

ID	I support the Rapanui cycleway (Preferred Route)	I support the Rapanui cycleway (Alternative Route)	I generally support the Rapanui cycleway (Preferred Route)	I generally support the Rapanui cycleway (Alternative Route)	I do not support the Rapanui cycleway	Full Comments Rapanui Shag Rock consultation submissions
1				Y		I support the alternate route east of St John's Street. Having the cycleway south of Linwood canal will make it completely separate from car traffic and allows for the inevitable crossing of Humphreys Drive to occur more naturally near the Ferrymead Shopping Centre. West of St Johns I support the preferred route.
2	Y					Only a few weeks ago I saw a family picnicking amongst the daffodils in the central meridian and thought I should do the same - it is a beautiful tree-lined grassy area. However, I drive past, have no reason to stop and apart from this one family, the only people who get to enjoy this area are occasional dashing across pedestrians or passing motorists. Putting the cycleway through the meridian would mean an increased number of ChCh residents would be able to enjoy this lovely space. If the alternative route is selected I can imagine cycling along it always regretting the lack of opportunity to be amongst the daffodils and Elms. Those people that planned this avenue originally would be delighted to see it opened up to residents rather than only viewed through a car windscreen.
3	Y					No comment
4	Y					Good stuff, I ride every day. I support more resources to cyclists. So any of the above are ok by me. Generally I don't mind sharing the road with cars but think the cycleway will be good for people to get into cycling and children to get to school etc.
5			Y			Not concerns just prefer the alternative route on page 86 - from along Linwood Canal, going through Charlesworth Reserve - not along the road or beside the road as this is 70km for motorists.
6	Y					We support the above as per tick box but it would also be very good to have kerbing on the other side of Linwood between St John and Kidbrooke Street as this would help the look of the area and also stop cars/trucks driving on the grass and making a mess.
7			Y			The extended use of only a 3 m shared pathway is far from ideal - it leaves little room for cyclists coming in both directions and pedestrians to avoid each other. The central verge on Linwood Ave should be wide enough for a 4 m width shared pathway. The crossing at St Johns Street is a pretty big detour and looks quite convoluted - it would be better for pedestrians and cyclists if it could be straightened. In general crossings that are not signalised should be prioritised so that motorists have to give way to cyclists and pedestrians. Consideration should be given to providing a crossing/connection to Ferrymead shops at Humphreys drive - this would allow local businesses to gain from increased foot and bike traffic.
8					N	A very poorly researched document with no respect for past decisions and ignoring the cycleways built by them. Are you aware of the cycleway from Linwood/Hargood corner to Linwood Park and Aldwins Road? It is still in use but limited with no connections. Putting a cycleway down the centre of the Avenue is just madness and environmentally questionable. Refer to Appendix A. Concerned about impact on trees and daffodils
9	Y					No comment
10	Y					This will be a brilliant facility and make cycling to the central city for events, entertainment and just riding around enjoying our wonderful city a pleasant experience rather than the endurance ride it is at the moment. A great use of ratepayer money and will link well. A couple of small comments: >I hope the "landscape separators" between the Humphreys Drive section will be substantial and not just "visual barriers". This is by far the most dangerous section of a commute to town, mostly I try to avoid it by going through the backstreets of Woolston. If it is to be a preferred route it needs a substantial separation from cars that belt along Humphreys drive >Can the landscaping please be a bit more naturalistic. The one criticism I have of the coastal pathway (I use the Redcliffs section round the bay most days) is the boring landscaping. I realise OiOi is probably flavour of the month with your landscapers but really it never grows in monoculture swathes in the wild. Can we have a bit more imagination with the landscaping: naturalness, natural plant community associations, some variety of height and texture can all be done while using site appropriate planting
11			Y			I support the 1st half of the Preferred Option cycle way from Linwood Park to Hargood Street. I then support the Alternative Route through residential service lanes and then taking the cycleway totally off-road through Charleston and Te Rakau Reserve. Awesome. Having controlled crossing at Ferrymead Shops an added bonus for right turning traffic coming out of Mitre 10/Countdown (crazy idea to have it near kite sports Park - are you deliberately trying to wind motorists up?). I commuted for 13 years on this route to my workplace in [REDACTED]. As a commuting cyclist there are too many intersections in your both plans (an additional six), potentially requiring many stop/starts - a real buzz-kill. So it's best to view this plan from a recreational cyclist's point of view, and utilise the 'way off road' options inside the Linwood Ave berm and Te Rakau Reserve. Just treat Tidal View as a service Lane. Has always been quiet to ride through. Just remove all road markings and restrict speed. Done. My daughter rides from Sumner to Hagley College. Would she be your clientele for this cycleway? Which route should she use from Cashel Street onwards (the cycleway disappears into commuting nowhere-land from here)? I guess Cashel-Madras-St Asaph. It's hard to talk her out of going straight down Ferry Road, the shortest most direct route. NB: Also responded to Heathcote #25
12	Y					As a cyclist, it would be best to be away from the Humphreys road traffic as much as possible, and to use the Charlesworth reserve would be ideal.
13	Y					I think the existing service lane in the middle section of the route could be an excellent cycle path, as suggested in the alternative route option. It would need a coloured surface and clear signage to demonstrate that cyclists and pedestrians are the primary users, and motor vehicles are secondary, but it would save building some infrastructure. However, I also recognise that it may be difficult to get buy-in for this option from local residents, so perhaps it is better to spend more money on the preferred route option.
14			Y			I generally support the Preferred Route for this part of the Rapanui Cycleway. SUPPORT - Cycleway in the median (much safer and more appealing) - Support the crossing design points at major intersections (Keighleys Rd) and from Linwood Park to Linwood Avenue. - Removal of some of the turning bays for vehicles RECOMMEND - Humphreys Drive From Dyers Road to Ferry Road - keep the cycleway on one side of the road (mid-block crossing is frustrating for both people cycling and people driving) - Vehicles give way to cyclists and pedestrians in the turning bays in the median of Linwood Avenue - Better crossing design from Linwood Avenue to Humphreys Drive (across Dyers Road)

15	Y					Love it! Love the idea of cycling down the middle of the trees - replanting the daffodils to the sides. My issues are the road cycling lane coming up to Hargood Street disappears for about 30 metres meaning you have to go into the traffic lane. Would be great to have this kink taken out when the crossing is designed. Secondly I live on beachville road and every second walker on coastal pathway has a dog. Could there be an off lead dog area at Barnett Park or similar which could be integrated into the coastal pathway system. Thirdly, more work needs to go into traffic movements around Linwood school the u turn bays. Understand the need to cut some out, but make sure what remains are the most helpful ones. thanks
16						NB: PREFERENCE NOT GIVEN - JUST COMMENTS My concern is the route through Redcliffs to Sumner. Roads very narrow and cyclists seem to prefer to ride in the car side of the cycle way. Have been teaching my children to drive in this area and it was often very hairy. Would prefer complete separation like the new coastal pathway although lots of cyclists still travel on the road.
17	Y					Looks awesome! Can't wait to ride it!
18	Y					Cycleways are a fantastic investment for our city, reducing congestion and is good for the environment and people's health. Keep up the good work!
19			Y			Having raised platforms but cyclists giving way to vehicles is contradictory. Vehicles giving way (as in the alternative) makes more sense for legibility (but the full alternative of having cycle lanes to the right of traffic is inconsistent with expectations). The alignment in crossing St Johns could be closer to Linwood Ave? Use the service lane (as per the alternative) means that it makes sense to kink it. Short cycle times at the signals are critical if full protection is provided (as it should be) to avoid cyclists chancing it with low turning vehicle volumes. Assuming the cycle times are short so that wait times for cyclists are no greater than for general traffic then I would think that most commuters would use the shared path from Ferrymead up to St Johns Road and then use the on road cycle lanes to avoid having to give way to traffic (unless you change the priorities on the raised platforms). In general will make my daily commute much safer, thank you!
20	Y					Looks wonderful
21	Y					1. The cycleway should be safe at all times, hours of daylight are shorter in winter increasing concerns over the alternative route through Charlesworth Reserve. 2. To encourage tourists and recreational use the most scenic route along the Estuary edge. Repair of the seawall will be beneficial for the area. 3. Keep cycles away from other traffic is the best option. The preferred route avoids shared use along the residential service lane. 4. I like the idea of travelling down the centre of the tree lines boulevard and this the need for armadillo separators. I presume scooters and skateboards may be used on the shared path. It will be safer than the footpath. 5. As a pedestrian I have been knocked over by a cyclist and have a concern over safety when a shared path is used. Children don't have awareness of others around them. 6. Will mobility vehicles and powered cycles be allowed on the cycleway?
22	Y					no comment
23	Y					No comment
24	Y					A great idea and will make for a much safer walking and cycling environment.
25					N	1. The amount of people who bike along Linwood Avenue is very minimal and not worth the expense. 2. We see this as a low priority at the moment. We prefer the money to fund this project be used to fix the roads and footpaths around the town first. 3. After what has happened after the latest earthquakes we feel the money for this project should be used elsewhere like the Highway heading north. 4. If your thoughts are the project is a safety measure, the amount of kids biking along the route is very small.
26	Y					Direct but safe route please
27			Y			I have concerns about the removal of U-turns on Linwood Avenue. This will have direct impact on traffic congestion especially during pick up and drop off times for school. I would also like the council to look at the ongoing issues such as the speed limit outside the school and parking as they are making major changes and logic would suggest that this an ideal time to consider all issues. I feel it is important to communicate with schools as our student population will be the long-time users of the cycleway. We would appreciate support in educating our kids around the protocols.
28			Y			See Sheet 7, page 31 - [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] Linwood Ave has concerns that the access way onto Linwood Ave maybe visually impeded with the tree planting nearest that entranceway at Linwood Ave. Residents are concerned traffic turning off/onto Linwood Ave/into Village is not clear enough and could cause undue risk of accidents. We would like the Council to review this access point (Sheet 7) to enhance visibility both ways for safety of residents, families, medical emergency services.
29		Y				I do not support sharing the road as a route with cyclists and walkers. I feel this will be dangerous. The grass berm in the middle is the better, safer option.
30	Y					No comment
31		Y				The North Canterbury Branch of the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society does NOT SUPPORT the preferred route option along Humphries Drive, but SUPPORTS the alternative route through Charlesworth Reserve. Many of our 2000 members would be concerned about the preferred option route because of its impact on birdlife and further roading encroachment into the Avon-Heathcote Estuary. 1. Forest and Bird North Canterbury find the encroachment into the Avon-Heathcote Estuary as significant and unnecessary when a perfectly adequate alternative route through Charlesworth Reserve is available. Not only would this avoid reducing the Estuary it would also introduce thousands of people to the successful rehabilitation of Charlesworth Reserve and its wildlife by hundreds of community volunteers. We cannot understand the logic of the preferred route considering the cumulative impact on the Estuary and wildlife and the availability of an alternative route. 2. The preferred route would be potentially destructive to birdlife on the Estuary as intermittent cyclists and walkers with dogs will be very disturbing to birds, often causing them to take to the wing and then resettling somewhere else. The cycle/walkway in this position is likely to permanently drive some species from this area. 3. We understand the Estuary route along Humphries Drive is preferred partly because it is claimed that the Charlesworth route is a security risk. We find this hard to believe, and if there is a problem with lighting this could be solved relatively cheaply compared to building a wide four metre cycleway out into the Estuary and then constructing a 2.5 metre rock sea wall. Forest and Bird North Canterbury also believes there are greater risks for cyclists crossing the entrances to the parking areas off Humphries Drive than the alternative route. 4. Many Forest and Bird members are cyclists and if there is a choice between cycling next to a very busy, noisy city road, with a supposed speed limit of 70kph, or cycling across quiet reserve land I have no doubt that the vast majority of our members would rather cycle across Charlesworth. Also this would be more sheltered from howling easterly winds. Surely the aim is to encourage cycling, not discourage it?
32			Y			I prefer the preferred route along the centre of Linwood ave but the alternative route to the south of Linwood ave between St. John st and tidal view
33	Y					How much of an increase in traffic will be expected with the closure of the Tilford st U turn? I am over all very pleased with the preferred route I would like to know if the cycle crossing in sheet 15 could be aligned with the Charlesworth bridge to facilitate entry to the existing Charlesworth reserve path.
34	Y					Really like the opportunities for totally separate shared cycleways. I ride this route to work every day. ([REDACTED]) and I love the connection to the coastal pathway. Cycling will become enjoyable instead of a series of scary near misses.
35					N	I do not support the further development of cycleways at all. They are an expensive item, but not an essential one, so in the interests of fiscal prudence they (and any other non-essential expenditures) should not go ahead.
36	Y					I am happy with either option as long as there's a safe and secure cycle way (especially to give confidence to school-aged children)

37			Y			<p>The link from Linwood Park opposite Chelsea street is difficult. The turning bay here is in the wrong place - few people use it, and those that do block cyclists using Linwood Avenue on road cycle lanes. This may make that worse. It would be better to remove this, There are few cars that come from Phillipstown and they could use the Southbound lane of Aldwins road if a parking area was made for school drop off times there. It's not really necessary - I like the pull off lane for the turning traffic further down Linwood avenue.</p> <p>There is a separate car parking area for Linwood Avenue, but if the grassed area by the park was removed and made into footpath, then there would be an awesome drop off area, during school time, and parking area for sports.</p> <p>The path in the middle of the trees is fantastic. I biked down there a couple of times recently and it is very special. I think that it will be a nice way for tourists to get from the central city hotels to the coastal pathway and then the sea on their hire bikes in the future. Amazing!</p> <p>Ideally the parking on the central reservation would be removed. Is it possible to create a carpark for Linwood park in the current tennis club area, and move the tennis club back? The courts are in bad shape and need replacing anyhow and having off-street parking here would be awesome.</p> <p>Does the crossing point at St John Street need to be so far back? Could a raised area be used instead - maybe slightly back??</p> <p>I really like the crossing point at Linwood Ave/Dyers Road. I like the option to go off through Charlesworth reserve. It is nice to have this option. Could this section be built as part of phase 2 - to give us somewhere to go while we wait for phase 3 please?? This would be really helpful and mean no wastage (having to redo a temporary solution).</p> <p>The crossing point at Hargood street is great. Please do the diagonal one.</p> <p>Replacing the missing trees would be great, and adding the ones to the section by Raupo street will be quite stunning. That area is badly off at the moment. Cycling under them is much preferred to the alternate version. Mixing up with the local traffic is difficult, nice to have a cycling area if possible.</p> <p>It's really good having on-road cycleways along Humphrey's drive also. This would really help giving an option for those that want to go fast to be able to do so, whereas the shared use pathway is for all people. It may need a tiny bit more reclamation but you have to rebuild the seawall anyway - so this could be done at that time...</p> <p>There is no good way of crossing from the city bound side of Ferry road on to the cycleway safely. Could the crossing point opposite Tidal view be improved?</p> <p>The alternate from Chelsea street along Linwood avenue is not as nice on the edges, and you lose lots of parking. Going from outside in and the out again to cross at smith/hay street is slightly awkward.</p> <p>I like the alternative through Charlesworth reserve - I bike this now. But really only as another option, not as the main route. I thought that this would have been my preference before I saw the designs, the preferred option is great.</p>
38					y	<p>I am unhappy with building a cycle way from Keighleys Rd to Eastgate as we already have a cycle way along the canal way which won't take much fixing and will be WAY cheaper to repair than building the new one. Traffic won't be disrupted as much both in the building of it and because they won't have to contend with the proposed foot, bike and scooter traffic. It will be less dangerous to use the existing canal way path as it is right away from the traffic. It doesn't take much for a child to ride or run off and no doubt some people walking their dogs will disobey the must be on a leash directive. All an accident waiting to happen. I also think there is a walkway on the other side of the canal from St John St to Dyers Rd, why not use it? Also further away from traffic. Once you get over Dyers Rd, there is a perfectly good pathway which takes you right through to Waterman Way I think it's called. I would prefer it carries on and meets up behind Mitre 10 and Countdown. I do remember someone telling me something about that being privately owned but not sure if I remember that correctly. All this is further away from traffic, uses a lot of what we already have, shorter, less disruptive to traffic that already struggles at certain times of the day and will be WAY CHEAPER. Use what we have!!!!</p>
39	Y					<p>The number of key destinations and schools off of this route make it an important addition to the Major Cycle Route network. I have worked at both Bromley School and Linwood Avenue School and have witnessed the need for safer routes for children and families traveling to these destinations by bike - especially at the intersection at Linwood Avenue onto Buckleys road where the buses and other drivers often drive over the bike lane.</p>
40			Y			<p>I regularly cycle this route between the city and Mt Pleasant, in both directions.</p> <p>I support the Preferred Route option as far as St Johns Street from which point I support the Alternative Route option. My reasons are that the Preferred Route to St Johns Street is more straightforward (cheaper) to produce and does not impact on the existing cycle lanes whilst achieving a desirable route for non-experienced cyclists at a further distance from the road traffic. The Alternative Route from St Johns Street continues this theme of being more straightforward to construct, physically distanced from the road and retains the existing cycle lanes.</p> <p>The problem with the Preferred Route from St Johns Street eastwards is that it completely takes away the option for an experienced cyclist to remain on the road. I want to remain on the road. Car drivers need to get used to having cyclists on the road, you can't take the cyclists off the road in one part of the network and have them back on another part of the network. By providing options for experienced and non-experienced cyclists you will achieve the familiarity with mixed speed road users as well as giving a safe route option for school children and families.</p> <p>Whichever route, or mixture, goes ahead it is essential that the transitions between road cycle lanes and off-road cycle lanes allow road-based cyclists to get on to the off-road lanes without having to slow down in the road. An example of the worst kind is Wrights Road. A road cyclist wishing to take the off-road cycle lane between Wrights Road southbound and Lincoln Road has to slow to an almost complete stop in order to make the turn onto the cycle lane. This at a point where the road has been narrowed. This forces the on-road cyclist to have to put themselves in a position of danger to block the following the traffic and slow it to an almost complete stop.</p> <p>The south-side on-road cycle lane has been retained on Humphries Drive in the Preferred Route but other sketches show that it has petered out. No detail is shown of how the cyclist using the road cycle lane can transition to the off-road route. It is assumed that the intention is for the on-road cyclist to take a hard left turn at the crossing point. This is exactly the scenario described on Wrights Road. The cyclist will have to come to an almost complete stop to make this transition, increasing the difference between their speed and that of closing vehicles.</p> <p>Retaining the on-road cycle lane network allows experienced cyclists to continue to use the road network (helping to familiarise other road users to having cyclists around).</p>
41	Y					<p>Without printing out the plans I couldn't figure out the differences between the preferred and alternative routes. A summary of the differences would have been helpful.</p>
42	Y					<p>1. I would prefer that the 3 remaining U turns on Linwood Avenue give priority to cycles. Vehicles will have to give way to oncoming traffic anyway and move slowly over the raised median. A good message, particularly to attract commuting cyclists.</p> <p>2. I think that the diagonal crossing from Linwood Avenue at the service lane /Hargood/Keighleys intersection is excellent. Should it be a cheaper option to simply modify the service road to operate as a 'shared greenway' (i.e. use alternative route here) I would support this, particularly if the savings could be applied to improvements and maintenance for the Charlesworth and Ti Rakau Reserves. Having both routes available will appeal to a greater number of users in this section (east of Harwood Street to Ferrymead)</p> <p>Additional thought from previous submission. (<i>separate email received</i>)</p> <p>Firstly a big thanks for the comprehensive booklet, it is a pleasure to use (albeit there is a rather a lot to take in).</p> <p>Secondly, the talk bubble on page 56 states 'connect to Ferrymead shops to browse the shops or enjoy a coffee' but the plan does not appear to indicate that there is any provision to be able to do this without having to move into the lane and indicate a right turn, or cross the oncoming lane and turn left. If the speed limit of this section (50kph) is not adequately enforced I wonder about the safety of such manoeuvres for the less than confident cyclist. Thanks for the opportunity to make this submission.</p>
43	Y					<p>This is a good choice offering the wow factor that may help getting some locals cycling more often. The shared path in the middle of the median strip needs to be 4m wide, there will be a lot of sight seers. The foreshore option on Humphreys Drive provides a visible path when the reserve does not feel safe while the reserve offers an alternative on those very windy days.</p>
44				Y		<p>The Linwood Ave alternatives would not encourage people to use them as they have to wait at either end or every U-turn point.</p>
45			Y			<p>The CDHB supports the cycleway design described in the preferred route, for the reasons outlined below.</p> <p>a) A shared pathway in the median of Linwood Avenue would provide greater separation between cars and cyclists, making it a safer option when compared with the alternative design which proposes using armadillo separators.</p> <p>b) Drivers are generally not accustomed to having cyclists on their right. The alternative route would place cyclists on the right hand side of the road, with only very low and narrow armadillo separators between them and cars. This is could create confusion and lead to accidents.</p> <p>c) An on road cycleway with armadillo separators is not suitable for children or 'interested but concerned' cyclists on a busy two lane road. This design also makes no provision for pedestrians. The preferred design of a shared pathway in</p>

					<p>the median would allow parents to walk with their cycling or scooting children on the way to school. The alternative route would not allow for pedestrians to use the route, meaning that young children who are accompanied by walking parents could not make use of the cycleway to get to school.</p> <p>d) A shared pathway in the median would allow the existing on road painted cycle lanes to remain, for use by more confident cyclists, and would require less change to on-road parking.</p> <p>Page 5 of 6</p> <p>11. The CDHB recommends that Council add more access points to the median along Linwood Avenue to make it easier and safer for residents of nearby streets to get on and off the cycleway. There are currently no clearly defined or designated access points between the beginning of the cycleway at Chelsea Street (Sheet 1) and the intersection of Linwood Avenue / Hargood Street / Keighleys Road (Sheet 6). There are existing footpaths from Tilford Street and McGregors Road that will provide some access (Item 4, Sheet 4) but there are no traffic lights or pedestrian refuges included in the plans that would assist cyclists or pedestrians to cross the two lanes of traffic to access the shared pathway at this point.</p> <p>12. The CDHB supports a shared pathway through the berm between Linwood Avenue and the residential service lane, as proposed in the preferred route (Sheet 6 – Sheet 9), for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>a) This would ensure a consistent design, extending the shared path along the median of Linwood Avenue. Consistent design is safer and easier for users to use and understand.</p> <p>b) This design offers greater separation of cars and cyclists, while also providing for pedestrians to share the path.</p> <p>c) There are no clear traffic calming measures such as raised platforms of street narrowing to support the 30km shared zone in the alternative route. It is therefore unclear how the 30km speed limit would be implemented or enforced.</p> <p>d) Putting the shared pathway in the berm would have no impact for residents' on street parking, and make good use of an existing green area.</p> <p>13. For the section of the route between St John Street and the Ferrymead Retail Area, the CDHB supports the alternative route for the following reasons:</p> <p>a) The CDHB is concerned about potential conflict between cyclists and vehicles at the entrance and exit of Windsurfer's Reserve in the preferred route (Sheet 15 – Sheet 17). The alternative route along the canal and through Ti Rakau and Charlesworth Reserves would take cyclists off the road, effectively bypassing this potential conflict point and reducing risk of accidents.</p> <p>Page 6 of 6</p> <p>b) The alternative route is safer as it offers better separation of cars and cyclists. The alternative route also provides for pedestrians, which the preferred route does not.</p> <p>c) The alternative route offers better connectivity with Ti Rakau and Charlesworth Reserves, which offer a pleasant destination as well as a safe place to take a break.</p> <p>14. The CDHB recommends that a detailed CPTED audit be conducted along the alternative route between St John Street and the Ferrymead Retail Area. Good visibility and lighting, contributing to a sense of safety, will be essential to ensure this route is used.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>15. The CDHB does wish to be heard in support of this submission.</p> <p>16. If others make a similar submission, the submitter will not consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.</p> <p>17. Thank you for the opportunity to submit on Rapanui Shag Rock Cycleway.</p>
46	Y				No comment
47	Y				The Christchurch-Little River Railtrail Trust is planning to extend the trail by making tracks across the peninsula from Little River to Diamond Harbour, using the ferry to cross the harbour and public transport to get through the tunnel. From there a preferred route is down to Ferrymead and around the estuary to the Avon mouth then following the Avon reserve back to the square. The provision of the separated path along Tidal View and Humphreys Drive will form part of this proposal so is welcomed by the Trust.
48	Y				If it gets more people cycling let's do it.
49	Y				I support the preferred route, the 4m shared path on the road but with a separator around Humphreys Drive and Tidal View
50	Y				No comment
51				Y	<p>I generally support the Rapanui-Shag Rock cycleway but I have some concerns. Linwood Avenue Union Church is on the corner of Linwood Avenue and Tilford Street and the building is used by community groups and the Church 7 days a week. The programs and activities draw a wide cross-section of people from the local community and beyond. My concern is the removal of the u -turn from both directions will restrict the traffic flow and make the distance greater for people to travel (especially the elderly) who attend our programs. As it is Linwood Avenue can become very congested (at time from the intersection of Aldwins road and Linwood Avenue up to Hargood street. Removing the U-turn would limit an alternative route for people to travel. The less access to the building will have a detrimental effect on the number of people able to attend our programs (such of which under the umbrella of the council).</p> <p>The removal of the U-turn at Tilford Street and having it one way will require a left turn onto Linwood Avenue and traffic will only be able to turn at Smith Street (more distance to travel) when needing to turn right on Linwood Avenue. The greater the distance the more expensive the travel becomes.</p> <p>I think a better alternative would be to keep the existing U-turns and provide a small bridge over them for cyclists and pedestrians to walk over, this would become easier as some of the trees are destined to be removed under the current proposal.</p>
52			Y		<p>My concern is re: the Hargood St intersection. If someone wants to u turn to come back up Linwood Ave the turn is quite sharp. Also with the introduction of a pedestrian/cycleway crossing how will the lights sequence be set up?</p> <p>Will there be a Go cycle/pedestrian light, and can there will there be a turning/uturn light for cars. If not I can see an issue with cars right turning into Hargood St or left turning into Keighleys road, making a u turn a little way down and then proceeding up to the lights to right turn (off Keighleys) or left turn (off Hargood) to come back up Linwood Ave towards Eastgate.</p>
53	Y				<p>This route will be a real asset to the east of Christchurch, especially with the connection to the Coastal Pathway and the path around the estuary beginning at Windsports Park.</p> <p>Removing the U-turn facilities on Linwood Avenue is a good idea, and will improve safety and reduce delay for MCR users. I don't mind that cycleway users would need to give way at the remaining U-turn locations as I wouldn't trust drivers enough to reliably give way, so your option is the safest.</p> <p>I agree with not using Charlesworth Reserve for the MCR for CPTED reasons, however it would be great if the existing path could be extended from the reserve past the back of the Ferrymead shops through to Humphreys Drive to make accessing the shops from the MCR easier.</p> <p>Looking forward to getting out with the family on this one, as well as the odd ride to work.</p>
54			Y		<p>Thank you for all the improvements proposed for pedestrians- the refuges, the signalised crossings and the widening of paths etc. Whikle Living Streets supports infrastructure build for people on bikes, this submission is primarily presented on behalf of pedestrians.</p> <p>Of the proposed options along Linwood Avenue from the centre path through the avenue of trees from Chelsea to Hargood Streets is our preferred option. This offers a beautiful "wow" factor that is will be attractive to use. Some of the parks in this area do not offer passive surveillance; feedback from residents through Community Support Workers indicates that people do not feel safe using them. This facility may in effect provide another play space for families, with eyes from the street providing security. However a bidirectional shared path of 3m width for all types of users is inadequate and will lead to conflicts if it becomes a success and is heavily used. We propose that a 4 m width be considered. We are also concerned that this option has to accommodate three crossing points. If commuter pedestrians and people on bikes are going to be enticed to use this route, there needs to be priority given at the signalised crossings and that users should not have to give way to vehicular traffic making U-turns. Otherwise we suspect that confident cyclists and many pedestrians will merely opt to use the Linwood Avenue cycle lanes and the footpaths respectively and Council may be seen to have wasted ratepayers money on a facility that is under-used. There also needs to be facilities to enable people who are joining mid-block to access this stretch of MCR as not all users will be doing the full length every time.</p> <p>On Linwood Ave east-ward from Dyers Road to Charlesworth Street we support the preferred route between the road and the canal with separators. Pedestrians however, will be better served by the Charlesworth Reserve path. However, should unconfident cyclist prefer this route, it needs improvements such as widening it to 4meters. Lightening is also a consideration.</p> <p>We encourage you to consider a signalised crossing where the path comes to the Ferrymead shops at the back of the Mitre !</p>

55	Y				No comment
56	Y				No comment
57			Y		<p>I think it's great that council is planning more cycle ways, but I have many concerns about the Linwood Avenue part of the preferred route. 1. Traffic on Linwood avenue will become congested at the Cranley street U-turn which also accesses Eastgate. If the Chelsea st U-turn is removed. 2. Removal of U-turns further up Linwood ave. opposite Damien pl. would mean In order for residents to drive down to Eastgate, they would need to make a u- turn at the Keighleys Rd/Hargood St, intersection!!! This intersection is already dangerous enough. Due to the amount of traffic, including trucks & due to Keighleys Rd, being on an angle, I would not wish to cross this road, in order to gain access to the new cycle way, in the middle of Linwood ave. 3. This new cycle way, will be for recreational use, serious cyclists probably won't use it, as it means crossing at the pedestrian lights. So when cars and cyclists cross paths, in order to stay safe, I think the cyclists should give way to cars, as this will keep traffic flowing and many drivers may not see the cyclists in time to stop. As you can tell I am not in favour of closing any of the U-turns at all. In my view, if there is enough space for the cyclists to stop and cross the U-turns and enough signage to keep them safe. Plus the raised platforms, then hopefully cars & bicycles can cross paths safely. But in saying this, you're still asking for trouble, when cars & bicycles need to cross paths.</p> <p>The best part of the planned cycle way, is the totally separate part, the 4m shared cycle way & walk way. From Hargood st down to ferry road. This is well planned. I wish this type of shared pathway could be in place right along the whole route, as this is by far the safest way to go.</p>
58			Y		<p>██████████ is very concerned about losing the turning bay at the school lights as we feel it's too dangerous to go down to the Eastgate turn at 5 0'clock when training finished as road is busy enough without putting extra pressure on the turn. We don't have enough patience parking outside park and with traffic speeding down Linwood ave and having to go the extra to turn parents will start taking short cuts which could lead to disaster.</p> <p>We definitely DONT support option 2 -as we would lose too much parking and then people would start parking on the grass leading to trouble for the cyclist.</p> <p>The council giving us parking on nursery site is only a short term solution to a big problem</p> <p>Even if we have parking in smith street there is still problems with those who live down hay street waiting to cross and cars banking up in the turning bay</p>
59				N	<p>The proposed cycle way and the measures to close U-turn bays and remove parking will disadvantage high-users of this area, in particular those with children at Linwood Avenue School (LAS) and groups/ sports clubs who use Linwood Park. The U-turn bay near Chelsea St is frequently used by LAS parents for school drop off and pickups and LAS parents use carpark on Linwood Ave to both drop off and pick up their child/Ren. - I do not believe sound monitoring of the use of this was conducted to reflect the true usage. Currently Linwood Park is underserved in carpark options. The park itself, is locked at almost every side with limited options to park a car nearby. This is park is heavily used by the local Linwood Keas League club and serves as it's home ground and currently when there is a home game the grassed median is being used for car parking due to the shortage of car parks near the grounds. This club has the largest number of junior players who train predominantly on Thursday nights, again, a lack of car parking on Linwood Ave presents itself. In the dark, cold winter a child will need to walk further in a 60km zone in order to reach the family car. This is not in the best interests of families or of club members, the very people this community is supposed to serve. When there are barriers to access our sports and schools, there is a negative impact, in this case child safety, potential loss of club members and school enrolments, loss of supporters to events held at both the school and park. We need to retain the very things that hold a community together and not make let the community suffer in order to let people use it as a thoroughfare. I do not believe that having this cycleway in this area can be the answer to my concerns as people can chose to bike instead of drive. The realities of the area would answer that this brings up the question of access to bikes, helmets and locks, how are the community to provide this? Where is the evidence to show that having a cycleway will influence behavioural change and people within the community will start to use this? It is not a viable option for a child to cycle home from league practice in the dark winter evening.</p> <p>I do support less use of cars on the road, I am a daily bus commuter. I do support the idea of making our city more cycle friendly. I do not support the current proposed Rapanui-Shag Rock cycle way in its proposed or alternative formats due to the negative impact I foresee on the school and sporting communities.</p>
60			Y		<p>At all points the shared cycle path should be a minimum of 4 m wide and doesn't necessarily need to be straight edge/i.e. the Linwood Ave section that could flow round trees where necessary. Pedestrians with children, dogs (on or off lead) or in groups of 3-4 will naturally spread wider and are more unpredictable in their movements.</p> <p>-In principle cycle-paths and Footpaths should be kept separate where possible/practicable as walkers, dogs, children, kids push scooters, skate-boarders, mobility scooters all move at significantly different speeds to cyclists, hence consideration should be made to leaving the cycle-path a cycle-only pathway and using the edges of the green space for pedestrians (instead of making these cycle-paths as proposed in the alternative route).</p> <p>-At ALL point's side pathways+ crossing points (with or without control) will be needed to connect cyclist and pedestrians TO AND FROM side streets/shops etc. Consideration/implementation of this needs to be done simultaneously to maximise the ease and hence adoption of the use of the cycle path.</p> <p>-maintain the on-road painted cycle lane, the whole length, for faster travelling commuter cyclists not in the 'interested, but concerned category.</p> <p>-there should be cycle path priority at the U-turns or a clear indication that vehicles should not be stationary on the cycle path within the U-turn.</p> <p>- the cycle path along the Residential Service lane should be separated, and can just as easily be placed along the southern edge of the green space/kerb to uncomplicated the entrance/exit crossings and reduce the chance of queuing onto Linwood Ave. These crossings should have cycle path priority, NOT Give way restrictions as these will be relatively low use roads by vehicles.</p> <p>-as per other side streets, a path over to/from Raupo Street will be needed.</p> <p>-St Johns Street- crossing lights w proximity/sensor triggering would be helpful. Presumably the indirect crossing away from Linwood Av is to reduce the chance of queuing of vehicles onto Linwood, otherwise it should just be direct.</p> <p>-From Dyers Rd the cycle pathway should be at least 4m wide-cyclists will be travelling at faster speeds in these open sections and hence reaction times will be reduced.</p> <p>-The preferred routes crossing of Linwood Av (North-South)-essential this remains signal controlled. Also, at this point it is unclear if the on-road cycle lanes continue- they should for commuter cyclists. These cyclists can and will travel at faster speeds than on the cycle-path.</p> <p>-Essential that there is a light controlled direct crossing point to/from the shopping area (perhaps at point red circle No3 on Map /Sheet 20, or at No 5 on Sheet 21 of the consultation brochure/booklet).</p> <p>-I am not fundamentally opposed to the alternative route- but it would most likely require the extra expense of good lighting (and possibly cameras should there subsequently be a problem) to reduce the perceived concerns about safety in these isolated (there WILL be many cyclists at most times) areas when they are in the dark. This route would be a pleasant weekend/evening/leisure route addition when heading to Sumner by bike.</p>
61			Y		<p>The Canterbury West Coast District of NZAA submits this feedback in relation to the have your say document on the Rapanui – Shag Rock Cycleway.</p> <p>This proposal details a preferred, and an alternative solution. The route starts in Linwood Ave just east of Aldwins Rd and finishes at the Ferrymead bridge linking with the already constructed coastal pathway.</p> <p>Preferred Option:</p> <p>This establishes a single cycleway that runs down the central median zone of Linwood Ave between the trees. It is thus mostly separated from the vehicle traffic.</p> <p>The pathway will be 3m wide and share with pedestrians (Maps 1-6). The cross roads have raised platforms to slow traffic where the cycleway crosses. A U-turn at Chelsea St will be removed and traffic will need to use the alternate facility at Cranley St</p> <p>Further along the U-turn at Tilford St (Map 4) will be removed and traffic will need to use the Smith St facility.</p> <p>At the Hargood St – Keighleys Rd intersection (Crematorium – Map 6) the intersection will be redesigned to include a cycle crossing from the central median to the south side of the road. A cycle crossing phase will be provided in the traffic lights.</p> <p>The cycleway will proceed east on the south side of Linwood Ave road within the grassed median between the avenue and the residential service lane (Maps 7-9). Again well separated from vehicle traffic and with raised platforms where access lanes cross the cycleway. A crossing point will be established on St Johns St set about 20 metres from the intersection with Linwood Ave (Map 9). Thereafter the route runs between the road and the canal through to Dyers Rd.</p> <p>At Dyers Rd (Map 12) provision for cycle crossing seems functional and adequate using a cycle crossing that is coupled with the existing pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>The cycleway then proceeds between the road and canal almost to Humphreys Drive before crossing to the north side of the road by way of a light controlled crossing (Map 16) which to me seems poorly placed at the end of a bend on a 70kph stretch of road. This is to be a pedestrian crossing also but I have no idea why pedestrians are being considered. There is no current pavement and I would doubt if I have seen more than one pedestrian walking the grass verge in</p>

					<p>any two month period.</p> <p>The cycleway now proceeds between the road (Humphreys Drive) and the estuary (Maps 17 and following) on a 4m wide pathway that runs beside the road now narrowed to two 3.5m wide vehicle lanes (obviously for less important vehicle traffic). A 0.85 m wide separator will exist between road and pathway. The pathway will be partly accommodated on a new seawall that will encroach into the estuary.</p> <p>The route continues around Tidal View and finally links into the Coastal pathway at Ferrymead Bridge.</p> <p>Alternative Route:</p> <p>There are three major variations from the preferred route above.</p> <p>Instead of passing through the centre of the median between Eastgate and Hargood St there would be two cycle lanes, one each side of the median. They would be on the roadway and separated by Armadillos (nice rounded humps that would have been much better in Ilam Rd). The split paths will combine at each intersection on a raised platform to cross to the next segment of the median as for the preferred option.</p> <p>The second variation is after crossing Hargood St/Keighleys Rd intersection where the cycleway will utilise the residential service lane instead of having a separate identity. Speed will be limited to 30kph.</p> <p>At St Johns Street the cycleway will merge with the existing gravel path that runs on the south of the canal. This will be upgraded to 3m. Over Dyers Rd the pathway follows the existing pathways through the Charlesworth Reserve wetland area, totally off-road, until exiting onto and crossing over Humphreys Drive at a signalised crossing adjacent to the northern entry to the Mitre 10 and Countdown Ferrymead business area.</p> <p>In the view of the AA District Council this is a better and safer crossing point than in the preferred option and the route across the wetland area, as an off road solution, is more attractive. The Reserve track would almost certainly carry higher pedestrian/cycle traffic than the proposed wider path of the preferred option.</p> <p>General:</p> <p>We favour the single on-median cycleway west of Hargood St (preferred option) and the off-road solution from St Johns St through to the Ferrymead business area. Changes to vehicle traffic flows involve minimal inconvenience to residential use and almost none to commercial users. Safety for cyclists seems to have been well considered.</p>
62			Y		<p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the Shag rock cycleway, I am generally in support of the route but would like to bring a few points to your attention as a keen commuter cyclist.</p> <p>1, I think shared paths should be 4m wide to accommodate all users without people having to move off them to let others past. The path through Hagley park at 4m struggles to cope at times.</p> <p>2, I have concerns about the U-turns between Smith and Hay st</p> <p>Cyclist going the same way as u turning cars, i.e. a west going cyclist and a west going u turning car will require the cyclist to look behind themselves over their left shoulder for a fast approaching indicating car, avoid others on the path, prepare to stop or make a decision to keep going then within a short space do it again although look on the other side.</p> <p>This is not something we would expect a car driver to be able to do and is quite a high workload for a competent cyclist let alone cyclists at the ends of the 8 to 80 spectrum made worse by poor light or weather.</p> <p>The same problem occurs at Tilford St for cyclists traveling SE.</p> <p>I think these two crossings need to be re looked at.</p> <p>3, There doesn't appear to be a good crossing about halfway along the centre median to get people safely on or off other than at the ends.</p> <p>4, I would think the residential service lane would be ok for cycling if it was developed as per the alternative option</p> <p>5, Again the path along the canal needs to be 4m wide if it is shared.</p> <p>6, is it possible to keep the path on the inland side of Humphreys Drive for two reasons.</p> <p>One if repairing the sea wall comes out of the cycleways budget that means less money elsewhere and two that during a strong NW wind and a high tide cycling along the sea side will be quite unpleasant with the inevitable sea spray blowing over the path.</p> <p>I prefer Humphreys Drive to Charlesworth Reserve as if one of the aims is to have a perception of safety this will be hard to create in the remoteness of the reserve and will lead to cyclists using Humphreys Drive during darkness to avoid going through there. There appears to be a track through the reserve now which confident cyclists could use.</p> <p>7, If staying on the inland side was chosen then a new design would be needed through to Ferry Rd, if staying on the sea side then the rest looks ok</p>
63				Y	<p>The proposed full Rapanui to Shag Rock Cycleway will greatly improve cycling accessibility from the central city to the Ferrymead bridge, where it will connect to the Coastal Pathway to Sumner. The implementation of this route is critical in establishing Christchurch as an accessible city for active transport, improving accessibility to Linwood Park, Eastgate and the Avon Heathcote Estuary. For this reason Generation Zero strongly supports the proposal.</p> <p>Generation Zero strongly support of the following design aspects of the Alternative Route:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed upgrading of the signalised intersection at Linwood Avenue/Hargood Street/Keighleys Road and at Dyers Road to include a crossing for cyclists, as well as the new signalised intersection for cyclists and pedestrians across the south end of Humphreys Drive, will facilitate an easier and safer crossing. The design of these crossings should include advanced signal detectors on the approaches to ensure minimal waiting times. - The Linwood Ave residential service lane south of Linwood Avenue should be upgraded to become a shared greenway, as this is a low traffic use road. By calming the the traffic and restricting parking, cyclists can safely share the road with cars. - The proposed reduction of car parking spaces along Tidal View from 39 to 21 carparks is essential in achieving a safe and user-friendly cycleway. Ratepayers should not be obliged to support on-street car parking for private businesses and a reduction in car parking will incentivised commuters to consider other alternative modes of transport to work. <p>To improve the design of the Alternative Route, Generation Zero requests that the following changes are made to the proposed plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We recommend a combination of the two proposed route options, consisting of a separated shared path down the Linwood Avenue medium, travelling south of the Linwood Canal, through the Ti Rakau and Charlesworth reserves to connect with the Ferrymead shops. The Preferred Route along Humphreys Drive may not appeal to the “interested but concerned” cyclist, as vehicles travel along this road at the high speed of 70km/hr. - Additional connecting paths along Linwood Avenue are needed to ensure cycling and pedestrian access to side roads. <p>To improve the safety of active transport users along the Alternative Route, Generation Zero requests that the following improvements are made to the proposed plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We ask that Council ensure the safety design measures of physical separation from motor vehicles and 3-4m wide shared paths and two-way cycleways are not compromised as a result of this consultation process. It is crucial that “interested but concerned” cyclists feel safe and confident if we are to see Christchurch move closer in the direction of a healthier, low carbon future. - To overcome the major safety concerns along the canal and through the reserves, robust design solutions need to be implemented to open and light up this route to provide cyclists with a sense of personal security. The safer this route is, the more confident the “interested but concerned” cyclist will feel using this cycleway. - The proposed closure of three existing U-turns on Linwood Avenue and the signal controlled left hand turn at the Dyers Road intersection will ensure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians using the cycleway. Motorists using the remaining U-turns on Linwood Avenue should give way to cyclists and pedestrians.
64	Y				No comment
65		Y			So long as there is great lighting installed for night time commutes, alternative route would be more pleasant.
66		Y			No comment
67				Y	<p>The proposed full Rapanui to Shag Rock Cycleway will greatly improve cycling accessibility from the central city to the Ferrymead bridge, where it will connect to the Coastal Pathway to Sumner. The implementation of this route is critical in establishing Christchurch as an accessible city for active transport and will improve accessibility to Linwood Park, Eastgate and the Avon Heathcote Estuary. For this reason I strongly support the second and third stages of this route.</p> <p>I strongly support the proposed upgrading of the signalised intersections at Linwood Avenue/Hargood Street/Keighleys Road and at Dyers Road to include a crossing for cyclists, as well as the new signalised intersection for cyclists and pedestrians across the south end of Humphreys Drive, as this will facilitate an easier and safer crossing. The design of these crossings should include advanced signal detectors on the approaches to ensure minimal waiting times.</p>

					<p>I strongly support the proposal to upgrade Linwood Ave residential service lane south of Linwood Avenue to become a shared greenway, as this is a low traffic use road. By calming the the traffic and restricting parking, cyclists can safely share the road with cars.</p> <p>I also strongly support the reduction of car parking spaces along Tidal View from 39 to 21 carparks, as this is essential in achieving a safe and user-friendly cycleway. Ratepayers should not be obliged to support on-street car parking for private businesses and a reduction in car parking will incentivised commuters to consider other alternative modes of transport to work.</p> <p>To improve the design of the Alternative Route, I request the following changes be made to the proposed plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The second and third stages of the Rapanui to Shag Rock cycleway should comprise of a combination of the two proposed route options; the route should follow the separated shared path down the Linwood Avenue medium and travel south of the Linwood Canal, through the Ti Rakau and Charlesworth reserves to connect with the Ferrymead shops. The Preferred Route along Humphreys Drive may prove unpopular with the “interested but concerned” cyclist, as vehicles travel along this road at the high speed of 70km/hr. - Additional connecting paths along Linwood Avenue are required in the proposed plans to ensure cycling and pedestrian access to side roads. <p>To improve the safety of active transport users along the Alternative Route, I request the following improvements be made to the proposed plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure the safety design measures of physical separation from motor vehicles and 3-4m wide shared paths and two-way cycleways are not compromised. It is crucial that “interested but concerned” cyclists feel safe and confident if we are to see an uptake in active transport users on this route. - To overcome the major safety concerns along the canal and through the reserves, robust design solutions need to be implemented into the proposed plans to open and light up this route to provide the “interested but concerned” cyclists with a sense of personal security. - The proposed closure of three existing U-turns on Linwood Avenue and the signal controlled left hand turn at the Dyers Road intersection will ensure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians using the cycleway. To further ensure the safety of active transport users I request that motorists using the remaining U-turns on Linwood Avenue give way to cyclists and pedestrians.
68	Y				<p>The reason that I am supportive of the preferred route option is because of the extra choice that will be available into the future. For many, the Linwood Ave/Humphrey's Drive will be perfectly adequate, particularly for those who wish to use the most direct route. Others will appreciate the peacefulness of the two reserves. Whilst it may be necessary to upgrade the paths at some point, for someone using the route for recreational purposes it will still be adequate as is. During the hours of darkness, the preferred route may be used for preference by those who have safety concerns.</p>
69			Y		<p>Overall, I strongly support the proposed cycleway to Ferrymead, but have some issues I'd like to see addressed.</p> <p>Firstly, I would like to see the path widened to at least 3.5m between the trees along Linwood Ave, as 3m will be too narrow when pedestrians are using it.</p> <p>Secondly, cyclists shouldn't have to give way at the vehicle U-turns that cut across the cycleway. On the alternative plans cars give way, so why not on the preferred route?</p> <p>Furthermore, I would like to see a cycle signals at the Hargood St intersection crossing east to west on the south side of the road, for those that want to travel via the drain pathway and not via Linwood Ave.</p> <p>Also, cyclists shouldn't have to give way where cars cross into Linwood Ave from the service lane between Hargood and St Johns Streets.</p> <p>Can the cycle crossing at St Johns Street be aligned better with the cycleway (i.e. refuge island shifted north)? It's a pretty terrible alignment- if we're encouraging commuter cyclists to use the route, dog-legs like this shouldn't be there.</p> <p>Also, the signalised crossing (near the windsurfers reserve) should be aligned 30m west of where it is proposed as it will then be aligned with the Charlesworth Bridge, making more convenient crossings into the reserve and coastal pathway.</p> <p>There seem to be no safe crossing points for those who wish to visit the shops in Ferrymead (the supermarket and other shops). There needs to be either a signalised crossing (like what is proposed in the alternative plans) or a refuge island to help cyclists and walkers cross from the coastal pathway to the shops.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to see a signalised crossing over Ferry Rd where the proposed cycleway meets with the bridge, as this will help cyclists and walkers use the river pathway south of the bridge, and will also enable westbound cyclists to cross and use Ferry Rd if wanted. Signals will be required here in the future anyway as the proposed Heathcote River Cycleway will connect here.</p>
70			Y		<p>Overall, I strongly support the proposed cycleway to Ferrymead, but have some issues I'd like to see addressed.</p> <p>Firstly, I would like to see the path widened to at least 3.5m between the trees along Linwood Ave, as 3m will be too narrow when pedestrians are using it.</p> <p>Secondly, cyclists shouldn't have to give way at the vehicle U-turns that cut across the cycleway. On the alternative plans cars give way, so why not on the preferred route?</p> <p>Furthermore, I would like to see a cycle signals at the Hargood St intersection crossing east to west on the south side of the road, for those that want to travel via the drain pathway and not via Linwood Ave.</p> <p>Also, cyclists shouldn't have to give way where cars cross into Linwood Ave from the service lane between Hargood and St Johns Streets.</p> <p>Can the cycle crossing at St Johns Street be aligned better with the cycleway (i.e. refuge island shifted north)? It's a pretty terrible alignment- if we're encouraging commuter cyclists to use the route, dog-legs like this shouldn't be there.</p> <p>Also, the signalised crossing (near the windsurfers reserve) should be aligned 30m west of where it is proposed as it will then be aligned with the Charlesworth Bridge, making more convenient crossings into the reserve and coastal pathway.</p> <p>There seem to be no safe crossing points for those who wish to visit the shops in Ferrymead (the supermarket and other shops). There needs to be either a signalised crossing (like what is proposed in the alternative plans) or a refuge island to help cyclists and walkers cross from the coastal pathway to the shops.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to see a signalised crossing over Ferry Rd where the proposed cycleway meets with the bridge, as this will help cyclists and walkers use the river pathway south of the bridge, and will also enable westbound cyclists to cross and use Ferry Rd if wanted. Signals will be required here in the future anyway as the proposed Heathcote River Cycleway will connect here.</p>
71			Y		<p>Overall, I strongly support the proposed cycleway to Ferrymead, but have some issues I'd like to see addressed.</p> <p>Firstly, I would like to see the path widened to at least 3.5m between the trees along Linwood Ave, as 3m will be too narrow when pedestrians are using it.</p> <p>Secondly, cyclists shouldn't have to give way at the vehicle U-turns that cut across the cycleway. On the alternative plans cars give way, so why not on the preferred route?</p> <p>Furthermore, I would like to see a cycle signals at the Hargood St intersection crossing east to west on the south side of the road, for those that want to travel via the drain pathway and not via Linwood Ave.</p> <p>Also, cyclists shouldn't have to give way where cars cross into Linwood Ave from the service lane between Hargood and St Johns Streets.</p> <p>Can the cycle crossing at St Johns Street be aligned better with the cycleway (i.e. refuge island shifted north)? It's a pretty terrible alignment- if we're encouraging commuter cyclists to use the route, dog-legs like this shouldn't be there.</p> <p>Also, the signalised crossing (near the windsurfers reserve) should be aligned 30m west of where it is proposed as it will then be aligned with the Charlesworth Bridge, making more convenient crossings into the reserve and coastal pathway.</p> <p>There seem to be no safe crossing points for those who wish to visit the shops in Ferrymead (the supermarket and other shops). There needs to be either a signalised crossing (like what is proposed in the alternative plans) or a refuge island to help cyclists and walkers cross from the coastal pathway to the shops.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to see a signalised crossing over Ferry Rd where the proposed cycleway meets with the bridge, as this will help cyclists and walkers use the river pathway south of the bridge, and will also enable westbound cyclists to cross and use Ferry Rd if wanted. Signals will be required here in the future anyway as the proposed Heathcote River Cycleway will connect here.</p>
72			Y		<p>Linwood Ave signalised crossing (Sheet 1)</p> <p>Can the cycle crossing be widened to 4m to allow two cyclists to queue on each side. This will also reduce conflicts and this location which will have high cycle and pedestrian volumes due to the school and mall. Consider including a slip lane for eastbound cyclists to access the signalised crossing from the Linwood Avenue cycle lane to turn right onto the MCR.</p> <p>Eastgate Mall (Sheet 1)</p> <p>Eastgate mall is likely to be a high trip generator for this cycle route however it is currently not clear how cyclists should access the mall or where they can park bicycles etc. Currently access and parking at locations such as malls is very</p>

					<p>poor throughout Christchurch. As part of the cycleway projects consultation should be undertaken with high trip generators such as the Eastgate Mall, Ferry Road shops etc. to identify options for providing safe and secure access and parking for cyclists. This will help to encourage uptake of the cycling routes and deliver improved safety for all road users.</p> <p>Side Roads – Jollie St, Thomas St, Gown Pl, Damien Pl (Sheets 2-5)</p> <p>It is not clear how cyclists will access the MCR from side roads. Have link paths similar to that near Tilford St been considered if traffic volumes are low enough for this to be safe?</p> <p>U-turns – Jollie St, Thomas St, Gow Pl, Damien Pl (Sheets 2 & 4)</p> <p>I support the shared path having priority over vehicles carrying out the U-turn manoeuvre.</p> <p>Hargood / Keighleys / Linwood Intersection (Sheet 6)</p> <p>Consider including slip lanes and short sections of shared path to enable northbound and southbound cyclists to travel between the MCR and Hargood Street.</p> <p>Consider including slip lanes and short sections of shared path to enable northbound and southbound cyclists to travel between the MCR and Keighleys Road.</p> <p>Consider including slip lanes to allow cyclists to access the signalised crossings from the Linwood Avenue cycle lanes.</p> <p>Consider enlarging the shared path areas at the intersection to make it easier for cyclists and pedestrians to negotiate conflicts.</p> <p>Residential Service Lane (Sheet 7 & 8)</p> <p>I support the shared path having priority over vehicles entering or exiting the residential service lane.</p> <p>Raupo Street (Sheet 7)</p> <p>Consider installing a pedestrian refuge island in the Linwood Avenue median north of Raupo Street to enable pedestrians and cyclists to safely access Raupo Street from the MCR.</p> <p>Pedestrian Refuge near St Johns Street (Sheet 9)</p> <p>Consider widening the pedestrian refuge in the Linwood Avenue median north of St Johns Street to make it safe for opposing cyclists and pedestrians to use at the same time as it is currently narrow. Consider also constructing a shared path on the north side of Linwood Avenue between this crossing and St Johns Street so that less confident cyclists have a safe route between St Johns Street and the MCR.</p> <p>St Johns Street (Sheet 9)</p> <p>Consider improving the alignment of the shared path on the west side of St Johns Street as the plan shows a sharp 45 degree angle on departure from the crossing.</p> <p>Bus stop (Sheet 10)</p> <p>Consider asphaltting the two landscape areas adjacent to the bus stop as this will improve access to the bus stop particularly for vision impaired pedestrians and also reduce conflicts with users of the shared paths. These landscape areas will also likely to be difficult to maintain.</p> <p>Kidbrooke Street (Sheet 7)</p> <p>Consider installing a pedestrian refuge island in the Linwood Avenue median north of Kidbrooke Street to enable pedestrians and cyclists to safely access Kidbrooke Street from the MCR.</p> <p>Linwood Avenue / Dyers Road Intersection (Sheet 12)</p> <p>Consider asphaltting the two landscape areas on the south side of Linwood Avenue between the shared paths and the kerb to increase negotiation space and reduce conflicts with users of the shared paths. These landscape areas will also likely to be difficult to maintain.</p> <p>Consider installing a cycle lane behind the new section of guardrail to allow northbound cyclists on Dyers Road to access the MCR.</p> <p>H signalised crossing (Sheet 15)</p> <p>Can the cycle crossing be widened to 4m to allow two cyclists to queue on each side. This will also reduce conflicts and this location which will have high cycle and pedestrian volumes due to the school and mall. Consider including a slip lane for eastbound cyclists to access the signalised crossing from the Linwood Avenue cycle lane to turn right onto the MCR.</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>I support the removal of on-street parking, where required, to create safe cycling facilities.</p> <p>St Johns Street to Dyers Road Alternate Route (Sheets 9-12)</p> <p>I support the alternate route (south of the drain) between St Johns St and Dyers Road.</p>
73			Y		<p>The cycle path needs to be 4 metres wide wherever possible, especially where paths are shared.</p> <p>-The path through the green space along the Residential Service Lane should be placed along the southern curb, still separated, making the 2 crossing points over the road easier and these should have cycle priority, i.e. give way control for vehicles. This will also reduce chances of queuing backing onto Linwood Ave</p>
74			Y		<p>The Rapanui-Shag Rock cycleway will be a great asset to the city and will provide a great link from the Coastal Pathway into the city.</p> <p>Our main concerns are that the off-road sections of the proposed cycleway is only 3 metres wide for much of its length. In our view this isn't wide enough to accommodate two way cyclists, as well as pedestrians, buggies etc. There are sections of the route where a four metre wide pathway can be accommodated but where only a 3 m wide pathway is proposed. For example along parts of Linwood Avenue, both beside the river, and within the avenue of trees, there are parts where a 4 metre wide path could be accommodated. In our experience with the completed sections of the Coastal Pathway, even with a 4 metre wide path, pedestrians tend to walk side by side and it can be difficult for cyclists to pass. If the cycleway is primarily designed for cyclists, then in our opinion a three metre wide path will be inadequate.</p> <p>The other concern we have is about the on-road cycle lanes on Humphries Drive. It appears that these are to be removed in both directions to accommodate the cycleway on the seaward side. These on-road cycle lanes are used by commuters opting for a fast, direct cycle route into town. The proposed cycle path is unlikely to be a suitable alternative for these cyclists as it is proposed to be a shared path with pedestrians, dogs etc. allowed on it, therefore is likely to get busy with walkers etc. at times, and not provide the required fast, direct access many commuters require. Adjacent to the Coastal Pathway we have retained on-road cycle lanes in both directions, and data has shown us that these are frequently used by cyclists, with the higher usage of the on-road cycle lane being on the opposite side to the Coastal Pathway, as it is more convenient than crossing over to enter the pathway.</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss these points with you if required.</p>
75			Y		<p>To save repeating myself, have a look at my blog post: http://cyclingchristchurch.co.nz/2016/12/07/rapanui-shag-rock-cycleway-consultation-continues/</p> <p>There are elements of both options that should be supported, e.g. preferred route in the central median with priority over U-turn traffic, greenway down the Linwood Ave service lane instead of a separate path. And some effort should go towards improving the existing alternative routes, in terms of lighting and signage.</p>
76			Y		<p>It is great to see the next stage of The Shag Rock cycleway moving forward. This is part of the infrastructure solution to encourage and allow more people to commute by bike from Sumner, Redcliffs and Ferrymead areas. And will therefore also be an important part of solving traffic congestion to/from these areas.</p> <p>Shared cycle/walk ways pose conflicts between people cycling (at various speeds), people walking/talking, dogs on/off leads, and children on scooters etc. So it is a must that these are a minimum of 4 meters and have clear markings to let all know to keep to the left to avoid collisions.</p> <p>The shared cycle/walk way in the middle of Linwood Ave green median does not have to be in a completely straight line, but can avoid tree roots as necessary to enable a minimum 4 meters width.</p> <p>It's welcomed that some U-turns are being removed, but cyclists/pedestrians should have right of way at the remaining U-turns to encourage cycling/walking and prevent unnecessary waiting for car traffic.</p> <p>While a proper separated cycleway is long overdue along the estuary on Humphreys Ave, this will be very exposed to strong winds, so an alternative, more sheltered cycleway would be appreciated to allow less confident cyclists to cycle</p>

					<p>thorough Charlesworth reserve on those windy days.</p> <p>It goes without saying that all of this cycleway will need to be well lit to allow 24/7 year-round use.</p> <p>We are many who are looking forward to this cycleway becoming a reality, and help make Christchurch a better place to work, live and move around.</p>
77		Y			No comment
78			Y		<p>Allow for deliberate planting above the MHW level in the riprap. We shouldn't be setting ourselves up for unnecessary chemical use like as has happened on the Causeway. Some scattered trees to break the wind without compromising the views would help improve the amenity greatly.</p> <p>A planted swale separating the road would be great and allow for pollutant removal before stormwater discharges to the estuary.</p> <p>Be good to have some pause/rest points along the route with a bench seat, interpretive signage, some attractive planting, and drinking fountain where practical. This could be a key attraction for visitors and residents and be great to make it work for both the commuter and recreational traffic.</p> <p>Running the cycleway through or beside the median seems like it is asking for conflict with traffic. I would prefer to upgrade the canal route and restoring the channelized creek as part of the project. Has there been a cost estimate looking at this as an option?</p>
79			Y		<p>Shared cycle/walk ways pose conflicts between people cycling (at various speeds), people walking/talking, dogs on/off leads, and children on scooters etc. So it is a must that these are a minimum of 4 meters and have clear markings to let all know to keep to the left to avoid collisions.</p> <p>The shared cycle/walk way in the middle of Linwood Ave green median does not have to be in a completely straight line, but can avoid tree roots as necessary to enable a minimum 4 meters width.</p> <p>This cycleway is part of the solution to traffic congestion to/from Sumner, Redcliffs and Ferrymead areas. So right of way for cycling/walking at the remaining U-turns is a no brainer.</p> <p>While a proper separated cycleway is long overdue along the estuary on Humphreys Ave, this will be very exposed to strong winds, so a secondary more sheltered cycleway would allow less confident cyclists.... and tourists to cycle thorough Charlesworth reserve on those windy days.</p> <p>It goes without saying that all of this cycleway will need to be well lit to allow 24/7 year-round use.</p> <p>Please also avoid planting that will hang over the cycleway, like along QEII drive and some parts of existing Northern Line, as this will make an otherwise wide cycle/walkway unfit for use.</p> <p>Can't wait to be able to cycle from the CBD right out to Sumner. Bring it on!</p>
80			Y		<p>We are very excited about the proposed cycleway, but have some concerns about the design.</p> <p>As a Transport Planner with experience with cycleways in London, I am concerned about much of the pathway being a shared pathway. I have read the Christchurch Transport Strategy and there is much emphasis on getting people onto their bikes to reduce congestion on the roads, as well as other benefits to health and wellbeing, local communities etc. The name of the project - "Major cycleways" indicates that the emphasis is on getting people on their bikes. While I understand the attractiveness of opening up the cycle ways to pedestrians and other road users, I feel this will compromise the usefulness of the cycleways for commuters. I discussed this with you during the consultation phase, and you said that you weren't targeting the lira-clad commuters, but rather all walks of life from 8 to 80 year olds. I agree that some more confident cyclists will prefer to cycle on the busy roads, I don't think the value of fast, direct, off road cycleways will be to most cyclists. If commuters have to continually weave in and out of walkers, dogs, buggy's etc., and slow down all the time, then the cycleway will become less attractive to them.</p> <p>One option is to have a cycleway and beside it a crushed gravel pathway for pedestrians. This could especially be an option along Linwood Avenue where I have been told the asphalt path can only be 3 metres wide due to tree roots - in this area a crushed gravel path could be put on the outside of the trees.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the off-road sections of the proposed cycleway is only 3 metres wide for much of its length. In our experience this isn't wide enough to accommodate two way cyclists, as well as pedestrians, buggies etc. If the route has to be a shared pathway (and in our opinion it shouldn't be) then every effort should be made to make it 4 metres wide wherever possible.</p> <p>I have studied the route in detail and note that here are sections of the route where a four metre wide pathway can be accommodated but where only a 3 m wide pathway is proposed. For example along parts of Linwood Avenue, both beside the river, and within the avenue of trees, there are parts where a 4 metre wide path could be accommodated, but haven't been provided for. Even with a 4 metre wide path, pedestrians tend to walk side by side, often mums with buggies etc. and take up most of the pathway, and it can be difficult for cyclists to pass. I think a 3m wide pathway will not be adequate in most instances, particularly if your focus is on getting people on their bikes.</p> <p>Specifically, in parts of the avenue of trees there are currently no trees - in this section a 4 m path could be accommodated (and I think in the sections where there are trees a crushed gravel path could be provided for pedestrians).</p> <p>We are very concerned about the proposed removal of the on-road cycle lanes on Humphries Drive. It appears that they are to be removed in both directions to accommodate the cycleway on the seaward side. These on-road cycle lanes are used by commuters, including my husband Brett, who are opting for a fast, direct cycle route into town. The proposed cycle path is unlikely to be a suitable alternative for these cyclists as it is proposed to be a shared path with pedestrians, dogs etc. allowed on it, therefore is likely to get busy with walkers etc. at times, and not provide the required fast, direct access many commuters require. While the east bound commuters will hopefully use the pathway along Humphries Drive, it is not convenient for city-bound commuters to do so as they would have to cross over the road to get to the cycleway. In our view the combination of the path being shared, and the removal of on-road cycle lanes may actually decrease the provision for commuters, rather than provide for them.</p> <p>Perhaps a compromise of the two route options along here could be a good option - for example take the path through Charlesworth Reserve for the recreational cyclists and pedestrians etc. to enjoy, and then make the on-road cycle-lanes safer by separating them from the main flow of traffic.</p> <p>Specific comments:</p> <p>Linwood Ave - from the artist's impression it looks like there is going to be lighting adjacent to the pathway, however this is not shown in the plan. Is lighting going to be installed?</p> <p>Linwood ave, adjacent to residential service lane - would be good to have the option for cyclists to go along the lane if there are pedestrians on the shared path - i.e. so provide dropped kerbs etc.</p> <p>Along here as trees are proposed, there is space for the path to be 4 metres wide - why then has a 3 metre path been proposed?</p> <p>St John st - pedestrian refuge is good feature</p> <p>Bus stop - will this be accessible? (I note that the bus stops along the coastal pathway are not accessible in many instances as the kerbs have been installed too low)</p> <p>East of St John st - will the proposed shared pathway encroach on the on-road cycle lane? Looks like the hard shoulder will be removed which many cyclists probably currently cycle on as it's a bit safer being further from the traffic lane.</p> <p>Next to Dyers Road intersection it looks like the on-road cycle lane will be completely removed?</p> <p>Adjacent to the Linwood canal it looks like the cycle lane could be wider than 3 metres.</p> <p>I have concerns about the proposed traffic lights - it makes more sense to me to have cyclists crossing at Dyers road intersection. Having a crossing in the proposed location looks a bit dangerous and will likely cause further delays for cyclists (as I can't imagine it being prioritised for cyclists at that location) and will also annoy drivers. Better to cross at the lights in my opinion.</p> <p>I would be happy to discuss any of these points with you. Thanks for considering my submission.</p>
81			Y		<p>Safety measures of physical separation from motor vehicles and 3-4m wide shared cycleways must not be compromised in order to ensure less confident cyclists feel safe and are encouraged to get on their bikes.</p> <p>A combination of the two proposed options would be best; a separated shared path down the Linwood Avenue medium, travelling south of the Linwood Canal, through the Ti Rakau and Charlesworth reserves to connect with the Ferrymead shops. The preferred route along Humphreys Drive may not appeal to the "interested but concerned" cyclist, as vehicles travel along this road at 70km/hr.</p> <p>Robust design solutions need to be put in place to open and light up this route to provide cyclists with a sense of personal security. The safer we can make this route, the more confident the "interested but concerned" cyclist will feel using this cycleway.</p> <p>Additional connecting paths along Linwood Avenue are needed to ensure cycling and pedestrian access to side roads.</p> <p>The proposed upgrading of the signalised intersections at Linwood Avenue/Hargood Street/Keighleys Road and at Dyers Road to include a crossing for cyclists, as well as the new signalised intersection for cyclists and pedestrians across</p>

					<p>the south end of Humphreys Drive, will facilitate an easier and safer crossing. The design of these crossings should include advanced signal detectors on the approaches to ensure minimal waiting times.</p> <p>The proposed closures of three existing U-turns on Linwood Avenue and the signal controlled left hand turn at the Dyers Road intersection are sensible features of this route as this will ensure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians using the cycleway.</p> <p>Motorists using the remaining U-turns on Linwood Avenue should give way to cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Linwood Ave residential service lane south of Linwood Avenue should be upgraded to become a shared greenway, as this is a low traffic use road. By calming the traffic and restricting parking, cyclists can safely share the road with cars.</p> <p>The proposed reduction of car parking spaces along Tidal View from 39 to 21 car parks is essential in achieving a safe and user-friendly cycleway. Ratepayers should not be obliged to support on-street car parking for private businesses and a reduction in car parking will incentivised commuters to consider other alternative modes of transport to work.</p>
82			Y		<p>In general I support the Spokes Canterbury submission. I do not support the route along the sea wall by the windsurfers reserve and strongly urge that the route be through the Charlesworth Reserve.</p> <p>A third option of a fully separated path along the Linwood canal should have been offered. The canal follows Linwood Avenue and could be contiguous for most of the proposed routes length while minimizing major intersection conflicts and expense. Public safety concerns for some secluded areas would be mitigated by a successful path increasing the number of users, lighting and landscaping changes. CCC needs to reinstate the Cycle Advisory Group and to allow the public to consider the full range of options prior to putting out limited choices to the public.</p> <p>Specific concerns and comments</p> <p>Where the shared path cuts back in at St Johns Street it makes most sense to move the cycle path to the canal location. This avoids pinch points such as the bus shelter by Kidbrooke.</p> <p>This continues a more scenic route through the Charlesworth Reserve. It also eliminates a crossing, increases safety and decreases cost. It removes the conflict point where cars entering/exiting the windsurfer's reserve would be crossing the shared path. Concern is that the Reserve path would not be public enough, especially at night. Making it visible is a better, cheaper and more sustainable option as the sea wall side will be ever more vulnerable to high tides, storms and sea level rise. On road cycle lanes would be provided for those who would choose to use them at night.</p> <p>Where the path comes to the Ferrymead shops signalise the first intersection (back driveway serving Mitre 10) to allow safe crossing from inland side to estuary side. This allows easy flow from estuary path to shops while also serving people on cycles to cross to the estuary. This is also required as the nearest other crossing point is at Tidal View.</p> <p>Eliminate right turns in or out to Humphreys to further quiet this intersection. Alternatively eliminate all motorised access from Humphreys and improve intersection at Ferry Road to allow access from it.</p>
83			Y		<p>It is good to see some progress on another major cycle route. Thanks to CCC for staying on task. Spokes, and the public's, contributions to this plan would have a greater impact if collaboration on routes occurred prior to the extensive planning and research that has gone into this proposal. Re-instatement of a cycle advisory panel is strongly urged to make the Major Cycle Routes, MCR, successful.</p> <p>What is a Major Cycle Route? A MCR is attractive to people on bicycles as it reduces interaction with motorised vehicles while also allowing them to efficiently and quickly get around. Offering a shared path, especially one too narrow for safe and attractive use, does not meet the implied promise of a MCR. Where a shared path is the only possible option it must be wide enough to easily accommodate all potential users. 4 meters width is a minimum and there must be room for expansion should it attract the use a properly designed and located path will encourage. It will also require signage, education and promotion to remind users that this is a shared space and how sharing can be best accomplished.</p> <p>Spokes understands that funding is not unlimited. However the temptation to do things 'on the cheap' typically offers a poor return on investment, if not being wasted entirely. There is also the need to break old habits; business as usual in transport has been proven to be unaffordable and ineffective for some time now.</p> <p>With either option Spokes supports motor vehicle turning restrictions to make the final route safer. Spokes understands that some residents and businesses will be challenged by the loss of on street parking. Road safety concerns and the need to use road space to meet transport needs, including for those who cycle or walk are more appropriate uses of ratepayers invested capital in real estate for transport.</p> <p>Two options are offered either a shared path in the centre median of Linwood Ave or cycle lanes on either side of the median. While a centre path through a green space well separated from traffic is seductive implementation leaves much to be desired.</p> <p>The centre path offering a bidirectional shared path of 3m width is wholly inadequate and will lead to conflicts. People on bicycles, mobility scooters, prams, Segway's, very young children on foot, children on bikes, dog walkers and the disabled will all be competing for space. This option also features 3 points where cars cross the path and path users must yield to them. This does not even meet the stated principles for MCR's to "limit conflicts between cyclists and other route users". There is a sad likelihood that many users will be dissuaded from using this section of the route due to their experiences on the path.</p> <p>For the bulk of the proposed route a 4m path is easily accommodated. As offered people using bicycles as daily transport and needing reliable travel times will be forced onto Linwood Avenue. Spokes appreciates that the Linwood Avenue cycle lanes are to be kept, but disappointed that the infrastructure on offer is unnecessarily limited and limiting.</p> <p>As proposed the needs of the interested but concerned might be met, many pedestrians will feel aggrieved if not shunted aside entirely, the status quo of sharing the road with cars will be retained and those who wanted to have good cycling commute routes are once again disappointed.</p> <p>The second option offers 2.1m wide single direction cycle lanes located on either side of the centre median and physically separated from traffic. These are not shared with pedestrians. The 2.1m width is less than the 2.4m width required by CCC Cycle Design Guideline 2.4.1 for a MCR. A plus to this option is cars must yield to bicycles at crossing points.</p> <p>A hybrid of the two options is easily possible and preferred. In option 1 give people on foot and bike priority over cars at the crossing points and expand the centre path width to at least 4 metres. The existing on road cycle lanes would be maintained. Spokes favours this option.</p> <p>A third option of a fully separated path along the Linwood canal is not offered. The canal follows Linwood Avenue and could be contiguous for most of the proposed routes length while minimizing major intersection conflicts and expense. Public safety concerns for some secluded areas would be mitigated by a successful path increasing the number of users, lighting and landscaping changes. Spokes would have appreciated the opportunity to explore this option prior to CCC releasing this limited 2 option consultation.</p> <p>This consultation makes clear why CCC needs to reinstate the Cycle Advisory Group and benefit from the perspective and experience of those who cycle regularly.</p> <p>Specific concerns and comments</p> <p>With either option both pedestrians and cyclists will be crossing Linwood Ave to access side streets. This will require paths across the median and safe crossing points on this busy street. This is noted in some sections, not in most. Are pedestrians expected to cross Linwood Avenue willy nilly or to walk increased distances to the few formal crossing points provided? Making this clear in the consultation plans allows people to make better submissions.</p> <p>Option 1 has vehicle 'U' turn and street access infrastructure interrupt the path at three points forcing cyclists to stop for cars and with the potential of cars blocking the lanes. Nb: cars accessing these turn lanes will be coming off Linwood at speed with a very short stopping distance to avoid cyclists and pedestrians who might already be crossing the lanes. These are very serious safety issues. Requiring drivers to give way and providing queueing space is clearly needed for safety and to make the path attractive. This must be done if option 1 is to be implemented successfully.</p> <p>Signal phasing offering people on bicycles a quick crossing will be required at the transition of the median location to the side berm by the service lane at Hargood/Keighleys. This would also be a very easy spot to transition the shared path to the canal option.</p> <p>Another conflict point in the preferred option with grave safety concerns is just east of Raupo St. where the path is interrupted by a crossing from Linwood Ave to the Linwood Ave residential service lane. Cyclists are required to give way. It is not clear how queueing cars will be stopped from blocking the path. Fast traffic from Linwood could easily hit someone crossing despite their being cautious. Given the many concerns this should be dropped with the similar break at Wanstead Place being retained as the single entry/exit point. Queueing space for cars needs to be provided to slow cars down and to keep cars from stopping across the shared path. Having the shared path along the canal would eliminate these safety concerns and the expense created by the current proposal. Spokes notes that option 2 requires cars crossing the path to give way, this should be implemented for option 1.</p> <p>Where the shared path cuts back in at St Johns Street it makes most sense to move the cycle path to the canal location. This avoids pinch points such as the bus shelter by Kidbrooke.</p> <p>From Dyers Road on Spokes accepts the sea wall route while looking forward to improvements to the Charlesworth Reserve path to allow a 4m wide well-lit shared path for those who would prefer this.</p>

					Where the path comes to the Ferrymead shops signalise the first intersection (back driveway serving Mitre 10) to allow safe crossings. This allows easy flow from estuary path to shops. This is also required as the nearest other crossing point is at Tidal View. Lanes to the shared path and from the shared path to the destinations people need to reach.
84	Y				For alternative route against this reasons why: 1) The no parking along Southside of Inwood Ave between Gow Pl-Hargood St (p64-72). 2) The median strip central shared walk/cycleway (2 way) is better (p62-72) 3) Continuing the walk/cycleway over the other side of canal St Johns St-Humphreys Drive notes good as between Av and canal - safer for both sections as more useable for longer egg: summer-winter +/-day - night (p36 - 48 & 78-92). 4) Also don't think the path should go through the Reserves as they will be adversely affected by the making of the path and afterwards the continued foot/wheel traffic through the area - long term affecting the flora and fauna doing this - negatively impacting on it (p88-92). The Smith & Thomas/Hay St along to removal of the Ormandy Pl/Damien Pl one is good too (p20 & p64/P26). The Tilford St/MacGregor's Road is probably alright or could they be contained so two way - well marked etc. (p24 & p68). 6) Don't agree with installing a NO RIGHT turn from Humphreys Drive into shopping area (p94).
85				N	As a resident who lives along Linwood Ave between Hargood St and Gow Place I do not support the cycleway that has been proposed in this booklet only as I don't agree with removing the parking from outside our houses. A few reasons are: - There are a lot of households that park their vehicles outside of these dwellings. Not only occupants but visitors also. - My neighbours and I pull out of the live lane to the kerbside to back into our driveways, doing so in a live lane on Linwood Ave is extremely dangerous. - The opposite side has two different areas to park, one kerbside and the other island side. Wouldn't it make more sense to remove of these? - It's a noisy enough road as it is without pushing the traffic closer to our properties. - The Council have just paid to have our side re-asphalted and remarked. - The middle of Linwood Ave is by far big enough to house a shared roadway and still being far enough from traffic.
86			Y		Sheet 3 - General concern about consultation process. Established valuable trees will be compromised by roading over roofs and drainage changes. Much effort protecting these trees from drought damage was done by Council prior to EQ all to be undone now. I suggest 2 cycleways along the road beside grassed area, elevated to protect cyclists from cars as done outside bus exchange - does this work? Then cyclists are going with traffic direction, space can be taken from the wide pavement rarely used and grass berms on the left side of dual carriageway. Sheet 15-19 - 2.5m encroachment into estuary. Excessive loss of bird feeding area. Pied silts, gotwits, oyster catchers all feeding up to this edge and the coastal pathway is far too wide for numbers of people who really use it compared to wildlife habitat loss. The seawall was always like this NOT EQ damage especially. I suggest narrowing cycleway and roading in this area. Slower speeds would help (80km normal at present despite 70) easterly wind strong so cyclists vulnerable to being pushed into fast traffic and being on seaward side would make this worse. Cycleway stay on west side till sheet 20, then change over. Take space from west side of road not estuary. Huge environmental impact. Is this really going to be worth it? Most cyclists I know say they use Ferry Road so this is a recreational path not commuter route.



Response form

Rapanui – Shag Rock Cycleway – Puari ki Rapanui

Christchurch City Council is seeking your views on its plans for improved cycling facilities as part of the Rapanui – Shag Cycleway, one of a network of 13 planned Major Cycle Routes in the city.

Submissions must reach the Council before consultation closes at **5pm Thursday 15 December 2016**.

Please indicate your views by selecting one of the tick boxes below:

- ☐ I support Rapanui – Shag Rock Cycleway Preferred Route option
OR
☐ I support Rapanui – Shag Rock Cycleway Alternative Route option

☐ I generally support the Rapanui – Shag Rock Cycleway (Preferred Route) but have some concerns (please comment)
OR
☐ I generally support the Rapanui – Shag Rock (Alternative Route) but have some concerns (please comment)

☒ I do not support the Rapanui – Shag Rock Cycleway (please comment)

Please provide your feedback on Rapanui – Shag Rock Cycleway below
(and use additional paper if required):

Cyclists using cycleways is fine, but part of the plan are crap.
A very poorly researched documents, with no respect for past decisions, and ignoring the cycleways built by them. Do you even know they built a cycleway from Linwood/Hargood corner to Linwood Park and Aldwins Road? It is still in use, limited by ~~so~~ far having no connections. Do you understand that the corner Hargoods/Linwood/Keighleys is a very busy and poorly designed corner that fails to cope with traffic flows now, and has many accidents. Making right hand turns legally is almost impossible now. Putting a cycleway out into the centre is just madness. The closing of the small Uturns in the Avenue will increase the traffic by up to a thousand cars a day, and is probably illegal. Up to the Earthquakes there was a no u-turn sign there. Putting a cycleway down the centre of the Avenue is environmentally questionable. It will kill most of the daffodil fields and damage already endangered ~~offices~~. This area has lost too much green space since the earthquakes.

The area between Hargood and the Linwood Park has had cycleways for decades. Still well over half the cyclist do not use them. They ride on the footpaths mostly. Older people (and handicapped) are most upset by this as they expect walkers to get out of there way. I find the same with so called 'strand pathway'. They are unsafe for the elderly/infirm to walk on. Use the already made cycleway for the main cycleway. There will always be small numbers of cyclists using the Avenue going to the mall (Eastgate) the present cycleways will cope, if only people could be made to use them.

Thank you for taking the time to respond. Please include your contact details over the page.

Removing the Uturns in the Avenue is a NO, NO.

haveyoursay
www.ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay

Christchurch
City Council

