

**Feedback**

114170047968

<b>NAME:</b> Rod & Victoria Crone	<b>SUBURB:</b> Kaiwharawhara	<b>ON BEHALF OF:</b> An individual	<b>ORAL SUBMISSION</b> Yes
--	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------

## General feedback

How important is it to rebalance our existing street space to make it safer and easier for people to walk, ride, scooter, or use public transport?

**Moderate importance**

Which route proposal/s would you like to have your say on?

**Ngaio Connection**

**Ngaio connection**

**Do you support the overall proposed changes to the Ngaio Connection route?**

These include traffic resolution TR180-22

**Why do you think that?**

While we are retired we own hybrid e-bikes and regularly cycle on cycle lanes and purpose built trails, but avoid cycling on busy roads because of the risks (having also had a work colleague lose his life when hit by a car on SH3 near Horokiwi). Accordingly we support cycle lanes and associated changes provided they are proportionate to the needs and use patterns of cyclists, public transport and other users within the constraints of Wellington's very narrow and relatively hilly streets.

**Do you support the proposed speed changes on the Ngaio route?**

**Support**

Decision made by Waka Kotahi

**Do you support the proposed changes for this section of the route on Kaiwharawhara Road?**

**Strongly oppose**

**Do you have any comments to make about the proposed design?**

Please refer to attached submission. We support the proposal for a shared cyclist/bus clearway from 4pm to 7pm. Our observation is that most cyclists (probably over 95%) are commuter cyclists who bike to work 7am-9am in the morning and home again 4pm-7pm in the evening, while buses using Kaiwharawhara Road are relatively few and rarely affected by peak time traffic. Accordingly, at this point only a shared cyclist/bus clearway from 4pm-7pm makes sense. While the Multi Criteria Analysis gave a separated cycle lane the highest rating there was not a lot in it between Option 1 (morning peak shared bike/bus lane/clearway) and Option 3 (a separated cycle

lane). Until the Council, users and others affected by the changes can observe the success (or otherwise) of the 4pm-7pm clearway and obtain real information on actual usage patterns, we are strongly opposed to any decision at this point to default to implementing the proposed changes outlined for Stages 2 (2024) and/or 3 (2025). Removing carparks in Kaiwharawhara Road will only incentivise more people to park in Cameron Street, yet no useful analysis or evidence (other than the rating analysis based on assumptions) has been provided to justify the case for extending the clearway to 2pm-9pm in 2024, or to a separated cycle lane in 2025. The staged approach is proposed "to give residents and businesses time to adjust to the relocation and removal of carparks on one side of the road", relocated to where (Cameron Street??). All other off-road parking in the area is associated with businesses who presumably own or lease the parks, there are no public off-road parking areas. We are strongly of the view that additional restrictions beyond a 4pm-7pm clearway must be justified by a sound business/safety case which at this point has not been provided and cannot be provided until more information is available after the initial clearway is established and in use. Accordingly, it would be inappropriate for Council to support a default to Stages 2 and/or 3 until the business/safety case supported by evidence is prepared and consulted on.

**Do you support the proposed changes on this section on Cameron Street (between Kaiwharawhara Road and the Kaiwharawhara Bridle Path)?**

**Support**

**Do you have any comments to make about the proposed design?**

Please refer to attached submission. Although discussions with several cyclists suggests no cycle lane/shoulder is necessary, we are comfortable with a 0.75m wide cycle shoulder. There is a 15m section (around 3 carparks) between the entrance to 2 C

**Do you support the proposed changes for this section of the route on Ngaio Gorge Road?**

**Support**

**Do you have any comments to make about the proposed design?**

We support the proposal apart from painted sharrows on the downhill section which we consider are unnecessary and will be a hazard for cyclists in wet weather.

**Do you support the proposed changes for this section of the route on Kenya Street and Crofton Road?**

**Support**

**Do you have any comments to make about the proposed design?**

We support the proposal apart from painted sharrows on any non-cycle lane sections which are unnecessary and a hazard for cyclists in wet weather.

**What do you think of the timing of the proposed approach?**

**Make the proposed changes more slowly**

**Why do you think that?**

Please refer to our submission. We support the proposal for a shared cyclist/bus clearway from 4pm to 7pm, but not the proposed stages 2 and/or 3 without a more robust business case based on usage patterns after stage 1 is completed and in place for at least 12 months. Our observation is that most cyclists (probably over 95%) are commuter cyclists who bike to work 7am-9am in the

morning and home again 4pm-7pm in the evening, while buses using Kaiwharawhara Road are relatively few and rarely affected by peak time traffic. Accordingly, at this point only a shared cyclist/bus clearway from 4pm-7pm makes sense. While the Multi Criteria Analysis gave a separated cycle lane the highest rating there was not a lot in it between Option 1 (morning peak shared bike/bus lane/clearway) and Option 3 (a separated cycle lane). Until the Council, users and others affected by the changes can observe the success (or otherwise) of the 4pm-7pm clearway and obtain real information on actual usage patterns, we are strongly opposed to any decision at this point to default to implementing the proposed changes outlined for Stages 2 (2024) and/or 3 (2025). Removing carparks in Kaiwharawhara Road will only incentivise more people to park in Cameron Street, yet no useful analysis or evidence (other than the rating analysis based on assumptions) has been provided to justify the case for extending the clearway to 2pm-9pm in 2024, or to a separated cycle lane in 2025. The staged approach is proposed "to give residents and businesses time to adjust to the relocation and removal of carparks on one side of the road", relocated to where (Cameron Street??). All other off-road parking in the area is associated with businesses who presumably own or lease the parks, there are no public off-road parking areas. We are strongly of the view that additional restrictions beyond a 4pm-7pm clearway must be justified by a sound business/safety case which at this point has not been provided and cannot be provided until more information is available after the initial clearway is established and in use. Accordingly, it would be inappropriate for Council to support a default to Stages 2 and/or 3 until the business/safety case supported by evidence is prepared and consulted on.

# Submission on proposed changes affecting Cameron Street and Kaiwharawhara Road as part of the Ngaio Connections project

Submitter: Rod & Victoria Crone, [REDACTED]

9 November 2022

## General

Before retirement Rod used public transport every day to travel to and from work, and since retirement we both use buses whenever practical. We frequently cycle and walk the Hutt Road cycleway both as a cyclist and pedestrian, and regularly walk the Bridle Track.

Our home is located on the route of the proposed cycle shoulder in Cameron Street, and this has enabled us to directly observe the behaviours of cyclists and vehicles.

Accordingly, we consider we are in a very good position to contribute constructively to the conversation regarding the proposed cycling and pedestrian friendly changes, and parking changes, proposed by the Council for Cameron Street, Kaiwharawhara Road and the Bridle Track.

We are very supportive of cycle lanes and related changes to the transport infrastructure where they make sense and can be accommodated within the constraints of the Wellington environment (narrow streets, relatively hilly) without unnecessary disruption to businesses and the community affected by the cycling changes.

Within these constraints it is important to find the right balance between the interests of cyclists, public transport, businesses, commercial and private vehicle owners, and residents. Notwithstanding the trend towards more climate friendly transport solutions, it is inappropriate to categorise the future as a community that will be able to rely exclusively or even predominantly on public transport and cycling. The solutions chosen by the Council must consider the long-term (lifecycle) costs and benefits and be proportionate to the needs of all users and not just a small minority.

The following table sets out our comments on the key changes proposed for Cameron Street and Kaiwharawhara Road.

Proposed	Comments
<p><b>Cameron Street uphill cycle shoulder:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• “Multi Criteria Analysis” dated 23/6/22 describes preferred option as “buffered cycle lane”.</li><li>• In response to a request for clarification Jonathan Kennett confirmed that the Council is going to work with Waka Kotahi and trial a type of cycle lane that is often used in Europe, and plan to call it a “cycle shoulder” which would be about 1.0m wide with broken white line and green blocks. The intention is that cyclists know they should keep left going uphill, and that people driving know to look out for cyclists but can carefully pull over into the cycle shoulder if</li></ul>	<p>We note the “Project details” link has a picture which shows what was described by Jonathan but without any dimensions.</p> <p>In response to a request for clarification we now understand that the cycle shoulder will likely be 0.75m wide.</p> <p>Although discussions with several cyclists suggests no cycle lane/shoulder is necessary, we are comfortable with a 0.75m wide cycle shoulder.</p>

Proposed	Comments
they need to allow a vehicle coming downhill to pass.	
<p><b>Cameron Street uphill cycle shoulder - Vegetation to be cut back up to 2.2m high to improve visibility:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Cameron Street, General Arrangement Plan, Sheet 2” indicates that “Vegetation to be cut back up to 2.2m high to improve visibility”.</li> <li>• In response to a request for clarification in respect of how far the vegetation will be trimmed (kerb line or behind kerb line) Jonathan Kennett confirmed on 4/11/22 that the detail will be decided following advice from horticulture team, but happy to hear what residents would like. He imagines WCC will want to trim 0.5-1.0m from kerb line but will need to ensure it does not damage the shrubs.</li> </ul>	<p>We note that the vegetation was trimmed on Friday 4/11/22 to the kerb line.</p> <p>While we earlier suggested that the vegetation should be cut back to improve visibility, we were thinking that it should be cut back behind the kerb line sufficiently to allow for re-growth before re-trimming once vegetation encroaches on the road.</p> <p>We suggest vegetation should be trimmed to around 0.2-0.3m behind the kerb, and at a frequency to ensure it does not encroach on the road below 2.2m.</p>
<p><b>Proposal for cycle shoulder and downhill sharrows painted on Cameron Street</b></p>	<p>We are comfortable with painted sharrows on the uphill cycle shoulder.</p> <p>However, we do not agree with painted sharrows on the downhill section as they are unnecessary and will make it unsafe for cyclists when it is wet.</p>
<p><b>No Stopping Restriction (broken yellow lines) around the three corners between Cameron Street and the Bridle Track</b></p>	<p>We agree with the proposal to establish a No Stopping Restriction using broken yellow lines on the three corners between Cameron Street and the Bridle Track.</p>
<p><b>New Give Ways at bottom of Fore Street, Marsh Way, and intersection with Cameron Street</b></p>	<p>We are comfortable with the proposal for three new Give Ways to improve safety.</p>
<p><b>Signs directing cyclists to cross private property to access the Bridle Track from Cameron Street</b></p>	<p>This needs to be resolved.</p> <p>When the Council has been approached on multiple occasions to maintain the section of road between Cameron Street and the Bridle Track, including when Cameron Street was resealed last summer, the Council has maintained it is private property and not the responsibility of the Council.</p> <p>If the Council wants to direct cyclists to cross the private property, then it needs to find a solution acceptable to residents who have a direct interest in the private property and the associated easements for the purposes of right of way and services.</p> <p>Although we are not directly affected, we have suggested that the Council should consider taking ownership and maintenance responsibility, or maintenance responsibility, to gain the support of residents directly affected.</p>

Proposed	Comments
<p><b>Bridle Track:</b></p>	<p>Anybody who walks up or down the Bridle Track and encounters cyclists will know of the dangers.</p> <p>With the Council promoting greater use of the Bridle Track by cyclists, it must consider and implement improvements in the surface (widening, additional fencing, surface cleaning and maintenance) and signage to make the track safer for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Often when walking the Bridle Track we have been 'spooked' by cyclists without any warning, often going too fast.</p> <p>It is only a matter of time before there is a serious incident involving a cyclist or cyclist hitting a pedestrian.</p>
<p><b>Cameron Street parking restrictions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to parking restrictions on the downhill side resulting in a combination of P60, P120 and P24hr carparks</li> <li>• "Proposed roll out of changes" includes the words "39x P24-hr spaces except residents". In response to a request for clarification Jonathan confirmed that the "except residents" is an error and the website will be updated. If residents get annoyed with long-stay non-resident parking they can call WCC and get the cars ticketed and towed, but if no one calls WCC it is unlikely parking wardens will go to Cameron Street. Jonathan noted that residents did not want a residential parking scheme.</li> <li>• "Changes in response to stakeholder feedback" includes a bullet point "Removing two carparks at the bottom of Cameron Street to make it safer for everyone"</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to the 39x P24hr carparks we agree residents do not want a residential parking scheme, although we did suggest a "P24hr except residents" restriction may be useful (consistent with streets near the airport). In any event, we are comfortable with a P24hr restriction without an exception for residents on the basis we can call the Council and get cars ticketed and towed if we get annoyed with long stay parking by non-residents.</p> <p>Removing two carparks at the bottom of Cameron Street is not identified on the "Cameron Street, General Arrangement Plan, Sheet 2". We are strongly of the view that the P60 carparks (15m of carparking space, 3x carparks?) at the bottom of Cameron Street on the downhill section between the entrance to Te Rau Ora (2 Cameron Street) and the existing broken yellow lines connecting with Kaiwharawhara Road must be removed and converted to a 'No Stopping Restriction' with an extension of the broken yellow lines. This section of road is a hazard for cyclists and vehicles alike as downhill vehicles are forced over the centre line to the opposite side of the road causing many near misses.</p> <p>Finally, we note the parking analysis for Cameron Street has included private rights of way (Curnow Street, Sargeson Way, Marsh Way) and suggested they provide 41x unrestricted parking spaces for non-residents. The rights of way are private property and only property owners (or guests with their approval) may park in these rights of way.</p>
<p><b>Cameron Street change 50 km/hr to 30km/hr for safer speeds on Cameron Street</b></p>	<p>We agree this change makes sense.</p>

Proposed	Comments
<p><b>Kaiwharawhara Road uphill cycle lane proposal:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stage 1 (2023) - create a clearway 4pm-7pm in 2023</li> <li>• Stage 2 (2024) - extend clearway times to 2pm-9pm</li> <li>• Stage 3 (2025) – replacing clearways with a separated cycle lane</li> </ul>	<p>We support the proposal for a shared cyclist/bus clearway from 4pm to 7pm.</p> <p>Our observation is that most cyclists (probably over 95%) are commuter cyclists who bike to work 7am-9am in the morning and home again 4pm-7pm in the evening, while buses using Kaiwharawhara Road are relatively few and rarely affected by peak time traffic. Accordingly, at this point only a shared cyclist/bus clearway from 4pm-7pm makes sense.</p> <p>While the Multi Criteria Analysis gave a separated cycle lane the highest rating there was not a lot in it between Option 1 (morning peak shared bike/bus lane/clearway) and Option 3 (a separated cycle lane). Until the Council, users and others affected by the changes can observe the success (or otherwise) of the 4pm-7pm clearway and obtain real information on actual usage patterns, we are strongly opposed to any decision at this point to default to implementing the proposed changes outlined for Stages 2 (2024) and/or 3 (2025).</p> <p>Removing carparks in Kaiwharawhara Road will only incentivise more people to park in Cameron Street, yet no useful analysis or evidence (other than the rating analysis based on assumptions) has been provided to justify the case for extending the clearway to 2pm-9pm in 2024, or to a separated cycle lane in 2025.</p> <p>The staged approach is proposed “to give residents and businesses time to adjust to the relocation and removal of carparks on one side of the road”, relocated to where (Cameron Street??). All other off-road parking in the area is associated with businesses who presumably own or lease the parks, there are no public off-road parking areas.</p> <p>We are strongly of the view that additional restrictions beyond a 4pm-7pm clearway must be justified by a sound business/safety case which at this point has not been provided and cannot be provided until more information is available after the initial clearway is established and in use.</p> <p>Accordingly, it would be inappropriate for Council to support a default to Stages 2 and/or 3 until the business/safety case supported by evidence is prepared and consulted on.</p>

**Feedback**

114181205214

<b>NAME:</b> David Murphy	<b>SUBURB:</b> Kaiwharawhara	<b>ON BEHALF OF:</b> An individual	<b>ORAL SUBMISSION</b> Yes
---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------

## General feedback

How important is it to rebalance our existing street space to make it safer and easier for people to walk, ride, scooter, or use public transport?

**Low importance**

Which route proposal/s would you like to have your say on?

**Ngaio Connection**

**Ngaio connection**

**Do you support the overall proposed changes to the Ngaio Connection route?**  
These include traffic resolution TR180-22

**Why do you think that?**

Far too much ratepayers' money being spent on providing a luxury to the minority of Wellingtonians who are cyclists. This is not Amsterdam or Christchurch and cycling in our difficult topography with frequently inclement weather (I have noted how much the total on the cycle counter outside Spotlight falls off when it rains) will never be a general form of transport here. The Council's priorities should be housing the homeless and fixing the shameful state of the city's roads and pipes.

**Do you support the proposed speed changes on the Ngaio route?**

**Neutral**

Decision made by Waka Kotahi

**Do you support the proposed changes for this section of the route on Kaiwharawhara Road?**

**Oppose**

**Do you have any comments to make about the proposed design?**

"Give businesses time to adapt to the changes" sounds like Orwellian Newspeak for "give them time to shut up shop and find something else to do". While I do not have a business there and live only walking distance away, the 2 cafes we frequent on Kaiwharawhara Road will suffer such a loss of business they will be forced to close. One of them is a small family-owned cafe. The Council, by deleting carparks all over the business area seems to be determined to drive retail customers out of town to Petone and the Hutt, which is already happening. Also, while environmentalists promote electric vehicles, this plan seems to ignore the fact that they also need somewhere to park.



Do you support the proposed changes on this section on Cameron Street (between Kaiwharawhara Road and the Kaiwharawhara Bridle Path)?

**Strongly oppose**

Do you have any comments to make about the proposed design?

The proposed "cycle shoulder" and "sharrows" are largely a waste of paint and may be dangerously slippery in wet weather. A simple "watch for cyclists" sign at the bottom of Cameron Street should suffice as uphill cyclists are quite visible - a cycle sho

Do you support the proposed changes for this section of the route on Ngaio Gorge Road?

**Neutral**

Do you have any comments to make about the proposed design?

Do you support the proposed changes for this section of the route on Kenya Street and Crofton Road?

**Neutral**

Do you have any comments to make about the proposed design?

What do you think of the timing of the proposed approach?

**Don't know**

Why do you think that?

I don't know what "adapt to the change and consider other ways of using off-street parking" means. As commented above, I fear that the businesses will find that their custom will collapse and simply close.

MEMORANDUM OF EASEMENTS IN CROSS

SHOWN	SERV. TEN.	PURPOSE	GRANTEE
K	Lot 34	GAS	NOVARGAS LIMITED
Q	Lot 28		
V	Lot 29		
X	Lot 30		
Y	Lot 15		
Z	Lot 42		
AA	Lot 41		
AB	Lot 32		
M	Lot 36		
AC	Lot 37		
AD	Lot 38		
AE	Lot 40		

MEMORANDUM OF EASEMENTS IN CROSS

SHOWN	SERV. TEN.	PURPOSE	GRANTEE
K	Lot 34	ELECTRICITY	UNITEDNETWORKS LIMITED
Q	Lot 28		
V	Lot 29		
X	Lot 30		
Y	Lot 15		
Z	Lot 42		
AA	Lot 41		
AB	Lot 32		
M	Lot 36		
AC	Lot 37		
AD	Lot 38		
AE	Lot 40		
K	Lot 34	TELEPHONE	TELECOM NEW ZEALAND LIMITED
Q	Lot 28		
V	Lot 29		
X	Lot 30		
Y	Lot 15		
Z	Lot 42		
AA	Lot 41		
AB	Lot 32		
M	Lot 36		
AC	Lot 37		
AD	Lot 38		
AE	Lot 40		

MEMORANDUM OF EASEMENTS

SHOWN	SERV. TEN.	DOM. TEN.	PURPOSE
I	Lot 35	Lots 15-21, 25-30, 32-34	R.O.W.
K	Lot 34	Lots 15-21, 25-30, 32, 33, 35	ELECTRICITY
Q	Lot 28	Lots 15-21, 25-27, 29, 30, 33-35	WATER SUPPLY
V	Lot 29	Lots 15-21, 25-28, 30, 32-35	TELEPHONE
X	Lot 30	Lots 15-21, 25-29, 32-35	SEWAGE DRAINAGE
Y	Lot 15	Lots 15-21, 25-30, 32-42	WATER SUPPLY
Z	Lot 42	Lots 32, 33, 36-41	TELEPHONE
AA	Lot 41	Lots 32, 33, 36-40, 42	SEWAGE DRAINAGE
AB	Lot 32	Lots 33, 36-42	WATER SUPPLY
M	Lot 36	Lots 32, 33, 37-42	TELEPHONE
AC	Lot 37	Lots 32, 33, 36, 38-42	SEWAGE DRAINAGE
AD	Lot 38	Lots 32, 33, 36, 37, 39-42	WATER SUPPLY
AE	Lot 40	Lot 39	SEWAGE DRAINAGE
L	Lot 33	Lot 34, 36	ELECTRICITY
AF	Lot 42	Lot 40, 41	TELEPHONE

NOTE: FOR OTHER EASEMENT MEMORANDA SEE SHEETS 2 & 3

CLASS I SURVEY

Total Area 6.8780 ha

Comprised in 36D/522 (ALL), 10C/752/UM (BAL), 48C/526 (ALL), 48C/525 (ALL), 44A/185 (ALL), 44A/186 (ALL)

Robert Graham Longley

Being a person entitled to practise as a licensed cadastral surveyor, certify that:

(a) The surveys to which this document relates are accurate, and were undertaken by me or under my direction in accordance with the Cadastral Survey Act 2002 and the Surveyor-General's Rules for Cadastral Survey 2002;

(b) This document is accurate, and has been created in accordance with that Act and those Rules.

Dated at Christchurch this 28th day of March 2003

For Seal: [Signature]

Reference Plans: DP's 1148, 1150, 2083, 2084, 2087, 2076, 3208, 3272, 3287, 3423, 3428, 37, 5047, 4, 8, 105, 1240, 3055, 504, 17417, 17508, 23818, 27708, 27862, 27966, 30638, 33125, 34778, 24518, 38720

Approved as to Survey [Signature]

Approved Surveyor [Signature]

Deposited this ... day of ... 2003 for Registrar-General of Land

File: Harbourside Stage 1 Received: 17 Oct 03 DP 321404



MEMORANDUM OF EASEMENTS IN CROSS

SHOWN	SERV. TEN.	PURPOSE	GRANTEE
K	Lot 34	WATER SUPPLY	Wellington City Council
Q	Lot 28		
V	Lot 29		
X	Lot 30		
Y	Lot 15		
Z	Lot 42		
AA	Lot 41		
AB	Lot 32		
M	Lot 36		
AC	Lot 37		
AD	Lot 38		
AE	Lot 40		
Z	Lot 42	R.O.W.	

LAND DISTRICT WELLINGTON  
 SURVEY BLK. & DIST. VII PORT NICHOLSON  
 NZMS 261 SHT R.27 RECORD MAP No 20.23 21.23 20.24 21.23

LOTS 1-42, 106-111, 114-116, 119-121, 123-125 BEING SUBDIVISION OF LOTS 9-12 DP1149, Pts SEC 3 and SEC's 118 & 166 HARBOUR DIST and SEC 1 SO 36720

TERRITORIAL AUTHORITY WELLINGTON CITY  
 Surveyed by Pritchard Group Limited  
 Scale 1:400 Date August 2002 - February 2003

