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Strategic Framework

The Council’s Vision – Christchurch is a city of opportunity for all.
Open to new ideas, new people and new ways of doing things – a city where anything is possible.

Whiria ngā whenu o ngā papa
Honoa ki te mau rua tāukiuki
Bind together the strands of each mat
And join together with the seams of respect
and reciprocity.

The partnership with Papatipu Rūnanga
reflects mutual understanding and respect,
and a goal of improving the economic,
cultural, environmental and social
wellbeing for all.

Overarching Principle
Partnership - Our
people are our taonga
– to be treasured and
encouraged. By working
together we can create
a city that uses their
skill and talent, where
we can all participate,
and be valued.

Supporting Principles
Accountability
Affordability
Agility
Equity
Innovation

Collaboration
Prudent Financial
Management
Stewardship
Wellbeing and
resilience
Trust

Community Outcomes
What we want to achieve together as our city evolves

Strong communities
Strong sense of
community
Active participation in
civic life
Safe and healthy
communities
Celebration of our
identity through arts,
culture, heritage and
sport
Valuing the voices of
children and young
people

Liveable city
Vibrant and thriving
central city, suburban
and rural centres
A well connected and
accessible city
Sufficient supply of, and
access to, a range of
housing
21st century garden city
we are proud to live in

Healthy environment
Healthy waterways
High quality drinking
water
Unique landscapes and
indigenous biodiversity
are valued
Sustainable use of
resources

Prosperous economy
Great place for people,
business and investment
An inclusive, equitable
economy with broad-
based prosperity for all
A productive, adaptive
and resilient economic
base
Modern and robust
city infrastructure and
community facilities

Strategic Priorities
Our focus for improvement over the next three years and beyond

Enabling active citizenship and connected
communities

Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant,
prosperous and sustainable 21st century city

Climate change
leadership

Informed and proactive
approaches to natural
hazard risks

Increasing active, public
and shared transport
opportunities and use

Safe and sustainable
water supply and
improved waterways
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1. **Apologies**  
   At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. **Election of a Chairperson**  
   At the start of the meeting a Chairperson will be elected.

3. **Declarations of Interest**  
   Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant and to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.
4. High Street (Cashel - St Asaph) and Tram Extension - High Street

Reference: 19/609800

Presenter(s): Neil Gillon – Senior Project Manager, Transport
Bill Homewood – Traffic Engineer (Investigation and Design)
Lynette Ellis – Manager Planning and Delivery, Transport

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise the Hearings Panel about the community consultation process to date and to inform it of the preferred option before it considers the views of submitters both oral and written. The report also requests that the Panel makes a recommendation to the Council that the Council approve the preferred option. This includes the length of High Street between Cashel Street and St Asaph Street, the length of Cashel Street between High Street and Manchester Street and the extension of the tram route from the High Street / Lichfield Street intersection, as shown in Attachment A.

2. Executive Summary

2.1 This project revitalises High Street between Cashel Street and St Asaph Street, and the length of Cashel Street between High Street and Manchester Street. This supports the development of the central city through public realm improvements identified in the Central City Recovery Plan, helps make the city more pedestrian-friendly and safe, and assists with the greening of the central city.

2.2 The project proposes to introduce new landscaping and paving, widened footpaths and a slow street (10 km/h) with a single surface boundary to boundary (no kerbs and gutters) in the southern two blocks allowing for an informal street and future flexibility in the street layout.

2.3 The project also provides for the extension of the tram route from its current end point at the Lichfield Street / High Street intersection into Poplar Street (via Lichfield Street) and returning into High Street near Tuam Street.

2.4 Two options have been considered with the preferred option being a modified scheme from that consulted on by making minor changes in the middle and southern blocks of High Street.

2.5 Two sub-sets of the preferred option include either adding more parking spaces in the southern block or limiting the work in the southern block to modification of the intersection with Tuam Street and repairs only to the remainder of that block. The latter option will maintain the existing speed limit of 30 km/h in the southern block.

2.6 Community views on the project were sought through engagement with key stakeholders and public consultation was undertaken during May and June 2019. Submissions were received from 90 individuals and groups.

2.7 The Council’s 2018-2028 Long Term Plan identifies the work under two separate projects, High Street (Hereford –St Asaph) (ID# 18342) and Tram Extension – High Street (ID# 45318). The budget provision for the each project is $6,717,013 (High Street) and $2,984,400 (tram extension).
2.8 The extension of the tram route is contingent on agreement for the Council to purchase land at 146 High Street. Negotiations are progressing with the body corporate representing the individual land owners. The tram extension will not proceed until the land is finally purchased.

3. **Staff Recommendations**

That the Hearings Panel:

1. Receives the information within and attached to this report and considers the written and oral submissions made as part of the public consultation process.

2. Recommends that the Council approves
   a. the scheme design of the network transformation project for High Street as detailed in Attachment A, and
   b. the extension of the tram route from the High Street / Lichfield Street intersection

3. Recommends to Council that the detailed traffic resolutions required for the implementation of the project are brought back to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee, or appropriate delegated committee for approval at the end of the detailed design phase, prior to the beginning of construction.

4. **Context/Background**

**Opportunity**

4.1 This project provides the opportunity to support the development of the central city through public realm improvements identified in the Central City Recovery Plan.

4.2 It also provides for a connection between key cycle routes in Ferry Road and Tuam Street. The project helps make the central city more pedestrian friendly and safe and assists with the greening of the central city.

**Strategic Alignment**

4.3 This project consists of two separate projects within the 2018 – 2028 Long Term Plan:
   - Project ID 18342 – High Street (Hereford – St Asaph)
   - Project ID 45318 – Tram Extension – High Street

4.4 Note that the title for Project ID 18342 provides for the length of High Street between Hereford Street and St Asaph Street. However, the length between Hereford Street and Cashel Street has been undertaken separately under Project ID 34418 – Paving Central City, City Mall and High Street.

4.5 This report supports the [Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028)]:

4.5.1 Activity: Active Travel
   - Level of Service: 16.0.10 Improve the perception that Christchurch is a walking friendly city.

4.5.2 Activity: Roads and Footpaths
   - Level of Service: 16.0.8.0 Maintain the condition of footpaths
   - Level of Service: 16.0.2.0 Maintain roadway condition to an appropriate national standard
Decision Making Authority

4.6 The Council has authority in accordance with the Delegations Register, Part D, Sub-part 1, section 2, to make decisions regarding roads within the Central City Area.

Previous Decisions

4.7 No previous decisions in relation to this project have been made by the Council or its committees.

4.8 The Mayor, and the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee were informed of progress on this project by way of a memorandum on 28 February 2019 (ref. 19/214690).

4.9 The Council was also briefed on consultation options at its meeting on 9 April 2019 where it recommended the option which would proceed to public consultation. The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board was briefed on the project at a seminar on 29 April 2019.

4.10 On 15 December 2016 the Council resolved that the trees outside the Duncan’s Building could be removed to allow work to proceed on the construction of the building (ref. Council resolution CNCL/2016/00484). The resolution stated that “approval of the removal is based on an agreement by the developer with Section 6 Option 1” of the report to Council. The resolution also noted that a detailed design will come back to the Council prior to the trees being re-planted in that section of High Street. Section 6 of the report to the Council recommended that the trees would be removed and replanted. The recommendation also stated that all costs are to be borne by the applicant; and that the trees are to be replaced on the completion of the redevelopment with an appropriate species of tree for the uniqueness of the location and in keeping with the heritage status of the buildings. The developer has agreed to replace the trees, at their cost, in accordance with the Council’s approved design.

Assessment of Significance and Engagement

4.11 The decision in this report is of medium significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

4.12 The level of significance was determined by the level of community interest city-wide apparent in this project, and social benefits. The level of impact on those people affected is expected to be high, especially during construction. However, the central city area affected by the works is small in relation to the size of the Christchurch District.

4.13 The Christchurch Central Recovery Plan and its transport chapter provides the strategic direction for the proposed design changes.

4.14 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the significance assessment. Engagement with key stakeholders, including property and business owners, and the tram operator, commenced early in the project to inform the development of scheme plans.
5. Options Analysis

Options Considered

5.1 The following reasonably practicable options were considered and are assessed in this report:

- Option 1 – Full revitalisation of High Street and tram extension (Preferred)
- Option 2 – Tram extension and asset repairs

5.2 Alternative options can be considered for the southern block between Tuam Street and St Asaph Street, as subsets of Option 1:

- Option 1A – Full revitalisation with some additional parking
- Option 1B – Do minimum in the southern block of High Street

5.3 Option 1 provides for the tram extension. The extension is contingent on the Council reaching an agreement for purchase of the land required to form the tram track loop between Poplar Street and High Street. Negotiations are progressing with the body corporate representing the individual land owners.

Option Descriptions

5.4 Preferred Option: Option 1 - Full revitalisation of High Street and tram extension, including minor changes

5.4.1 Option Description: This option provides for the full revitalisation of High Street between Cashel Street and St Asaph Street, and Cashel Street between High Street and Manchester Street, and the extension of the tram route. It differs from the consultation plan by minor changes to the three blocks of High Street in response to submissions received (refer to Attachment A). These changes are detailed in Section 6.14.

Key features of the scheme include:

- Revitalises the three city blocks through new landscaping and paving, widened footpaths and a slow street (10 km/h) with a single surface boundary to boundary (no kerbs and gutters) in the southern two blocks allowing for an informal street and future flexibility in the street layout
- Enhanced streetscape to provide a more attractive place for people to visit and do business
- Widened footpath where possible to cater for increased foot traffic including a large widened pedestrian amenity area outside the Duncan’s Building in the southern block of High Street
- Creates an entry to the central city from Lyttelton, Sumner and Ferrymead following a diagonal route first used by Māori, represented in the streetscape by cultural markers and tohu (signs, symbolic representations) which represent Ngāi Tūāhuriri hapū sites of significance and associations with travel
- Safe cycle link between the cycleway on St Asaph Street and Tuam Street, and the Heathcote Expressway on Ferry Road
- Accessible for all users
- Courtesy crossings to provide safe and accessible mid-block crossings of High Street
• Provision of time-restricted parking spaces as detailed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northern Block</th>
<th>Middle Block</th>
<th>Tuam Street (additional)</th>
<th>Southern Block</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P60 metered</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P30 metered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P30 metered or P5 free</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading Zone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Simplified intersection at Tuam Street reducing number of signal poles from 19 to six
• Additional street trees and a large rain garden to provide amenity and environmental benefits
• Southern block one-way from Tuam Street to St Asaph Street allowing for vehicle exit into St Asaph Street to be reinstated
• Tram route extended along Lichfield Street, Poplar Street and back up High Street.

5.4.2 Option Advantages

In addition to the scheme features listed above, this option:

• Provides a focus on pedestrian amenity by providing widened footpaths, slower vehicle speeds, and additional seating and landscaping
• Safety for pedestrians
• Support for future development
• Is supported by 40 submitters with 23 submitters requesting less emphasis on parking.

5.4.3 Option Disadvantages

• Reduces the number of on-street parking spaces by 27. This reduction is measured from Option 2 – the number that will exist once all construction barriers have been removed.

5.5 Option 1A – Full revitalisation of the southern block of High Street with additional parking.

5.5.1 Option Description: This option provides for the full revitalisation of High Street between Tuam Street and St Asaph Street, as for Option 1, but with additional parking as requested by 25 submitters (refer Attachment B).

The changes in the key features from Option 1 are:

• Removal of the courtesy crossing and one street tree in the vicinity of 165 High Street
Increased parking numbers – 16 60-minute metered parking spaces, one loading zone, one mobility park, and one park for motorcycles, as detailed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern Block</th>
<th>Additional parking over Option 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P60 metered</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading Zone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2 Option Advantages

In addition to the features listed above and in Option 1, this option:

- Provides additional parking in the southern block to meet the request of 19 submitters who state that parking is required to ensure the survival of new businesses in this block, while maintaining the objective of this being a key pedestrian and cycle street
- Flexibility of the single surface treatment enables additional parking to be implemented in future without significant construction works and associated costs.

5.5.3 Option Disadvantages

- Removes additional pedestrian amenity space on the footpath, a courtesy crossing and one proposed street tree as a result of the additional parking provision, compared to Option 1
- Removes 23 parking spaces in the southern two blocks (from what will exist once all existing barriers are removed) – the tram extension and asset repairs option (Option 2).

5.6 Option 1B – Do minimum in the southern block of High Street

5.6.1 Option Description: This option provides for repairs to be undertaken in the southern block between Tuam Street and St Asaph Street to make good damage caused as a result of the earthquakes and from subsequent demolition works, and includes the proposed changes at the Tuam Street / High Street intersection. The repair work includes footpath resurfacing and road repairs where required (refer Attachment C).

Work is required at the Tuam Street intersection to enable removal of the extra traffic signals and permits operation of the intersection in a safe manner with the modified street layout in the middle block.

The speed limit within the southern block would be maintained at 30 km/h.

5.6.2 Option Advantages

- Allows for the safe and efficient operation of the Tuam Street / High Street intersection
- Reduces the extent of disruption to businesses and users of the southern block of High Street. Note that repair works will still cause some disruption
5.6.3 **Option Disadvantages**

- Does not meet the Council’s objective for the southern block of High Street of supporting the development of the central city through public realm improvements identified in the Central City Recovery Plan
- Does not provide for a connection between key cycle routes in St Asaph Street, Tuam Street and Ferry Road
- Does not help make this block of the city more pedestrian friendly and safe nor does it assist with the greening of the central city
- Does not provide the exit for traffic from High Street into St Asaph Street
- Following repair work, the slope on the footpath between the Ara building boundary and the kerb will be greater than permitted in the Council’s Infrastructure Design Standard. In order to meet the standard, the kerb will need to be constructed at a higher level requiring significant reconstruction of the adjacent roadway.
- Removes 11 parking spaces in the middle block (from what will exist once all existing construction barriers are removed).

5.7 **Option 2 – Tram extension and asset repairs**

5.7.1 **Option Description:** This option provides for the tram extension, and for repairs to be undertaken in the three blocks to make good damage caused as a result of the earthquakes and from subsequent demolition works. This includes kerb and channel repairs, footpath resurfacing, and road repairs where required (refer **Attachment D**).

5.7.2 **Option Advantages**

- The tram extension is completed once the land purchase is finalised
- Reduces the magnitude of disruption to businesses and users of High Street and Cashel Street. Note that repair works, however, will cause disruption
- Retains all existing parking spaces, except where crossings for new buildings are required in the future
- Provides an estimated saving to this project in the Transport Programme budget in the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan for the High Street project (CPMS 19342) of $5.9 million.

5.7.3 **Option Disadvantages**

- Does not meet the Council’s objective of supporting the development of the central city through public realm improvements identified in the Central City Recovery Plan
- Does not provide for a connection between key cycle routes in Ferry Road and Tuam Street
- Does not help make the city more pedestrian friendly and safe nor does it assist with the greening of the central city
- Does not provide the exit for traffic from High Street into St Asaph Street
- Following repair work, the slope on the footpath between the Ara building boundary and the kerb will be greater than permitted in the Council’s Infrastructure Design Standard. In order to meet the standard, the kerb will need to be constructed at a higher level requiring significant reconstruction of the adjacent roadway.

**Analysis Criteria**

5.8 A multi-criteria analysis was undertaken for the options providing revitalisation of the three blocks of High Street (Option 1 and Option 1 with 1A). The analysis considered the following factors:

- **Transport**
  - Alignment with strategies
  - Pedestrian, vehicle and parking provision
  - Cycle facilities

- **Tram**
  - Alignment with strategies
  - Operational requirements
  - Future proofing of tram route

- **Amenity and context**
  - Alignment with Streets and Spaces Design Guide
  - Vitality / amenity / footfall
  - Corners of the frames
  - Flexibility / future proof urban environment
  - Urban gateway concept
  - Greening the city
  - Ecology
  - Street trees
  - Impact on heritage settings

- **Stakeholders**
  - Alignment with community expectation
  - Alignment with adjacent owners and occupiers

- **Risks associated with the timing of project delivery**

**Options Considerations**

5.9 Options 1 meets the objectives of the Council’s Long Term Plan.

5.10 Option 1A amends Option 1 by adding extra on-street parking in the southern block of High Street.

5.11 Option 1B is an alternative amendment to Option 1 providing for the Tuam Street / High Street intersection to be modified but the length of High Street south of this to be repaired only. The
revitalisation of the southern block of High Street would be reprogrammed, depending on the availability of budget or, alternatively, not undertaken. This option would not meet the objectives of the Long Term Plan.

5.12 Option 2 does not provide for revitalisation of High Street or the block of Cashel Street but provides for their repair only. It includes the extension of the tram route in High Street. The revitalisation of High Street and Cashel Street would be reprogrammed, depending on the availability of budget or, alternatively, not undertaken. This option would not meet the objectives of the Long Term Plan.

6. Community Views and Preferences

6.1 Property owners, businesses and tram operators were advised of the revitalisation and tram extension project in March 2018. Various concepts to upgrade the street were discussed with them at drop-in sessions.

6.2 When the project area was expanded in January 2019 to include the Cashel Street block, other stakeholders who were most affected were invited to view possible options.

6.3 Proposals were discussed with the Joint Technical Review Panel including representatives from Environment Canterbury, the New Zealand Transport Agency and Ōtākaro Limited.

6.4 Emergency services representatives raised no issues when they viewed the concept plans at a meeting to discuss scheme designs for central city projects.

6.5 Staff twice presented concepts to the Central City Transport Liaison Group comprising representatives of a wide range of city groups with an interest in transport.

6.6 Formal consultation on a preferred plan opened on 14 May and closed on 10 June 2019. Ninety one submitters commented on the High Street revitalisation and 61 on the tram extension.

6.7 The consultation report for the High Street revitalisation and tram extension project is Attachment E.

High Street revitalisation

6.8 People were asked for their comments on the project. Of the 90 individuals and organisations who provided feedback on the revitalisation consultation plans:

- 40 indicated that they supported or generally supported the proposals.
- 44 indicated they did not support the plan or had concerns. Twenty three submitters, including nine who supported or generally supported the proposals, said there should be less emphasis on cars and on-street parking in the plans. Another 25 said more parking was needed to support local businesses. (An alternative plan was submitted for the southern block from Tuam Street to St Asaph Street.)
- Six did not indicate their view of the overall plan.

6.9 What submitters liked about the plan:

- Inclusion of more trees and planting
- Wider footpaths
- Lower speed limit – 10 km/h
- Simplified Tuam Street intersection
- No kerbs in two blocks
6.10 Key issues raised:

- Too much emphasis on cars at expense of other types of travel
  - Too much parking
  - Should be pedestrianised
- Not enough parking to support businesses
  - Alternative plan for southern block submitted
  - Alternative parking variations for mid-block
- Concern regarding cycle facilities
- Need to reflect climate emergency
- Defer works to allow time for new businesses to establish in the southern block of High Street
- Impact of construction on operation of businesses.

Tram Extension

6.11 The proposed extension of the tram route along Lichfield Street and Poplar Street then back up High Street was supported by 50 (81 per cent) of the 62 submitters who provided feedback.

6.12 Tram operator Christchurch Attractions & Hanmer Attractions Tourism Group said this loop would provide additional safety features and operational advantages than extending the tram into the next block between Tuam Street and St Asaph Street. These include the ability to operate trailers and avoid the need to move the tram in a reverse direction on the track as it does currently.

6.13 The tram proposal is subject to the purchase of land at the corner of Poplar Street and High Street.

Changes presented to the Hearings Panel as a result of consultation

6.14 The preferred Option 1 incorporates the following minor changes as a result of the feedback received on the consultation plan:

Northern block

- Loading zone outside 198 High Street moved eastward to accommodate a future possible footpath crossing
- Commemorative plaque retained in its present location in paving in City Mall.

Middle block

- One additional park for motorcycles located outside 174/176 High Street
- 60 minute metered parking outside C1 café and opposite 180 High Street changed to shorter term parking (30 minute metered parking and 5 minute free parking)
- Corgis placed on a raised plinth to lessen the hazard of tripping and at the request of the artist.
Southern block

- Motorcycle parking space opposite 155 High Street replaced by 60 minute metered car park
- Additional motorcycle parking space located outside 143 High Street
- Street furniture relocated from outside 139 High Street to provide access to the building from High Street
- Cycle crossing across St Asaph Street added.

6.15 Staff have prepared two alternative options for the southern block between Tuam Street and St Asaph Streets, as subsets of Option 1

- **Option 1A** – Full revitalisation with additional parking (four P60 parking spaces), detailed in Attachment B and in 5.5 of this report.
- **Option 1B** - Do minimum. Work would include road repairs and changes at the Tuam Street / High Street intersection, detailed in Attachment C and in 5.6 of this report. The speed limit would remain at 30 km/h.

6.16 Staff have also included a tram extension and asset repairs option (Option 2). This is detailed in Attachment D and 5.7 of this report.

7. **Legal Implications**

7.1 There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision, beyond the normal decision-making considerations for the Council under the Local Government Act 2002.

7.2 This report has been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

8. **Risks**

8.1 The inherent risks associated with this project are considered to vary between high and moderate, dependant on the options chosen. The risks are tabulated below with the associated consequences and proposed mitigation measures.

8.2 **Option 1: Full revitalisation of High Street and tram extension (Preferred)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disruption to businesses</td>
<td>Disruption to the operation of businesses on High Street during the construction period</td>
<td>Daily engagement with the business owners to identify concerns and inform on construction activities. Undertake some construction during hours that businesses are not open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism from business and property owners about loss of on-street parking</td>
<td>Negative media, dissatisfied stakeholders</td>
<td>Proactive and early communications and engagement about the benefits of increased pedestrian amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public criticism</td>
<td>Negative media, dissatisfied stakeholders</td>
<td>Proactive and early communications and engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3 Option 1A - Full revitalisation of High Street and tram extension including additional parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disruption to businesses</td>
<td>Disruption to the operation of businesses on High Street during the construction period</td>
<td>Daily engagement with the business owners to identify concerns and inform on construction activities. Undertake some construction during hours that businesses are not open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public criticism</td>
<td>Negative media, dissatisfied stakeholders</td>
<td>Proactive and early communications and engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4 Option 1B – Revitalisation of the northern and middle blocks of High Street, repairs to southern block of High Street, and tram extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disruption to businesses</td>
<td>Disruption to the operation of businesses on High Street during the construction period</td>
<td>Daily engagement with the business owners to identify concerns and inform on construction activities. Undertake some construction during hours that businesses are not open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public criticism</td>
<td>Negative media, dissatisfied stakeholders</td>
<td>Proactive and early communications and engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public criticism about not delivering the project as proposed</td>
<td>Negative media, dissatisfied stakeholders</td>
<td>Proactive and early communications and engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath outside Ara has slope to kerb greater than the Infrastructure Design Standard</td>
<td>Difficulty for use by some pedestrians</td>
<td>Lift the adjacent kerb and channel to meet the maximum cross-fall specified in the Infrastructure Design Standard. Increases cost of repair option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.5 Option 2 – Tram extension and asset repairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disruption to businesses</td>
<td>Disruption to the operation of businesses on High Street during repair works and tram track extension</td>
<td>Daily engagement with the business owners to identify concerns and inform on repair activities. Undertake some work during hours that businesses are not open, if possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public criticism about not delivering the project as proposed</td>
<td>Negative media, dissatisfied stakeholders</td>
<td>Proactive and early communications and engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath outside Ara has slope to kerb greater than the Infrastructure Design Standard</td>
<td>Difficulty for use by some pedestrians</td>
<td>Lift the adjacent kerb and channel to meet the maximum cross-fall specified in the Infrastructure Design Standard. Increases cost of repair option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Next Steps

9.1 Following the Hearings Panel’s consideration of this report and submissions received, the Hearings Panel may seek further information of the project team, if it considers it necessary, and then report to the Council for a decision on its recommended option. It is desirable that the Council will consider the Hearings Panel’s report at its meeting on 12 September 2019.

9.2 Upon approval of the recommended option, the project team will commence detailed design.
### 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 - Full revitalisation of High Street and tram extension (Preferred)</th>
<th>Options 1 &amp; 1A - Full revitalisation of High Street and tram extension including additional parking</th>
<th>Options 1 &amp; 1B - Revitalisation of the northern and middle blocks of High Street, repairs to southern block of High Street, and tram extension</th>
<th>Option 2 - Tram extension and asset repairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost to Implement</strong></td>
<td>High: $6,100,000 Tram: $2,960,000</td>
<td>High: $6,100,000</td>
<td>High: $5,100,000</td>
<td>High: $200,000 Tram: $3,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance/Ongoing</strong></td>
<td>An additional $11,200 per annum. This is due to additional street furniture, street trees, green surfacing and landscaping areas. This will need to be provided for in the planning of future Long Term Plans.</td>
<td>An additional $11,100 per annum. This is due to additional street furniture, street trees, green surfacing and landscaping areas. This will need to be provided for in the planning of future Long Term Plans.</td>
<td>An additional $10,100 per annum. This is due to additional street furniture, street trees, green surfacing and landscaping areas. This will need to be provided for in the planning of future Long Term Plans.</td>
<td>$1,000 per annum. This has been allowed for in ongoing maintenance budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Source</strong></td>
<td>2018-2028 Long Term Plan High (ID# 18342): $6,717,013 NZTA has indicated that this project is unlikely to receive subsidy. In line with Council resolutions, staff will report back to Council prior to construction, if subsidy is not confirmed.</td>
<td>2018-2028 Long Term Plan High (ID# 18342): $6,717,013 NZTA has indicated that this project is unlikely to receive subsidy. In line with Council resolutions, staff will report back to Council prior to construction, if subsidy is not confirmed.</td>
<td>2018-2028 Long Term Plan High (ID# 18342): $6,717,013 NZTA has indicated that this project is unlikely to receive subsidy. In line with Council resolutions, staff will report back to Council prior to construction, if subsidy is not confirmed.</td>
<td>2018-2028 Long Term Plan High (ID# 45318): $2,984,400 Subsidy for this work would be claimed under the NZTA maintenance and renewals work category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item No.: 4**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 1 - Climate Change Impacts</th>
<th>Tram (ID# 45318): $2,984,400</th>
<th>Tram (ID# 45318): $2,984,400</th>
<th>Tram (ID# 45318): $2,984,400</th>
<th>The tram project is not eligible for NZTA subsidy and has not assumed subsidy in the LTP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item No.: 4</td>
<td>Tram (ID# 45318): $2,984,400</td>
<td>Tram (ID# 45318): $2,984,400</td>
<td>Tram (ID# 45318): $2,984,400</td>
<td>The tram project is not eligible for NZTA subsidy and has not assumed subsidy in the LTP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Rates</td>
<td>The tram project is not eligible for NZTA subsidy and has not assumed subsidy in the LTP.</td>
<td>The tram project is not eligible for NZTA subsidy and has not assumed subsidy in the LTP.</td>
<td>The tram project is not eligible for NZTA subsidy and has not assumed subsidy in the LTP.</td>
<td>The tram project is not eligible for NZTA subsidy and has not assumed subsidy in the LTP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rates will be impacted by 0.0023% from the year of delivery.</td>
<td>Rates will be impacted by 0.0023% from the year of delivery.</td>
<td>Rates will be impacted by 0.0021% from the year of delivery.</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of on-street parking provision thus reducing emissions from vehicles in High Street. Additional street planting. Cycle lanes to encourage more travellers to cycle</td>
<td>Some reduction of on-street parking provision thus reducing emissions from vehicles in High Street. Additional street planting. Cycle lanes to encourage more travellers to cycle</td>
<td>Minor reduction of on-street parking assisting in reducing emissions from vehicles in the middle block of High Street. Some additional street planting.</td>
<td>This option does not reduce emissions from vehicles nor provide additional street planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This option provides for improved accessibility for the mobility impaired, for pedestrians and cyclists</td>
<td>This option provides for improved accessibility for the mobility impaired, for pedestrians and cyclists. Accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists is not as good as for Option1.</td>
<td>This option provides for improved accessibility for the mobility impaired, for pedestrians and cyclists in the northern and middle blocks of High Street. Footpath resurfacing will result in the cross-fall of the footpath on the Ara side being more than accepted in the Council’s Construction Standard Specification.</td>
<td>This option does not provide for improved accessibility for the mobility impaired, nor for pedestrians and cyclists. However, footpath repairs will benefit pedestrians by creating an even surface. Footpath resurfacing will result in the cross-fall of the footpath in the southern block on the Ara side being more than accepted in the Council’s Construction Standard Specification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria 2 - Accessibility Impacts**

|                                  | Reduction of on-street parking provision thus reducing emissions from vehicles in High Street. Additional street planting. Cycle lanes to encourage more travellers to cycle | Some reduction of on-street parking provision thus reducing emissions from vehicles in High Street. Additional street planting. Cycle lanes to encourage more travellers to cycle | Minor reduction of on-street parking assisting in reducing emissions from vehicles in the middle block of High Street. Some additional street planting. | This option does not reduce emissions from vehicles nor provide additional street planting. |
|                                  | This option provides for improved accessibility for the mobility impaired, for pedestrians and cyclists. Accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists is not as good as for Option1. | This option provides for improved accessibility for the mobility impaired, for pedestrians and cyclists in the northern and middle blocks of High Street. Footpath resurfacing will result in the cross-fall of the footpath on the Ara side being more than accepted in the Council’s Construction Standard Specification. | This option provides for improved accessibility for the mobility impaired, for pedestrians and cyclists in the northern and middle blocks of High Street. Footpath resurfacing will result in the cross-fall of the footpath on the Ara side being more than accepted in the Council’s Construction Standard Specification. | This option does not provide for improved accessibility for the mobility impaired, nor for pedestrians and cyclists. However, footpath repairs will benefit pedestrians by creating an even surface. Footpath resurfacing will result in the cross-fall of the footpath in the southern block on the Ara side being more than accepted in the Council’s Construction Standard Specification. |
### Item 4

#### Criteria 3 - Health & Safety Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1 - Full revitalisation of High Street and tram extension (Preferred)</th>
<th>Options 1 &amp; 1A - Full revitalisation of High Street and tram extension including additional parking</th>
<th>Options 1 &amp; 1B - Revitalisation of the northern and middle blocks of High Street, repairs to southern block of High Street, and tram extension</th>
<th>Option 2 - Tram extension and asset repairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of the footpaths will reduce health and safety impacts that currently exist. Cycle connections between St Asaph Street and Tuam Street will provide safer access for cyclists.</td>
<td>Reconstruction of the footpaths will reduce health and safety impacts that currently exist. Cycle connections between St Asaph Street and Tuam Street will provide safer access for cyclists.</td>
<td>Reconstruction of and repairs to the footpaths will reduce most health and safety impacts that currently exist. The cross-fall on the footpath on the northeast side of the southern block may be a health and safety issue for the mobility impaired. No provision of a safe cycle connection between St Asaph Street and Tuam Street will disadvantage cyclists.</td>
<td>Repairs to the footpaths will reduce most health and safety impacts that currently exist. The cross-fall on the footpath on the northeast side of the southern block may be a health and safety issue for the mobility impaired. No provision of a safe cycle connection between St Asaph Street and Tuam Street will disadvantage cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cross-fall on the footpath on the northeast side of the southern block may be a health and safety issue for the mobility impaired. No provision of a safe cycle connection between St Asaph Street and Tuam Street will disadvantage cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statutory Criteria

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

- **Option 1**: This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value. However, Matapopore has been engaged to provide.
- **Option 1 & 1A**: This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value. However, Matapopore has been engaged to provide.
- **Option 1 & 1B**: This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value. However, Matapopore has been engaged to provide.
- **Option 2**: This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value. For this option, Matapopore Charitable...
## Item 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Council Plans &amp; Policies</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>engagement to provide cultural advice on Ngāi Tahu values, narratives and aspirations, and guidance to enhance urban design. For this option, Matapopore Charitable Trust input is high with key cultural values involved in the design.</td>
<td>This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural advice on Ngāi Tahu values, narratives and aspirations, and guidance to enhance urban design. For this option, Matapopore Charitable Trust input is high with key cultural values involved in the design.</td>
<td>This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural advice on Ngāi Tahu values, narratives and aspirations, and guidance to enhance urban design. For this option, Matapopore Charitable Trust input is high with key cultural values involved in the design.</td>
<td>This option is partially consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies. Adoption of these in the southern block may be delayed and not fulfilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust input will not be utilised.</td>
<td>This option is not consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies unless revitalisation occurs in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

(i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and

(ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

Authors

- Neil Gillon - Senior Project Manager
- Sharon O’Neill - Team Leader Project Management Transport
- William Homewood - Traffic Engineer - Investigation & Design
- Jennie Hamilton - Senior Engagement Advisor

Approved By

- Lynette Ellis - Manager Planning and Delivery Transport
- Richard Osborne - Head of Transport
- Peter Langbein - Finance Business Partner
- David Adamson - General Manager City Services
Item No.: 4

High Street
Cashel Street - St Asaph Street
Plan for Approval (Option 1)
High Street revitalisation and tram extension consultation report

1. Background

Property owners, businesses and tram operators were advised of the revitalisation and tram extension project in March 2018. Various concepts to upgrade the street were discussed with them at drop-in sessions.

Proposals were discussed with the Joint Technical Review Panel, including representatives from Environment Canterbury, the New Zealand Transport Agency and Ōtākaro Limited.

Emergency services representatives were shown the concept plans at a meeting arranged for them and raised no concerns.

Staff twice presented concepts to the Central City Transport Liaison Group comprising representatives of a wide range of city groups with an interest in transport.

When the project area was expanded in January 2019 to include the Cashel Street block, other stakeholders who were most affected were invited to view possible options.

2. Formal consultation

Consultation on a preferred plan opened on 14 May and closed on 10 June 2019. Emails were sent to 330 stakeholders inviting them to provide feedback on the Council’s have your say site and 600 printed booklets were hand delivered to central city businesses on or near High Street.

In addition, 140 copies were posted to property owners and another 100 booklets were provided to Council service centres and libraries. The consultation was promoted on social media, radio and in local newspapers.

Two drop-in sessions were organised for those who wanted to discuss any issues with members of the project team.

Ninety individuals and organisations commented on the High Street revitalisation and 62 provided feedback on the tram extension.

3. High Street revitalisation

People were asked to comment on the project. Of the 90 submitters who provided feedback on the revitalisation plans:

- 40 indicated that they supported or generally supported the proposals.
- 44 indicated they did not support the plan or had concerns. Twenty three submitters, including nine who supported or generally supported the proposals, commented that there should be less emphasis on cars and on-street parking in the plans. Another 25 said more parking was needed to support local businesses. (An alternative plan was submitted for the southern block from Tuam Street to St Asaph Street.)
- 6 did not indicate their view of the overall plan.

4. What people liked about the High Street proposals in the consultation plan

Comments from those who supported the plan referred to the overall design, additional trees and planting, slower speed limit and shared space.

Supporters of the upgrade included the Community and Public Health section of Canterbury District Health Board, which commended the Council on the consultation plan: “It clearly
incorporates aspects of a Healthy Streets approach, given the emphasis on reduced speed, shared use and an interesting streetscape which will encourage people to stop, rest and relax.”

The Road Transport Association, said it would be “great to see this when completed as I am sure the people utilising the area will enjoy the new environment”.

Specific features of the plan that appealed to submitters were:

4.1 Slower speed limit – 10 km/h

Twelve submitters supported slowing the speed of traffic to 10 km/h. Six opposed this proposed speed limit restriction. They were advised that the slower speed limit will help make the street a safer and more pedestrian and cycle-friendly environment. The street is intended as a destination and the lower speed limit supports this intention.

4.2 More trees and planting

Additional trees and planting, including the proposed rain garden, would enhance the streetscape, according to six submitters. Several respondents queried the species of trees and two asked for more native planting.

The alternative plan for the southern block, submitted by respondents, includes small trees rather than replacement oak trees to avoid obscuring the heritage façade of the Duncan’s Building.

They have been advised that in the project team’s preferred plan there are fewer trees proposed in front of the heritage building than pre-earthquake, and they are further away from the building.

4.3 Simplified Tuam Street intersection

Several submitters supported the redesign of the Tuam Street intersection where the number of poles is reduced from 19 to six.

A cyclist asked who has right of way at the proposed intersection layout. He has been advised that when using the Tuam Street cycle lane, vehicles and cyclists are expected to follow the give way rules. Vehicles left turning into High Street give way to cyclists left turning into High street, but have priority over cycles who are right turning in. This is the same as at any other intersection in the city.

4.4 No kerbs in two blocks

Several submitters referred to the kerbless design in the mid and southern blocks, noting that the street layout could be adapted in the future.

Kerbs remain for the Cashel Street to Manchester Street section of High Street and Cashel Street between High Street and Manchester Street. This road was upgraded before the earthquakes and the kerbs are in good condition.

5. Main issues raised by submitters who did not support the plan

5.1 Too much emphasis on cars at the expense of other types of travel

Comments from the 23 submitters who wanted less emphasis on cars and parking ranged from the need to provide fewer parking spaces for motor vehicles to full pedestrianisation of the street. Reasons given included the climate change emergency and the requirement in the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan to prioritise pedestrian and cycle movements on High Street.

Those who provided feedback included Ōtākaro Limited which suggested a shared zone pedestrian mall that would enable businesses to take full advantage of the character of the area,
utilise the space for dining, cafes, and support other activities such as events and busking. Seven submitters said High Street should be pedestrianised either now or in the future.

5.2 More parking required to support businesses

Twenty-five submitters wanted more parking spaces to support local businesses, particularly those trying to get established in newly reopened buildings. They said there was no close alternative parking available to replace the on-street spaces lost in the consultation plan.

With regard to the loss of parking, the consultation plan indicated a reduction of 26 of the existing 94 on-street parking spaces across all three blocks. Following consultation the number of car parks has been increased overall by one in the preferred plan.

5.2.1 Alternative plan for southern block

Nineteen submitters opposed the proposed parking reductions in southern block of High Street, saying this would have a significant negative impact on the commercial viability of their businesses. They submitted an alternative plan for High Street from Tuam Street to St Asaph Street.

Their plan provides 29 car parks (plus a mobility park and loading zone) compared to 11 parks (plus a mobility park and loading zone) in the consultation plan. The proposed footpath – 8.2 metres wide in front of the Duncan’s Building – is reduced to a maximum width of 6.7 metres. Those who submitted the plan said their alternative street layout was similar to an earlier plan developed by Council staff, but with more parking.

5.2.2 Alternative parking variations for the mid-block

Five submitters called for more parking to be reinstated in the mid-block from Lichfield Street to Tuam Street. Two of them supported an earlier plan developed by Council staff but with three or four more car parks.

5.3 Concern re cycle facilities

Eleven of the submitters who wanted less emphasis on cars and parking also wanted to see cycling facilities improved. Their concerns included:

5.3.1 Difficulty travelling through the Manchester / Lichfield / High streets intersection.

Response. The Lichfield Street intersection is complicated by the presence of tram tracks. Provision is made for cyclists to use cycle crossings to cross Lichfield Street from High Street. These crossings are provided on three of the four approaches.

5.3.2 More space needed for cyclists to negotiate tram tracks in the proposed street layout, especially in the northern block.

Response. The space proposed allows for two-way traffic as well as cyclists to travel safely in both directions. Note that the cycle lane is 1.8 m wide on the southwest side of the road.

5.3.3 Entry from High Street to St Asaph Street

Response. Vehicles have a stop control at St Asaph Street and will therefore be approaching the intersection carefully. It is expected that all users of the roadway will be aware of each other. Adding a give way control on one of the exit lanes, with vehicles having to give way where the road splits, would add unnecessary confusion on what will be a low volume, low speed road.
5.4 Need to reflect climate change emergency
Six submitters referred to the Council’s climate change emergency declaration on 23 May 2019.
Response: The declaration of a climate change emergency occurred during consultation. Although not specifically considered as a design consideration, the project supports active transport, water sensitive urban design and increased landscaping.

5.5 Defer works while businesses re-establish in southern block
Seven submitters wanted upgrading works in the southern block to be delayed until new businesses had time to get established.
Response: Extensive repair work is required to the footpath on the east side and stormwater / drainage repairs are potentially required if this block is left for a period of up to five years. Provision has also been made for cyclists to safely use the road to provide the link between the existing cycleways on Tuam Street and St Asaph Street. The proposed work is scheduled to start in mid 2020. If reconstruction of this block is delayed, the access to St Asaph Street would also be delayed.

5.6 Impact of construction
Ten submitters were concerned about construction saying that when work does start, it should be completed as soon as possible. Contractors should work at nights and weekends.
Response: The Council will be working with a contractor to ensure that the construction work is undertaken in as short a time frame as possible. We will also ensure that the contractor keeps business owners fully informed of the work to be undertaken and maintains access to all businesses.

6. Tram Extension
The proposed extension of the tram route along Lichfield Street and Poplar Street then back up High Street was supported by 50 (81 per cent) of the 62 submitters who responded.
Tram operator, Christchurch Attractions & Hanmer Attractions Tourism Group, said this loop would provide additional safety features and operational advantages than extending the tram into the next block between Tuam Street and St Asaph Street. It would prefer to see the tram stop moved further toward Poplar Street to give passengers a more open view along High street to the south.
The owner of a nearby business said he would like the tram shelter located outside the High Street former Post Office where it would ‘have better leverage for Christchurch tourism’.
Seven submitters said the tram should be incorporated in Christchurch’s public transport system, and four said the tram route should be further extended.
The tram proposal is subject to the purchase of land at the corner of Poplar Street and High Street.

7. Options presented to the Hearings Panel as a result of consultation
7.1 The Project Team’s preferred Option 1 – Full revitalisation of High Street and tram extension - incorporates the following minor changes to the consultation plan:
- Northern block –
  - Loading zone outside 198 High Street moved eastward to accommodate a future possible footpath crossing
  - Commemorative plaque retained in its present location in paving in City Mall.
• Middle block –
  o One additional park for motorcycles located outside 174/176 High Street
  o Paid 60 minute parking outside C1 café and opposite 180 High Street changed to shorter term parking
  o Corgis placed on a raised plinth to lessen the hazard of tripping and at the request of the artist.
• Southern block –
  o Motorcycle parking space opposite 155 High Street replaced by paid 60 minute car park
  o Additional motorcycle parking space located outside 143 High Street
  o Street furniture relocated from outside 139 High Street to provide access to the building from High Street
  o Cycle crossing across St Asaph Street added.

7.2 Staff have prepared two alternative options for the southern block between Tuam Street and St Asaph Streets, as subsets of Option 1

   Option 1A – full revitalisation but with additional parking in the southern block (four P60 parking spaces) detailed in Attachment B and in 5.5 of the report to the Hearings Panel.

   Option 1B - do minimum in the southern block of High Street. Work would include road repairs and changes at the Tuam Street / High Street intersection detailed in Attachment C and in 5.6 of this report. The speed limit would remain at 30 km/h.

7.3 Staff have also included Option 2 – tram extension and asset repairs. This is detailed in Attachment C and 5.7 of the report to the Hearings Panel.

7.4 These options will be presented to the Hearings Panel on 15 August. The Panel will make a recommendation to Council, which is expected to make a decision in September 2019.
5. Submissions Received on the Proposed High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

Reference: 19/876504
Presenter(s): Aidan Kimberley – Hearings Advisor

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to collate for the consideration of the Hearings Panel the submissions received in response to the consultation on the proposed High Street revitalisation and tram extension project.

1.2 The Local Government Act 2002 requires, as one of the principles of consultation, that “the views presented to the local authority should be received by the local authority with an open mind and should be given by the local authority, in making a decision, due consideration” (section 82(1)(e)).

1.3 The Hearings Panel should consider all submissions received, the enclosed staff report and other relevant considerations in its deliberations, before deciding its recommendation to the Council, which the Council may accept or reject.

1.4 The volume of written submissions from submitters who asked to be heard in person by the Hearings Panel, and the schedule of submitters booked to speak at the meeting is included as Attachment A.

1.5 The volume of written submissions from submitters who indicated that they wished to speak to the Hearings Panel, but subsequently decided they no longer want to speak is included as Attachment B.

1.6 The submissions received from submitters who indicated in their submission that they did not wish to be heard is included as Attachment C.

2. Staff Recommendations

That the Hearings Panel:

1. Receives the written submissions received on the High Street revitalisation and tram extension project.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Volume of Written Submissions from Submitters Wishing to be Heard</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Volume of Written Submissions from Submitters No Longer Wishing to be Heard</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Volume of Written Submissions from Submitters Not Wishing to be Heard</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submissions on the
High Street Revitalisation and
Tram Extension

Volume 1

Heard Submissions
Thursday 15 August 2019
## CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

### HIGH STREET REVITALISATION AND TRAM EXTENSION

#### SUBMITTERS WHO WISH TO BE HEARD

**THURSDAY, 15 AUGUST 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Submission Number</th>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.20am</td>
<td>25484 25499</td>
<td>Stockman Group Limited, SFT Group 177 Limited</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Shaun Stockman</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.35am</td>
<td>25470</td>
<td>Christchurch Attractions &amp; Hanmer Springs Attractions Tourism Group</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Michael Esposito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45am</td>
<td>25459</td>
<td>The Tramway Historical Society Inc</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dave Hinman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.55am</td>
<td>25277 25456</td>
<td>Generation Zero</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cameron Bradley</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.05am</td>
<td>25331</td>
<td>Urbis Traffic Planning and Development</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ray Edwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15am</td>
<td>25210 25450</td>
<td>Spokes Canterbury</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dirk de Lu</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.40am</td>
<td>25361</td>
<td>Peebles Group Ltd, 181 High Limited and Duncans Lane Limited</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Richard Peebles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.55am</td>
<td>25381 25475</td>
<td>AE Architects Ltd</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Andrew Evans</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.05am</td>
<td>24654</td>
<td>David Hawke</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10am</td>
<td>25314</td>
<td>C1 Espresso</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sam Crofsey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20am</td>
<td>25346 25284</td>
<td>Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rachel Ducker</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30am</td>
<td>24630</td>
<td>William Hall</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.35am</td>
<td>25452</td>
<td>Connie Christensen</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.40am</td>
<td>25451</td>
<td>Go Cycle Christchurch</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Connie Christensen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.50am</td>
<td>25389</td>
<td>Blind Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Carine Duke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

**High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension**

- Received via Have Your Say -

**Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Shaun Stockman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/11/2019 4:43:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>SFT Group 177 Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I Wish to Speak at the Hearing**

| Yes |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am Shaun Stockman representing SFT Group 177 Limited as Owner of the replacement building in respect to High Street located in the CBD Christchurch. I am making this submission to the Christchurch City Councillors and/or their representatives on the proposed revitalisation up-grade on the lower section of High Street CBD. I one three cycles/bikes and two motor vehicles, and regularly cycle in the CBD. I currently have in this section of High Street 28 tenants plus their staff being an estimated 70 people in small everyday Kiwi businesses plus visitors to the site. Having studied the Councils preferred plan for this section of High Street I have some serious concerns with it. There are currently 32 carpark spaces in this section of High Street and the Councils preferred plan sees that number reduce to 11 carpark spaces with no right turn out of High Street to allow for further circulation within the CBD. The loss of this many carpark spaces is simply not justified, and spells further decline and or death of the CBD. Car parking costs in the CBD have increased with the weekly costs of a carpark now three times what they were pre quake. It is very clear the demand for car parking is stronger now that ever, which is not surprising given 1/2 of the CBD was acquired for the Frames, with the increased demand in car parking and the costs increasing three times post-quake, I cannot understand the rationale behind Council’s motivation in reducing the current carpark spaces further and creating further upward costs, and confirm the public perception don’t come to Town there are no car-parks there. My first preference is that you leave this section of High Street for at least three years and ‘patch’ it in the interim thus giving the businesses time to establish before the final works are carried out. My second preference in terms of the up-grade plan is attached. This has been a joint effort with all the other active owners and tenants in this section of High Street while consulting with Council staff through the process. I have also engaged a qualified traffic engineer and auditor to assist create this option. The attached plan is not that different to what Councils preferred is other than saving parks, and achieves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 32 parallel parks for cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 24 bike parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1 mobility parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 1 loading zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Street crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rain gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Outdoor dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dedicated two way cycle lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Existing trees retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the plan is balanced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The reduction from 32 car park spaces to 11 is simply not balanced. The Transport recovery plan states that if Council are going to remove car park spaces from the Road they must supply alternative parks conveniently located. Where are these alternative car park spaces?
* The Transport recovery plan also states that Council must consider the economic impact on businesses when removing car park spaces.

Have you asked the business owners whose livelihood depends on them being accessible?

The amended plan achieves everything the Council's preferred option contains, but retains parking for shoppers which are the life blood of the retailers and hospitality operators, this section of the Street is made up of small Kiwi businesses, many of which are boutique style businesses that require a balance of parking and accessible options for all modes of transport enabling customers and clients the ability to park and shop. The Council's preferred plan does not accommodate this and in my view is a total imbalance, which will result in the further decline and or Death of our CBD.

The attached amended plan allows for Loading, accessible parks, Cyclists and parking for shoppers with P60 parking with a friendly 10kmh speed limit.

* The ability to turn South on to St Asaph at the end of High Street is critical to the flow of traffic and ability to move within the precinct, my fear is without this people will just head home.

* There are currently a few Cycle parks currently at the South end of the Street. But this plan allows for 24.

* Christchurch does not want to repeat what they have done in the USA and design Bike Friendly Cities for Wealthy Cyclists - there needs to be a balance refer https://www.citylab.com/

* I strongly urge Council to be mindful of the timing and manner of works for this project as the businesses that are there currently are fragile and have not had time to establish. Long drawn out construction periods will certainly spell the end for many of these businesses.

* I implore you to listen to the needs of the CBD community and adopt a balanced solution it is hard work right now for inner city businesses with the malls and outer shopping hubs all having free car parking and the advantage that the City was closed for 2 1/2 years and is still in re-build mode. Reducing the car parking spaces and making it harder to move around the city will spell death for the CBD.

* A balanced plan that caters for everyone ensuring growth and prosperity for the CBD is surely the result the elected members should be seeking.

I would like to be granted the opportunity to speak at the up-coming hearing

Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop
Creating Spaces for People

10th June 2019

Submission Lower High Street up-grade revitalisation

Dear Sir/Madam

I am Shaun Stockman representing SFT Group 177 Limited as Owner of the replacement building in respect to High Street located in the CBD Christchurch.

I am making this submission to the Christchurch City Councillors and/or their representatives on the proposed revitalisation up-grade on the lower section of High Street CBD.

I own three cycles/bikes and two motor vehicles, and regularly cycle in the CBD.

I currently have in this section of High Street 28 tenants plus their staff being an estimated 70 people in small everyday Kiwi businesses plus visitors to the site.

Having studied the Councils preferred plan for this section of High Street I have some serious concerns with it. There are currently 32 carpark spaces in this section of High Street and the Councils preferred plan sees that number reduce to 11 carpark spaces with no right turn out of High Street to allow for further circulation within the CBD. The loss of this many carpark spaces is simply not justified, and spells further decline and or death of the CBD.

Car parking costs in the CBD have increased with the weekly costs of a carpark space now three times what they were pre quake. It is very clear the demand for car parking is stronger now than ever, which is not surprising given ⅔ of the CBD was acquired for the Frames, with the increased demand in car parking and the costs increasing three times post-quake, I cannot understand the rationale behind Council’s motivation in reducing the current carpark spaces further and creating further upward costs, and confirm the public perception don’t come to Town there are no car-parks there.

My first preference is that you leave this section of High Street for at least three years and ‘patch’ it in the interim thus giving the businesses time to establish before the final works are carried out.

My second preference in terms of the up-grade plan is attached. This has been a joint effort with all the other active owners and tenants in this section of High Street while consulting with Council staff through the process. I have also engaged a qualified traffic engineer and auditor to assist create this option.

Stockman Group Limited
SFT Group Holdings Limited
Stockman Trustees Limited
Hillary & Baxter Limited
The attached plan is not that different to what Councils preferred is other than saving parks, and achieves:

1. 32 parallel parks for cars
2. 24 bike parks
3. 1 Mobility parking
4. 1 Loading zone
5. Street crossings
6. Rain gardens
7. Outdoor dining
8. Dedicated two way cycle lane
9. Existing Trees retained

Overall, the plan is balanced.

- The reduction from 32 car park spaces to 11 is simply not balanced. The Transport recovery plan states that if Council are going to remove car park spaces from the Road they must supply alternative parks conveniently located. Where are these alternative car park spaces?

- The Transport recovery plan also states that Council must consider the economic impact on businesses when removing car park spaces.

  Have you asked the business owners whose livelihood depends on them being accessible?

  The amended plan achieves everything the Councils preferred option contains, but retains parking for shoppers which are the life blood of the retailers and hospitality operators, this section of the Street is made up of small Kiwi businesses, many of which are boutique style businesses that require a balance of parking and accessible options for all modes of transport enabling customers and clients the ability to park and shop. The Councils preferred plan does not accommodate this and in my view is a total imbalance, which will result in the further decline and or Death of our CBD.

  The attached amended plan allows for Loading, accessible parks, Cyclists and parking for shoppers with P60 parking with a friendly 10kmh speed limit.

  - The ability to turn South on to St Asaph at the end of High Street is critical to the flow of traffic and ability to move within the precinct, my fear is without this people will just head home.
Creating Spaces for People

- There are currently a few Cycle parks currently at the South end of the Street. But this plan allows for 24.

- Christchurch does not want to repeat what they have done in the USA and design Bike Friendly Cities for Wealthy Cyclists – there needs to be a balance refer https://www.citylab.com/

- I strongly urge Council to be mindful of the timing and manner of works for this project as the businesses that are there currently are fragile and have not had time to establish. Long drawn out construction periods will certainly spell the end for many of these businesses.

- I implore you to listen to the needs of the CBD community and adopt a balanced solution it is hard work right now for inner city businesses with the malls and outer shopping hubs all having free car parking and the advantage that the City was closed for 2 ½ years and is still in re-build mode. Reducing the car parking spaces and making it harder to move around the city will spell death for the CBD.

- A balanced plan that caters for everyone ensuring growth and prosperity for the CBD is surely the result the elected members should be seeking.

I would like to be granted the opportunity to speak at the up-coming hearing.

Yours Sincerely

[Signature]

Shaun Stockman Director
### CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

#### High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- **Received via Have Your Say**

- **Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Shaun Stockman</th>
<th>Submission No: 97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/12/2019 8:49:35 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Stockman Group Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

Submission on Middle High Street up-grade revitalisation and Tram extension

I am Shaun Stockman and I represent SFT Ruby Black Limited in respect to High Street, SFT Cotters Lane Limited in respect to High Street and High Equities Limited in respect to High Street in the CBD Christchurch.

I make this submission to the Christchurch City Councillors and/or their representatives on the proposed up-grade on lower section of High Street CBD.

I own three cycles/bikes and two vehicles and regularly cycle in the CBD.

In this section of the High Street once the buildings are completed, these sites will have 33 tenants, mainly small everyday Kiwi businesses, plus visitor to the sites.

I have studied the preferred Council plan for this section of the Street and have some serious concerns with it. There are currently 27 carpark spaces in this section of High Street; the Council’s preferred plan sees that number reduce to 12. The loss of this many car park spaces is simply not justified, and spells a further decline and certain death for the CBD.

Car parking costs in the CBD have increased with the weekly costs of a carpark space now three times what they were pre quake. It is very clear the demand for car parking is stronger now than ever. With the increased demand in car parking and the costs increasing three times, I cannot understand the rationale behind reducing the current carpark spaces further, and creating upward pressure on car parking.

The attached option was an earlier option put aside by Council and is my preferred option; however I have modified it to reflect the needs of the Street in a balanced manner.

1. The addition of four additional car park spaces form the plan.
2. Only 1x accessible car park adjacent accessible crossing, there is not the demand for 2x accessible parks, with the accessible park right by the crossing it allows good vision and easier access for the parker, there is also a motorcycle park located in the plan.
3. From the scaling of the drawings it appears the footpath on the south west side is being reduced in width (to approx. 2.9-3m from the current 4.05m wide footpath) to accommodate the bike lane. There are verandas at 199 & 201 High Street that come out at least as wide as the proposed footpath (coming off boundary almost exactly 3m). The bike lane needs to belly up to the tram tracks and the car park spaces shunted further north east; or less preferred the landscape strip needs to be a bit longer outside 199-201 High; but other owners at 209 high veranda is coming out at least 2.52m (from old set of Highgate drawings we have) so the footpath can’t get too close.

* The reduction from 27 car park spaces to 12 is simply just not balanced. The Transport recovery plan states that if Council are going to remove car park spaces from the Road they must supply alternative parks conveniently located.

Where are these alternative car park spaces?

* The Transport recovery plan also states that Council must consider the economic impact on businesses when removing car park spaces.

Have you consulted with the retailers and hospitality operators what is the result of this consultation on the loss of car-parks for their clients?

This section of the Street is made up of small Kiwi businesses, many of which are boutique style businesses that require a balance of parking and accessible options for all modes of transport enabling customers and clients the ability to park and shop. The preferred plan does not
accommodate this and in my view is a total imbalance, which will result in the further declined of our CBD.

The attached amended plan allows for Loading, accessible parkers, Cyclists, the Tram and car parking for shoppers and clients with P60 car parking, 21 car park spaces down from the current 27 with a 10km speed limit.

* I am concerned to see the Corgis are proposed to be moved to another location, as they have been park of High Street for some 30 years. I do not want to see them removed.

* The plan also does not have bike parks on it. This is a total imbalance, as they need to be accommodated.

* Christchurch down not want to repeat what they have done in the USA and design Bike Friendly Cities for Wealthy Cyclists - there needs to be a balance refer https://www.citylab.com/

* I urge Council to be mindful of the timing and manner of works for this project as the businesses that are there are fragile and have not had time to establish with long drawn out construction periods will certainly spell the end for the business.

* I implore you to listen to the needs of the CBD community and adopt a balanced solution it is hard work right now for inner city businesses with the malls and outer shopping hubs all having free car parking and the advantage that the City was closed for 2 1/2 years and is still in re-build mode. Reducing the car parking spaces and making it harder to move around the city will spell death for the CBD.

* A balanced plan that caters for everyone ensuring growth and prosperity for the CBD is surely the result the elected members should be seeking.

I would like to be granted the opportunity to speak at the up-coming hearing.

| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop |
Creating Spaces for People

10th June 2019

Submission on Middle High Street up-grade revitalisation and Tram extension

I am Shaun Stockman and I represent SFT Ruby Black Limited in respect to High Street, SFT Cotters Lane Limited in respect to High Street and High Equities Limited in respect to High Street in the CBD Christchurch.

I make this submission to the Christchurch City Councillors and/or their representatives on the proposed up-grade on lower section of High Street CBD.

I own three cycles/bikes and two vehicles and regularly cycle in the CBD.

In this section of the High Street once the buildings are completed, these sites will have 33 tenants, mainly small everyday Kiwi businesses, plus visitor to the sites.

I have studied the preferred Council plan for this section of the Street and have some serious concerns with it. There are currently 27 carpark spaces in this section of High Street; the Councils preferred plan sees that number reduce to 12. The loss of this many car park spaces is simply not justified, and spells a further decline and certain death for the CBD.

Car parking costs in the CBD have increased with the weekly costs of a carpark space now three times what they were pre quake. It is very clear the demand for car parking is stronger now than ever. With the increased demand in car parking and the costs increasing three times, I cannot understand the rationale behind reducing the current carpark spaces further, and creating upward pressure on car parking.

The attached option was an earlier option put aside by Council and is my preferred option; however I have modified it to reflect the needs of the Street in a balanced manner.

1. The addition of four additional car park spaces form the plan.
2. Only 1x accessible car park adjacent accessible crossing, there is not the demand for 2x accessible parks, with the accessible park right by the crossing it allows good vision and easier access for the parker, there is also a motorcycle park located in the plan.
3. From the scaling of the drawings it appears the footpath on the south west side is being reduced in width (to approx. 2.9-3m from the current 4.05m wide footpath) to accommodate the bike lane. There are verandas at 199 & 201 High Street that come out at least as wide as the proposed footpath (coming off boundary almost exactly 3m). The bike lane needs to belly up to the tram tracks and the car park spaces shunted further north east; or less preferred the landscape strip needs to be a bit longer outside 199-201 High; but other owners at 209 high veranda is coming out at least 2.52m (from old set of Highgate drawings we have) so the footpath can’t get too close.
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- The reduction from 27 car park spaces to 12 is simply just not balanced. The Transport recovery plan states that if Council are going to remove car park spaces from the Road they must supply alternative parks conveniently located.

Where are these alternative car park spaces?

- The Transport recovery plan also states that Council must consider the economic impact on businesses when removing car park spaces.

Have you consulted with the retailers and hospitality operators what is the result of this consultation on the loss of car-parks for their clients?

This section of the Street is made up of small Kiwi businesses, many of which are boutique style businesses that require a balance of parking and accessible options for all modes of transport enabling customers and clients the ability to park and shop. The preferred plan does not accommodate this and in my view is a total imbalance, which will result in the further decline of our CBD.

The attached amended plan allows for Loading, accessible parkers, Cyclists, the Tram and car parking for shoppers and clients with P60 car parking, 21 car park spaces down from the current 27 with a 10km speed limit.

- I am concerned to see the Corgis are proposed to be moved to another location, as they have been park of High Street for some 30 years. I do not want to see them removed.

- The plan also does not have bike parks on it. This is a total imbalance, as they need to be accommodated.

- Christchurch does not want to repeat what they have done in the USA and design Bike Friendly Cities for Wealthy Cyclists – there needs to be a balance refer https://www.citylab.com/

- I urge Council to be mindful of the timing and manner of works for this project as the businesses that are there are fragile and have not had time to establish with long drawn out construction periods will certainly spell the end for the business.

- I implore you to listen to the needs of the CBD community and adopt a balanced solution it is hard work right now for inner city businesses with the malls and outer shopping hubs all having free car parking and the advantage that the City was closed for 2 ½ years and is still in re-build mode. Reducing the car parking spaces and making it harder to move around the city will spell death for the CBD.
Creating Spaces for People

- A balanced plan that caters for everyone ensuring growth and prosperity for the CBD is surely the result the elected members should be seeking.

I would like to be granted the opportunity to speak at the up-coming hearing.

Yours Sincerely

Shaun Stockman Director
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

**Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Michael Esposito</th>
<th>Submission No: 90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/11/2019 10:16:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Christchurch Attractions &amp; Hanmer Springs Attractions Tourism Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

The Christchurch City Council is part of the Christchurch Attractions Tourism Group. The group operates the Port Hills Gondola, Punting on the Avon, Caterpillar Garden Tours and Thrillseekers Hanmer.

Tourism is an integral part of Christchurch and the Christchurch Tramway has played an important part, being an internationally recognised icon of Christchurch. Since commencing operation over 24 years ago, the Christchurch Tramway has integrated itself within the local community and plays an important part with inner city events that Christchurch hosts, both local and international. The Christchurch Tramway gives Christchurch a point of difference with its city tour, tourism charters and the Restaurant Tram which is unique to Christchurch. The tram operation also plays an important part in supporting the Tramway Historical Society's restoration business at Ferrymead.

Christchurch Tramway Ltd supports the Council's proposals for the revitalisation of High Street and the tram extension and our comments are as follows:

2. Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)

Christchurch Tramway Ltd has no concerns, from a tram operational perspective, with the plans currently suggested for all three of the street blocks the subject of this consultation. While some of the design detail has yet to be done, the general principle of two way operation in the two northern High St blocks (Cashel to Manchester and Manchester to Tuam) and including Cashel Street between High and Manchester, together with the parking layout proposed, appears to be compatible with safe and efficient tram operation. We do however note a couple of existing issues which should be attended to as part of the refurbishment programme. There is currently no effective signage restricting motor vehicle access and parking in the Stranges Lane area (where the current terminus and crossover are located). It is intended that the crossover remain in use to provide operational flexibility and this is also where one of two mobility lifts on the tram system is located, and there are sometimes issues for the tram there, with service vehicles in particular blocking the tram tracks.

Also, where the tram in High Street will enter and cross Manchester Street on its return to the central city, current signage facing both directions states "No Entry - Except Authorised Vehicles". This seems to suggest that trams and other vehicles will head south along the northbound tram line! This would be unsafe and should be changed to simply "No Entry". The signage allowing "authorised" vehicles to travel north along the tram tracks should say "no Entry - Except Trams". (See Fig 2 attached). It is good to see the "T" lights are already in operation at this intersection, but although no trams yet operate, they are currently part of a continuous sequence. We would like the Council to consider perhaps operating these signals only when the tram is present but giving some priority to the tram when it is there.

Earlier options for the two northern blocks also suggested one-way operation for motor vehicles, and this would also work for the tram should the Council decide to adopt this in either or both streets.

Regarding the southern block of High Street (Tuam to St Asaph), as the tram will not at this time be entering this block it will not be directly affected. The favoured one-way option does appear to be more pedestrian friendly than two way and this may be a good thing for tram passengers wishing to experience that part of High Street and its retail and other business offering. Should in the longer-term future a further extension of the tram through this part of High Street become a consideration, some further changes to street design there would be inevitable.
Thank you for this opportunity to comment on and support the Council’s proposal for High Street and the tram extension. Christchurch Tramway Ltd wishes to speak to this submission at the hearings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Proposed tram route extension, including new poles along Lichfield Street, and the new stop Christchurch Tramway Ltd has been a participant in the on-going engagement process which assisted the Council in evaluating options for the revitalisation of this part of High Street including the further extension of the city tramway. We have seen a series of options evolve into those currently proposed by the Council and now open for wider public consultation. Regarding the tram extension, it is our preference that it terminate in a turnaround loop rather than having a further crossover in High Street between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as earlier proposed. This will provide some additional safety features and operational advantages, obviating the need to change or turn the tram poles and passenger seats, and thus also save some time, as well as allowing for the future return of trailer operation should that be needed. Given the impracticality of constructing a turnaround loop further along High Street towards St Asaph Street, the turn from Poplar Street back into High Street at Tuam Street is seen as a good solution. We also support the intention to include a turnout from Poplar, with the track beyond this towards Tuam remaining and accessible for short time stopping and to allow trams to pass, while leaving the option open for possibly further extending the tramway in the future. Having the tram stop located as proposed will give both passengers on the tram a good view along High Street to the south and people in that part of High Street a view of the tram as it arrives, minimising the distance needed to walk to the stop. We do have some concerns however that the location proposed for the tram shelter could restrict those views and request that it be moved further towards Poplar Street, and perhaps turned to be parallel with Poplar Street, thus leaving a clear view to and from High Street (see Fig. 1 attached) Regarding tram poles required to support the overhead wiring for the tram, we note that some location and other details have yet to be completed and advised. The “contemporary” design adopted for the existing extension in Oxford Terrace, Cashel and High Street Malls and High Street south of Cashel to Manchester would be appropriate for this part of the extension as well. We note that some poles are already in position in Poplar Street and that it may be a tidy solution if attachments to buildings could also be considered, particularly for part of the curve out of Poplar into High. It is great to hear that negotiations are well advanced in relation to the land purchase needed to allow the tram to turn from Poplar into High, following a rail safety audit confirming what is needed for safe operation. We consider that this corner can be transformed into a very attractive tram stop and pedestrian space while encouraging quality adjacent development including an active frontage. We look forward to the early completion of the land purchase as we are keen to see the tram extension agreed and constructed as soon as practicable, and if at all possible able to be in operation by 14 May 2020. This is because that is when the Annual 4 day TRENZ Conference (NZ's largest tourist industry trade show) will commence in Christchurch for the first time since the earthquakes. In 2018 This event attracted 1800 delegates world-wide with 30 countries in attendance. This will be a great opportunity to showcase the tramway and its extension into this rejuvenating area. The Innovation Precinct/SALT District is set to become a "must see" attraction of the Central City and the tramway will be well placed to play its part in bringing visitors and locals to it and assisting in its promotion.
10 June 2019

Engagement Team
Public Information and Participation Unit
Christchurch City Council

Attention Jennie Hamilton

Email:

COMMENTS FROM CHRISTCHURCH TRAMWAY LTD ON THE REVITALISATION OF HIGH STREET (CASHEL STREET TO ST ASAPH STREET) AND PROPOSED TRAM ROUTE EXTENSION.

The Christchurch Tramway is part of the Christchurch Attractions Tourism Group. The group operates the Port Hills Gondola, Punting on the Avon, Caterpillar Garden Tours and Thrillseekers Hanmer.

Tourism is an integral part of Christchurch and the Christchurch Tramway has played an important part, being an internationally recognised icon of Christchurch. Since commencing operation over 24 years ago, the Christchurch Tramway has integrated itself within the local community and plays an important part with inner city events that Christchurch hosts, both local and international. The Christchurch Tramway gives Christchurch a point of difference with its city tour, tourism charters and the Restaurant Tram which is unique to Christchurch. The tram operation also plays an important part in supporting the Tramway Historical Society's restoration business at Ferrymead.

Christchurch Tramway Ltd supports the Council's proposals for the revitalisation of High Street and the tram extension and our comments are as follows:

1. Proposed tram route extension, including new poles along Lichfield Street, and the new stop

Christchurch Tramway Ltd has been a participant in the on-going engagement process which assisted the Council in evaluating options for the revitalisation of this part of High Street including the further extension of the city tramway. We have seen a series of options evolve into those currently proposed by the Council and now open for wider public consultation.
Regarding the tram extension, it is our preference that it terminate in a turnaround loop rather than having a further crossover in High Street between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as earlier proposed. This will provide some additional safety features and operational advantages, obviating the need to change or turn the tram poles and passenger seats, and thus also save some time, as well as allowing for the future return of trailer operation should that be needed. Given the impracticality of constructing a turnaround loop further along High Street towards St Asaph Street, the turn from Poplar Street back into High Street at Tuam Street is seen as a good solution. We also support the intention to include a turnout from Poplar, with the track beyond this towards Tuam remaining and accessible for short time stopping and to allow trams to pass, while leaving the option open for possibly further extending the tramway in the future.

Having the tram stop located as proposed will give both passengers on the tram a good view along High Street to the south and people in that part of High Street a view of the tram as it arrives, minimizing the distance needed to walk to the stop. We do have some concerns however that the location proposed for the tram shelter could restrict those views and request that it be moved further towards Poplar Street, and perhaps turned to be parallel with Poplar Street, thus leaving a clear view to and from High Street.  (see Fig. 1 attached)

Regarding tram poles required to support the overhead wiring for the tram, we note that some location and other details have yet to be completed and advised. The “contemporary” design adopted for the existing extension in Oxford Terrace, Cashel and High Street Malls and High Street south of Cashel to Manchester would be appropriate for this part of the extension as well. We note that some poles are already in position in Poplar Street and that it may be a tidy solution if attachments to buildings could also be considered, particularly for part of the curve out of Poplar into High.

It is great to hear that negotiations are well advanced in relation to the land purchase needed to allow the tram to turn from Poplar into High, following a rail safety audit confirming what is needed for safe operation. We consider that this corner can be transformed into a very attractive tram stop and pedestrian space while encouraging quality adjacent development including an active frontage.

We look forward to the early completion of the land purchase as we are keen to see the tram extension agreed and constructed as soon as practicable, and if at all possible able to be in operation by 14 May 2020. This is because that is when the Annual 4 day TRENZ Conference (NZ’s largest tourist industry trade show) will commence, in Christchurch for the first time since the earthquakes. In 2018 this event attracted 1800 delegates world-wide with 30 countries in attendance. This will be a great opportunity to showcase the tramway and its extension into this rejuvenating area. The Innovation Precinct/SALT District is set to become a “must see” attraction of the Central City and the tramway will be well placed to play its part in bringing visitors and locals to it and assisting in its promotion.

2. **Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

Christchurch Tramway Ltd has no concerns, from a tram operational perspective, with the plans currently suggested for all three of the street blocks the subject of this consultation. While some of the design detail has yet to be done, the general principle of two way operation in the two northern High St blocks (Cashel to Manchester and Manchester to Tuam) and including Cashel Street
between High and Manchester, together with the parking layout proposed, appears to be compatible with safe and efficient tram operation. We do however note a couple of existing issues which should be attended to as part of the refurbishment programme. There is currently no effective signage restricting motor vehicle access and parking in the Stranges Lane area (where the current terminus and crossover are located). It is intended that the crossover remain in use to provide operational flexibility and this is also where one of two mobility lifts on the tram system is located, and there are sometimes issues for the tram there, with service vehicles in particular blocking the tram tracks.

Also, where the tram in High Street will enter and cross Manchester Street on its return to the central city, current signage facing both directions states “No Entry – Except Authorised Vehicles”. This seems to suggest that trams and other vehicles will head south along the northbound tram line! This would be unsafe and should be changed to simply “No Entry”. The signage allowing “authorised” vehicles to travel north along the tram tracks should say “No Entry – Except Trams”. (See Fig. 2 attached.) It is good to see that “T” lights are already in operation at this intersection, but although no trams yet operate, they are currently part of a continuous sequence. We would like the Council to consider perhaps operating these signals only when the tram is present but giving some priority to the tram when it is there.

Earlier options for the two northern blocks also suggested one-way operation for motor vehicles, and this would also work for the tram should the Council decide to adopt this in either or both streets.

Regarding the southern block of High Street (Tuam to St Asaph), as the tram will not at this time be entering this block it will not be directly affected. The favoured one-way option does appear to be more pedestrian friendly than two way and this may be a good thing for tram passengers wishing to experience that part of High Street and its retail and other business offering. Should in the longer-term future a further extension of the tram through this part of High Street become a consideration, some further changes to street design there would be inevitable.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on and support the Council’s proposals for High Street and the tram extension. Christchurch Tramway Ltd wishes to speak to this submission at the hearings.

Yours sincerely

Michael Esposito | Managing Director

M: 
E: 
W: 

W:
Attachments

Fig 1. Tram shelter relocation suggestion

Fig 2. High St Signage (south of Manchester St)
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**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

**BACKGROUND**

The Society was established nearly 60 years ago and has a well-established operating tram and trolley bus museum at Ferrymead Heritage Park. Through its subsidiary the Heritage Tramways Trust (HTT) it is the supplier of five of the seven trams now operating on the City Tramway. The HTT also assists Christchurch Tramway (CTL) with major repair and tram refurbishment work. The Society has further unrestored tram bodies in storage, able to be brought back to full operating condition for town operation when required, if and when funds are available.

The Council has rightly recognised the need to repair and revitalise these parts of High Street (and also Cashel Street between High and Manchester). The tram already successfully operates in High Street between Manchester and Cashel, this being the only section of double track in the system and where motor vehicles and the trams need to occupy the same road space in both directions. If a one-way motor vehicle option was to be further considered for these blocks of Cashel and High Streets, we suggest it should be in an anticlockwise direction (i.e. E-W along Cashel, and NW-SE along High). This would result in less potential tram/motor vehicle conflict points than one way in the opposite direction.

For High Street between Manchester and Tuam, a one-way option with motor vehicles travelling north (i.e. same as the tram) would have the least potential tram/motor vehicle conflict points. For High between Tuam and St Asaph, while the tram will not be in this part of the street at this time, the one way south bound for motor vehicles as proposed, plus cycleway, widened footpath etc, suggest that if the tram were to use this part of High Street in the future, the least disruption to the currently proposed layout would see a south bound only tram track with return to the central city being via another street.

The Society wishes to speak to its comments at the forthcoming hearings.

---

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**

**TRAM EXTENSION**

The Tramway Historical Society has long been a strong supporter of the further extension of the tramway along High Street to assist in the revitalisation of this part of the central city and help it to become a ‘must see’ destination for visitors and our own citizens. The tram tracks along Lichfield, Poplar and much of High Street between Manchester and Tuam Streets are mostly already in place, having been constructed in accordance with the 2009 approved and funded plan which would have taken the tram in two stages all the way along High Street and on to Barbadoes Street, returning through the CPIT (now ARA) campus. Stage 1 of the extension, if it had been fully completed, would have seen a loop from Poplar Street back into High Street crossing Tuam Street and passing in front of the historic former High Street Post Office, now C1 Coffee and Alice in Videoland. Because of the earthquakes this didn’t happen but in recent years the need to continue the completion of the extension beyond the temporary terminus at Manchester Street, completed in 2015, has been recognised and requested.

We applaud the reinstatement of funding for further extending the tram when the Council approved its 2018-28 Long Term Plan a year ago and it is good to see the progress that has since been made in planning and engaging with the community. It is pleasing to note that the loop back into High Street from Poplar Street, as requested by CTL and without having to cross Tuam Street, has proven to be feasible and we understand that negotiations for the necessary land purchase are close to completion.

It is also good to see that the additional section of line already built along Poplar Street to Tuam Street will not be abandoned and can be used as a stopping and passing bay for trams while
| retaining a long term option for possibly further extending the system along High Street and beyond as envisaged prior to the earthquakes. We support the request of CTL to have the tram extension in operation by mid May next year in time for the TRENZ event, noting that with much of the track already in place it should be possible to complete the detailed design for the balance and award contracts for construction for this part of the overall project ahead of the associated High and Cashel Street revitalisation work. Some of the tram overhead poles are also in place and continuation of the 'contemporary' overhead design, including attachments to buildings where practicable would seem to be a 'no brainer'. |
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**Item No.: 5**
High Street revitalisation

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to the proposed upgrade of High Street. This submission is made on behalf of Generation Zero - a nationwide youth-led advocacy group, with a vision to see New Zealand achieve net zero Greenhouse Gas emissions by 2050.

High Street is designated as a key walking link in the An Accessible City plan. It is not singled out to cater for any other modes. The street links the Retail precinct, West End, the convention centre and Cathedral Square with Ara, the Multi Use Arena, Little High and several other shops/restaurants and bars in the area. As such we believe this street should be geared primarily towards pedestrians. The move to a 10km/h speed limit supports this and we strongly support the Council’s ambition here. While we appreciate fully pedestrianising the street would be difficult creating a shared space like is seen on the Promenade would create a great environment while still maintaining vehicle access. We note our support for the kerbless nature of the two southern blocks proposed.

Northern Block

The northern block particularly has a great opportunity to become integrated with the bustling retail precinct by extending the shared space. Currently the block contains shops, bars, offices and one (soon to be two) hotels who would benefit from becoming part of the excitement, as well as several empty sites bringing even more potential.

The removal of kerbs will give people who cycle and people with mobility impairments or prams more freedom in how they can get around as well as emphasising the shared space nature of the space. This could be further improved by creating a clear path outside of the tram tracks. Some additional cycle parking on Cashel Street would be appreciated.

Our understanding is there are no permanent off street car parks requiring access off this block, so we can not see any compelling reason why two-way traffic should be retained in this block. A south to north one way flow would maintain vehicle access and continue to allow buses to pick up/drop off guests right outside the BreakFree on Cashel.

In the mornings while people are trying to walk to work, the BreakFree on Cashel often has large groups of guests either waiting to be picked up, getting dropped off or loading/waiting for baggage. A separated drop off/pick up area for buses or even just a wider footpath would reduce this congestion.
High/Manchester/Lichfield

We would appreciate consideration of a Barnes dance crossing at the intersection of High Street/Manchester Street/Lichfield Street as this would allow people to move down the High Street key walking link more easily than they currently can and would be able to in what is proposed.

Middle Block

The middle block seems appropriate to support C1 and Smash Palace with car parking and vehicle access, however we ask for the shared space aspect to be kept obvious to maintain the key walking link.

We would ask for one or two more sets of cycle parking towards the centre of the block. Knowledge of sharrows still seems imperfect so explanatory signage for drivers entering the sharrows would be appreciated.

Southern Block

We appreciate the move to create the southern block one-way for vehicles instead of two-way, again we would ask for the shared space aspect to be kept obvious for this key walking link.

It is good to see cycle parking towards the south - one additional set of cycle parking towards the north of the block would complete the puzzle. Again, explanatory signage of expected behaviour in the sharrows would improve driver education.

Tram

We support the extension of the tram lines as the trams bring extra people and amenity to the areas. We would appreciate some consideration given as to whether trams could be run along these lines as a form of public transport, especially when the multi-use arena is opened.

Summary

Our requests are summarised below.

Throughout the whole scheme, we ask for:
- The whole area to be acknowledged as a shared space rather than streets with sidewalks;
- Explanatory signage for expected behaviour around sharrows.
In the north block:
- The kerbs to be removed in line with High Street to the north and what is proposed to the south;
- A corridor for people who want to cycle/scoot outside of the tram tracks;
- An extra set of cycle parks on Cashel Street;
- One-way south to north vehicle flow;
- A separated bus-taxi drop-off lane outside the BreakFree on Cashel.

At the High/Manchester/Lichfield intersection:
- A Barnes dance crossing arrangement.

In the Manchester to St Asaph block:
- Cycle parks in the middle of the block.

In the south block:
- Cycle parks towards the north of the block.

We believe that these changes would provide a great link for people taking carbon-less active transport into the city, as well as creating a more pedestrian friendly central city environment where future residents do not feel like they need a car. We can see in the long term this scheme would help set the project area up to become an extension of the Cashel Street pedestrian mall and even further shift us away from the private car and towards a more sustainable future.

Thank you,
Cameron Bradley

On behalf of Generation Zero
https://www.generationzero.org/
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**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to the proposed upgrade of High Street. This submission is made on behalf of Generation Zero - a nationwide youth-led advocacy group, with a vision to see New Zealand achieve net zero Greenhouse Gas emissions by 2050.

High Street is designated as a key walking link in the An Accessible City plan. It is not singled out to cater for any other modes. The street links the Retail precinct, West End, the convention centre and Cathedral Square with Ara, the Multi Use Arena, Little High and several other shops/restaurants and bars in the area. As such we believe this street should be geared primarily towards pedestrians. The move to a 10km/h speed limit supports this and we strongly support the Council’s ambition here. While we appreciate fully pedestrianising the street would be difficult creating a shared space like is seen on the Promenade would create a great environment while still maintaining vehicle access. We note our support for the kerbless nature of the two southern blocks proposed.

**Northern Block**

The northern block particularly has a great opportunity to become integrated with the bustling retail precinct by extending the shared space. Currently the block contains shops, bars, offices and one (soon to be two) hotels who would benefit from becoming part of the excitement, as well as several empty sites bringing even more potential.

The removal of kerbs will give people who cycle and people with mobility impairments or prams more freedom in how they can get around as well as emphasising the shared space nature of the space. This could be further improved by creating a clear path outside of the tram tracks. Some additional cycle parking on Cashel Street would be appreciated.

Our understanding is there are no permanent off street car parks requiring access off this block, so we can not see any compelling reason why two-way traffic should be retained in this block. A south to north one way flow would maintain vehicle access and continue to allow buses to pick up/drop off guests right outside the BreakFree on Cashel.

In the mornings while people are trying to walk to work, the BreakFree on Cashel often has large groups of guests either waiting to be picked up, getting dropped off or loading/waiting for baggage. A separated drop off/pick up area for buses or even just a wider footpath would reduce this congestion.

**High/Manchester/Lichfield**

We would appreciate consideration of a Barnes dance crossing at the intersection of High Street/Manchester Street/Lichfield Street as this would allow people to move down the High Street key walking link more easily than they currently can and would be able to in what is proposed.

**Middle Block**

The middle block seems appropriate to support C1 and Smash Palace with car parking and vehicle access, however we ask for the shared space aspect to be kept obvious to maintain the key walking link.

We would ask for one or two more sets of cycle parking towards the centre of the block.

Knowledge of sharrows still seems imperfect so explanatory signage for drivers entering the sharrows would be appreciated.

**Southern Block**
We appreciate the move to create the southern block one-way for vehicles instead of two-way, again we would ask for the shared space aspect to be kept obvious for this key walking link.

It is good to see cycle parking towards the south - one additional set of cycle parking towards the north of the block would complete the puzzle. Again, explanatory signage of expected behaviour in the sharrows would improve driver education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</th>
<th>Tram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We support the extension of the tram lines as the trams bring extra people and amenity to the areas. We would appreciate some consideration given as to whether trams could be run along these lines as a form of public transport, especially when the multi-use arena is opened.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our requests are summarised below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout the whole scheme, we ask for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The whole area to be acknowledged as a shared space rather than streets with sidewalks;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Explanatory signage for expected behaviour around sharrows.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the north block:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The kerbs to be removed in line with High Street to the north and what is proposed to the south;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A corridor for people who want to cycle/scoot outside of the tram tracks;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An extra set of cycle parks on Cashel Street;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One-way south to north vehicle flow;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A separated bus/taxi drop-off lane outside the BreakFree on Cashel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the High/Manchester/Lichfield intersection:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A Barnes dance crossing arrangement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Manchester to St Asaph block:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cycle parks in the middle of the block.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the south block:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cycle parks towards the north of the block.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We believe that these changes would provide a great link for people taking carbon-less active transport into the city, as well as creating a more pedestrian friendly central city environment where future residents do not feel like they need a car. We can see in the long term this scheme would help set the project area up to become an extension of the Cashel Street pedestrian mall and even further shift us away from the private car and towards a more sustainable future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)

Submission on Lower High Street on Behalf of Duncan's 135 Limited

The purpose of this letter is to provide a submission on behalf of Duncan’s 135 Limited in relation to the Council’s proposed road upgrade works on High Street between Tuam Street and St Asaph Street. Duncan’s 135 Limited is the owner of High Street which is part of the heritage listed red brick buildings shown, in pre-earthquake form, on the left-hand side in Figure 1 below and also in Figure 2 on the next page:

Background to the Submission

The Duncan's building was extensively damaged in the Canterbury Earthquake sequence, and has recently been rebuilt whilst retaining as much as possible of the historic building structure. Considerable commercial investment has been made by the various owners of the wider building to retain this special part of Christchurch’s historic fabric and character. The Duncan's Buildings original façade has been restored and new buildings built behind for ground floor boutique retailers and 1st floor offices. The property enjoys the benefits of stunning heritage features combined with contemporary design and the mix of fashion and hospitality tenants will create a unique retail experience.

This commercial investment decision was not made lightly, and a key influence in the decision to rebuild in the manner undertaken is the availability of parking in this section of High Street. As can be seen in Figure 1, High Street historically had parallel parking along both sides of the road. There was a total of approximately 40 spaces provided along the road and these had various time restrictions placed upon them. Occupancy of these parking spaces was very high because the various retail outlets along the south-western side of this block of High Street had no other convenient parking source at the time.

The earthquake sequence caused significant damage to both the buildings and to High Street itself. The parking on the southwestern side of the street converted informally to angle parking, with parallel parking retained as before on the north-easter side. The parking capacity on this block remained at around 40 spaces and this continued to be very well utilised even though most of the retail tenancies were empty as earthquake rebuilds or repairs progressed.

The relatively intensive level of redevelopment that has now occurred along the south-western side of the block means that the demand for on-street parking in this location will only intensify as the Duncan building is progressively tenanted. Given the relative lack of convenient parking facilities elsewhere (noting that the nearby Wilson car ark to the south of ‘Little High’ is frequently operating at capacity) it is therefore critical that a high level of on-street parking is retained in this section of High Street.

In relation to the provision of on-street parking, it is noted that the Council's road proposal reduces the amount of on-street parking spaces from around 40- to 11. This is a significant reduction in any area where trade will be specifically derived from passing motorised traffic flow. Any proposal to remove on-street parking within a business area requires consideration on the effects of the loss of this parking on the operation of the businesses alongside. To quote Action 1.3.2 of the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan:

“Parking measures can initiate rapid changes in travel behaviour, but wider effects are complex and must be carefully considered.”

The submitter is not aware of any Council analysis of the potential impact on neighbouring business as a result of the Council’s proposed 29-space parking supply reduction within this block.
despite such analysis being a specific requirement of the Council’s own master planning document.

Further the Council’s design proposal, has not provided proper recognition of the importance of parking – including on-street parking – to overall business vitality and, ultimately for many, business survival. Objective 3.1: of the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan it states:

“Easy movement of and access to goods and services” and “Easy movement of and access to goods and services will support the economic recovery and growth of the city.”

Further the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan states that:

“The challenge for Christchurch is to establish and manage a network that will help to improve access to goods and services, increase the reliability of journey times for regional and national freight travel and protect the network for future growth, at the same time balancing this with the need for safe and attractive communities and neighbourhoods.”

It is submitted that the Council’s design proposal, which removes the majority of the heavily utilised on-street parking supply in this section of High Street, goes too far towards providing for urban amenity at the expense of business activity that helps to create that amenity.

Further, Action 3.1.3 ‘Parking’ of the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan states that:

Action 3.1.3 Parking

Parking that supports the city’s economy

Parking is a valuable asset to the network. The provision of parking is a key part of the overall transport network. A good supply of convenient, secure, well placed and easy to find parking will support economic recovery and the future prosperity of the city.

And:

Re-allocating on-street parking

Where a shared priority corridor is identified through the new road classification system, there may be a need to reprioritise road space for public transport and active transport on priority corridors or landscaping where road space is limited. Where there remains a need for parking in the area, parking will be reallocated to convenient off -street locations.

The Council’s consultation to date makes no effort to properly consider the effects of the removal of on-street parking will have on the adjoining businesses. The Council has made no effort to address the issue of a compensatory convenient parking supply.

The Council Road Redevelopment Proposal

Reviewing the Council’s design proposal in finer detail, Duncan’s 135 supports the redevelopment of High Street in general terms. The road is long overdue for repair, and it is logical that this occurs following redevelopment of the buildings alongside.

In relation to the Council’s latest proposed road layout, Duncan’s 135 Limited supports:

• The concept of a ‘kerbless’ road to provide flexibility with future use of the available road reserve area;

• The provision of trees, landscaping and artworks within the streetscape.

• Reducing the speed limit to 10km/h (although it is questioned how this would be enforced for both motorised and non-motorised traffic along the street);

In relation to the Council’s proposed road layout, Duncan’s 135 Limited does not support:

• The reduction of the number of parking spaces within the block from around 40 to 11. This will have a significant negative impact on the commercial viability of the tenants within the Duncan’s building.

• The proposal for expansive areas of on-street parking to be converted to pedestrian amenity areas. While this idea has merit for outside food and beverage outlets, these outlets can change location over time such that permanently creating such spaces may not reflect the amenity needs of the block relative to the types of commercial activity operating along it. In any case, within a 20m wide road reserve there is ample room to provide for amenity areas, such as outdoor dining areas, whilst retaining on-street parking along the majority of both sides of the road – especially so if the one-way southbound route is adopted.

An Alternate Road Redevelopment Proposal

As part of the various land owners evaluation of this roading project, consideration has been given to an alternate road layout that adopts the majority of the design concepts in the Council’s layout, but relocates the space in order to maintain an on-street parking supply of 30 spaces including accessible spaces. A loading zone and two-mid-block road crossing points is also included within the alternate design proposal. A copy of the submitters preferred road layout is attached to this submission.
In relation to specific Council design criteria for this type of road it is noted that the alternate design proposal provides:

- A ‘kerbless’ cross section design that is adaptable to cater for potential future changes in the use of the road reserve area;
- Kerb buildouts at the identified pedestrian crossing points. The buildouts themselves have rounded edges to prevent kerbing by manoeuvring vehicles;
- Parking space lengths of 52.4m at ends of rows and 6.3m within the rows which is within 200mm of the design lengths often adopted by the Council;
- Accessible parking spaces located next to the crossing points so that rear loading vehicles have additional room to unload wheelchair bound passengers;
- A 12m long loading zone;
- A 12m wide separation between parking spaces and amenity features to provide for car door openings and an accessible route between parked cars and the amenity features.

It is the position of the submitter that the alternate road redevelopment proposal provides a far superior design compromise for the competing demand on the available road space, and at the same time provides an acceptable reduction on the provision of on-street parking such that business viability along the street is not unduly affected.

The Business Group wants to work with the Council to achieve this.

The submitter wishes to speak at the hearing where the Council deliberates on this project.

If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me directly on or
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**Item No.: 5**

**A. PLAN VIEW (SCALE 1:400)**

**LEGEND**
1. Landscape planting with a mix of low growing natives and exotics
2. Existing trees retained on the North side of the street
3. Proposed street trees on south side of the street to be small to medium sized. Suggested species including Magnolia, Maple or Flowering Cherry
4. Crossing and safety splay with patterned surface to create a ‘courtesy crossing’
5. Open landscaped puddletanks (6x3m) with seating and glass panels to provide barrier from the road
6. Bike parking space (6x3m) - 8 spaces each
7. Tactile paving at crossing points
8. Mobility parking bay
9. Loading zone
10. 300mm Dish channel to capture runoff
11. 150mm flush kerbs to allow ease of movement across street
12. Cycle lane - with 200mm dividing line between cycle lane and car parking
13. Rain garden

**B. SECTION - ELEVATION FACING NORTH SIDE (NTS)**

**30 PARALLEL PARKING BAYS**
- 1 Loading zone (incl. 1 mobility) - 24 Bike parking spaces

**Revision No.**
- A
- B
- C
- D

**Amendment**
- Client comments
- Client comments
- 4m north side
- 7m south side
- Client comments
- 4.3m north side
- 4.7m south side

**Approved**
- DCC
- DCC
- DCC
- DCC

**Date**
- 04.06.2019
- 05.04.2019
- 08.06.2019
- 10.06.2019

**Project No.** / Drawing No.: 2019/054/0001
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Attention: Jennie Hamilton
Via email:

11th June 2019

Dear Jennie,

RE: SUBMISSION ON LOWER HIGH STREET ON BEHALF OF DUNCAN’S 135 LIMITED

The purpose of this letter is to provide a submission on behalf of Duncan’s 135 Limited in relation to the Council’s proposed road upgrade works on High Street between Tuam Street and St Asaph Street. Duncan’s 135 Limited is the owner of High Street which is part of the heritage listed red brick buildings shown, in pre-earthquake form, on the left-hand side in Figure 1 below and also in Figure 2 on the next page:

![Image of High Street](attachment:image.jpg)

Figure 1: The southern section of High Street, viewed looking northwest from the St Asaph Street intersection.
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Figure 2: Elevation of the per-earthquake Duncan Building, viewed looking southwest from outside the Ara building. Note the on-street parking demand.

Background to the Submission

The Duncan’s building was extensively damaged in the Canterbury Earthquake sequence, and has recently been rebuilt whilst retaining as much as possible of the historic building structure. Considerable commercial investment has been made by the various owners of the wider building to retain this special part of Christchurch’s historic fabric and character. The Duncan’s Buildings original façade has been restored and new buildings built behind for ground floor boutique retailers and 1st floor offices. The property enjoys the benefits of stunning heritage features combined with contemporary design and the mix of fashion and hospitality tenants will create a unique retail experience.

This commercial investment decision was not made lightly, and a key influence in the decision to rebuilt in the manner undertaken is the availability of parking in this section of High Street. As can be seen in Figure 1, High Street historically had parallel parking along both sides of the road. There was a total of approximately 40 spaces provided along the road and these had various time restrictions placed upon them. Occupancy of these parking spaces was very high because the various retail outlets along the south-western side of this block of High Street had no other convenient parking source at the time.
The earthquake sequence caused significant damage to both the buildings and to High Street itself. The parking on the southwestern side of the street converted informally to angle parking, with parallel parking retained as before on the north-eastern side. The parking capacity on this block remained at around 40 spaces and this continued to be very well utilised even though most of the retail tenancies were empty as earthquake rebuilds or repairs progressed.

The relatively intensive level of redevelopment that has now occurred along the south-western side of the block means that the demand for on-street parking in this location will only intensify as the building is progressively tenanted. Given the relative lack of convenient parking facilities elsewhere (noting that the nearby Wilson car ark to the south of ‘Little High’ is frequently operating at capacity) it is therefore critical that a high level of on-street parking is retained in this section of High Street.

In relation to the provision of on-street parking, it is noted that the Council’s road proposal reduces the amount of on-street parking spaces from around 40- to 11. This is a significant reduction in any area where trade will be specifically derived from passing motorised traffic flow. Any proposal to remove on-street parking within a business area requires consideration on the effects of the loss of this parking on the operation of the businesses alongside. To quote Action 1.3.2 of the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan:

“Parking measures can initiate rapid changes in travel behaviour, but wider effects are complex and must be carefully considered.”

The submitter is not aware of any Council analysis of the potential impact on neighbouring business as a result of the Council’s proposed 29-space parking supply reduction within this block despite such analysis being a specific requirement of the Council’s own master planning document.

Further the Councils design proposal; has not provided proper recognition of the importance of parking – including on-street parking – to overall business vitality and, ultimately for many, business survival. Objective 3.1: of the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan it states:

“Easy movement of and access to goods and services” and “Easy movement of and access to goods and services will support the economic recovery and growth of the city.”
Further the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan states that:

“The challenge for Christchurch is to establish and manage a network that will help to improve access to goods and services, increase the reliability of journey times for regional and national freight travel and protect the network for future growth, at the same time balancing this with the need for safe and attractive communities and neighbourhoods.”

It is submitted that the Council’s design proposal, which removes the majority of the heavily utilised on-street parking supply in this section of High Street, goes too far towards providing for urban amenity at the expense of business activity that helps to create that amenity.

Further, Action 3.1.3 ‘Parking’ of the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan states that:

Action 3.1.3 Parking

Parking that supports the city’s economy

Parking is a valuable asset to the network. The provision of parking is a key part of the overall transport network. A good supply of convenient, secure, well placed and easy to find parking will support economic recovery and the future prosperity of the city.

And:

Re-allocating on-street parking

Where a shared priority corridor is identified through the new road classification system, there may be a need to reprioritise road space for public transport and active transport on priority corridors or landscaping where road space is limited. Where there remains a need for parking in the area, parking will be reallocated to convenient off-street locations.

The Council’s consultation to date makes no effort to properly consider the effects of the removal of on-street parking will have on the adjoining businesses. The Council has made no effort to address the issue of a compensatory convenient parking supply.
The Council Road Redevelopment Proposal

Reviewing the Council’s design proposal in finer detail, Duncan’s 135 supports the redevelopment of High Street in general terms. The road is long overdue for repair, and it is logical that this occurs following redevelopment of the buildings alongside.

In relation to the Council’s latest proposed road layout, Duncan’s 135 Limited supports:

- The concept of a ‘kerbless’ road to provide flexibility with future use of the available road reserve area;
- The provision of trees, landscaping and artworks within the streetscape.
- Reducing the speed limit to 10km/h (although it is questioned how this would be enforced for both motorised and non-motorised traffic along the street);

In relation to the Council’s proposed road layout, Duncan’s 135 Limited does not support:

- The reduction of the number of parking spaces within the block from around 40 to 11. This will have a significant negative impact on the commercial viability of the tenants within the Duncan’s building.
- The proposal for expansive areas of on-street parking to be converted to pedestrian amenity areas. While this idea has merit for outside food and beverage outlets, these outlets can change location over time such that permanently creating such spaces may not reflect the amenity needs of the block relative to the types of commercial activity operating along it. In any case, within a 20m wide road reserve there is ample room to provide for amenity areas, such as outdoor dining areas, whilst retaining on-street parking along the majority of both sides of the road – especially so if the one-way southbound route is adopted.

An Alternate Road Redevelopment Proposal

As part of the various land owners evaluation of this roading project, consideration has been given to an alternate road layout that adopts the majority of the design concepts in the Council’s layout, but relocates the space in order to maintain an on-street parking supply of 30 spaces including accessible spaces. A loading zone and two-mid-block road crossing points is also included within the alternate design proposal. A copy of the submitters preferred road layout is attached to this submission.
In relation to specific Council design criteria for this type of road it is noted that the alternate design proposal provides:

- A ‘kerbless’ cross section design that is adaptable to cater for potential future changes in the use of the road reserve area;
- Kerb buildouts at the identified pedestrian crossing points. The buildouts them selves have rounded edges to prevent kerbing by manoeuvring vehicles;
- Parking space lengths of 52.4m at ends of rows and 6.3m within the rows which is within 200mm of the design lengths often adopted by the Council;
- Accessible parking spaces located next to the crossing points so that rear loading vehicles have additional room to unload wheelchair bound passengers,
- A 12m long loading zone;
- A 12m wide separation between parking spaces and amenity features to provide for car door openings and an accessible route between parked cars and the amenity features.

It is the position of the submitter that the alternate road redevelopment proposal provides a far superior design compromise for the competing demand on the available road space, and at the same time provides an acceptable reduction on the provision of on-street parking such that business viability along the street is not unduly affected.

The Business Group wants to work with the Council to achieve this.

The submitter wishes to speak at the hearing where the Council deliberates on this project.

If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me directly on .

Yours faithfully,

Ray Edwards
Managing Director
URBIS TPD LIMITED
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Please see attached submission. This is a priority pedestrian route and the block from Tuam to Madras a priority cycling route which these plans instead prioritize for on street parking. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | This tourist tram reduces road safety while adding nothing to public transport. |
June 8 2019

RE: High Street

SUBMISSION FROM SPOKES CANTERBURY

Spokes Canterbury is a local cycling advocacy group with approximately 1,200 members that is affiliated with the national Cycling Action Network (CAN). All submissions are developed online and include members’ input. Spokes is dedicated to including cycling as an everyday form of transport in the greater Christchurch area.

We would like the opportunity to appear at any public hearing that is held to consider submissions on these projects. Should there be an officer’s report or similar document(s) we would appreciate a copy(s).

If you require further information or there are matters requiring clarification, please contact our Submissions Convenor Dirk De Lu in the first instance. His contact details are:

Phone:  
Email:  

Don Babe  
Chairperson, Spokes Canterbury
Thank you for trying to make the best of this congested space. Spokes supports the 10km/h speed limit and appreciates that cycle parking is shown on the plans.

In this submission specific issues are raised and some suggestions are offered. The real problem is the continued pandering to on street parking regardless of the safety issues created. Safety and support for multi modal transport should always be prioritised over vehicle storage.

**Public Sentiment and City Transport**

Share an idea found wide support for a city inviting to people on foot and bicycles. The vision for the central city was as a shared space where people on foot or bicycle would feel safe and engage in the community.

The Accessible City Plan designates High Street as a priority pedestrian route from St Asaph through to Hereford Street. The section of High Street from Tuam St through to Ferry Road/Madras/St Asaph and connecting to the cycle route through the East Frame is designated as a priority cycle route. All city streets should provide a safe environment for cycling. **No portion of High Street is designated a priority for cars or on street parking.**

Council has made efforts to encourage active transport and a commitment to curtail greenhouse gas emissions. This project undermines both by catering to the obsession with on street parking. Council needs staff able to present and act on both the international and NZ sourced research which finds that on street parking is not the profit centre too many remain convinced it is.

Council’s practice of favouring some groups as ‘key stakeholders’ continues to produce plans which perpetuate the status quo.

**High St Cashel to Manchester**

This shared space with two sets of tram tracks and on street parking on both sides presents people on bikes with hard choices. Choose to keep left of the tracks to be wedged between cars, trams and on street parking or cross a track to take the lane or avoid the street entirely.

Cashel St offers a similar treatment with the added hazards of landscaped pinch points.

Please prominently sign both streets as shared spaces.
High St Lichfield to Tuam

More on street parking on both sides with a shared roadway for north bound cycles and south bound cycles in a narrow painted lane squeezed between parked cars, carriageway and tram tracks.

The cross section here has on street parking allocated 2m. This is very narrow. The cycle lane hard up against the parked cars is shown as 1.8m with an unspecified buffer between it and the tram tracks whose width is also not specified. Submitter’s are not provided with the information required to comment. Consultation is undermined by lack of information.

Trucks and most SUV’s along with poorly parked cars will protrude into the bike lane. With a door swing area of 0.9m the cycle lane is reduced to 0.9m, at best. Handlebar width of typical ebikes, cruisers, utility and comfort bikes are 0.7m+.

Under ideal conditions with cars parked hard up against the kerb people on bikes will have 0.3m of free space when dodging a car door opened into their path. People on bikes can hope that the trams and cars are very observant and will only pull out or pass when it is safe. No doubt this hope will be crushed from time to time.

Congestion will be increased by on street parking with a 60 minute limit assuring frequent ins and outs to interrupt traffic and further reduce safety.

Both the entry and exit points to High St need to be clearly labelled as shared space.

Tuam to High St

Where both car and bicycle traffic from Tuam come into the shared space on High St it is unsafe for people on bikes coming from the right to give way to cars on their left. Traffic coming from the right is expected to have right of way when entering a shared space. The proposal is counter to road user’s expectations. The on street parking on both sides presents an additional and unacceptable hazard.

Spokes acknowledges that car traffic from Tuam has little cueing space and may cause a tail back onto Tuam Street. This could be considered an advantage alerting more attentive drivers to slow to 10km/h. Sharrow marking and green paint at this transition point is needed to alert drivers to this hazardous design. People on bicycles will need give way signage and on street marking to make them aware that their reasonable expectation of right of way has been denied.

High St from Tuam to St Asaph/Madras

Further south where High connects to Madras/St Asaph traffic is offered a ‘Y’ intersection to choose left to Madras or right to St Asaph. Include sharrow markings on pavement in centre of ‘Y’ and at stop signs. Ideally the arms to Madras and St Asaph would have a bike lane to access the bike lanes on both streets to reinforce the advantage that cycling offers over
driving. This supports Accessible City’s ‘safe, accessible and people friendly’ focus and Council’s climate change and active transport goals.

Spokes appreciates the cycle infrastructure to the corner to facilitate access for people on bicycles coming on St Asaph from the east and to allow east bound cycles to get to Ferry Road.

Council Recommended Alternative

To comply with Council’s Cycle Design Guidelines for a local cycle way in this setting the project would need to implement section 3.2. (Emphasis added)

“3.2. Local cycleways through urban commercial centres
Local cycleways through commercial centres ideally will be separated cycle paths to provide a comfortable and safe environment for cyclists. Separation can be achieved in a variety of different ways depending on the individual centre and competing needs.

*Where there is limited street space available other options such as wide cycle lanes or a slow street environment can be considered."

A slow streets environment is recommended.

Due to the limited space alternatives must be considered. The Cycle Design Guidelines 3.3 offers more help.

“3.3. Local cycleways and residential streets
In urban residential streets, local cycleways ideally will be neighbourhood greenways which create a slow, safe environment where bicycles, vehicles and people can comfortably co-exist. The quality of the environment and amenity of the residential street is also enhanced through the design.”

A slow streets and neighbourhood greenways approach with pedestrian and cycle priority is a far better fit for a narrow street in this densely commercial area with high pedestrian numbers. This is recognized as speed is limited to 10km/h.

Unfortunately the tram tracks complicate the street by creating a real hazard for two wheeled vehicles. A standard quiet streets approach providing a wide hazard free shared carriageway is not possible.

To provide a safe space some on street parking needs to be removed to improve safety and to accommodate cycle lanes, especially for the St Asaph to Tuam section. Ideally to comply with the pedestrian priority route designation footpaths would be widened.
Benefits

The plan recognizes that this is a major route for Ara and for the planned stadium. People will be encouraged to walk noting the dining and shopping options, benefiting High Street merchants. With parking removed merchants will benefit by offering a space with reduced car congestion conducive to strolling, shopping and dining.

Supplementary

Getting people on bikes from the St Asaph St intersection to Ara’s bike park off Madras St is a crucial missing link. Doing so legally requires walking a bike on the Madras footpath for 100m to access the facility. Many just ride either in the road or on the footpath. A contra-lane along Madras St to Ara is needed. Council staff had indicated to Spokes in year’s past that this would soon be delivered. Now is the time.
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -
Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Dirk De Lu</th>
<th>Submission No: 85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/11/2019 9:07:09 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Spokes Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)

Thank you for trying to make the best of this congested space. Spokes supports the 10km/h speed limit and appreciates that cycle parking is shown on the plans.

In this submission specific issues are raised and some suggestions are offered. The real problem is the continued pandering to on street parking regardless of the safety issues created. Safety and support for multi modal transport should always be prioritised over vehicle storage.

Public Sentiment and City Transport
Share an Idea found wide support for a city inviting to people on foot and bicycles. The vision for the central city was as a shared space where people on foot or bicycle would feel safe and engage in the community.

The Accessible City Plan designates High Street as a priority pedestrian route from St Asaph through to Hereford Street. The section of High Street from Tuam St through to Ferry Road/Madras/St Asaph and connecting to the cycle route through the East Frame is designated as a priority cycle route. All city streets should provide a safe environment for cycling. No portion of High Street is designated a priority for cars or on street parking.

Council has made efforts to encourage active transport and a commitment to curtail greenhouse gas emissions. This project undermines both by catering to the obsession with on street parking. Council needs staff able to present and act on both the international and NZ sourced research which finds that on street parking is not the profit centre too many remain convinced it is.

Council’s practice of favouring some groups as ‘key stakeholders’ continues to produce plans which perpetuate the status quo.

High St Cashel to Manchester

This shared space with two sets of tram tracks and on street parking on both sides presents people on bikes with hard choices. Choose to keep left of the tracks to be wedged between cars, trams and on street parking or cross a track to take the lane or avoid the street entirely.

Cashel St offers a similar treatment with the added hazards of landscaped pinch points.

Please prominently sign both streets as shared spaces.

High St Lichtfield to Tuam

More on street parking on both sides with a shared roadway for north bound cycles and south bound cycles in a narrow painted lane squeezed between parked cars, carriageway and tram tracks.

The cross section here has on street parking allocated 2m. This is very narrow. The cycle lane hard up against the parked cars is shown as 1.8m with an unspecified buffer between it and the tram tracks whose width is also not specified. Submitter's are not provided with the information required to comment. Consultation is undermined by lack of information.

Trucks and most SUV's along with poorly parked cars will protrude into the bike lane. With a door swing area of 0.9m the cycle lane is reduced to 0.9m, at best. Handlebar width of typical ebikes, cruisers, utility and comfort bikes are 0.7m+.

Under ideal conditions with cars parked hard up against the kerb people on bikes will have 0.3m of free space when dodging a car door opened into their path. People on bikes can hope that the trams and cars are very observant and will only pull out or pass when it is safe. No doubt this hope will be crushed from time to time.
Congestion will be increased by on street parking with a 60 minute limit assuring frequent ins and outs to interrupt traffic and further reduce safety. Both the entry and exit points to High St need to be clearly labelled as shared space.

Tuam to High St

Where both car and bicycle traffic from Tuam come into the shared space on High St it is unsafe for people on bikes coming from the right to give way to cars on their left. Traffic coming from the right is expected to have right of way when entering a shared space. The proposal is counter to road user’s expectations. The on street parking on both sides presents an additional and unacceptable hazard.

Spokes acknowledges that car traffic from Tuam has little cueing space and may cause a tail back onto Tuam Street. This could be considered an advantage alerting more attentive drivers to slow to 10km/h. Sharrow marking and green paint at this transition point is needed to alert drivers to this hazardous design. People on bicycles will need give way signage and on street marking to make them aware that their reasonable expectation of right of way has been denied.

High St from Tuam to St Asaph/Madras

Further south where High connects to Madras/St Asaph traffic is offered a ‘Y’ intersection to choose left to Madras or right to St Asaph. Include sharrow markings on pavement in centre of ‘Y’ and at stop signs. Ideally the arms to Madras and St Asaph would have a bike lane to access the bike lanes on both streets to reinforce the advantage that cycling offers over driving. This supports Accessible City’s ‘safe, accessible and people friendly’ focus and Council’s climate change and active transport goals.

Spokes appreciates the cycle infrastructure to the corner to facilitate access for people on bicycles coming on St Asaph from the east and to allow east bound cycles to get to Ferry Road.

Council Recommended Alternative

To comply with Council’s Cycle Design Guidelines for a local cycle way in this setting the project would need to implement section 3.2. (Emphasis added)

“3.2. Local cycleways through urban commercial centres

Local cycleways through commercial centres ideally will be separated cycle paths to provide a comfortable and safe environment for cyclists. Separation can be achieved in a variety of different ways depending on the individual centre and competing needs.

Where there is limited street space available other options such as wide cycle lanes or a slow street environment can be considered.”

A slow streets environment is recommended.

Due to the limited space alternatives must be considered. The Cycle Design Guidelines 3.3 offers more help.

“3.3. Local cycleways and residential streets

In urban residential streets, local cycleways ideally will be neighbourhood greenways which create a slow, safe environment where bicycles, vehicles and people can comfortably co-exist. The quality of the environment and amenity of the residential street is also enhanced through the design.”

A slow streets and neighbourhood greenways approach with pedestrian and cycle priority is a far better fit for a narrow street in this densely commercial area with high pedestrian numbers. This is recognized as speed is limited to 10km/h.

Unfortunately the tram tracks complicate the street by creating a real hazard for two wheeled vehicles. A standard quiet streets approach providing a wide hazard free shared carriageway is not possible.

To provide a safe space some on street parking needs to be removed to improve safety and to accommodate cycle lanes, especially for the St Asaph to Tuam section. Ideally to comply with the pedestrian priority route designation footpaths would be widened.

Benefits

The plan recognizes that this is a major route for Ara and for the planned stadium. People will be encouraged to walk noting the dining and shopping options, benefiting High Street merchants. With parking removed merchants will benefit by offering a space with reduced car congestion conducive to strolling, shopping and dining.

Supplementary

Getting people on bikes from the St Asaph St intersection to Ara’s bike park off Madras St is a crucial missing link. Doing so legally requires walking a bike on the Madras footpath for 100m to access the facility. Many just ride either in the road or on the footpath. A contra-lane along
| Madras St to Ara is needed. Council staff had indicated to Spokes in year’s past that this would soon be delivered. Now is the time. |

| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop |
| Full Name*: | Richard Peebles | Submission No: 62 |
| Date Sent: | 6/10/2019 12:20:50 PM |
| Name of Organisation: | Peebles Group Ltd |
| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing | Yes |

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

We are very concerned regarding the impact on existing business both during and after upgrades. Do Not support any reduction in on street parking. If it is required, alternative parking within an easy 2 minute walk must be required.

We do not support the proposed plan for the block between Tuam and St Asaph Street and attached an alternative plan which has been agreed upon by the property owners and tenants within this block. The proposed reduction from 32 Car parks to 11 in this one block is strenuously opposed.

We suggest that any work this this block is delayed as long as possible and when and if it is undertaken it is done as quick as possible.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**

We support the new tram lines and reduction in number of poles.
A. PLAN VIEW (SCALE 1:400)

B. SECTION - ELEVATION FACING NORTH SIDE (NTS)

30 PARALLEL PARKING BAYS
+1 Loading zone (incl. 1 mobility) +24 Bike parking spaces

LEGEND
1. Landscape planting with a mix of low growing natives and exotics
2. Existing trees retained on the North side of the street
3. Proposed street trees on south side of the street to be small to medium sized. Suggested species including Magnolia, Maple or Flowering Cherry
4. Crossing and safety splay on corner with patterned surface to create a 'courtesy crossing'
5. Open landscaped pedestrian (6x3m) with seating and glass panels to provide barrier from the road
6. Bike parking space (6x3m) - 8 spaces each
7. Tactile paving of crossing points
8. Mobility parking bay
9. Loading zone
10. 300mm Disch channel to capture runoff
11. 150mm flush kerb to allow ease of movement across street
12. Cycle lane - with 200mm dividing line between cycle lane and car parking
13. Rain garden

attachment A

Item 5
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | see attached |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | see attached |
AE Architects Limited

Re: High Street revitalisation and tram extension Submission
Andrew Evans, AE Architects Ltd

10/6/19

Submitter background:

I cycle to work just about every day and ride mountain bikes often.

I am not being paid to do any of the work on Lower High St, im doing it out of love for the street (though I am being compensated some of the work on Middle High St)

I have done a lot of work on both new and heritage building on the areas of High St some projects include:

1) Lower High St (St Asaph to Tuam): 135 High (Matt & Shaun Stockman)- new build, currently under construction, 153-157 High St (Shaun Stockman, pre-earthquake strengthen & fit out), 145-149 (Kishor Singh) & 159-161 (David Collins): both earthquake repairs/ strengthen between Sept 2010 & Feb 2011, some work for Arts Family at 137-139 High, The new Billens building at 177 High St (for Shaun Stockman)- completed

2) Middle High St (between Tuam and Lichfield): 199-201 High St (Shaun Stockman)- Ruby Black new building retaining heritage façade, under construction, 158 High St AKA cotters (Shaun Stockman)- has resource consent, 160 High St (Shaun Stockman)- done concepts

3) Northern High St (between Lichfield and Cashel): 225 High St AKA Bonnington House (Shaun Stockman)-fitout & strengthen of heritage building

Submission on lower High Street (between St Asaph & Tuam St):

1. The attached preferred alternative scheme by DCM Urban Design Ltd (29 parks excluding disabled & loading zone) is very similar to the council scheme (11 parks excluding disabled & loading zone) except it has a decent amount of parking (currently 32 parks) i.e.: it is car friendly shared with a bike lane the other way, it has an exit to both Madras and St Asaph, street trees on ARA side are retained. There is a wide and well landscaped footpath (8.7m including landscaping) to the retail side of high street for pedestrian use, the council scheme shows 8.2m (including landscaping) — this is overkill, the foot traffic will not increase to mall like proportions, especially if the car parking is vastly reduced the street is boutique and small scale not a pedestrian highway; it is also very much the end of the line for wandering pedestrians from the city.

2. The preferred alternative scheme provides pretty much all the amenity of the council scheme, but retains car parks which are critical to retail success as others will discuss in more detail

3. Ara/ CPIT/ the Polytech Jazz School has been in place for over 20 years & have used the ground floor of their building as teaching space, recently they have added even more frosted glazing, this discourages shoppers, that side of the street is lifeless, used for people to pass through only and not linger. Ara has shown no commitment to improving things, it is better to judge them on their record and on that side (NE) & provide minimal improvements and emphasise the other side of the street.
AE Architects Limited

4. The council own document high level ‘Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan’ requires a good supply of convenient, secure, well placed and easy to find parking will support economic recovery and the future prosperity of the city. In preliminary discussion with CCC staff they noted that ‘parking will be reallocated to convenient off-street locations’ & that they consider the Lichfield St. car parking building as a ‘convenient off-street location.” Google maps shows Lichfield Car parking building over 550m away (round 3 blocks) and that’s to the corner of High & Team, if you on the south end its more like 750m (4 blocks), I’m sceptical about the word ‘convenient’ being relevant to shoppers, especially if they decide to purchase heavy items. I believe, though not sure that the SALT parking building is more for private cars, the Crossing building is closer than the Lichfield car park building but this is private owned, I’m not sure the council could claim this as legitimate off street parking; I also hear rumours the council is trying to shut down the temporary off street car parks round the city which could make things even worse for struggling retailers.

5. The central city retail is in direct competition, no matter what the council staff may say, with the malls which provide free and convenient parking, I have friends who never come into the city for this reason (& they are extremely keen mountain bikers) & they are not alone. The proposed alternative designs provide great amenity for ALL users- cyclists, pedestrians & car users (who become pedestrians when they leave their cars) If in 10 years car parks are no longer needed they can be removed, but right now retailers need these parks to survive. Convenience is important (& legally required).

6. The preferred alternative scheme has had preliminary review by both an independent traffic engineer and council traffic engineers as being feasible.

7. It would be it would be great to defer doing work in this part of High St so that: a) new businesses could establish themselves now that most of Duncans is coming on stream and 135 High is under construction b) there is less hurry as the tram is not going down c) it gives the polytechnic 5 years to create life/ retail on their side (the have already has more than 20 years), if in 5 years they have changed their ways the design could be adjusted to make their side of footpath a bit wider & more comprehensively landscaped d) the capital cost (& therefore rates rises) could be deferred and spread over along period

8. Altering the road levels to reduce the flood risk (as per below) would be wonderful

9. I support not running the tram up lower High St & simplifying the street poles at the intersection of Tram & High.

Submission on Middle High St (between Tuam and Lichfield):

I had a look at previous council plans (that they discarded), and the attached pretty much ticks all the boxes with the following changes:

1. Add 3 additional parks- parking is essential for retail to work as others will argue
2. Only 1x accessible park adjacent accessible crossing, there isn’t demand for 2 x accessible parks. Note that by being adjacent the accessible crossing as it is unoccupied most of the time if provides even more visibility for pedestrians, also it is mid-block and crossing the road is easier for disabled users.
3. Due to the RM rule on 200 year flood events floor levels end up being very High on High St, this creates a barrier for shoppers entering shops- either ramps or worse steps up; if the proposed street works can improve by even 100mm that would make a big difference. Middle High St is still not fully developed, there is an opportunity to adjust both the footpaths and maybe the road to both reduce flood risk overall and with
AE Architects Limited

a higher footpath at the boundary to buildings. Aim for channel in central of road to lower street to reduce flood risk/level, sadly lowering tram height not going to happen but maybe raise footpath to reduce ramping/steps into retail (even outside Cotters) -100mm or higher (but no more than round 180mm- max level RL 15.085) would be great. At Ruby Black (199-201 High St) raise footpath at boundary to around RL 15.16 would be great, but you might have to infill the ramp at unit 3 (199 high St).

4. Scaling off the drawings it appears the footpath on the south west side is being reduced in width (to round 2.9-3m from current 4.05m wide footpath) to accommodate the bike lane, we have verandahs at 199 & 201 High St that come out at least as wide as the proposed footpath (we come off boundary almost exactly 3m)- the bike lane needs to be as close to absolute minimum tram clearances as its 10kph, trams move in a straight line and don’t veer & I suspect will be moving contraflow to bikes. I took my tape measure out and a tram appears to protrude about 0.55m beyond the track (?) scaling off the council plan I get the clearance at 1.1m so reduce clearance by 0.55m and the car parks shunted further north east (or less preferred the landscape strip needs to be a bit longer outside 199-201 High); but other owners at 209 high verandah is coming out at least 2.52m (from old set of Highgate drawings we have) so the footpath cant get too close.

In conclusion:
1) The council should adopt the preferred alternative scheme attached for lower High street
2) This scheme provides great amenity for all users- cyclists, pedestrians, retailers and car users.
3) Car parking is critical to retail success, especially a block at the very outer edges of pedestrian wandering
4) The council should adopt their ‘High-Street-Previous-Concepts-Considered’ scheme with minor alterations as attached
5) I support not running the tram up lower High St & simplifying the street poles at the intersection of Tram & High.

Intrados Architecture

| Tel | Email | Web |

Item No.: 5
Appendix 1: The Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan
“The challenge for Christchurch is to establish and manage a network that will help to improve access to goods and services, increase the reliability of journey times for regional and national freight travel and protect the network for future growth, at the same time balancing this with the need for safe and attractive communities and neighbourhoods.”

- Further, Action 3.1.3 ‘Parking’ of the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan states that:
  Action 3.1.3 Parking
  Parking that supports the city’s economy
  Parking is a valuable asset to the network. The provision of parking is a key part of the overall transport network. **A good supply of convenient, secure, well placed and easy to find parking will support economic recovery and the future prosperity of the city.**
  And:
  Re-allocating on-street parking
  Where a shared priority corridor is identified through the new road classification system, there may be a need to reprioritise road space for public transport and active transport on priority corridors or landscaping where road space is limited. **Where there remains a need for parking in the area, parking will be reallocated to convenient off-street locations.**
C. SECTION - ELEVATION FACING SOUTH SIDE (NTS)

30 PARALLEL PARKING BAYS
• 1 Loading zone (incl. 1 mobility) • 24 Bike parking spaces

Legend:
A. Canopies on the South side of the street. Softfit of 2.8m from footpath level, 2.8m from buildings boundary, 500mm tall
B. Bench seating and Landscape ship planted with a mix of low growing natives and exotics and lancewoods to add a vertical element on North side of the street

PLANTING PALETTE

- Magnolia (Magnolia ‘Grandiflora’)
- Lithodora (Lithodora ‘Blue Moon’)
- Hebe (Hebe ‘Emerald Gem’)
- Quasi Lindheimeri (Lindheimeri ‘Siskyou Pink’)
- Panokensi (Phalia angustata)
- Liriope (Liriope Muscari ‘Royal Purple’)

Revision:
- Client / project name: HIGH STREET
- Drawing name: HIGH STREET PROPOSAL - OPTION C
- Designed by: Dave Compton-Moen / Will Todd
- Original issue date: 28 May 2019
- Scales: NTS

Revision no: A

Amendment

Approved

Date

DCM
DCM
DCM
DCM
04.06.2019
05.06.2019
08.06.2019
10.06.2019
Preferred Mid High St Design

High Street
Lichfield Street - St Asaph Street

Central channel to reduce flood risk
Existing Tree to be removed
Accessible crossing
"Wood for the trees" to be relocated elsewhere

Reduce this gap: move bike lane. Parks closer to tram tracks so footpath to SE remains at round 4m

Concept to be relocated nearby

Potential location for cultural artwork by others

Key:
- Existing Kerb
- Proposed Kerb
- Header Strip
- No Stopping
- Landscape Planting
- Patterned Surface
- Tactile Paver
- Existing Tree
- Proposed Tree
- Bollard
- Proposed Light
- Seat

Scale (m)
### CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

**High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension**

- **Received via Have Your Say**

**Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Andrew Evans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/11/2019 12:26:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>AE Architects Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attached submission:**

**Submitter background:**

I am an Architect, and round 30 years working as an Architect. Between 2003-2011 I shared an office with in the Duncans Building, number before the street was 'cool'. Our office now resides at just round the corner.

I cycle to work just about every day and ride mountain bikes often.

I am not being paid to do any of the work on Lower High St, im doing it out of love for the street (though I am being compensated some of the work on Middle High St)

I have done a lot of work on both new and heritage building on the areas of High St some projects include:

1) Lower High St (St Asaph to Tuam): 135 High (Matt & Shaun Stockman)- new build, currently under construction, 153-157 High St (Shaun Stockman, pre-earthquake strengthen & fit out), 145-149 (Kishor Singh) & 159-161 (David Collins): both earthquake repairs/ strengthen between Sept 2010 & Feb 2011, some work for Arts Family at 137-139 High, The new Billens building at 177 High St (for Shaun Stockman)- completed

2) Middle High St (between Tuam and Lichfield): 199-201 High St (Shaun Stockman)- Ruby Black new building retaining heritage façade, under construction, 158 High St AKA cotters (Shaun Stockman)- has resource consent, 160 High St (Shaun Stockman)- done concepts

3) Northern High St (between Lichfield and Cashel): 225 High St AKA Bonnington House (Shaun Stockman)-fitout & strengthened of heritage building

**Submission on lower High Street (between St Asaph & Tuam St):**

1. The attached preferred alternative scheme by DCM Urban Design Ltd (29 parks excluding disabled & loading zone) is very similar to the council scheme (11 parks excluding disabled & loading zone) except it has a decent amount of parking (currently 32 parks) i.e.: it is car 1 way shared with a bike lane the other way, it has an exit to both Madras and St Asaph, street trees on ARA side are retained. There is a wide and well landscaped footpath (6.7m including landscaping) to the retail side of high street for pedestrian use, the council scheme shows 8.2m (including landscaping) — this is overkill, the foot traffic will not increase to mall like proportions, especially if the car parking is vastly reduced the street is boutique and small scale not a pedestrian highway; it is also very much the end of the line for wandering pedestrians from the city.

2. The preferred alternative scheme provides pretty much all the amenity of the council scheme, but retains car parks which are critical to retail success as others will discuss in more detail

3. Ara/ CPIT/ the Polytech Jazz School has been in place for over 20 years & have used the ground floor of their building as teaching space, recently they have added even more frosted glazing, this discourages shoppers, that side of the street is lifeless, used for people to pass through only and not linger. Ara has shown no commitment to improving things, it is better to judge them on their record and on that side (NE) & provide minimal improvements and emphasise the other side of the street.

4. The council own document high level 'Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan' requires A good supply of convenient, secure, well placed and easy to find parking will support economic recovery and the future prosperity of the city. In preliminary discussion with CCC staff they noted that ‘parking will be reallocated to convenient off-street locations’ & that they consider the Lichfield St car parking building as a ‘convenient off-street location.” Google maps shows Lichfield Car
parking building over 550m away (round 3 blocks) and that’s to the corner of High & Team, if you on the south end its more like 750m (4 blocks), I’m sceptical about the word ‘convenient’ being relevant to shoppers, especially if they decide to purchase heavy items. I believe, though not sure that the SALT parking building is more for private cars, the Crossing building is closer than the Lichfield car park building but this is private owned, I’m not sure the council could claim this as legitimate off street parking; I also hear rumours the council is trying to shut down the temporary off street car parks round the city which could make things even worse for struggling retailers.

5. The central city retail is in direct competition, no matter what the council staff may say, with, the malls which provide free and convenient parking, I have friends who never come into the city for this reason (and they are extremely keen mountain bikers) & they are not alone. The proposed alternative designs provide great amenity for ALL users-cyclists, pedestrians & car users (who become pedestrians when they leave their cars) if in 10 years car parks are no longer needed they can be removed, but right now retailers need these parks to survive. Convenience is important (& legally required).

6. The preferred alternative scheme has had preliminary review by an independent traffic engineer as being feasible.

7. It would be it would be great to defer doing work in this part of High St so that: a) new businesses could establish themselves now that most of Duncans is coming on stream and 135 High is under construction b) there is less hurry as the tram is not going down c) it gives the polytechnic 5 years to create life/ retail on their side (the have already has more than 20 years), if in 5 years they have changed their ways the design could be adjusted to make their side of footpath a bit wider & more comprehensively landscaped d) the capital cost (& therefore rates rises) could be deferred and spread over along period

8. Altering the road levels to reduce the flood risk (as per below) would be wonderful

9. I support not running the tram up lower High St & simplifying the street poles at the intersection of Tram & High.

Submission on Middle High St (between Tuam and Lichfield):

I had a look at previous council plans (that they discarded), and the attached pretty much ticks all the boxes with the following changes:

1. Add 3 additional parks- parking is essential for retail to work as others will argue 2. Only 1x accessible park adjacent accessible crossing, there isn’t demand for 2 x accessible parks. Note that by being adjacent the accessible crossing as it is unoccupied most of the time if provides even more visibility for pedestrians, also it is mid-block and crossing the road is easier for disabled users.

2. Due to the RM rule on 200 year flood events floor levels end up being very High on High St, this creates a barrier for shoppers entering shops- either ramps or worse steps up; if the proposed street works can improve by even 100mm that would make a big difference. Middle High St is still not fully developed, there is an opportunity to adjust both the footpaths and maybe the road to both reduce flood risk overall and with a higher footpath at the boundary to buildings. Aim for channel in central of road to lower street to reduce flood risk/ level, sadly lowering tram height not going to happen but maybe raise footpath to reduce ramping/ steps into retail (even outside Cotters) -100mm or higher (but no more than round 180mm- max level RL 15.085) would be great. At Ruby Black (199-201 High St) raise footpath at boundary to around RL 15.16 would be great, but you might have to infill the ramp at unit 3 (199 high St).

4. Scaling off the drawings it appears the footpath on the south west side is being reduced in width (to round 2.9-3m from current 4.05m wide footpath) to accommodate the bike lane, we have verandahs at 199 & 201 High St that come out at least as wide as the proposed footpath (we come off boundary almost exactly 3m)- the bike lane needs to be as close to absolute minimum tram clearances as its 10kph, trams move in a straight line and don’t veer & I suspect will be moving contraflow to bikes. I took my tape measure out and a tram appears to protrude about 0.55m beyond the track (?) scaling off the council plan I get the clearance at 1.1m so reduce clearance by 0.55m and the car parks shunted further north east (or less preferred the landscape strip needs to be a bit longer outside 199-201 High); but other owners at 209 high verandah is coming out at least 2.52m (from old set of Highgate drawings we have) so the footpath cant get too close.

In conclusion:

1) The council should adopt the preferred alternative scheme attached for lower High street
2) This scheme provides great amenity for all users- cyclists, pedestrians, retailers and car users.
3) Car parking is critical to retail success, especially a block at the very outer edges of pedestrian wandering
4) The council should adopt their ‘High-Street-Previous-Concepts-Considered’ scheme with minor alterations as attached

5) I support not running the tram up lower High St & simplifying the street poles at the intersection of Tram & High.

Appendix 1: The Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan
(see https://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/The-Council/Plans-Strategies-Policies/Bylaws/Strategies/ChristchurchStrategyTransportPlan2012.pdf ) states that “The challenge for Christchurch is to establish and manage a network that will help to improve access to goods and services, increase the reliability of journey times for regional and national freight travel and protect the network for future growth, at the same time balancing this with the need for safe and attractive communities and neighbourhoods.”

- Further, Action 3.1.3 ‘Parking’ of the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan states that: Action 3.1.3 Parking

Parking that supports the city’s economy

Parking is a valuable asset to the network. The provision of parking is a key part of the overall transport network. A good supply of convenient, secure, well placed and easy to find parking will support economic recovery and the future prosperity of the city.

And:

Re-allocating on-street parking

Where a shared priority corridor is identified through the new road classification system, there may be a need to reprioritise road space for public transport and active transport on priority corridors or landscaping where road space is limited. Where there remains a need for parking in the area, parking will be reallocated to convenient off-street locations.

| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop |
### CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

**Submission close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>David Hawke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/30/2019 1:35:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)
In the project, the segment I'm interested in is that from Tuam St to St Asaph St. I commute by bike from Halswell to my work at Ara, and so use the above section. The proposed set up look good to me. I think that putting bikes in with the cars in the direction toward St Asph St will work fine, because there shouldn't be much traffic in that direction. The width of the proposed cycling contra-lane (1.8m) looks sufficient. The missing link, however, is to get from the St Asaph St intersection to the bike parking facilities at Ara, off Madras St. As it stands (both at present and in the High St project), the law abiding cyclist must walk along the footpath to the campus entry about 100m along Madras St. In March 2017, I was involved with discussions that included Ara's then Sustainability Manager and City Council's Steve DeJong. A plan was hatched (that I think included detailed design work) for a contra-lane along the section of Madras St concerned. At Ara, we surveyed neighbouring business owners and monitored usage of the affected car parks. We were told that the project was straight-forward from a City Council perspective and would happen that year. It didn't. In my opinion, this project needs to be resurrected and added on to the current High St project. Without it, you have a major employer (Ara) that has worked hard to build sustainability in the travel arrangements of staff and students, stranded as an island that is separated from the city’s cycling projects.

#### Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop
Nothing in particular
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Sam Crofiskey</th>
<th>Submission No: 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/9/2019 6:09:06 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>C1 Espresso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)

About us:
C1 has been in business on our block of High Street for 23 years. Our longevity is no indicator of our resilience or our ability to weather everything thrown at us. High Street would be the perfect location for a community coffee house if it weren’t for the constant disruption. We are one of only two businesses fronting onto our block of High Street.

In support of the project:
I would like to be able to convince your team to leave our block alone indefinitely to avoid disruption to our business - but it would be a hard argument as the street is clearly broken. Our block of High Street has been characterised by broken buildings, shipping containers, uneven footpaths, closed roads and neglect for the past seven years.

Landscaping, paving, trams and shared vehicle spaces - these all are things we would put on a wish list for High Street, because in its current state it is a real mess. We are in full support of the tram rolling down High Street. It would be of benefit to us and the city to have an extended tram route.

I imagine that there is an impetus to get in and get the work done now to minimise the effect on future placemakers of the street and to attract future investment.

Our concerns of the project:
We have observed the continued removal of on street parking which we would really like to keep for our business. We rate on street parking of a very high importance for our business.

We have seen easy access to our block impeded following the one way swap - i.e. without intimate knowledge of the city, our block is not an easy find to the uninitiated. We would be very distressed to see this made more difficult. The Central City, High Street and C1 have a perception of being difficult to access. It is this perception that ultimately drives our customers decision making process around where to spend their patronage.

We are feeling ill at the thought of continued road works. In particular we have grown tired at the length of time that these works take. We are tired of being held to ransom by the traffic management teams. And we are distressed by the financial concessions we must make to enable the work to be carried out.

We do not subscribe to the acceptance that constant disruption is the cost of doing business in the Christchurch CBD. Riccarton Mall built a second floor without anyone noticing. Airports around the world can renovate and operate.

We imagine a time in the future when pedestrian priorities will be important - a time when people live, work and play in the central city. We believe that time is in the distant future. We are concerned that these roading changes would be better timed for when the city demands it. Removing carparks or access in the hope people cycle, or walk more will cause immediate and lasting harm to our ability to trade.

The length of time and slow progress of roadworks.

When roadworks are taking place, we have observed that cost saving measures to the contract are worn by surrounding businesses.

Every day that the contract drags on, will be another day that our business, our team and our family suffers.

Evidence in support of this:
Contractors parking on the street instead of a paid carpark, reducing patronage.
Traffic management is set up at times when no work was taking place, further reducing
patronage. Few to no workers being on site, lengthening the time the contract takes and
therefore disrupting our business.

Our Request:
Work day and night, 7 days a week until the job is done.

Our mental health:
It has been our experience that during the time the road works take place, I will need to be on site
daily to deal with whatever things are thrown our way. During previous works we have
experienced service cuts to access, electricity and water a number of times, coupled with
attempting to carry out business in the middle of a work site, which our management team are not
equipped to deal with. This constant threat of disruption is unhealthy to us as a business and as
individuals.

After everything we have been through over the past number of years, I am very anxious about
these road works and their impact on our health.

Our Request:
We have only ever experienced lip-service in treating our needs to run our business with minimal
disruption. A small street sign saying that it is business as usual, or a point of contact (whom we
can not contact) are not enough to show that you are trying to minimise disruption to us. The
previous work’s treatment of us amounts to nothing short of bullying. We would like to see a big
effort that ensures that the upshot of this project is greater than the relief of it being finally over.

Woods for the Trees:
The removal of this art work appears to be a waste. Is there a possibility that this is repaired and
reinstated on
the street.

Our Request:
Approach business leaders, property owners, Brown Bread & Regan Gentry to see if we are able
to raise the funds to keep the work here.

The Corgis:
Throw us a bone. C1 gets a win through an Instagram opportunity by installing them near us. The
city gets a win because they will be photographed with a good looking backdrop.

Our Request:
Place the corgis in front of the High Street Post Office.

When will it end?:

Our block of High & Tuam Streets have had major construction works over these past and
upcoming years:
2010 Tram Tracks
2011 Tram Tracks
2012 CERA Demolition works
2013 CERA Demolition works/SCIRT works
2014 SCIRT Works/Accessible City
2015 SCIRT Works/Accessible City
2016 Tuam/High Traffic Lights
2020 High Street Project
2021 High Street Project

Gnarly when you list it out, and even gnarlier to try to do business in the middle of all this. It is
hard to quantify a reward for doing business here. And I am unsure of the economic benefit from
all this work to either our business or our community. It is emotionally draining to see the street
torn up on so many occasions over the years.

Tram Stop:
It will be very disappointing if the tram stop is placed on the opposite side of the road to C1 and
not at it’s closest point to our front door. It will mean that after enduring yet another series of road
works, we will have neither a tram stop nor car parks. It will have been all for nothing. Although
we can accept that this may catalyse development of that corner - in a field of dreams way, a tram
stop in front of the High Street Post Office would have better leverage for Christchurch tourism.
P10s.
Loading zones or short term parking (P5s or P10s) are very important to us. P10s designated at both sides of the street at the intersections of High Street and Tuam and also at the intersection of High Street and Manchester are necessary. This enables those who are passing through the Street to still have an option of a park that is turning over quickly.

Reduction of carparks:
We are very hesitant to support any roading layout changes that reduces on street parking. It is widely accepted that Christchurch is in fragile state for both retail and hospitality. And those are the two activities that this project is trying to activate in this area. Our business, as a good working example, requires on street car parking.

Prior to the earthquakes there were 33 carparks on the Street. The reduction to 12 is tooo large a reduction.

It is a big ask from the Council to force change on our business model to facilitate the removal of on street car parking. It is a disappointment to go unheard by a city to whom we have given so much.

Evidence in support of this:
At the start of the week beginning 10th September 2018, on street parking was removed to enable some works at the Cotter’s Building. Our trade for the period was down 30% for the 48 hours that the parking was removed.

Worse still (yet harder to measure) is the ongoing effect of those 48 hours - people’s perceptions that our business is hard to access are confirmed and customers change their routines and habits and frequent other businesses. Anecdotally we know this to be true.

A downturn, like what we observed at the start of the week, would require us to shed 9 x Full-time jobs from our team. We are facing this when the work is carried out on High Street.

Our Request:
The removal of on street parks in the area marked #2 on the attached map appears unnecessary. Please do not do this.

Please place P10s near the entry and exits of the street. This would help greatly with the perception of parks being available. We require P10s for takeaway customers to be able to frequent us.

Please move the accessible park/paraplegic off the street and to the nearest available/permitable place. It is our observation that this park is not utilised.

I’m unsure if customers understand a loading zone and would prefer the parks are marked as P10s. We require P10s for takeaway customers to be able to frequent us.

Plantings:
Any of the plantings around us we would like to be suitable as edibles. Some consultation with us would be great for us to continue with our edible urban garden that we maintain at our corner.

Traffic Management:
The approach of the traffic management crews amounts to bullying. They have the final word on what ever disruptive behaviour they choose to do in the name of safety. Often the safety areas that are cordoned off are ridiculous with no work taking place within. The traffic management workers are often combative and defensive in their approach. There is too big an imbalance between the disruption of these crews and our ability to do business.

Our Request:
Have the work crews stay off the street if they are not working.

Have the crews lease private land off the street to store their gear and vehicles.

Have the crews only close off carparks when work is taking place.

Never close the street.

Our Outdoor Lease:
We feel anxious about how this would be approached in a way that is not disruptive.

We would like to be a part of the plans for this outdoor area to ensure that we have water, power and shade incorporated into the design. This is crucial for our on going success and for the vibrancy of the area.
poles and new
stop
Preferred Design

1. Central channel to reduce flood risk
2. Existing tree to be removed
3. "Wood for the trees" to be relocated elsewhere
4. Reduce this gap: move bike lane, parks closer to tram tracks so footpath to SE remains at round 4m
5. Cables to be relocated nearby

High Street
Lichfield Street - St Asaph Street

Key:
- Existing Kerb
- Proposed Kerb
- Header Strip
- No Stopping
- Landscape Planting
- Patterned Surface
- Tactile Paver
- Existing Tree
- Proposed Tree
- Bollard
- Proposed Light
- Seat
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**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- *Received via Have Your Say* -  
*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Rachel Ducker</th>
<th>Submission No:</th>
<th>59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/10/2019 9:41:26 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments** -  
Revitalisation of High Street  
(Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)  

See attached submission made on behalf of Boltbox Limited

**Comments** -  
Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop
10 June 2019

Christchurch City Council

Attention: Jennie Hamilton
ccc.govt/haveyoursay

Dear Jennie

SUBMISSION ON HIGH STREET REVITALISATION AND TRAM EXTENSION WORKS
(HG REF: 2170 14549607)

Harrison Grierson acts for Boltbox Limited the landowner of the properties at 198, 200 and 202 High Street, Christchurch (Lots 3, 4, 5 DP 9572) which have frontage to High Street. We have reviewed the High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension consultation document (the Document) prepared by Christchurch City Council and wish to make the following submission on behalf of the property owner.

Background

Our client's property is held in three separate titles and is currently vacant following post-earthquake demolition of buildings which formerly occupied the site. Our client has plans to redevelop this property in the future as either a single development or a series of separate developments. However, no detailed plans confirming site access, built form, and car park location have been prepared to date. Therefore, our client would like to retain some flexibility about the number and location of vehicle accessways along the High Street frontage of all three separate titles.

We note that the Christchurch District Plan requires active frontages and continuous verandahs along this section of High Street while making provision for accessways up to 7m in width. It also enables one vehicle crossing per site set back at least 10m from the intersection with Manchester Street.

Submission

We support the following aspects of the proposed works:

- Proposed retention of two-way traffic flow in this section of High Street. This is imperative to maintain vehicle access to properties in this location and also for broader vehicle movements in the area.
- Streetscape works including pavement widening, new paving and landscaping to improve the amenity and walkability of High Street.
- Upgrade of tram infrastructure including proposals to minimise overhead wiring and associated support structures.
- Provision of shared on-road vehicle/cycle lanes rather than separated cycle lanes with raised paving.

We wish to make the following submission in opposition to the following aspects of the works related to High Street (Cashel Street to Manchester Street) as shown on Page 12 of the Document. We are making this submission as our client has not yet finalised their development plans and wishes to retain some flexibility regarding the location of accessway/s to their property. We understand from
our recent meeting with Jennie Hamilton (Engagement Team) and Neil Gillon (Project Manager) that we should document this feedback as there is potential to amend the final design. The proposed changes we are seeking to the design of the works includes:

- The proposed location of cycle stands outside 198, 200 and 202 High Street. We consider that these cycle stands should be relocated within the triangle of open space to the south of Tuam Street in the vicinity of the proposed seating and landscaping planting.
- The proposed location of the tree outside 202 High Street. We consider that this tree should be relocated further to the north-west of 202 High Street or an alternative location so that it does not restrict access to our client’s properties.
- We note that the flyover video shows a pole containing a street-light and flag is proposed outside our client’s properties. However, this is not shown on the plan of this section of works on page 12 of the consultation document. We consider that this lamp-post should be relocated to an alternative location so that it does not restrict access to our client’s property.
- The proposed loading zone, which we understand is likely to be used for buses dropping guests off at the proposed hotel on the corner of High and Manchester Streets, should be located as far as practical towards Manchester Street. This would ensure that it does not limit any vehicular access to our client’s property.

We wish to be heard in support of our submission.

We understand that Council may not undertake these works for 18 months and we would appreciate being kept informed about the design of the proposed works. Likewise, our client’s plans may be developed further in this timeframe and we will keep Council informed of our client’s plans. Our address for service is or phone ( ).

Yours sincerely

Rachel Duckett

Planning Manager
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Rachel Ducker</th>
<th>Submission No: 69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/10/2019 3:17:55 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Harrison Grierson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

Harrison Grierson acts for Boltbox Limited the landowner of the properties at 198, 200 and 202 High Street, Christchurch (Lots 3, 4, 5 DP 9572) which have frontage to High Street. We have reviewed the High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension consultation document (the Document) prepared by Christchurch City Council and wish to make the following submission on behalf of the property owner.

**Background**

Our client’s property is held in three separate titles and is currently vacant following post-earthquake demolition of buildings which formerly occupied the site. Our client has plans to redevelop this property in the future as either a single development or a series of separate developments. However, no detailed plans confirming site access, built form, and car park location have been prepared to date. Therefore, our client would like to retain some flexibility about the number and location of vehicle accessways along the High Street frontage of all three separate titles.

We note that the Christchurch District Plan requires active frontages and continuous verandahs along this section of High Street while making provision for accessways up to 7m in width. It also enables one vehicle crossing per site set back at least 10m from the intersection with Manchester Street.

**Submission**

We support the following aspects of the proposed works:

- Proposed retention of two-way traffic flow in this section of High Street. This is imperative to maintain vehicle access to properties in this location and also for broader vehicle movements in the area.
- Streetscape works including pavement widening, new paving and landscaping to improve the amenity and walkability of High Street.
- Upgrade of tram infrastructure including proposals to minimise overhead wiring and associated support structures.
- Provision of shared on-road vehicle/cycle lanes rather than separated cycle lanes with raised paving.

We wish to make the following submission in opposition to the following aspects of the works related to High Street (Cashel Street to Manchester Street) as shown on Page 12 of the Document. We are making this submission as our client has not yet finalised their development plan and wishes to retain some flexibility regarding the location of accessway/s to their property.

We understand from our recent meeting with Jennie Hamilton (Engagement Team) and Neil Gillon (Project Manager) that we should document this feedback as there is potential to amend the final design. The proposed changes we are seeking to the design of the works includes:

- The proposed location of cycle stands outside 19, 200 and 202 High Street. We consider that these cycle stands should be relocated within the triangle of open space to the south of Tuam Street in the vicinity of the proposed seating and landscaping planting.
- The proposed location of the tree outside 202 High Street. We consider that this tree should be relocated further to the north-west of 202 High Street or an alternative location so that it does not restrict access to our client’s properties.
- We note that the flyover video shows a pole containing a street-light and flag is proposed outside our client’s properties. However, this is not shown on the plan of this section of works on page 12.
of the consultation document. We consider that this lamp-post should be relocated to an alternative location so that it does not restrict access to our client’s property.

- The proposed loading zone, which we understand is likely to be used for buses dropping guest off at the proposed hotel on the corner of High and Manchester Streets, should be located as far as practical towards Manchester Street. This would ensure that it does not limit any vehicular access to our client’s property.

We wish to be heard in support of our submission.

We understand that Council may not undertake these works for 18 months and we would appreciate being kept informed about the design of the proposed works. Likewise, our client’s plans may be developed further in this timeframe and we will keep Council informed of our client’s plans. Our address for service is or phone .

Yours sincerely
Rachel Ducker
Planning Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.: 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -  
*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

| Full Name*: | William James Hall | Submission No: 29 |
| Date Sent: | 5/27/2019 11:24:55 PM |
| Name of Organisation: | |
| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing | Yes |

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

Yes sounds great, it would be good to see the building around High St have some residential zoning as currently the city feels dead after 8 PM and getting some Urban AFFORDABLE living would defiantly improve the city and help sustain the shops and business that are placed along the streets development. Currently we see zoning in CHCH CBD as retail on the ground floor and above being offices. But changing this up putting residential on the top floors and a mix of offices and retail on the ground floors would defiantly be important in ensuring a greater community developed in the CBD.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**

The Tram seams utterly underused in CHCH at the moment, We seem to see the trams as a tourist attraction but not as a already defined public transport network. If we were to see an expansion of the tram network in CHCH It would be intresting to see the integration of it with the Metro card network, as currently to get from one side of the CBD to another you must either walk or lime. The potential would still be there to continue running specialist trams for Tourists only, however running a European style public tram network could be easily feasible. If further development of the line was put in to connect the bus interchange, you could connect ARA, the Interchange, Ballentine's, BNZ Centre The Christchurch Central Library, the art Gallery and the Museum along with these new development on High St witch is already home to Little High Eatery it could all together create a cool public transport system that encourages and rewards people to see lots of Christchurch but also use the already established bus network to come into the city. Christchurch is at the moment not centralised enough for a enjoyable shopping experience (unlike Riccarton or Northlands) and busses feel aquwards and aren't desirable. Also not cost effective for the size of the CBD. Making the tram more accessible to the public would defiantly create significant output. We can see across city in Europe they are making the switch to light rail or tramways in order to connect showing areas together. In Croydon in London the Tramlink project has created massive jobs and developments all over South London. The Centrale Shopping Centre has become a massive draw card for Croydon and is now bringing tens of thousands of people to the once undesirable area. CHCH could easily draw more people into the CBD but currently people choose to shop in other areas because its too spread out and barren but a draw of shops, Trams and for tourist a longer ride (better value for money) could really improve the CBD. Wellington is said to be going ahead with there own tram network, why not Christchurch? We already have a majority of the infrastructure and if we were to bring a Public Tramway back to the CBD we could further limit cars in the CBD and decrease our carbon footprint as a city!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*: Connie Christensen</th>
<th>Submission No: 83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent: 6/11/2019 12:06:02 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)

Sigh! Please look up the 100,000+ submissions from the original 'Share An Idea' and change this plan to have on-street car parking, as it makes the environment dangerous for everyone, and provide a safer shared environment encouraging people to move by foot, scooter or cycle (this is also shown to increase spending).

### Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop

I love the tram, so please extend and make it a general transport option within the CBD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Connie Christensen</th>
<th>Submission No:</th>
<th>82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/10/2019 11:59:54 PM</td>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Go Cycle Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</td>
<td>Please provide a safe environment for cycling and walking rather than more unsafe on-street car parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)

- files attached

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</th>
<th>We have no issues with the proposed tram route. The new route will considerably reduce the number of traffic lights on the High/Tuam Corner, which is visually overloaded. 12.06.2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Street Partners.</td>
<td>We discuss only the lower High Street block- ie from Tuam to St Asaph Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.We believe that: the city and High Street has not recovered enough to warrant changing the road layout yet it is our observation that this section of High Street is in the very early recovery stage. (Lower High Street has just re-opened recently after a 8.5 year closure.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.We feel that the plans presented are disruptive to our recovery, unrealistic and bear no resemblance to the reality of trading in a vastly altered city. ie The plans at the moment are not in the best interests of the recovery of the street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.This area will become Mixed Use and destination shopping ie our tenants are service industry similar to pre-earthquake (due to our distance from the CBD). Service industries require the ability to pick up and drop off. There are only going to be a very limited number of retailers in the lower High Street Block.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 15-20, to survive this far from the central city they will rely on easy access for customers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB. Lower High Street does not rely on casual foot traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.To reflect its Destination status, We would want parking space numbers to remain reasonably similar to the current situation, including a loading zone area and disabled parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Retail is currently a challenge due to low foot traffic numbers. (In a traffic/pedestrian count on Friday 24th May from 12.45 to 1.15pm in Lower High St at the St Asaph St end, we counted only 145 pedestrians, 14 bikes and 8 lime scooters. We do not feel that this warrants such drastic measures as proposed by the CCC to turn us into a one way street. We feel that One Way Streets are a failed experiment from the 1960's and overseas they are being removed and the streets reinstated as they were before. 'One way streets are confusing for drivers, are less liveable, speeds are higher, and we believe also that two-way street increase visibility.' (Reference: <a href="https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2013/01/case-against-one-way-streets/4549/">https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2013/01/case-against-one-way-streets/4549/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.We do not have retail on both sides of the street. (The polytechnic has since 1998 not established retail stores in it's building in High St, as its consent promised. This situation needs to be resolved.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.We also need constant turn over off car parks. Every 30- 60 minutes maximum ideally. (This needs to be policed much more rigorously than in the past as High Street and St Asaph streets have become easy car parks for the Poly technic students; staff and some retailers as well; this situation continues to this day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. There is no close alternative parking available, the car park, on St Asaph St behind Little High is already crowded and is struggling to cope with the current situation and there has been a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant loss of easy accessible short term parking on St Asaph street. (Loss of 75 along the full length of St Asaph St).

The Lichfield Street car park is at least 8 minutes walk away and overloaded. (Over 750m away) ie Not convenient.

The council's own document 'Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan' notes the importance of car parking (partial extracts below). It states that: "parking will be reallocated to convenient offstreet locations." & that they consider the Lichfield st car parking building as a 'convenient off-street location.' Further, Action 3.1.3 'Parking' of the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan states that: Action 3.1.3 Parking. Parking that supports the city's economy.

Parking is a valuable asset to the network. The provision of parking is a key part of the overall transport network. A good supply of convenient, secure, well placed and easy to find parking will support economic recovery and the future prosperity of the city. And: Re-allocating on-street parking

Where a shared priority corridor is identified through the new road classification system, there may be a need to reprioritise road space for public transport and active transport on priority corridors or landscaping where road space is limited. Where there remains a need for parking in the area, parking will be reallocated to convenient off-street locations. The plan does not state where these reallocated parks are.

5 m (from the current 3.5) on the east -polytechnic side (including landscaping). The foot traffic will not increase to mall like proportions, the street is boutique and small scale not a pedestrian highway.

The polytechnic side is historically dark, cold and not under cover (ie People pass through only and do not linger.) Pedestrians usually walk on the Duncan's side of the street, under cover of the verandahs where it is more lively.

I would submit that the east side pavements area is left at 3.5m. This would allow for extra space for the North & South bound cycle lanes to be merged as a shared carriage way, separated by street marking or planter boxes and shifted to the Polytechnic side of the street and made wider to accommodate 2 way bike traffic.

We believe the contra flow cycle plan is a major barrier to the frontage of the Historic Duncan's Buildings. ie This removes the visual barrier that the separated cycle lane North creates in front of the Historic Duncan's frontage. As the Street speed is so slow at 10km I feel that this is an alternative option. (Even cyclists will have trouble with 10kph, especially seeing that the lime scooters are doing 30kph on the footpaths & ebikes are doing 30kph.)

I would suggest increasing the speed on the street form 10kph to 15kph

No Trees on the Duncan's side: Suggested trees, Quercus robur 'Fastigiata': Growth Rate: Medium Height when mature: 30m(_google)

Duncan's Buildings are approximately 13m high. It has a beautiful heritage brick facade. It is not logical to obscure the frontages with 30m high trees sited approximately 3.8 metres from the building. The trees on the Duncan's side of the street need to be removed completely. Given the final size of the proposed trees, even if they reach half the size estimated, they will be too high. Leave the trees on the east side and replace the trees on the south side with a small to medium sized species. (Suggested species including Magnolia, Maple or Flowering Cherry or preferably a low native. (NOT oaks please, they cover the street in leaves that are never swept up from one season to the next).

One of the unusual feature advantages of our unit is that we have large opening double doors on our ground floor that allow machinery, stock and vehicles to be moved into the building. This is a useful feature and is being used in the marketing for future service based tenants. We will require unimpeded access to our double doors on the south side of the frontage. ie no trees, benches, signage or cycle stands that can not be removed on the 137 side of the building.

(Thus the seating/tree shown on the plan close to 137 High Street needs to be moved either closer to the St Asaph St rain garden area, or further North, to keep clear our front opening, garage style doors.) This is also relevant if any other plan adopted.

Our first preference for Lower High Street is for it to remains 2 Way, it keeps the historic linkages open as it aligns with the 2 other High Street blocks. It also retains the old fashioned and gritty nature of the street. As a slow shared street it would negate the need for separate cycle lanes and be considerably more visually appealing. We submit that the street remains 2 way, as it is now and lets see what develops in 5 years time.

ie We would prefer to defer doing any major redesign work in this part of High St so that: a) new businesses can establish themselves now that more of Duncan's units are coming on stream, 135 High is under construction and 141 and 129 High Streets have been sold to new owners. b) there is less hurry as the tram is not going down this section of High Street c) it gives the polytechnic 5 years to create life/ retail on their side.
But, if the 2 way option is not chosen, our fall back position is the plan attached, proposed by Messrs Stockman and Peebles. This option provides pretty much all the amenities of the council scheme, but retains more of the car parks which are critical to retail success.

The preferred option shown (which has approximately 30 parks excluding disabled & loading Zone) is similar in design to the council scheme except it has a decent amount of parking (currently 32 parks) i.e. It is one way with a shared bike lane one side, with a separate contra bike lane the other way, it has an exit to both Madras and St Asaph, street trees on ARA side are retained. (I do not like the contra bike lane as mentioned previously as it is a visual barrier to the Heritage frontage of the Duncan's Buildings).

There is a wide and well landscaped footpath 6.7m wide including landscaping to the Duncan's side of high street for pedestrian use, and a 4.3 m wide footpath on the Ara side. Both of these are more than ample for the Streets requirements.

I note that the seating on the Ara side in this plan needs to be reassessed, that side of the street does encourage sitting, it is too cold. The nicest place to sit in our end of lower High street is outside 129 High Street as it gets the most winter sun.

Again I feel that the north flowing contra cycle lane is a visual impediment to the Heritage frontage of the Duncan's Buildings.

I would like more attention to be paid to the Heritage grain of our area. I feel this is being overlooked in all the plans presented.

To reflect our 'bohemian grain' and status as a gritty area, I would like to see an EV charging station. For Bikes and cars.

I support the allowance for loading zones, mobility parking and crossing points.

I would like to see the funky red cycle stands remaining in the street

I support the decision regarding the tram turning back into High St at the old Para site.

I also note that Lower High Street redevelopment has been delayed by 8 plus years, we are still in very early recovery stage, fact there are still major unresolved issues at the St Asaph Street end.
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**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

I would like to comment on the southern end of the High St revitalisation plan (Tuam st through to St Asaph st). I am strongly opposed to the councils preferred plan.

The new proposal reduces the car park numbers from the existing number of around 30 down to 14. This reduction in parking will have serious negative impacts on our tenants, all of whom have expressed serious concerns to us. They all signed up thinking there would be a similar amount of car parks as there were before the earthquakes, so deleting half of them is unacceptable to them.

As a property investor, who has invested significant amounts of money into the new CBD, I was horrified to hear that the car parks the council were taking away from High st are effectively being replaced in the Lichfield car park building which is over 500m away! Any mall that had car parks 500m away from their shops would never attract any tenants and would therefore go bankrupt, why does the council think that the CBD retail would be any different?

I have attached a plan that we understand ticks all of the boxes from a council point of view but also manages to keep 30 car parks. This is the plan I would like to see implemented.

I would also ask that when it comes time to do the work, that it is done as quickly as possible (contractors working nights and weekends) to mitigate negative impact to our tenants.

Our tenants are really struggling in post earthquake Christchurch, shoppers aren't coming back in the numbers that make retail sustainable, and the biggest critique from the public seems to be parking.

I know there is a real push from the current council to replace all cars with bikes and public transport, but if this is done only in the CBD and not at the malls, all the shoppers will simply drive their cars to malls where they know they can access car parks with ease and walk short distances to the shops. This is not rocket science.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**
Hearings Panel
15 August 2019

Attachment B

Item 5

C. SECTION - ELEVATION FACING SOUTH SIDE (NTS)

30 PARALLEL PARKING BAYS
+ 1 Loading zone (incl. 1 mobility) + 24 Bike parking spaces

client / project name: HIGH STREET
high street proposal - option C

original issue date: 28 MAY 2019
scales: NTS

Bench seating and landscape strip planted with a mix of low growing natives and exotics and lanscewoods to add a vertical element on North side of the street.

LEGEND
A Canopies on the South side of the street. Softfit at 2.4m from footpath level, 2.8m from buildings boundary, 500mm tall
B

PLANTING PALETTE

Magnolia
(Magnolia ‘Grandiflora’)

Hebe
(Hebe ‘Emerald Gem’)

Abelmoschus
(Pratia angularis)

Liriope
(Liriope Muscari ‘Royal Purple’)

N. E. 90
(Libertia peregrinans)

Gaara Lindheimeri
(Lindheimerii ‘Siskiyou Pink’)

25370

Item No.: 5

Page 124
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | I do not support the proposed plan due to the large reduction in car parks. Our city has already lost a significant number of street car parks. If the adopted plan requires the removal of car parks then alternative car parks should be made available which are within easy (2-3 mins) walking distance. Easily accessible car park are vital for the city's businesses. Car parks are already in high demand and essential for the inner city business to succeed. I also feel that once started the work needs to be done with urgency so the businesses are not faced with lengthy disruptions to their trade. I strongly support the alternative plan attached. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | I support the tram extension |
C. SECTION - ELEVATION FACING SOUTH SIDE (NTS)

30 PARALLEL PARKING BAYS
• 1 Loading zone (incl. 1 mobility) • 24 Bike parking spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>client / project name:</th>
<th>HIGH STREET PROPOSAL - OPTION C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>designed by:</td>
<td>Dave Compton-Moen / Wil Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original issue date:</td>
<td>28 MAY 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scales:</td>
<td>NTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>revision no.</th>
<th>amendment</th>
<th>approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Client comments</td>
<td>DCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4m north side</td>
<td>DCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7m north side</td>
<td>DCAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.3m north side</td>
<td>DCAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7m south side</td>
<td>DCM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| date | 04.06.2019 | 05.04.2019 | 08.06.2019 | 10.06.2019 |
| DCM  |            |            |            |            |
| DCM  |            |            |            |            |

LEGEND

A. Canopies on the South side of the street. Softfit at 2.8m from footpath level, 2.8m from buildings boundary, 500mm tall

B. Bench seating and Landscape ship planted with a mix of low growing natives and exotics and lancewoods to add a vertical element on North side of the street

PLANTING PALETTE

- Magnolia [Magnolia 'Grandiflora']
- NZ ½ [Liriope muscari 'Royal Purple']
- Hebe [Hebe 'Emerald Gem']
- Qauru Lindheimeri [Lindheimeri 'Siskiyou Pink']
- Panoenka [Panoenka angustata]
- Liriope [Liriope muscari 'Royal Purple']
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

**High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension**

- Received via Have Your Say -

*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Rachel Gould</th>
<th>Submission No: 66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/10/2019 2:36:50 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>181 High Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</th>
<th>We strongly oppose the Councils proposed plan to upgrade the street, as it will mean a large reduction in the number of carparks. The loss of this parking will be very detrimental to the businesses in the immediate area. There has already been a considerable loss of parking the central city. We support the attached alternative proposed plan - option C. The other concern we wish to raise, is the impact on the businesses during any upgrade works. We request that this work be undertaken at night and completed as quickly as possible to limit the impact on the businesses in this area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | We support the proposed tram extension and see this as beneficial to the local businesses. |
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension  
- Received via Have Your Say -  
Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019

| Full Name* | kris inglis |  |
| Date Sent: | 6/10/2019 3:52:47 PM | Submission No: 70 |
| Name of Organisation: | Duncans Lane Ltd and 181 High Ltd |  |
| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing | Yes |  |

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**
I support the alternative plan with 30 parallel car parks

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**
I support the proposed tram extension
A. PLAN VIEW (SCALE 1:400)

B. SECTION - ELEVATION FACING NORTH SIDE (NTS)

30 PARALLEL PARKING BAYS
- 1 Loading zone (incl. 1 mobility) - 24 Bike parking spaces

attachment B

Item 5

- Landscape planting with a mix of low growing natives and exotics
- Existing trees retained on the North side of the street
- Proposed street trees on south side of the street to be small to medium sized. Suggested species including Magnolia, Maple or Flowering Cherry
- Crossing and safety splay with patterned surface to create a 'courtesy crossing'
- Open landscaped pavers (6x3m) with seating and glass panels to provide barrier from the road
- Bike parking space (6x3m) - 8 spaces each
- Tactile Paver of crossing points
- Mobility parking bay
- Loading zone
- 300mm Dish channel to capture runoff
- 150mm flush kerb to allow ease of movement across street
- Cycle lane - with 200mm dividing line between cycle lane and carparking
- Rain garden
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Summary of submission:  
The plan is of concern because it prioritises motor vehicle traffic in an area of the city which mostly has pedestrian malls at both ends of the section of High Street covered by this plan. Cyclists are very poorly catered for with little appreciation of the added safety risks they face because of the presence of the tram tracks, particularly in the north block section where there are two tram tracks side by side, and the expectation of car parking being provided on both sides of the street is an unreasonable wastage of the limited space on a relatively narrow thoroughfare.  
As High Street is not a major traffic route, parts of the section under review should be closed to motor vehicle traffic entirely or their access or the amount of parking provided for, severely restricted. This would be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. High Street is so close to other roads which are open to vehicle traffic that there would be little inconvenience in limiting vehicle access and parking in the manner described in the detailed submission which follows. For example there is access to a car park in the northern block from an access lane through the Stranges Building complex off Lichfield St. Likewise, premises in the mid and southern blocks are easily accessible from rear access from adjoining Manchester, Lichfield, Madras and Tuam Streets. It is therefore extremely difficult to justify the need for vehicle access onto High Street and car parking (except mobility parking). |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | I support the tram route extension as shown on the proposals. However special allowances must be made for the difficulty of having tram tracks along a narrow roadway (High Street) where there is limited space for cyclists and motor vehicles as detailed in the previous section. This is especially important for cyclists who cannot cross tram tracks at a shallow angle without encountering significant hazards. |
Patrick Dunford (Christchurch Transport Blog)
Christchurch

Submission on the CCC High Street Redevelopment Proposal
11 June 2019

Summary of submission:

The plan is of concern because it prioritises motor vehicle traffic in an area of the city which mostly has pedestrian malls at both ends of the section of High Street covered by this plan. Cyclists are very poorly catered for with little appreciation of the added safety risks they face because of the presence of the tram tracks, particularly in the north block section where there are two tram tracks side by side, and the expectation of car parking being provided on both sides of the street is an unreasonable wastage of the limited space on a relatively narrow thoroughfare.

As High Street is not a major traffic route, parts of the section under review should be closed to motor vehicle traffic entirely or their access or the amount of parking provided for, severely restricted. This would be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. High Street is so close to other roads which are open to vehicle traffic that there would be little inconvenience in limiting vehicle access and parking in the manner described in the detailed submission which follows. For example there is access to a car park in the northern block from an access lane through the Stranges Building complex off Lichfield St. Likewise, premises in the mid and southern blocks are easily accessible from rear access from adjoining Manchester, Lichfield, Madras and Tuam Streets. It is therefore extremely difficult to justify the need for vehicle access onto High Street and car parking (except mobility parking).
Northern Block – Cashel Street to Lichfield Street.

The proposed treatment includes:

- Two way traffic
- Two tram lines (which are already installed). Whilst these lines are properly the two sides of the loop, there is a one-way crossover (it can be entered by the left hand line in either running direction) between the two lines next to Strange’s Building.
- Widening the footpath on the south side only, to 5.5 metres
- Two raised crossing areas for pedestrians which are also intended to slow vehicle traffic.
- Seventeen P60 parking spaces.
- A loading zone near the Manchester Street intersection.
- 10 km/h speed limit for vehicles.
General features / observations of this area:

- Because of the tramlines, this is a narrow street section.
- Because of this narrowness, it is hazardous for cyclists to pass down the street when having to pass cars and avoid the tram lines. Perhaps this is why the proposal make no special mention of cycles.
- The actual driveable section for vehicles along the tram tracks is only about 100 metres long.
- The section outside Strange’s Building is currently reserved for pedestrians, and I presume this will not change.
- At the Manchester Street end, the street is left in left out only for traffic. I presume this will not change.
- The section of High Street immediately north of this is a pedestrian mall.
- There is a large block which used to be the Centra Hotel site and which can clearly be seen as an empty area to the right of the Cashel Street – High Street intersection. I do not know what is planned for this area, such as whether the hotel is proposed for rebuilding.

My thoughts / proposals:

1. There is no compelling need for full vehicle access along this short section of the street, part of which is already reserved for pedestrians.
   1. Cyclists accessing the street will find it difficult, as they already do, to dodge cars which are pulling in or out of parks along the sides of the street, because of the tram tracks, which are hazardous when crossed on a shallow angle.
   2. It is only 100 metres long.
   3. Its proposed speed limit of 10 km/h will discourage its use by through traffic in any case. However, this could be difficult to enforce.
   4. There is a carpark adjacent to the H&M building. This appears to have partial access from a laneway off Lichfield Street opposite the bus exchange.

2. Vehicle access should therefore be limited to:
   1. The slip road at the south end (intersecting with Manchester Street) should become a dead end section, with the rest of the street becoming a pedestrian mall. This section is already proposed for a loading zone, that should remain as such.
   2. There may be a need for an exit from the off street carpark next to H&M and this being the case, this should be a one way lane onto Cashel Street.It is unclear if this carpark is a permanent feature of the area or is intended to be built on in future.
   3. If a hotel is proposed to be rebuilt on the Centra site, coach / PSV access should be reasonably well catered for on the dead end section of Cashel Street.
   4. Any mobility parks or motorcycle parking.

3. The raised crossing humps pose questions about how they can be made to work with tram tracks crossing through them, maintaining enough clearance under the tram through which four tram rails must pass, and without creating additional trip hazards for pedestrians. Obviously if the street is closed to traffic, these humps will not be necessary.
Mid Block – Lichfield St to Tuam St

The proposed treatment includes:

- Two way vehicle traffic, maintaining the existing intersection with Manchester Street.
- High Street / Tuam Street intersection, which is currently fully signalised, is proposed to be signalised only for cycles and pedestrians. (The signalisation of this intersection was previously widely ridiculed for having no fewer than 19 signal poles, partly because of the provision for extension of the tram tracks through the intersection, and partly because of the Tuam Street cycleway)
- A cycle lane painted on the road for northbound traffic only. Southbound cyclists share the existing roadway with vehicles. Carparking is retained in this northbound section.
- Tram line extension to form a loop onto the existing tram line running down Poplar Street. This is subject to purchasing a piece of land that the curved part of the extension crosses at the Poplar Street / Tuam Street intersection. A tram shelter will be added at this corner for a passenger stop if the extension proceeds.
• Twelve P60 parks, mobility park, motorcycle parking and loading zone.
• 10 km/h speed limit.

General features / observations of this area:

• This area has only one tramline along the northward side of the street.
• This makes the northward side of the street hazardous for cyclists with cars manoeuvring around the carparks.
• How does the Council propose to enforce speed limits? These speed limits appear to be a cop out because of the hazards that are highlighted due to the difficulty of accommodating all the different modes with tram tracks running through these areas creating additional cyclist hazards.
• Both ends appear to be left in left out for vehicle traffic and I presume this will not change. This is one of the reasons the intersection on Tuam Street can be simplified.

My thoughts / proposals:

1. Due to the narrowness of the northbound side of the street with the tramlines posing hazards to two wheeled vehicles, this section should be closed to vehicles entirely.
   1. This affects four P60 parks and a loading zone.
   2. The cycle lane proposed should be separated from the footpath and tram lines, instead of being painted on.
2. This section of High Street should therefore be one way only, on the southbound side, insofar as motorised traffic is concerned.
3. This area currently has many empty sites which have yet to be developed. Planning should ensure that these sites provide adequate offstreet parking for their business needs, leaving the on street parking on the south side only, for mobility, loading zone, motorcycle and a small number of car parks.

Southern Block – Manchester St to Tuam St
The proposed treatment for this section includes:

- One way vehicle traffic southbound only
- A painted cycle lane for northbound cyclists only. On the southbound side cyclists will share the vehicle lane.
- Widened footpaths, cycle stands, rain garden etc.
- Eleven P60 parks, mobility parking, loading zone, motorcycle parking.
- 10 km/h speed limit.

General features / observations of this area:

- No tram tracks
- Cyclists along their lane will still have to dodge vehicles using the loading zone and two carparks despite vehicles not being permitted to drive along this section.
- There are bound to be motorists driving in the cycle lane northbound to access these areas despite the restriction on vehicle access which present a hazard to cyclists.
• Two vehicle exits at the St Asaph Street end.
• This area is the most built up with the existing Duncans buildings along the northbound side and the Ara Institute music school at the southern end.

My thoughts / proposals:

1. Remove the parking and loading zone along the northbound side
2. Build the cycle lane as off-road. These two measures combined will ensure the safety of cyclists using the cycle lane along this side of the street.
3. Ensure off street parking is required/provided for all businesses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Name</strong>:</th>
<th>Lois Lea</th>
<th><strong>Submission No:</strong></th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing:</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street):**

Bit worried about car parks outside businesses having to find a park & walk, put people off sometimes. Especially if an alternative shop is available elsewhere. Used to love High Street & looking forward to new businesses starting up. it is quite narrow, so widening it is probably impossible.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop:**

The route planned looks very good. I always understood the trams would travel to ARA Polytech is this still likely to happen? The poles positions look acceptable, they have to be there for the trams anyway. The extension to the tram lines is great, needs to be done.
THANK YOU FOR PROVIDING ÔTÀKARO LIMITED (ÔTÀKARO) WITH THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED HIGH STREET REVITALISATION PROJECT RELEASED FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE 14TH MAY 2019. THE COUNCIL'S PROPOSAL AIMS TO 'REDRAW THE TRANSPORT LINKS AND ADD TO THE SPECIAL CHARACTER OF HIGH STREET' BY WIDENING FOOTPATHS AT SOME POINTS, ADDING CROSSING POINTS, NEW PAVING AND LANDSCAPING, INCLUDING A CYCLEWAY ON THE SECTION OF HIGH STREET BETWEEN TUAM AND ST ASAPH STREETS, AND MAKING THIS SECTION ONE-WAY TO PEOPLE TRAVELLING IN VEHICLES AND ON BICYCLES.

ÔTÀKARO SUPPORTS THE COUNCIL'S GOAL OF REVITALISING THIS PART OF THE CENTRAL CITY, AND HAVE THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER IF THEY WISH.

A 'SLOW / SHARED STREET'

THE TRANSPORT CHAPTER OF THE CHRISTCHURCH CENTRAL RECOVERY PLAN (CCRP) IDENTIFIES HIGH STREET AS A KEY PEDESTRIAN ROUTE AND THE CHRISTCHURCH CENTRAL STREET AND SPACES DESIGN GUIDE CLASSIFIES HIGH STREET AS A 'SLOW / SHARED STREET'. THESE SHARED ROUTES IN THE SLOW CORE PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES TO DESIGN ENVIRONMENTS THAT ARE CONducIVE TO PEDESTRIANS, VEHICLES AND CYCLISTS SHARING STREET SPACE AND WHERE CYCLE SEPARATION IS LESS IMPORTANT DUE TO THE LIMITED NUMBER AND SLOW SPEEDS OF VEHICLES.

ÔTÀKARO CONSIDERS THAT THERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO ENHANCE AND REINFORCE HIGH STREET'S REPUTATION AS A POPULAR AND UNIQUE RETAIL DESTINATION BY CREATING A SHARED ZONE (LIKE THE AVON RIVER PRECINCT) OR A PEDESTRIAN MALL (LIKE CASHEL STREET).


SOUTH FRAME ANCHOR PROJECT

HIGH STREET PROVIDES IMPORTANT CONNECTION TO THE EASTERN END OF SALT DISTRICT AND THE SOUTH FRAME. ÔTÀKARO WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST THAT SURROUNDING SOUTH FRAME LANeways ARE SHOWN ON FUTURE CONSULTATION MATERIAL/PROJECT PLANS FOR THE HIGH STREET REVITALISATION PROJECT SO THAT THE CONTEXT OF THE STREET CAN BE SEEN.

NGÀI TAHU NARRATIVE AND PLACEMAKING INITIATIVES

ÔTÀKARO CONSIDERS THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO INCORPORATE MANA WHENUA NARRATIVES INTO THE PROPOSAL DESIGN (FOR EXAMPLE, THROUGH THE INCLUSION OF INDIGENOUS FLORA IN THE VEGETATION MIX, OR THE INCORPORATION OF NGÀI TAHU DESIGN INTO THE UPGRADE WORKS). ALONGSIDE PLACEMAKING INITIATIVES, THIS WILL ENSURE THAT THE CITY'S UNIQUE VALUES ARE CELEBRATED. CURRENTLY THE PROPOSAL LACKS DETAIL ON HOW IT WILL ADDRESS THESE CONSIDERATIONS.
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | Tram Extension  
In many cities around the world trams are a popular and highly efficient mode of public transport as well as a tourist attraction. Ōtākaro suggest that over the longer term Council could consider integrating the tram network into the public transport system. Again, this would create a point of difference for this part of the city and assist the city in planning for the future and reducing the reliance on car transport in the city.  
These comments are just suggestions for Council to consider, and as always, we would be more than happy to discuss any of the above |
Submissions on the High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension
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**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension  
- Received via Have Your Say -  
*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**  
I work at Manchester St, and have done so for four years. I welcome all the changes especially the lowering of the speed limit.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**  
It's good to extend the reach of a carbon neutral mass transit option (even if it's not the fastest!)
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension  

- Received via Have Your Say -  
Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Michele Dyer</th>
<th>Submission No: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/14/2019 3:50:47 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Michele Dyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Support in it's proposed format. Request native planting |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | Support in it's proposed format |
**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
**High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension**

- Received via Have Your Say -  
**Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Date Sent</th>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</th>
<th>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</th>
<th>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Ascroft</td>
<td>5/14/2019 6:21:44 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fully support this plan, especially the 10 km/h speed limit and shared usage for cycles and pedestrians. Should remove more on street car parking and increase fees for the few that are left.</td>
<td>Enabling the tram to loop instead of reversing seems sensible. Good to provide some extra safety for cycles interacting with tram tracks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension  
- Received via Have Your Say -  
*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*: Arthur McGregor</th>
<th>Submission No: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent: 5/14/2019 8:21:11 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street):**

I am writing in support of this proposal for the revitalisation of High Street. I really like the priority that has been given to pedestrians, as well as cyclists and other non-vehicle traffic. I think the low speed is a crucial aspect to this and support all the traffic calming measures. These changes will make the area a very pleasant place to visit and spend some time. Not only will they be a significant improvement over the status quo, but it will be an improvement over the pre-quake situation as well.

As a regular cyclist who works on the corner of High & Lichfield, I have a few concerns over the cycling provision. As a cyclist:

- How do I turn right and enter the St Asaph St cycleway at the southern end of High St?
- How do I cross Lichfield St to travel along High St? (in either direction)
- When heading east along the Tuam St cycleway, do I have right of way over cars entering and exiting High St?

I think there could be much more clarity to ensure cyclists travel safely and predictably without taking over pedestrian spaces or needing to mount the kerb.

In addition, I am concerned about the St Asaph / High St intersection. Although I think it is an improvement over the status quo, I would like to see more protection for cyclists on St Asaph to reduce the likelihood of cars turning left into High St without seeing cyclists. My suggestion here would be to extend the raised section back along St Asaph St, so that cars reach the bump before their nose enters into the cycleway. This would mean that cars slow down before cutting in front of the cycleway. Also, although not noted either way on the plan, I hope there will be plenty of signage to make it clear who has right of way. Perhaps some flashing lights could be added to warn vehicles of oncoming cyclists, similar to those located in the cycleway on Tuam St approaching the bus interchange.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop:**

I support extending the tram route. This will bring a unique bit of character to the area and increase the number of tourists visiting this end of the town.
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street *(Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)* | ok, more of those red maples will add colour in all seasons, than just the oaks, unless the oaks get real big to add personality to the city. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | Good, but why not extend tram even further, right down high st to get nearer to Ara and make it useful to students to use to get into town on. Need as many people going into city as possible to keep businesses there open. |

---

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

*Received via Have Your Say - Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

| Full Name*: | Craig Nicholson | Submission No: | 5 |
| Date Sent: | 5/14/2019 10:01:30 PM |
| Name of Organisation: | |
| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing | No |
### CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension
- Received via Have Your Say -
*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Jordan Dyer</th>
<th>Submission No: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/15/2019 2:40:23 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Yes I believe this is needed and wholeheartedly support the project. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | Again, I support this part of the project. |
| Item No.: 5 | Attachment C | Page 154 |

### CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

**High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension**

- Received via Have Your Say -

**Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Sabrina Kunz</th>
<th>Submission No: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/15/2019 4:18:06 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</strong></td>
<td>Great. Wish it could start sooner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</strong></td>
<td>Great. Would be fabulous if the trams were free/ more affordable and could be used as innercity public transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>- Received via Have Your Say -</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Name</strong>: Michael O'Grady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Sent</strong>: 5/15/2019 8:33:17 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Organisation</strong>: Michael O'Grady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</strong>: No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</strong>: On street car parking is very inefficient use of what is limited space on this street. The amount of people that can use this space for parking is much, much less than, for example having wider pedestrian and cycle paths. It also detracts from the general appeal of the street - having wider paths and gardens would make it much more attractive, encouraging people to the area to come to, and spend time in the area. On street parking should be limited to mobility parks only. More native trees should be used. It is old thinking to use European &quot;specimen&quot; trees. We have plenty of beautiful trees native to this country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</strong>: I support the tram extension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Name*</td>
<td>Lewis Anderson</td>
<td>Submission No: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/16/2019 7:27:50 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>The University of Auckland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**
Overall I strongly support the proposed design. However, there are still quite a lot of parking spaces taking up valuable street space. I’d like to see High Street completely pedestrianised with more/all carparks removed. Build Christchurch for humans and not cars!

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**
I don't really have a strong opinion on this since the tram isn't generally used as public transport. But I like trams anyway :)
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Concerned with the bike lanes merging into the car lane in one direction in stretches of High St. There should be inclusion of bike parking and less focus on car parks on the sides of the road. Ideally it should be fully pedestrianised but a shared space is a step in the right direction. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | |
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -  
*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

| Full Name*: Alex Fletcher | Submission No: 11 |
| Date Sent: 5/17/2019 11:58:27 AM |
| Name of Organisation: | |
| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing: No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It looks very nice from the concept provided. However I would suggest we go a step further and remove private vehicles from High Street. There is not much benefit in providing vehicle access for the general public nor the provisions for a small number of kerbside parking spaces. This would reduce the need for excessive intersection designs where the street intersects the other parallels. The removal of private vehicles would also be more pleasant for pedestrians and would not interfere with tram operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I support extension of the tram route wherever it may be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Name*:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

Hi Jennie. Please do not be offended by this comment, but talking to people around the town many on losing patience with these never ending roadworks. I just wonder if we all need a break for a couple of years. Its been 10 years now of constant disruption, and people are getting tired. You might want to pass this onto a couple of Councillors?

Cheers nick h

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension  
- Received via Have Your Say -  
Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019 |
|-------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Ella Harris</th>
<th>Submission No: 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/18/2019 2:13:06 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | This looks like a plan I'm pretty happy with. Yes; I agree that the lovely corgis need to be moved - this is from someone who managed to trip over one! Please replace the missing ice cream too!! I would like to say that it does worry me a bit when I see all this marvellous landscaping and huge numbers of seats going everywhere in our city but I still strongly feel that what's lacking is cafes actually being permitted to spill out onto the footpaths, as they do everywhere in Europe. If you want an area to be more vibrant this absolutely needs to happen all over the city. I'd love to see more lighting, sculptures and art work in these areas too. I agree with car access and parking. I think it's really important to work WITH shop/ business owners on this proposal. They're the ones who have gone out on a limb to establish businesses in a city which is still very quiet because many of the promises of 'certainty' the government made straight after the city reopened have not been delivered upon as yet. I find this appalling actually because so many businesses are absolutely struggling as a result. I do not blame the cash-strapped City Council for this. I think our successive governments should have stepped up to inject a lot more cash into our city to get big projects over the line. It's tragic and sad that this hasn't happened and that I'm walking around seeing businesses closing down as a result. |

| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | Great to get rid of the ridiculous 19 traffic lights and hopefully make the traffic left hand turn there more user friendly. Love the idea of the tram extension and that the new stop will look 'heritage'. |

---

**Attachment C**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item 5</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Michael van Ee</th>
<th>Submission No:</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/19/2019 7:33:25 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street):**

The concept if generally good and I support the majority of the design however there are two aspects that I do not agree with. First the traffic lights at the intersection of high street and Tuam are appalling eyesore. Since Tuam is a one way street the traffic could be controlled at the Manchester Tuam Street intersection eliminating all the traffic lights. Secondly the proposed 10km/hour speed limit is unnecessary and compliance by all road users, cycles, lime scooters, and cars will be very low to non-existent. The existing speed limit is fine for mix of traffic and pedestrians.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop:**

I support this extension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension  

*Received via Have Your Say - Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Justin Morgenroth</th>
<th>Submission No: 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent</td>
<td>5/19/2019 8:01:37 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation</td>
<td>Justin Morgenroth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing | No |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</th>
<th>I support the proposed changes.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</td>
<td>I support the proposed changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -
Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>John Lieswyn</th>
<th>Submission No: 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/19/2019 8:18:54 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</td>
<td>Brilliant concept. Build it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</td>
<td>Love it - will bring more tourists to this area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cahesh Street to St Asaph Street)</td>
<td>strongly supported, including the cycleway provision and level streets. Good to see the High/Tuam intersection simplified. 10km/h seems needlessly slow for cars: make it 20. developers and businesses in this area deserve council support, and collaborative design/implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</td>
<td>ideal, both the route and the stop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

**High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension**

- Received via Have Your Say -

*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>David Arnold</th>
<th>Submission No: 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/19/2019 11:32:03 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

We fully endorse these proposals.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**

We fully endorse these proposals.
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

**Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Tony O'Donnell</th>
<th>Submission No: 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/20/2019 9:30:52 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</td>
<td>I am against the proposal and prefer the status quo. Particularly against spending ratepayers money to benefit a private company by providing the tram extension. Also against the narrowing/removal of car carriageway and parking. Do not see the planting of oaks and increased width of footpaths and cycleways as a net benefit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</td>
<td>I am against the proposal and prefer the status quo. Particularly against spending ratepayers money to benefit a private company by providing the tram extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -
Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Sally Provan</th>
<th>Submission No: 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/20/2019 10:52:38 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | I support the proposed changes, especially the extra street trees and the 10kph limit on part of high street |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | I support extending the tram |

ID: 24393
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 5</th>
<th>Submission No: 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name*: Grace Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent: 5/22/2019 8:14:21 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation: Grace Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)

As someone who has been tram tracked twice, I support and reference to the Spokes draft submission below.

Thank you for trying to make the best of this congested space. Spokes supports the 10km/h speed limit and appreciates that cycle parking is shown on the plans.

Public Sentiment and City Transport

Share an Idea found wide support for a city inviting to people on foot and bicycles. The vision for the central city was as a shared space where people on foot or bicycle would feel safe and engage in the community.

The Accessible City Plan designates High Street as a priority pedestrian route from St Asaph through to Hereford Street. The section of High Street from Tuam St through to Ferry Road/Madras/St Asaph and connecting to the cycle route through the East Frame is designated as a priority cycle route. No portion of High Street is designated a priority for cars or on street parking.

Council has made efforts to encourage active transport and a commitment to curtail greenhouse gas emissions. This project caters to some merchant’s obsession with on street parking. Council needs staff able to present both the international and NZ sourced research which finds that on street parking is not the profit centre too many remain convinced it is.

Spoke’s can only assume a deliberate choice was made to exclude cycle lanes between parked cars and the tram from the safety audit done for this project. Pretending a problem does not exist does not make it so.

Council’s practice of favouring some groups as ‘key stakeholders’ continues to produce plans which fail the broader community, Council goals and policies and the future by advantaging the status quo.

High St Cashel to Manchester

This shared space with two sets of tram tracks and on street parking on both sides presents people on bikes with hard choices. Choose to keep left of the tracks to be wedged between cars, trams and on street parking or cross a track to take the lane or avoid the street entirely.

Cashel St offers a similar treatment with the added hazards of landscaped pinch points.

Please prominently sign both streets as shared spaces.

High St Lichfield to Tuam

More on street parking on both sides with a shared roadway for north bound cycles and south bound cycles in a narrow painted lane squeezed between parked cars, carriageway and tram tracks.

The cross section here has on street parking allocated 2m. This is very narrow. Including wing mirrors many full size cars will exceed this width. Even compacts are generally at least 1.9m wide.

The cycle lane hard up against the parked cars is shown as 1.8m with an unspecified buffer between it and the tram tracks whose width is also not specified.

Trucks and most SUV’s along with poorly parked cars will protrude into the bike lane. With a minimal door swing area of 0.9m the cycle lane is reduced to 0.9m, at best. Handlebar width of typical ebikes, cruisers, utility and comfort bikes are 0.7m+.
Under ideal conditions with cars parked hard up against the kerb people on bikes will have 0.2m of free space when dodging a car door opened into their path. People on bikes can hope that the trams and cars are very observant and will only pull out or pass when it is safe. No doubt this hope will be dashed from time to time.

Congestion will be increased by on street parking with a 60 minute limit ensuring frequent ins and outs to interrupt traffic and further reduce safety.

Both the entry and exit points to High St need to be clearly labelled as shared space.

Tuam to High St

Where both car and bicycle traffic from Tuam come into the shared space on High St it is unsafe for people on bikes coming from the right to give way to cars on their left. Traffic coming from the right is expected to have right of way when entering a shared space. The proposal is counter to road user’s expectations. The on street parking on both sides presents an additional and unacceptable hazard.

Spokes acknowledges that car traffic from Tuam has little cueing space and may cause a tail back onto Tuam St. It is also acknowledged that on street parking seems sacrosanct and worth more than preventing death or injury. Redesign is required.

High St from Tuam to St Asaph/Madras

Further south where High connects to Madras/St Asaph traffic is offered a ‘Y’ intersection to choose left to Madras or right to St Asaph. Include sharrows markings on pavement in centre of ‘Y’ and at stop signs. Ideally the arms to Madras and St Asaph would have a bike lane to access the bike lanes on both streets to reinforce the advantage that cycling offers over driving. This supports Accessible City’s ‘safe, accessible and people friendly’ focus and Council’s climate change and active transport goals.

Spokes appreciates the cycle infrastructure to the corner to facilitate access for people on bicycles coming on St Asaph from the east and to allow east bound cycles to get to Ferry Road.

Council Recommended Alternative

To comply with Council’s Cycle Design Guidelines for a local cycle way in this setting the project would need to implement section 3.2. (Emphasis added)

“3.2. Local cycleways through urban commercial centres

Local cycleways through commercial centres ideally will be separated cycle paths to provide a comfortable and safe environment for cyclists. Separation can be achieved in a variety of different ways depending on the individual centre and competing needs.

Where there is limited street space available other options such as wide cycle lanes or a slow street environment can be considered.”

A slow street environment is recommended.

Due to the limited space alternatives must be considered. The Cycle Design Guidelines 3.3 offers more help.

“3.3. Local cycleways and residential streets

In urban residential streets, local cycleways ideally will be neighbourhood greenways which create a slow, safe environment where bicycles, vehicles and people can comfortably co-exist. The quality of the environment and amenity of the residential street is also enhanced through the design.”

A slow streets and neighbourhood greenways approach with pedestrian and cycle priority is a far better fit for a narrow street in this densely commercial area with high pedestrian numbers. This is recognized as speed is limited to 10km/h.

Unfortunately the tram tracks complicate the street by creating a real hazard for two wheeled vehicles. A standard quiet streets approach providing a wide hazard free shared carriageway is not possible.

To provide a safe space on street parking needs to be removed to accommodate cycle lanes, especially for the St Asaph to Tuam section.

Benefits

The plan recognizes that this is a major route for Ara and for the planned stadium. People will be encouraged to walk noting the dining and shopping options, benefiting High Street merchants. With parking removed merchants will benefit by offering a space with reduced car congestion conducive to strolling, shopping and dining. The current design leaves people on bicycles in an unsafe zone wedged between unrealistically narrow on street parks, traffic and the trams.
<p>| route extension, poles and new stop |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension  

- Received via Have Your Say -  
Submit your comments by 5pm on 10 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Mark Bellamy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent</td>
<td>5/24/2019 2:08:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | I work on lower High Street and am in support of the proposed revitalisation of High Street. High Street is a street which should be predominantly used by pedestrians with only minor allowance for traffic - similar to the Avon River precinct. Paving the street would be fantastic but understand a big cost implication in this. I am in full support in the reduction of car parks on the street as there is plenty of off street parking options in the near-by vicinity. The works should be carried out ASAP - definitely a lot earlier than the indicated mid-2020. |

| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | I am in support of the new tram route. |
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | I fully support this project, it will do wonders for the redevelopment of this area of the city and should go ahead as proposed. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop |   |
# CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Shaun Bosher</th>
<th>Submission No: 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/25/2019 8:22:37 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

Without a keen look over the plans, all I can say is that I support the plan in principle.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**
| Item No.: 5 | Page 174 |

### CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- **Received via Have Your Say** -
*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>John de Senna</th>
<th>Submission No: 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/25/2019 2:46:14 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>John de Senna NZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | I support this revitalization WITH THE EXCEPTION of the proposed speed reduction; the speed limit should be kept at 30kph or, at most, reduced to 20kph. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | |
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | a waste of time and my rates money. Other areas like Worcester St footpath needs fixing among hundreds of others in bad condition. Once the new sports stadium is completed then maybe do this. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | not needed at present so is a waste of money. There are far more important things to fix |
| Item No.: 5 |  | Page 176 |

## CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

| Full Name*: | Jeremy Chang | Submission No: 30 |
| Date Sent: | 5/28/2019 7:08:04 AM |
| Name of Organisation: | |
| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing | No |

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | How about finish everything else you have started first, let the citizens breath for a bit, before you make further changes? High Street needs to be open to the public first. Where’s the information about the cost to the city and the construction time? is this going to be like another Saint Asaph Street with more than 10 years of road works? |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | No. Who takes the tram anyway? That is for tourists. The travel speed of the tram is slower than walking. You are taking public roads away in favour of a private company. |
## CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

**Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Jonathan Tunnell</th>
<th>Submission No: 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent</td>
<td>5/28/2019 7:29:59 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing | No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loving the continued emphasis on joining up existing cycling routes and making it safer for cyclists. Before the cycle ways were in place I didn't use to go to the city. I can now bike into the city with my 3.5 year old son on the Quarymans Trail without feeling like a moving target for motorists. The city looks great now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great work ccc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>John Bond</th>
<th>Submission No: 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/28/2019 9:40:08 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Road Transport Association of NZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Morning Jenny  
The Road Transport Association of NZ (RTANZ) have no issues with the revitalisation program. I will be great to see this when completed as I am sure the people utilising the area will enjoy the new environment.  
Regards  
John Bond  
Area Executive, Road Transport Association |

<p>| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 5</th>
<th>Submission No: 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension  
- Received via Have Your Say -  
Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Matt McPherson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent</td>
<td>5/28/2019 10:07:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**  
The revitalisation of High Street would mean that it is easier to move between the city and Ara while also connecting the south and east frames. While studying at Ara this was something that was seen as off putting to walk into the city as the access meant there was not an easy way to do so. The proposed entry to the city would change this and make an easy route to cycle into the middle of town and connect with other cycle ways.

The reduced speed limit would be good on high street for cyclist in the city and also vehicles as this is a similar speed to what many currently do on high st when looking for a park or for example outside smash palace where they are slowing down where people are walking on the road.

The removal of car parks along high street, will help with encouraging people to use high street to access the city due to the reduction of cars that can park elsewhere, this is something that I think should be encouraged with the proposed stadium near by and a residential area with air bnb's it would create a friendly route into the city that is welcoming as well with the trees and plants along the street, this is something that should be done in other parts of the city as well.

I like the incorporation of a rain garden into the design as it means that not all rain water is going straight down the drain, where possible I would like to see this used more on High Street as it would also help reduce flooding when drains are blocked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By adding in the new covered tram stop it gives a proper stop for tourist outside of where the hotels are located and closer to air bnb's, I would also like to think that it would help businesses in this part of town.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By cutting the corner on Popular it will reduce the amount of poles used at the intersection which will make it more aesthetically pleasing which is something that need to happen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extension would also help tie in the south est of the city which currently feels very disjointed from the rest of the central city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Name*:</td>
<td>Vanessa Mander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>5/28/2019 12:45:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street</td>
<td>We are interested in the future of the sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</td>
<td>known as the “Woods for the Trees” that is to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>removed from its current site as part of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>revitalisation project. I understand that this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sculpture is CCC owned but naturally DOC has an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interest in its future as we had a fair amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of input on its creation both financially and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inspirationally. We are wondering what the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future holds for this sculpture? Is it to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moved to another location? Stored? Any and all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information is greatly appreciated. I am currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>working with Jennie to understand this situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Proposed tram route extension,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poles and new stop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Name*</td>
<td>Emma Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent</td>
<td>5/28/2019 10:26:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

I am really concerned that this proposal puts the future of Smash Palace at risk. Smash Palace has become an iconic part of post quake Chch and offers and important place for the community to gather. It is a popular hospitality establishment and shows great success and resilience as a post quake business start up. Please ensure that this development goes ahead in such a way that it will not harm Smash Palace.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | the further reduction of the speed limit to 10kmph is one more nail in the coffin of easy access to the city centre. Can you please come up with something that will reverse [some of] the post-quake exodus to Riccarton Road and the Westfield area. Christchurch is a major city without a beating heart. It just limps along. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | I am sure the tourists will love the extra 5-10 minutes trip they will get. It makes almost no difference to the residents of the city since the tram is a thing for tourists and not residents. Unlike Melbourne, the trams in Christchurch are not an integral part of the public transport system. So, for the vast majority of city residents, the tram is a pointless affectation. |
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | I am overall supportive of the proposed changes, especially keeping low speeds and minimising on-street parking. Any on-street parking increases the risk of conflict zones (car doors) for people cycling, which is of particular note towards the St Asaph St end where people are likely to be biking as it connects with the Heathcote Expressway Major Cycle Route. Keep up the great placemaking work - more varied furniture might be nice to see e.g. benches with bike parking slots on the back of them |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | |

<p>| Full Name*: Natalie Brodie | Submission No: 38 |
| Date Sent: 5/31/2019 2:31:02 PM | |
| Name of Organisation: | |
| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing: No | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*: Tyler Ashcroft</th>
<th>Submission No: 39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent: 5/31/2019 6:52:05 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation: Tropicana outdoor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street):**
I think these are fine proposals am a little worried about the art piece on the corner of Manchester and high st as it holds a stigma with all Christchurch before the quakes. Happy to chat about this via call or catch up.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop:**
Great to see the tram continuing even one heading out to sumner as it once did It could be a neat way to provide public transport. Aswell as a speed tram that could go pretty quick. However people will always drive as Christchurch is to spread out with rolleston to rangiora all traveling in with no easy fast reliable public transport available.
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Please find attached a plan with suggested amendments. It is important to maintain as many street car parks as possible in this area as the buildings in this area do not have off street parking. I feel the landscaping can be reduced without compromising the look and feel of the street. I am overseas hence the submission is less formal. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop |  |
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**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -  
*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Gemma D</th>
<th>Submission No: 41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/5/2019 4:04:14 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | With 'ample off-street parking available nearby', why do these plans focus so heavily on retaining the unrestricted movement of vehicles and parking? Where are the people focussed spaces like what has been developed through the South and East frame and the Innovation Precinct? Businesses and shoppers aren't going to benefit from an attractive and vibrant street as it is still so heavily dominated by motor traffic.

Through the information it refers to multiple options being discussed with stakeholders, more specifically 'business and property owners', but why wasn't this undertaken with a wider group of stakeholders including people who currently use the street and those that ride and walk along these links. So are these plans a given if this is what business owners are ok with even though this is public space?

The whole provision for cycling looks like an afterthought and seems very poor for people travelling on bicycles even though it is acknowledged as a key cycle route? In the middle section cyclists travelling north have to cross tram tracks twice and the angle at the north of this section looks severe. In the southern section why do cyclists have to give-way at the vehicle slip lane on to St Asaph Street. Why not retain the exit on to Madras St only and retain the newly created public space?

The cycle provisions are not that legible. Was there consideration for a two-way bike facility that travelled on the southwest side of the southern section and then switched to the northeast side of the middle section (only requiring cyclists to cross the tram line once)? This would provide a direct and seamless route from the directional crossing at Ara to the shared crossing at Lichfield St. The connection to Rauora Park on Poplar St has also been missed. The shared space and path through the park provide a much better level of service for people travelling by bicycle north and south it's just a mess at Lichfield Street where on-street parking blocks access to the connections.

Why are there no dimensions on the plans or cross-sections? It makes it more difficult for people to understand the space that is being allocated to different users. If a small amount extra was given to cycling, this space shouldn't be taken from pedestrians but for motorists.

What considerations have been given to micro-mobility and space for scooters?

Hasn't Council declared a climate change emergency, how do these plans align with a low carbon future?

There are huge opportunities for the public realm along High Street to support these developments, just seems like it hasn't been taken or discussed with wider stakeholders and users. |

| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | No issue with completing the tram route. |
## CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

**Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Julie Robertson-Steel</th>
<th>Submission No: 42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent</td>
<td>6/6/2019 12:16:10 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | I am very supportive of the proposed revitalisation. I like the sound of the plans and this will upgrade an area of the city that is still in need of work after the earthquakes, attracting more people to visit and live in the central city. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | I support this tram route extension and associated work. The trams are a real asset to the city and a link to part of the city's history which I think it is important to foster, especially as we lost so much heritage in the earthquakes. |
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission close 5pm on 10 June 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Name</strong>: Roy Sinclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Sent</strong>: 6/6/2019 3:08:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Organisation</strong>: Roy Sinclair Co. Writers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</strong>: No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**: 1A Wherstead Road

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**: 1A Wherstead Road. I fully support proposed tramway extension. It will further enhance the city landscape.
<p>| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Yes! |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | Yes! |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Ashley Crook</th>
<th>Submission No: 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/6/2019 6:38:57 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</td>
<td>Put the tram all the way down high street. Then up Madras Street then down Cashel St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</td>
<td>Put the tram all the way down high street. Then up Madras Street then down Cashel St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</td>
<td>Agree with proposal to revitalise this sad area. If the proposed 10kph speed limit is put in place, where do e scooters fit? they are not bound by vehicle speed limits, they need to be banned from area totally. One can imagine the damage they will cause to the paving, have a look at Margaret Mahey, Victoria Square and the Terrace!!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</td>
<td>Good Idea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</td>
<td>I support this. I support measures for streetscape revitalisation and believe Chch is headed in an exciting modern direction with these sorts of redevelopments. I wish there was more provisions for safe cycling and walking though - having the streets as through routes will mean it's less safe for people who aren't in cars.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</td>
<td>As long as the ratepayers aren't subsidising a private business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)

Generally the proposal is a big improvement over what is currently in place. However there is a real missed opportunity here to create a genuinely good place for non motorised vehicles and pedestrians to be able to use the space. Much of this area has been closed to vehicles for a number of years with no detrimental effects so why not make the whole stretch car free? This frees up space for pedestrians, on street space for businesses and provides the opportunity for more cycling and scooter space. In street parking is quite literally a colossal waste of limited space.

If Council are serious about implementing measures to fit he climate emergency declared they should be taking real steps in schemes like this to discourage car use not perpetuating the same established transport modes.

### Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop

Need to ensure tram lines are as safe as possible for cyclists and scooters. If cars were not permitted this would free up space for dedicated cycle and scooter space away from trams and pedestrians.
| **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
| **High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension**  
| **- Received via Have Your Say -**  
| **Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**  

| **Full Name:** | Paul Dale |
| **Date Sent:** | 6/7/2019 2:02:28 PM |
| **Name of Organisation:** | Private Citizen |
| **I Wish to Speak at the Hearing:** | No |

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street):**

10km per hour! Are you joking. Have the planners ever tried to drive a vehicle at a steady driving speed of 10km. I believe that it is impossible. Maybe council is looking at putting a speed camera on street. What a revenue gatherer that would be.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop:**
<p>| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | This is just sad that you keep imagining the near future with cars. The tramway? Looks more like a joke! Why aren't you planning for using tramway as public transportation? Why parking spaces? There are heaps of parking now in the city centre, more than needed. We need more public transport so exploit the tramway, prepare for cycling routes that are safe and not shared with cars. People won't change their car habit until they are forced to drop it and offered cheap (or free) means of transportation. Your views are so not modern or adapted to our future needs. This is outrageous that public money will go into funding this project. Christchurch will never be regarded as a beacon for modernity or an exemplar of sustainable development. It will be seen as a missed opportunity and a big mistake. Building carparks, retail offices and a touristy tramway will just make a few people richer than what they already are. Enough with that! Listen to what younger generations want and also please inform yourself about what is being done positively in the rest of the world. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | See previous comment. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension  
- Received via Have Your Say -  
*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019* |
| Full Name*: | Robert Fleming | Submission No: | 53 |
| Date Sent: | 6/9/2019 5:07:10 PM |
| Name of Organisation: |  |
| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing | No |
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | I would prefer that the vehicle access between Cashel Street and Tuam Street was one-way only. If there are to be spaces available for on-street parking then the roadway space remaining is not sufficiently wide for two vehicle lanes, plus safe cycle movements, particularly when there are tram tracks to be aware of also. The 10kph speed limit is great, but will it be adhered to? This is going to enable a great link for cycles from the Square to the SE, there will be 1000's each day particularly in time, when the Heathcote Express Cycleway is completed. The cycle route access crossing Manchester Street at present, is atrociously difficult. The plan is unclear, but looks little better. This needs to be addressed. Thanks for the opportunity to make this submission. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | I think this extension is logical. The tram is an added benefit to the city. It is good to see a more logical route enabled. |

ID: 25309
### CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

**Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Kenneth Henderson</th>
<th>Submission No: 54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent</td>
<td>6/9/2019 5:08:45 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

I fully support the proposals for this part of the city which has its own charm.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**

The completion of the tram route is essential. The trams are a great tourist attraction for Christchurch as evidenced by the numbers of people riding the beautiful restored vintage vehicles. Local people who are able to purchase annual passes are using the tram in increasing numbers. The tram route has linked some of the main features of the city centre and now that the rebuild is becoming more evident in the High St area it makes good sense to complete the circuit as soon as possible.
## CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Justin Rogers</th>
<th>Submission No: 56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/9/2019 7:05:51 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Justin Rogers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Looks good. Will it happen quickly enough for the businesses to survive? Please don’t push Smash Palace aside for a laneway without offering them the outdoor dining space gratis. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | Just watch the bike/tram crossings. |
## CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

**Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Vince Eichholtz</th>
<th>Submission No: 57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/9/2019 8:49:33 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Cannot see a reason not to pedestrianise High Street. The plans need to be seen through the lens of the Climate emergency, with less emphasis on vehicle movements. Otherwise a good plan |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | Good to extend the tram lines and develop the loop and the historic tram stop-similar to the square? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Angela Walsh</th>
<th>Submission No: 58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/9/2019 9:31:42 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</td>
<td>There seems to be a lot of lost potential to make this a great pedestrian and cycle environment (and tram). If vehicles must be allowed then I support the 10km/hr. However by trying to fit all modes into a small space the vision of a pedestrian heavy lively environment, with possible on street eating is threatened. I am really looking forward to this link between the cycleway from ferry road and the city being open.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment: Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

The idea of reducing the number of street car parks in Middle High Street between Manchester and Tuam Streets will impact heavily on business. There are only two businesses that have opened and survived in that block in the past nine years. Both these businesses rely heavily on street parking.

The city has been literally suffocated with cycle ways, so please leave this piece of paradise alone for the customers of Smash Palace and C1 Coffee.

The consultation process is obviously a repetition of what we have just experienced in Ferry Road. Business and property owners have no rights, but are expected to pay increased rates demands which in turn pays the salaries of those who are implementing the unworkable designs.

Anthony & Joanna Carey  
Property owners  High Street
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Benny Castles</th>
<th>Submission No: 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/10/2019 2:18:32 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Benny Castles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

The proposed plan is not acceptable due to large reduction in carparks
We Support an alternative plan. Please see attached.
A reduction in onsite parks must be accompanied by alternative parking in easy walking distance(Less than 2-4 minutes).
If and when the work is undertaken it is done urgently and quickly. Working at nights and weekends.
We have many concerns over the impact on our business if parks are removed and the impacts on business during the construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
C. SECTION - ELEVATION FACING SOUTH SIDE (NTS)

30 PARALLEL PARKING BAYS
1 Loading zone (incl. 1 mobility) + 24 Bike parking spaces
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**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

The plans are mostly fine, but sadly unambitious for a council that has recently recognised the existence of a climate emergency and which oversees an urban area in which transport is responsible for more than 50% of carbon emissions. It is sad to see how much room on one of the central routes and meeting places in town is handed over to parking cars. Parking cars or the ability to park my car is not what attracts me to the CBD. Good pedestrian and cycling facilities, an attractive streetscape, and outside gastronomy do attract me (combined with public transport). An ambitious plan would get rid of the parking and make the street more inviting to people, not to cars.

The plan currently also has a fundamental flaw as relates to cycling provisions. High St is a major north/south connection for cyclists and even more important given how Colombo St and Manchester St fail to accommodate anybody except for people who like to sit in idling cars. However, the plan does not make it easy for cyclists to cross the Manchester St/Lichfield St/High St intersection. The idea appears to be that cyclists travelling south-east follow High St past the point where cars are directed on a left curve towards Manchester St, for cyclists to then cross first Manchester St, then Lichfield St via the pedestrian traffic lights to end up back on High St.

I can predict that many cyclists will be unable to discern that this is the intention. There are no clear markings or on-road cycle lanes combined with shared path markings to direct cyclists that way.

Furthermore, a diagonal crossing, like the tram going north-west, is an easier option/desire line and many cyclists in the absence of clear infrastructure will take the easy desire line if it means avoiding having to go through two traffic lights to simply follow the street they are on.

Going north-west, a cyclist wanting to cross the same intersection is faced with a similar problem, here propounded by the fact that they would need to cross High St with traffic behind them to get on the right side for the traffic light on the east side of Manchester St to go north.

| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | Looks good. |
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Trees, shrubs and flowers - a great way to attract people to the area. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | The tram route extension is vital for the success of the businesses in this area. Short stay visitors (eg cruise ship passengers and overnight visitors) will mostly not venture into this area and the tram is the ideal way to get them into this corner of the inner city. |
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Hi  
The proposed plan is not acceptable due to large reduction in carparks but am quite impressed by the pebbles group alternate plan  

Like most business es in the area we are reliant on clients being able to access us and so any reduction in onsite parks needs to be accompanied by alternative parking in easy walking distance. We have invested significantly in being back in the central city and were one of the first tenants in the little high complex and have had regular disruption to access over the last 3 years.  

On that basis if and when the work is undertaken it is done urgently and quickly. Working at nights and weekends.  

I would like to think that these concerns are considered from a disruption to business perspective and we don't lose more parking in the area |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop |  |
C. SECTION - ELEVATION FACING SOUTH SIDE (NTS)

30 PARALLEL PARKING BAYS
• 1 Loading zone (incl. 1 mobility) • 24 Bike parking spaces

LEGEND
A Canopies on the South side of the street. Softfit at 2.8m from footpath level, 2.8m from buildings boundary, 500mm tall
B Bench seating and Landscape ship planted with a mix of low growing natives and exotics and lancewood to add a vertical element on North side of the street

PLANTING PALETTE
- Magnolia (Magnolia 'Grandiflora')
- Leucothoe (Leucothoe peregrinans)
- Hebe (Hebe 'Emerald Gem')
- Gaultheria Lindheimeri ('Lindheimeri 'Sisklou Pink')
- Panurus (Pratia angulata)
- Liriope (Liriope Muscari 'Royal Purple')

Item 5

Attachment C
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | Following a review of the information for the High Street revitalisation and tram extension, there are some great suggestions and recommendations been made. However is proposed plan is NOT acceptable due to the large reduction of street car parking. The constant removal of car parks from the CBD is only making it more difficult for businesses to survive and for the CBD to flourish. Colliers International is an office tenant located at High Street and our reasons when making the decision to locate to this part of the CBD was good street parking for customers. Our business is pro the CBD, however our customers don’t ride the bus or a bike to come to meetings in our offices. Not only do we need car parks, but so do the retail tenants that occupy the shops in the surrounding area. Ultimately if its made to hard for tenants to do business they move to locations which are easier to conduct business. I’ve have attached the alternative plans which I support as does our business as a tenant that would be affected by the changes. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | Highly supportive of the tram extension. |
A. PLAN VIEW (SCALE 1:400)

LEGEND
1. Landscape planting with a mix of low growing natives and exotics
2. Existing trees retained on the North side of the street
3. Proposed street trees on south side of the street to be small to medium sized. Suggested species including Magnolia, Maple or Flowering Cherry
4. Crossing and safety splay with patterned surface to create a ‘courtesy crossing’
5. Open landscaped pedestrian (6x6m) with seating and glass panels to provide barrier from the road
6. Bike parking space (6x6m) - 8 spaces each
7. Tactile paving of crossing points
8. Mobility parking bay
9. Loading zone
10. 300mm Dish channel to capture runoff
11. 150mmflush kerb to allow ease of movement across street
12. Cycle lane - with 200mm dividing line between cycle lane and car parking
13. Rain garden

B. SECTION - ELEVATION FACING NORTH SIDE (NTS)

30 PARALLEL PARKING BAYS
* 1 Loading zone (incl. 1 mobility) * 24 Bike parking spaces
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| Full Name* | ANNA SMALL | Submission No: 73 |
| Date Sent: | 6/10/2019 4:01:06 PM |
| Name of Organisation: | COLLIER INTERNATIONAL |
| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing | No |

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | YOU ARE REDUCING THE NUMBER OF CARPARKS WHICH OUR CLIENTS USE SO WE DISAGREE WITH THIS |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | |

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

**High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension**

- Received via Have Your Say -

*Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019*
## CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension

- Received via Have Your Say -

**Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Danny Valentine</th>
<th>Submission No: 74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/10/2019 4:05:46 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>D&amp;V Services Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | The proposed plan is not acceptable due to large reduction in car parks and therefore support the alternative plan as attached. We have concerns over the impact on our local business during construction if parks are removed. We request that any reduction in onsite parks is accompanied by alternative parking in easy walking distances (less than 2-4 minutes). We also request that when the work is undertaken it is done urgently and quickly, working at nights and in weekends. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | I support the Tram extension as proposed |

ID: 25398
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We are one of the new tenants of the newly established Duncan units in lower High St. We think the proposed plan is not acceptable due to large reduction in car parks. We are highly concerned over the impact on our business if parks are removed. We also are very concerned about the impacts on business during the construction. If and when the work is undertaken, please do it urgently and quickly, including working at nights and weekends. We also suggest a delay in starting any work on our block until the character and business uses for the newly opened street is established. Patching and not doing the upgrade could be an option. We fully support the alternative plan attached. This is an alternative plan for the High Street between Tuam and St Asaph Street which retains most of the parks and still meets the CCC objectives regarding alternative modes of transport and pedestrian use. Thank you!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully support tram route extension around Poplar St and loop back into High St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hearings Panel
15 August 2019
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LEGEND

1. Landscape planting with a mix of low growing natives and exotics
2. Existing trees retained on the North side of the street
3. Proposed street trees on south side of the street to be small to medium sized. Suggested species including Magnolia, Maple or Flowering Cherry
4. Crossing and safety splay with patterned surface to create a 'courtesy crossing'
5. Open landscaped pedestrian (6x3m) with seating and glass panels to provide barrier from the road
6. Bike parking space (6x3m) - 8 spaces each
7. Tactile Paver of crossing points
8. Mobility parking bay
9. Loading zone
10. 300mm Dish channel to capture runoff
11. 150mm flush kerb to allow ease of movement across street
12. Cycle lane - with 200mm dividing line between cycle lane and car parking
13. Rain garden
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension
- Received via Have Your Say -
Submissions close 5pm on 10 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*</th>
<th>Bronwyn Larsen</th>
<th>Submission No: 76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent</td>
<td>6/10/2019 4:31:09 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation</td>
<td>Community &amp; Public Health, Canterbury District Health Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBMISSION ON HIGH STREET REVITALISATION AND TRAM EXTENSION

Details of submitter
1. Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB).
2. The Ministry of Health requires the submitter to reduce potential health risks by such means as submissions to ensure the public health significance of potential adverse effects are adequately considered during policy development.

Details of submission
3. We welcome the opportunity to comment on the High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension. The future health of our populations is not just reliant on hospitals, but on a responsive environment where all sectors work collaboratively.

General Comments
4. Health creation and wellbeing (overall quality of life) is influenced by a wide range of factors beyond the health sector. These influences can be described as the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age, and are impacted by environmental, social and behavioural factors. They are often referred to as the ‘social determinants of health’. The most effective way to maximise people’s wellbeing is to take these factors into account as early as possible during decision making and strategy development.

5. Transport and urban design have particular influences on the health and wellbeing of New Zealanders. The greatest impact is how the design of streetscapes can encourage or inhibit physical activity. Low physical activity is the 10th leading risk factor for death and disability in New Zealand and contributes to a number of preventable diseases which cause the most deaths per year in the developed world.

6. The CDHB commends the Christchurch City Council (the council) in the development of this concept plan. It clearly incorporates aspects of a Healthy Streets approach, given the emphasis on reduced speed, shared use and an interesting streetscape which will encourage people to stop, rest and relax. As it is anticipated that there will be further retail, hospitality and commercial development in the area, we would also encourage the use of shade and shelter to encourage its use in all weathers.

7. The CDHB supports collaboration with Mataopere Charitable Trust to include sites of significance and cultural markers within the project area. As indicated in the consultation information, this street holds significance for both mana whenua and the early settlement of Christchurch city which is important to maintaining cultural connections to the land.

8. The CDHB recommends that priority signals at intersections are provided for cycles and trams and that pedestrians are given their own crossing sequence given High Street crosses through a number of busy streets.

9. The CDHB strongly supports a 10km/h speed limit throughout High Street to ensure that pedestrian safety is prioritised. This speed limit should be for all modes (cycles, scooters etc.), and clearly marked as such. This will reduce the risk of high speed collisions with vehicles, cycles and e-scooters.

10. On-street car-parking should be minimised, as cars pulling in and out of parks can be a hazard for pedestrians and cycles, reducing lines of sight and creating ‘pinch-points’ particularly when trams may be passing.
11. While vehicle access is still enabled it would be ideal if the area was designed in such a way that it could be blocked off for events or carnival type activities. This could also include the use for example, of art or display spaces.

12. The CDHB recommends that mobility parking is prioritised over standard on-street parking, given that there are multiple off-street parking facilities close-by which can be easily accessed by those without mobility needs.

13. The CDHB supports installation of a tram stop at the Tuam Street loop which includes seating and shelter as proposed.

14. The proposed signal changes at the High Street/Tuam Street intersection are supported. The current configuration of 19 signal poles is confusing and overwhelming, therefore reducing their number is likely to improve safety.

15. The CDHB recommends that changes in vehicle access and direction are marked very clearly to avoid confusion. This is particularly essential given the wide variation throughout the route.

Conclusion

16. The CDHB does not wish to be heard in support of this submission.

17. Thank you for the opportunity to submit on High Street revitalisation and tram extension.

Person making the submission

Dr Anna Stevenson  
Date: 10/06/2019

Public Health Physician

Contact details

Bronwyn Larsen

For and on behalf of

Community and Public Health

C/- Canterbury District Health Board

P

Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop
### CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

**High Street Revitalisation and Tram Extension**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name*:</th>
<th>Paul Lonsdale</th>
<th>Submission No: 77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Sent:</td>
<td>6/10/2019 4:54:37 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Wish to Speak at the Hearing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

The proposed plan is not acceptable due to large reduction in carparks: I support the alternative plan attached or the original plan developed with the business community through the project teams consultation which was not presented for wider consultation.

Any reduction in on-street parks should be accompanied by alternative parking in easy walking distance (Less than 2-4 minutes).

I also suggest that when the work on this project is undertaken that it is done urgently and quickly. Working at nights and weekends as I have grave concerns on the impact these works will have on local business if carparks are removed and the impacts on business during the construction.

I suggest that 18 months is too long a construction timeframe and suggest splitting the project into two parts -

Part 1: The Tram Extension Project
Part 2: The Lower High Street Upgrade.

I further suggest that the lower High Street works be delayed giving time for the newly completed buildings to be tenanted and for those tenants to have enough time to get established.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**

Part 1: The tram extension project I fully support the tram extension plan but ask that you do all you can to minimise impact on the surrounding businesses. Ensure that contractors DO NOT park in any of the available on street carparks with contractor parking.
Hearings Panel
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LEGEND

A. Canopies on the South side of the street. Softfl
   at 2.8m from footpath level, 2.8m from buildings
   boundary, 500mm tall

B. Bench seating and Landscape ship planted with
   a mix of low growing natives and exotics and
   lancewoods to add a vertical element on North
   side of the street

PLANTING PALETTE

- Magnolia
  (Magnolia 'Grandiflora')
- N.Z. 69
  (Libertia peregrinans)
- Hebe
  (Hebe 'Emerald Gem')
- Quercus Lindheimeri
  (Lindheimeri 'Biskiyou,'
   FHM')
- Panoenuse
  (Pratia angulata)
- Liriope
  (Liriope Muscari 'Royal
   Purple')

---
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Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)

The proposed plan is not acceptable due to large reduction in carparks. I support alternative plan attached as it retains the carparks. I have concerns over the impact on local business if parks are removed and the impacts on business during the construction.

I would suggest that any reduction in onsite parks is accompanied by alternative parking in easy walking distance (Less than 2-4 minutes).

If and when the work is undertaken it is done urgently and quickly. Working at nights and weekends.

Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop

The proposed plan is not acceptable due to large reduction in carparks. I support alternative plan attached as it retains the carparks. I have concerns over the impact on local business if parks are removed and the impacts on business during the construction.

I would suggest that any reduction in onsite parks is accompanied by alternative parking in easy walking distance (Less than 2-4 minutes).

If and when the work is undertaken it is done urgently and quickly. Working at nights and weekends.
30 PARALLEL PARKING BAYS

- 1 Loading zone (incl. 1 mobility) + 24 Bike parking spaces

C. SECTION - ELEVATION FACING SOUTH SIDE (NTS)

**LEGEND**

A. Canopies on the South side of the street. Softfit of 2.8m from footpath level, 2.8m from building boundary, 500mm tall

B. Bench seating and Landscape with a mix of low growing natives and exotics and lancewoods to add a vertical element on North side of the street

**PLANTING PALETTE**

- Magnolia [Magnolia ‘Grandiflora’]
- Nerine sarniensis [Lilium peregrinans]
- Hebe [Hebe ‘Emerald Gem’]
- Olearia Lindheimeri [Lindheimeri ‘Siskyou Pink’]
- Panakoena (Pratia angulata)
- Ulope [Ulope Muscari ‘Royal Purple’]
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**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

I support the cycle access to the High Street and the increased number of trees; however, I think that the current plan, with so much car traffic and parking, is very unappealing. There are a few reasons for this, which are outlined in the points below.

- There is already plenty of parking in the CBD and the abundance of on-street parking as shown in the plan is unnecessary. It is ugly; it presents problems for cyclists, pedestrians, and other drivers when it comes to opening doors and manoeuvring in small spaces; and it gives people an incentive to drive in to town instead of walking, cycling, or taking the bus.
- The High Street would be much more attractive as a car-free zone. A pedestrian/cycle/tram-only shopping area would encourage people to stay on the High Street longer and to relax; if they feel safe and not rushed, they will do more shopping and even stay somewhere for a bite to eat. There would also be much more space for outdoor dining if room did not have to be made for cars, and cycle lanes heading in either direction could be placed more to one side so that a) cyclists could be farther away from the trams and the tram rails, which are a hazard for bike wheels, and b) cyclists could have a clearly defined space out of the main area where pedestrians are likely to walk.
- Making the High Street a pedestrian/cycle/tram-only zone would also solve the problem in the current plan of having cyclists share the south-eastbound lane with drivers. Although the new speed limit would be quite low, it is highly unlikely that most drivers in Christchurch will actually keep to this limit and, based on my personal experience, equally unlikely that they will stay a safe distance behind cyclists. If the proposed set-up were instated on the High Street, I personally would never cycle down it, as I think it looks both stressful and unsafe.
- It is unclear to me what is supposed to happen to cyclists moving north up Manchester Street and crossing Lichfield Street; the cycle lane disappears on the west side of Manchester Street, and there is no way for a cyclist to cross Manchester Street to access the shared footpath on the east side of the street without the awkward and cumbersome manoeuvre of crossing Lichfield Street on one light and then waiting to cross Manchester Street on a second light. (This is an already-existing problem that could be solved at this stage; not only is the manoeuvre awkward, but the overly small area intended for cyclists at the light is also not clearly marked and so is often overtaken by pedestrians.)
- It is also unclear to me how cyclists are supposed to follow the High Street north-west/south-east and diagonally cross Manchester Street, as there does not seem to be a light system for this. If a similar two-light crossing system is intended, then this is unclear and again is aware and frankly a disincentive for cycle traffic. Since the tram is intended to make a diagonal crossing, however, then such a crossing should also be put in for cyclists.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**

I think that the tram should be used more as a useful transport service than just as a tourist feature and support all extensions for it.
| Full Name*: | Chris Hyslop | Submission No: 81 |
| Date Sent: | 6/10/2019 9:01:21 PM | |
| Name of Organisation: | | |
| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing | No | |

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

High St is an obvious biking route into the central city linking to the major cycle route at its SE end. It is also a major pedestrian route linking ARA to the city. It is not a major vehicle route in anyway. However the the proposed layout appears to prioritise vehicle movements over biking and pedestrian movements. The intersection at Tuam St is particularly overly complicated. Problems include:

- a very sharp turn for cyclists heading NW while trying to negotiate pedestrians on the crossing and other cyclists heading E.
- at the point where traffic enters and leaves High St on the northern side of Tuam St there are multiple give ways and it isn't intuitive who has right of way.
- A short section where cyclists travel in the opposite direction to the rest of flow on Tuam St.
- No pedestrian crossing over Tuam St on the western side of the intersection. People naturally want to cross here to access to/from the laneway to little high.

I suggest keeping the intersection layout similar to as it is at the moment but moving the stop lights on Tuam St further west to line up with the laneway from little high allowing for a pedestrian crossing at this point.

At the lichfield intersection there is no obvious route for cyclists to diagonally cross the intersection and continue in either direction on High St. At present cyclists use the team tracks route and cross on the tram signal. This is not ideal and will become less ideal once the tram is running on the tracks. At the drop in session I was told this is intentional to discourage cyclists entering the mall further up High St where it meets Cashel St. However there are bike stands and even bike tyre pumps in the mall so this would seem to encourage cyclists into the mall? Provision for cyclists diagonally crossing Lichfield St is therefore requested.

Otherwise in general I support the upgrade especially the increased plantings and rain gardens proposed.

| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | | |

---

**Attachment C**  
**Item 5**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street):**

NZAA Canterbury/West Coast District Council Consultation Response to High Street revitalisation and tram extension

Overall the design of the proposed redevelopment of High Street between St Asaph and Cashel Streets is impressive and attractive. So it is sad that as a consequence of inadequate parking provision maybe even a majority of Christchurch and Canterbury residents may never visit this precinct.

As has been repeatedly confirmed by NZAA surveys and other research, around 85 per cent of Cantabrians still remain largely reliant on private cars for transport to and from the CBD. Despite the decades of determined efforts to persuade shoppers or visitors to the city centre to use other transport modes, such as buses or bicycles, there seems to have been no significant increase in the proportion of the population opting for any of the strongly promoted alternatives.

Indeed some of the research we have compiled indicates that fifty years ago less than two thirds of the much larger commuter traffic flows then entering the city each day comprised private cars or single occupant vehicles. If the sustained campaign to bring about a switch to other modes was achieving desired objectives surely buses and bikes would comprise more than a third of the current vehicle flows by now. But in fact the more apparent results have been decreases in pedestrian counts on various central city streets as car owners respond to council strategies designed to keep them out.

We suggest consideration be given to restoring at least some of the eliminated kerbside parks in the recommended scheme by reinstating aspects one of the rejected design options. As is required by the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan the council has an ongoing responsibility to maintain adequate provision of parking options.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop:**
| Full Name*: | Noeline Ross | Submission No: 88 |
| Date Sent: | 6/11/2019 9:28:34 AM |
| Name of Organisation: | |
| I Wish to Speak at the Hearing | No |

**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**
The thank you for the chance to make a request or to make a comment about the parking I would personally like a disabled park in the strip of High Street from Tuam to Madras on the side where the shops are i.e. Kennetts, Ara is on the other side of the street so the area is always busy. I'm so grateful for the disabled parking spots as I don't do parking buildings.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**
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**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

The proposed plan is not acceptable due to large reduction in carparks. We feel any reduction in onsite parks should be accompanied by alternative parking in easy walking distance (2 minutes away). If work happens this will effect our business, so we ask the work undertaken urgently and quickly - ie working nights and weekends. The removal of these carparks will have a detrimental effect on our business and the others in this area, and this will have a huge impact on business during the construction times. I would possibly be a good idea to delay the start in work on this block until the character and business uses for the newly opened street is established, maybe a patch up for now could be an option.

| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | I Support the tram Extension as proposed. |
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | I support this scheme and the continued investment in the central city. It will create a much needed cycling link between Tuam Street and St Asaph Street/Ferry Road. It looks to have a good balance between parking and amenity/safety. It would be nice to have more direct cycling connections between the sections of High Street either side of Lichfield Street/Manchester Street, as well as continuing the formalised cycling facilities further north along High Street past this point. Could the crossing over the tram tracks opposite 188 High Street be angled 30 degrees or so as well? As a regular user of the Tuam Street cycleway, I have some specific comments around the portion of this project along Tuam Street: There is an isolated narrowing of the cycleway on Tuam Street at the High Street intersection. Can this be addressed as part of this project? It looks as if the triangular island to the west of High Street that creates part of the pinch is to remain. It looks unclear as to who has right of way out of cyclists and motor vehicle traffic at the High Street/Tuam Street intersection as all have give way controls. I presume cycleway users will have right of way? It looks overly-controlled, like Ferry/St Asaph. Can a fence, planters or something similar be installed behind the kerb either side of the zebra crossing over the cycleway by the High Street crossing? I find presently that people walk east along the path and suddenly veer onto the cycleway, with no cue to people cycling that they are about to do so. A fence or planters would make pedestrians need to square up a little before crossing, giving everyone a little more time to see each other and react accordingly. It would also stop people from walking onto the cycle crossing from the new tram shelter. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop |
| Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street) | The proposed plan is not acceptable due to significant reduction in carparks. Our business is an appointment business where we are a specific destination rather dependent on casual browsing or foot traffic. Our customers will therefore travel by a variety of means to us specifically for their appointment, including by car and therefore require sufficient parking. At peak times such as Christmas, parking is already in short supply. Our customers then support the other local businesses whilst in the precinct for their appointment with us. Therefore adequate parking availability it vital to support our customers and the surrounding business. On this basis we strongly oppose the reduction in carparks. We instead support the alternative option per the drawing attached. If any reduction in onsite parks is unavoidable, then this must be accompanied by alternative parking made available within easy walking distance (less than 2-4 minutes). Further as the precinct is now only starting to reach a critical mass of patronage and customers after its regeneration, it is essential that disruption from these works is minimised and if/when any work is undertaken it is done urgently and quickly, working at nights and weekends else the economic value of the area will be stunted, possibly irreparably given its critical embryonic current status. |
| Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop | We support this proposed tram route extension. |
C. SECTION - ELEVATION FACING SOUTH SIDE (NTS)

30 PARALLEL PARKING BAYS
• 1 Loading zone (incl. 1 mobility) • 24 Bike parking spaces
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LEGEND

A Canopies on the South side of the street. Softfit of 2.8m from footpath level, 2.8m from buildings boundary, 500mm tall

B Bench seating and Landscape shrub planted with a mix of low growing natives and exotics and lancewoods to add a vertical element on North side of the street
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**Comments - Revitalisation of High Street (Cashel Street to St Asaph Street)**

Overall love the design. We do have one comment we would love to be considered at the submission regarding the space directly in front of 141 High street. We feel this area has been negatively impacted by the design twice. By having a loading zone AND a bike stand in front of it it therefore makes it the narrowest area of pedestrian footpath in the whole block. This would negatively impact commercial opportunities (e.g. less favorable for hospitality - outdoor seating) proportionally more than at other sites eg 151 High Street as an example.

**Comments - Proposed tram route extension, poles and new stop**
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