 is not long enough to go to more than one shop or wait to get takeaways. The owner of the fish and chip shop on Stanmore Road suggested that P30 or P60 is required.
- Three requested fewer yellow lines and more parking for residents. However, this plan doesn't remove any parking, which has been addressed in responses.

Finally, 6% (4) of all submitters suggest a kerb extension on the south-east side of the Stanmore/Gloucester Street intersection, saying that the current design encourages speeding.

Supplementary information

Social media

The [Facebook shared Newline story](#) has generated 47 'reactions' (like, laugh, love, wow), 58 comments and three 'shares'. All comments were either neutral (tagging other people) or negative. The general sentiment from these are that the plan doesn't cover the main issues in the area; anti-social behaviour, affordable living, and fixing the roads throughout Linwood.

Posts made to three different local Facebook community groups contained very similar negatives to the Newline story. The most prevalent comments have to do with frustration towards landowners who have left their land derelict. Other common feedback includes wanting a separate cycle lane in the area, that P10 parking isn't wanted, and the desire for the same sort of plan for Richmond Village.

Informal conversations

In addition to official consultation feedback, the project team had conversations with users of Stanmore Road between 11:30am-1pm on Tuesday 15 February. This aimed to capture feedback from residents who may not otherwise take part in formal consultation. We had thorough conversations with 11 individuals and brief conversations (alerting them to the consultation) with a further 10. The overwhelming consensus was that they would be happy with any improvements, and that they would like us to 'just get on with it'. Other positive feedback was about the 'greening' of the village and slowing traffic. Some mentioned that the plan would be enhanced by only including native trees that provide lots of shade. Further casual street conversations were not held as a result of staff safety concerns.