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Executive summary

As part of the continuing upgrade of the Golden Mile, Lower Cuba Street was upgraded to a ‘shared space’ in 2011. Shared spaces are areas shared by pedestrian and vehicles and give pedestrians right of way. They rely on ambiguity to give a heightened state of awareness and to regulate vehicle behaviour.

To evaluate the success of the project, several activities were undertaken including a visual analysis, intercept surveying, behavioural observation, interviews with tenants, analysis of retail transaction data and pedestrian counts.

Findings showed that the space has some elements of a successful shared space and works moderately well. Economic performance has improved, tenancies have increased in volume and quality and user perception is good. Data limitations mean it is unclear as to whether pedestrian usage has increased.

Visual analysis of the space showed that several elements take away from the ‘shared space’ aspect of the street, including parking and other design elements, which frame the street and give visual cues more akin to a regular city street. This flowed through into pedestrian behaviour where only a minority of street users used the centre of the street for pedestrian purposes.

Recommendations are designed to be considered for future shared space projects and include considerations around the removal or reduction of parking, changing design elements and strengthening the shared space concept in future designs.

Introduction

Over the past decade, Wellington City Council has been undertaking an upgrade of the ‘Golden Mile’ - the stretch of road between the Beehive and Kent Terrace, incorporating Lambton Quay, Willis Street, Manners Street and Courtenay Place. As part of the upgrade, buses were re-routed along Manners Street (previously a pedestrian space) in 2010. To ameliorate this loss of public space, an upgrade of Lower Cuba Street was undertaken and completed in October 2011.

A key goal of the upgrade was to create a ‘shared space’ – a public space with a high level of amenity where pedestrians had the right of way over vehicles.

What is a shared space?

‘Shared space’ is an urban design approach which seeks to reduce vehicle dominance and create pedestrian friendly environments. Such spaces have been created worldwide in several different jurisdictions and rely on the principle of ambiguity to lower vehicle speeds and enable better sharing of spaces.

This is done in several ways including removing demarcations between road and footpath – this increases uncertainty and is designed so motorists reduce their speed.

The theory suggests that by creating a greater sense of uncertainty and making it unclear who had right of way, drivers reduce their speed, and everyone increases their levels of awareness. Rather than restricting or not allowing vehicles, design features encourage low speeds.
The upgraded Lower Cuba Street has the following features:

- It is a slow-speed area where drivers and cyclists must give way to pedestrians.
- Vehicle and cycle access is one-way - from Manners Street to Wakefield Street.
- Drivers and cyclists must give way to pedestrians.
- The speed limit is 10 km/h.
- Two-hour parallel parking replaces angle parking.
- The wide areas next to the shops are for pedestrians only.
- The design extends the ‘feel’ from Cuba Mall to reinforce the pedestrian link to Civic Square
- The space is flexible so it can be closed to traffic and used for special events like the Cuba Street Carnival.

This document

This document presents the result of an outcomes evaluation of Lower Cuba Street against a set of project objectives. Where possible, we examine the observed changes between pre and post implementation of the upgrade.

Project objectives and evaluation questions

The project objectives (drawn from a number of planning and governance documents) were:

- Create a safe ‘shared space’ environment that gives high priority to pedestrians.
- Increase pedestrian usage of the area
- Increase the economic viability and diversity of the street.
- Encourage and increase recreational use of the street area.
- Reduce the speed of vehicles using the street.

In order to evaluate the project against these stated objectives, this report will address the following evaluation questions:

1. Has the upgrade resulted in a change of perception of the space?
2. Does lower Cuba Street have the elements of an effective shared space?
3. Do pedestrians believe they have priority, and is this evidenced through behaviour?
4. Has the speed of vehicles using the street been decreased?
5. Has pedestrian usage of the area increased and are people using the area to recreate in?
6. Has the economic viability of the area been improved?
7. Are retailers performing better than prior to the upgrade, and in comparison to the rest of the city?
8. Has the mix of businesses changed and if so, how?
Evaluation activities

To answer the evaluation questions and assess the project outcomes against the stated objectives, the following activities were undertaken:

- Pre and post upgrade visual surveys of tenancies
- Pre and post upgrade pedestrian counts
- Post-upgrade interviews with selected tenants
- Post upgrade survey of street users
- Post upgrade behavioural analysis of pedestrian and vehicle behaviour
Q1) Has the upgrade resulted in a change of perception of the space?

Pedestrian survey
An intercept survey was conducted of pedestrians and other users of the street in late 2012. The survey asked participants about their impressions of the street, their usage patterns and their general feedback on the upgrade.

Overall knowledge and impressions

Awareness of the upgrade: 79% of users were aware the space had been upgraded.

Has upgrade changed users impressions? 70% believe that Lower Cuba is better than it used to be. 71% said the upgrade has changed the way they use or think about the space. Those that answered ‘yes’ were asked how. These unprompted answers were categorised and are presented below:

![How has the upgrade changed the way you think about or use Lower Cuba Street? - Comment theme](Image)

Representative responses for each of the categories are as follows:

Improved appeal/ attractiveness: 62%

“Vast improvement, very pleasant”
“Nice place to go”
“Nicer, think it’s more accommodating”
“A lot nicer, more classy. I spend more time here now”

Improved pedestrian amenity: 34%

“Love that there are no buses, easier to walk up and down, more relaxed”
“Choose to walk this way now it’s nicer”
“Much more pleasant to walk in”
“Better, not so many cars, more pedestrian friendly”
Improved public space: 20%

“Vast improvement, it offers opportunities for events, provides great event space”
“Nicer, think it’s more accommodating”
“A lot nicer, more classy. I spend more time here now”
“Places to sit, nicer”

Safer 14%

“Open and looks safe”
“Seems more safe than before”

Missed opportunity : 5%

“Disappointed that isn’t just for pedestrians, but I do like it”
“Hoping it would be more of a pedestrian space. Fewer cars would be better”
“Yes but I think it was a missed opportunity to make it a pedestrian space”

Other impressions

We also asked about users’ agreement with a set of statements regarding impressions of the space – while these offer no ‘before and after’ picture, the help understand the current impressions held of the space by users. They were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cuba Street is easy to get to and around</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cuba street is a good place for pedestrians</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cuba street feels safe</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cuba street is better than it used to be</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cuba Street has a good range of shops and services</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy spending time on Lower Cuba Street</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion: Has the upgrade resulted in a change of perception of the space?

*Overall impressions of the upgrade are generally positive. There is clear evidence that the upgrade has changed the impression and usage of the street for the majority of users, the vast majority of which see it as a positive thing.*
Q2) Does lower Cuba Street have the elements of an effective shared space?

Visual analysis

To inform this question, a useful approach is to compare Lower Cuba Street with other successful shared spaces. Ready examples exist in the new shared space developments undertaken in Auckland. These spaces had similar objectives to Lower Cuba Street and as such make a useful comparison to look at other information from this evaluation in context. One important difference to note when undertaking this comparison is that the Auckland shared spaces have little parking - only loading zones are incorporated into these designs.
Key differences

Framing elements: The most striking difference between the Auckland examples and Lower Cuba Street is the elements that strongly frame Lower Cuba into the centre and the peripheral areas. This framing occurs through the use and placement of several elements:

- The provision of car parking in the ‘expected’ place, forming a near continuous line of parked cars framing the street centre (the strongest element).
- The placement of the rain gardens (planting areas) and trees.
- The change in surface treatment (pavers in places at the street edge and asphalt in the street centre).
- Alignment of the concrete seating and other street furniture.
This framing has a strong negative impact on the key element that shapes behaviour in a shared space – ambiguity. Instead of ambiguity, the elements highlighted above encourage the perception of ‘spaces for purposes’. That is; the street centre being for vehicles and the edge for pedestrians.

In contrasting Lower Cuba Street with the Auckland spaces, we see a much more ambiguous set of cues in the Auckland examples. The principle of uncertainty has been used better in these contexts, and the same framing noted in Lower Cuba Street is conspicuously absent.

A fair comparison?

A reasonable perspective to take here is that a direct comparison is not really a fair one. The Auckland spaces had the luxury of a larger budget which enabled a universal (and relatively expensive) surface treatment. They also did not incorporate parking. These two differences certainly do make a difference, but it is possible that any future implementations of shared space could be improved, even with these constraints.

In answering the next evaluation question (Q3: Do pedestrians believe they have priority, and is this evidenced through behaviour?) we see what may be the impact of this strongly framed design, primarily in the behaviour of pedestrians using the space.

See the conclusions and recommendations section for comments and suggestions of improvements going forward.
Q3) Do pedestrians believe they have priority, and is this evidenced through behaviour?

A well functioning shared space should see the pedestrian taking precedence or at least, pedestrians and vehicles sharing the space equally. To this end, we conducted a series of activities to quantify how pedestrians and vehicles behaved on the street.

**Pedestrian versus vehicle priority**

We asked pedestrians to state their impressions of what types of user the street (when considered as a whole) was primarily designed for. The results are in the figure below.

In these results we see that the intention of the shared space concept is reflected in user perceptions. However the picture becomes a little different when we dig further.

**Pedestrian vs vehicle priority – a further analysis of street zones.**

To further dig into users perceptions around the nature of the interaction between vehicles and pedestrians, we used visual materials to divide the street into zones. (See Fig 3 below)
A well functioning shared space should see the pedestrian taking precedence or at least, pedestrians and vehicles sharing the space equally. To this end, we asked pedestrians about who they felt had priority in each of the two zones. The most interesting findings are observed when asking about the centre of the street. Results for the street centre (Zone A) are presented below.

We can see here that there is still a wide perception among users that the street centre is primarily a vehicle space. Only a third of respondents see the centre as a true shared space where there is either parity between pedestrians and vehicles, or priority for pedestrians.
As a follow up question, we also asked what areas of the street people would be ‘happy’ walking in: The street centre (zone A), the periphery (zone B), or both. While this is less of an exact measure, it sheds light on pedestrians’ impressions and therefore behaviour in the space.

Most (58%) said that zone B (the ‘footpath’) only. 42% said they would be happy walking in all areas of the street. Unsurprisingly, no respondents said they would be most happy in Zone A (the street centre). Again we see that majority of pedestrians don’t see the whole street as a place where pedestrians have priority or parity.

**Observation of pedestrian patterns**

Behavioural observations of actual street movement were undertaken over three days around the lunchtime peak. The observations broke pedestrian behaviour into 3 categories:

**Street crossers**: Those that wanted to gain the other side of the street but treated the centre area as a vehicle dominant space and crossed it in the same manner as a normal street. They either took a direct route across the street or a slight diagonal.

**Centre occupiers**: These pedestrians used the centre area in much the same way as a footpath would be used. They also may have been crossing the road but did not take a route that minimised the time they spent in the centre area. – in short they used the shared centre space as it was designed to be used.

**All other pedestrians**: Pedestrians who used the sides of the street reserved for pedestrians only – they did not cross or use the street centre at all.

The following figures show some typical behaviour in each of the tree categories.
Figure 6: The pedestrians on the left are using the centre of the street to transit – classified as ‘centre-occupiers’. Most pedestrians used the street sides only – as seen on the right of the image.

Figure 7: A ‘street crosser’ seen on the left takes a slightly diagonal route but minimises their time in the middle of the street. The pedestrian on the right is a ‘centre occupier’, and walked the length of the street down the centre.

All pedestrians were classified in one of the above categories and the counts are presented below in Figure 8.
As we can see, centre occupiers are relatively rare. Most pedestrians used the street sides only. ‘Road crossers’ had a clear opportunity to use the centre space (as they transited it while crossing it anyway) but did not. Road crossers outnumbered centre occupiers by a ratio of around 3:1. All pedestrians outnumbered centre occupiers by 17:1.

**Summary: Do pedestrians believe they have priority, and is this evidenced through behaviour?**

Pedestrians generally feel that the street as a whole is pedestrian friendly. However, closer analysis reveals a reluctance to use the street centre and a belief that the street centre is primarily for vehicles. This finding is backed up by direct observation – the majority of behaviour on Lower Cuba Street is similar to what we might see on a standard city street.

While few users pedestrians use the centre of the street as a pedestrian area, those that did showed that to an extent the ideas of that shared space has been taken on board by some.

Overall, the space is only partially functioning as a true shared space, but there are indications that some users understand the concept and use the space as such.

**Q4) Has the speed of vehicles using the street been decreased?**

**Vehicle speed and behaviour**

Direct measurement of vehicle speeds was not undertaken, but all vehicles observed transiting the space were scored as their speed being reasonable or excessive. 83% of vehicle speeds were judged to be reasonable and 17% were excessive. This judgement was undertaken in the context of observation happening during a busy lunchtime peak with large numbers of pedestrians in the space.

All observed vehicle speeds were far under the old speed limit of 50 Km/hr.
Q5) Has pedestrian usage of the area increased and are people using the area to recreate in?

53% of street users said they use the space weekly or more often, as opposed to 46% prior to the upgrade – an increase of 7%.

Pedestrian usage

To understand the impact of the upgrade of pedestrian density, we undertook point-in-time pedestrian counts before and after the upgrade. These counts were undertaken in September 2010 and in October 2012. The following issues with the data need to be taken into account when considering the data we present:

### Pedestrian counts – issues to note

Pedestrian counts can provide valuable insights into the performance of a street but the approach we currently take is limited in its ability to identify meaningful change due to a number of issues.

**Counts taken over a short period of time:** Manual counts are currently taken over a period of a few days. This means that periods that are counted can be unduly affected by weather and other factors such as events or a cruise ship in port.

**All pedestrians are not equal:** Our current approach to counts treats all movements past a specified point as one pedestrian. This fails to account for multiple movements of a single person, and does not delineate different forms of behaviour such as lingering or the presence of service persons such as couriers.

For this reason, our current approach to pedestrian counts is useful to uncover long term trends when multiple data points are available but is far more limited as shedding light over shorter periods. See recommendations for further discussion of pedestrian counts and suggested approaches for the future.

### Before and after pedestrian counts analysis

Pedestrian counts were undertaken by Traffic Design Group over three days in September 2010 and again in October 2012.

A limiting factor in this analysis is that significantly different weather conditions were experienced in 2012 from those experienced during the counts in 2010 (the weather was more inclement for the more recent counts). There was also a significant change of use in the street in that Lower Cuba Street was a major bus stop that generated significant pedestrian movements prior to the upgrade. This stop has now been moved out of Lower Cuba Street to the far side of Manners Street.

With these caveats in mind, the broad results are as follows:

- Overall counted volumes decreased 8% from 2010 to 2012.
- Morning and evening counts at both time periods had similar weather, and showed a 5% increase (morning) and a 1% increase (evening) from 2010 to 2012.
- Night counts (7-9pm) dropped considerably (by 26%) but the 2012 count had considerably worse weather than the 2010 count.
- Saturday (10am-midday) counts dropped by 8%, with more inclement weather noted in the 2012 count.
**Analysis of street sides**

The east side of lower Cuba was the one that hosted the bus stop. To attempt to control for the effect the closure of this may have had on total counts, we looked at foot traffic on the west (no bus stop) side of the street only. While still being an approximation, footfall on this side of the street should have been less affected the change in use. Results showed that:

- Overall, footfall on the west side of the street increased between the 2010 and 2012 counts by 6%.
- The increase was greatest during the morning and evening peaks.
- The east (former bus stop) side of the street showed a significant reduction in footfall over the two counts – a total reduction of 15%.

It seems reasonable to assume that the change in use has had a considerable impact of pedestrian counts over the two recorded periods. The side that lost the bus stop showed a significant decrease while the ‘unaffected’ (west) side showed a modest increase. It is also worth noting that the drop in footfall on the east side of the street is greater that the total noted reduction for the street as a whole.

**Recreation in the space**

41% of users agreed with the statement: “Lower Cuba Street is a good place to linger or hang out”.

Observations were undertaken of pedestrian and other user behaviour post-upgrade. This included the counting frequencies of people using the area to recreate in, and observing their behaviour patterns.

**Pedestrians: Transiting and lingering.**

The majority of observed street users were using the street to transit through or were accessing shops and services on the street. A minority, however, were lingering in the street area engaging in activities such as meeting friends or eating lunch. This type of behaviour was noted and frequencies noted.

Over the three lunchtime periods, 126 people were observed using the street as a recreational space. This compares with around 2,500 pedestrians noted in total. Most of these people were using the area in and around the new concrete seating in the middle of the street. Due to a lack of pre-upgrade measurement, it is impossible to say whether this is an increase on levels seen before the upgrade.

**Central seating area: Some issues**

The majority of recreating behaviour was seen around this new seating but observation also revealed some issues with the seating that may impact on it’s usefulness as a recreational space.

People who wish to spend time with another on the seating must sit side by side (which may not be desirable for them) or sit on two separate seats that face each other. Groups of people sitting on seats facing each other are spaced far enough apart as to make it difficult to easily converse and this affects the ‘intimacy’ of the interaction. In many ways, these issues mean that the concrete seating arrangement as it stands may not be a desirable space for groups of people to meet and spend time. Reconfiguration of this movable seating may improve the space as a place to spend leisure time in.
Summary: pedestrian and recreational use of the space:

In terms of pedestrian density, the data we have used presents a somewhat blurry picture. In seeing an overall reduction in pedestrian counts, weather conditions and change of use appeared to have played a significant part. The most comparable data (which had similar weather, day of the week and time) showed a modest increase in numbers. Likewise, when compared with 2010 data, the change of use (removal of bus stop) seems to have had a significant effect, accounting for more variation than seen across the street as a whole. While it is problematic to say that the data present a positive picture, the reduction noted in the overall raw count seems to have reasonable explanations.

A lack of data around recreating in the space prior to the upgrade also limits our ability to make good conclusions. However, the space is being used and some modest improvements to the seating may enable an increase in usage.
Q6) Is economic activity better than prior to the upgrade in comparison to the rest of the city?

Merchant performance

In order to ascertain the effect of the upgrade on the economic viability of the street, a representative sample of Eftpos spend data was obtained for the businesses on the street and for a comparison sample in the Wellington CBD.

In order to make the data sources readable and comparable, data was totalled on a rolling year basis and indexed to be equal as of September 2010. It is worth noting, that while this data treatment enabled good comparison, it gives the effect of a time lag in the data.

The results are presented below in Figure 9.

![Figure 9: Relative performance of merchants on Lower Cuba Street compared to a CBD-wide sample.](image)

As can be seen, from the time the bus stop on Lower Cuba Street was closed to make way for the upgrade, merchant performance dipped below the comparison sample. This trend continued after the project broke ground and right through to project completion. This decrease is reasonably significant and was presumably due to the disruption caused the works and the lesser footfall due to the bus stop closure. This downward trend was reversed once the project was completed and a relative improvement in transactions has been continuous since that time, recently eclipsing the CBD sample.

Currently, Lower Cuba Street is performing 1.4% above 2010 levels and 5.9% above the CBD comparison sample.
Q7) Has the mix of businesses changed and if so, how?

Tenancy assessment

An assessment of tenancies was carried out before (in October 2010) and after the upgrade (in December 2012).

There has been some change in the street, with the general trend being to higher end businesses.

Two low end businesses – Cash Converters and Downtown Local Bar and Café have left the street. Also, one high end designer shop has left along with a computer game retailer.

Two new major tenants are now present on the street: the combined Le Cordon Bleu / Weltec Cuisine School and the Rockshop.

In addition, there are two new beauty businesses (nails and makeup). There is one vacant space on the street – a ground floor site in the Le Cordon Bleu School building. This compares to a large vacant street frontage (the site of the former food court) and a site adjacent to Cheapskates. Thus, there has been an overall net gain in active street frontage.

Several retailers we spoke to indicated that the street is still ‘settling’ and finding its niche post upgrade, so it may be useful to re-assess this analysis in a year or two.

Figure 10: Cuba Street prior to the upgrade. Cheapskates in the foreground neighboured by a vacant space and the Downtown Local Bar and Café. Source: Google Streetview.
Q8) Has the economic viability of the area been improved?

Retailer interviews

To further understand the economic performance of the street, we spoke with retailers and other tenants. We spoke with three retailers and a service sector tenant. Two tenants had been there since before the upgrade, and two had begun trading either during the project or soon after its conclusion.

Overall, tenants were positive about the outcome of the upgrade on their businesses and their prospects looking forward, but were generally not yet ready to say the project had been a resounding success. A large qualifying factor for the two long term tenants was the effects the works had on their business and that they were still in a state of recovery. This theme was by far the most dominant one noted in the retailer interviews, and in some ways took the focus away from the outcomes of the project. Implementation issues are outside the scope of this evaluation but there may be lessons to be learnt in this space with respect to the impact Council projects have on surrounding businesses.

Tenants were generally positive about the outcome from an aesthetic point of view:

“It feels more sunny – it’s opened up a bit. I guess having the trees there.”

Some felt that the enhanced environment is probably attracting more business. One tenant stated:

“It’s hard to pin down the reasons we’re doing better but the space has probably got something to do with it.”

This improvement was noted by another tenant, but they felt that this improvement was due to cessation of work on the street:

“We struggled a lot during that period – it’s great that it’s over now but it really hurt us.”

More than one tenant alluded to the fact the street is still settling, but continues to find a niche. One apparel retailer stated:
“Us and (another fashion retailer) and so forth do get a lot of the same customers. — I feel like it might evolve a bit more as well. There is a wee cluster emerging.”

All retailers noted that the quality on tenancies were generally improving and held a reasonably bright outlook for the future of their businesses and the street.

**Summary – economic performance**

There is clear evidence of enhanced performance of the street from an economic perspective.

Transaction volumes have improved, despite the impact of the works themselves. They also compare favourably with the comparison sample over the same period.

There is also some evidence of Lower Cuba street being a more viable and desirable place for higher end businesses. This picture will evolve over time and it may be useful to reassess the street again in a year or two to monitor this change.
Other issues and findings

Implementation: disruption to businesses and communication

Retailer interviews revealed a strong theme of significant disruption to businesses caused by the works on Lower Cuba Street. Retailers cited noise, impeded access and reduction in customer footfall as big issues. This is backed up by the economic data which shows a 15% drop in transaction values over the period of the works. Interviewees also cited issues with communication from contractors and the Council about what to expect.

The scope of this work meant that these themes were not explored in detail, but we recommend that there is value in looking at this issue in more detail.

Accessibility issues

Throughout the evaluation process, issues have been raised regarding accessibility issues on the upgraded street, particularly with respect to persons with disabilities. These issues lay outside the scope of the stated objectives of the upgrade, and evaluation questions that stemmed from these objectives. While these issues are being dealt with, we recommend that due consideration be given in design and implementation and regular communication be undertaken with concerned parties and groups.
Conclusions

In regarding the upgrade of lower Cuba Street from its previous state, we are seeing several positives. Economic activity has recovered and is improving; tenancy is improving both in terms of density as well as quality; and users are generally happy and positive about the space. There is less certainty around the volume of pedestrians using the space and whether it is functioning well as a recreational space.

However, if we are regarding the success of Lower Cuba Street against the primary objective of creating a functional shared space, we are seeing evidence of a partial success only. The concept shows potential and could potentially work very well in the Wellington context, however, the main issue stopping a more successful public space are the compromises made during the design phase.

The success of shared spaces in other New Zealand contexts as well as internationally relies on ambiguity. Our visual analysis shows that this is not a strong point of the Lower Cuba design. Instead there is strong framing of the different areas of the street, implying ‘spaces for purposes’, rather than a truly open and shared space. This framing appears to be materially affecting the way that people interact with the street. Most pedestrians are generally treating the space similarly to a city street (albeit one with a low traffic volume) and users who use the space as intended are a definite minority.

We are proposing a set of recommendations for consideration for lower Cuba Street particularly as well as for future shared space projects. Implementation of these recommendations is likely to enhance the functioning of Lower Cuba Street as well as enhance the prospects of success in any future shared space projects.

Recommendations

Concept and design

- The possibility of more shared spaces in Wellington should be closely examined. The concept is a good fit for the city and its people. The likelihood of success, if well designed and implemented, is high.

- Creation of shared spaces in the future needs to be bolder and stronger, adhering closer to the principles that have made them successful elsewhere. The principle of ambiguity should be a guiding one.

- Including elements that strengthen the framing of the street into differentiated areas should be actively avoided. The provision of car parking is a case in point, and careful thought should be given to negative effect of parking to a shared space.

- Surface treatments should be continuous from side to side. If there are budgetary limitations, surface treatments can be varied, but this should result in ‘banding’ effect as travel down the street is undertaken. The principle of ambiguity between the street edge and the street centre is the important factor here.

- Care should be taken that other street elements have a minimal ‘framing’ effect, and do not interfere with the edge to edge ambiguity of the space.

Implementation

- Consideration should be given to realigning the concrete seating, to both make it a more ‘social’ space, and possibly to break up the framing effect referred to above.
Objectives and Evaluation

- Care should be taken that a clear set of measurable objectives are set in place as part of the project scoping. These objectives should form the heart of a cohesive evaluation plan.

- Care should be taken that adequate pre-measurement around all of the project objectives is budgeted for and undertaken.

- Consideration should be given to a change in technique for measuring pedestrian density. In general, point-in-time counts are of limited use for the evaluation of interventions in the city. A move to a more continuous measurement regime is recommended.
Appendix 1: Lower Cuba Street intercept survey

Hi There. I’m doing a quick survey on behalf of the Wellington City Council about this area. Do you have a few minutes to spare?

My name’s __________. Just before we start, I want to let you know that your answers are anonymous and you can refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to.

1) About how often are you on Lower Cuba Street? (indicate area)

Read options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily or more</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around Weekly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between once a week and once a month</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First time here</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Are you passing through Lower Cuba or will you spend some time here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passing through/transiting</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May/ intend to Browse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific destination on Lower Cuba street</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref/DK</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2B) If passing/transiting : Why did you choose to come this way?

3) Are you aware that this area has recently been upgraded?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/ Ref</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3B) If yes: How often did you use this space prior to the upgrade?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily or more</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around Weekly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between once a week and once a month</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3C) If yes: Has the upgrade changes the way you use or think about the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes – probe “tell me a bit about that”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/Ref</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) I’m going to read out some statements and I’d like you to tell me how much you agree with them using these (present card) options.

Just choose the response that most closely matches what you think. Just read out the number that corresponds to the response that most closely matches what you think.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cuba street feels safe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cuba street is a good place for pedestrians</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cuba street is a good place to linger or ‘hang out’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cuba Street is easy to get to and around</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy spending time on Lower Cuba Street</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cuba Street has a good range of shops and services</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cuba street is better than it used to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) Take a look at this card (present card). It shows parts of the area marked A and B.

Which areas would you be happy walking down? Area A, B or both?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) How would you classify Area (A)? (read out options)

| Made for pedestrians only | 1 |
| Made mainly for pedestrians | 2 |
| Made for pedestrians and vehicles equally | 3 |
| Made mainly for vehicles | 4 |
| Made for vehicles only | 5 |
| Don’t now/ ref | 6 |

7) Would you feel safe walking down the street in area A?

| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |
| DK/Ref | 3 |

Why / why not?

Take back card

8) When you think about the street as a whole, how would you classify it

| Made for pedestrians only | 1 |
| Made mainly for pedestrians | 2 |
| Made for pedestrians and vehicles equally | 3 |
| Made mainly for vehicles | 4 |
| Made for vehicles only | 5 |
| Don’t now/ ref | 6 |

Lower Cuba street is designed as a shared space, where vehicles give way to pedestrians.

9a) Were you aware of this?

| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |
| DK/Ref | 3 |
9b) Does lower Cuba street feel like a shared space to you?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/Ref</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If yes or no: why do you say that?*

9c) In your experience, do vehicles give way to pedestrians here?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/Ref</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) Just a bit about you now. What is your age bracket?  
| 17 and Under | 1 |
| 18-29 | 2 |
| 30-39 | 3 |
| 40-49 | 4 |
| 50-59 | 5 |
| 60+ | 6 |
| REF | 7 |

**DO NOT ASK**  
**Code Gender**  
| M | 1 |
| F | 2 |

11) Do you live in Wellington City? *(If Yes)* What suburb do you live in?  
| Not Wellington City | |
| Suburb | |

Any other comments about Lower Cuba street or the upgrade?  

Thanks for your time today – we really appreciate your thoughts