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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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whiria ngā whenu o ngā papa</th>
<th>Overarching Principle</th>
<th>Supporting Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honoa ki te maurua tāukiuki</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>Agility</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Prudent Financial Management</th>
<th>Stewardship</th>
<th>Wellbeing and resilience</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Community Outcomes**

What we want to achieve together as our city evolves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongs communities</th>
<th>Liveable city</th>
<th>Healthy environment</th>
<th>Prosperous economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong sense of community</td>
<td>Vibrant and thriving central city, suburban and rural centres</td>
<td>Healthy waterways</td>
<td>Great place for people, business and investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation in civic life</td>
<td>A well connected and accessible city</td>
<td>High quality drinking water</td>
<td>An inclusive, equitable economy with broad-based prosperity for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and healthy communities</td>
<td>Sufficient supply of, and access to, a range of housing</td>
<td>Unique landscapes and indigenous biodiversity are valued</td>
<td>A productive, adaptive and resilient economic base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration of our identity through arts, culture, heritage and sport</td>
<td>21st century garden city we are proud to live in</td>
<td>Sustainable use of resources</td>
<td>Modern and robust city infrastructure and community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing the voices of children and young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Priorities**

Our focus for improvement over the next three years and beyond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enabling active citizenship and connected communities</th>
<th>Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable 21st century city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate change leadership</td>
<td>Informed and proactive approaches to natural hazard risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing active, public and shared transport opportunities and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe and sustainable water supply and improved waterways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Areas of Focus
The focus of the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee is the governance of roading and transport, three waters, waste management, and natural hazards protection.

The Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:

- Encourages opportunities for citizenship, community participation and community partnerships
- Works in partnerships with key agencies, groups and organisations
- Considers the impact of climate change in its decisions

The Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee considers and reports to Council on issues and activities relating to:

- Water supply, conservation and quality
- Stormwater drainage including the Land Drainage Recovery Programme
- Natural environment, including the waterways, aquifers, ecology and conservation of resources
- Natural hazards protection, including flood protection and river control
- Solid waste minimisation and disposals
- Sewage collection, treatment and disposal
- Roads, footpaths and streetscapes
- Transport including road operations, parking, public transport, cycle ways, harbours and marine structures consistent with Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee Terms of Reference

Delegations
The Committee delegates to the following working group the responsibility to consider and report back to the Committee:
- Land Drainage Working Group matters relating to the Land Drainage Recovery Programme, including opportunities for betterment.

**Major Cycleway Route (MCR) Programme**

At the Council meeting of 9 March 2017:

It was **resolved** that the Council:

1. Delegates to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee the authority to make all decisions in connection with the Major Cycleway Routes (MCR) programme, including final route selections and anything precedent to the exercise by the Council of its power to acquire any property, subject to:
   
   a. The Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee and affected Community Boards being briefed prior to any public consultation commencing on any Major Cycleway Route project.
   
   b. The relevant Community Board Chair(s) will be invited by the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee to participate in the relevant Major Cycleway Route item discussion and give their Board’s feedback or recommendations.

2. Notes and reconﬁrms Councils previous decision to designate the MCR programme a metropolitan project, as set out in the Council’s resolutions on 29 January 2015.

   13.4 Agree to the Major Cycleway Route programme being declared a Metropolitan Programme and delegate to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee all decision making powers.

**Christchurch Biodiversity Fund**

At the Council meeting of 20 June 2017:

It was **resolved** that the Council:

5. Delegate authority to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee to consider and approve applications to the Christchurch Biodiversity Fund.
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1. **Apologies**
   At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. **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.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   That the minutes of the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting held on Monday, 22 July 2019 be confirmed (refer page 7).

4. **Public Forum**
   A period of up to 30 minutes may be available for people to speak for up to five minutes on any issue that is not the subject of a separate hearings process.

5. **Deputations by Appointment**

   5.1 **Victoria Street Revitalisation**
   George Forbes will speak regarding the Victoria Street revitalisation project.

   5.2 **Victoria Street Revitalisation**
   Dirk De Lu will speak on behalf of Spokes Canterbury regarding the Victoria Street revitalisation project.

6. **Petitions**
   There were no petitions received at the time the agenda was prepared.
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The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   
   There were no apologies.

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   **Part B**
   
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   
   **Part C**
   
   Committee Resolved ITEC/2019/00021
   
   That the open and public excluded minutes of the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 10 July 2019 be confirmed.
   
   Councillor Cotter/Councillor Clearwater  
   
   Carried

4. **Public Forum**
   
   **Part B**
   
   There were no public forum presentations heard at this meeting.

5. **Presentation of Community Board Feedback**
   
   **Part B**
   
   Mr Mike Mora, Chairperson of the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board, indicated he would present the Community Board’s feedback after the public submissions.
6. Hearing of Verbal Submissions

Verbal submissions on the South Express Major Cycle Route were heard in the following order:

1. Tiger Lu
2. Henk Buunk
3. Warren and Wendy Hill
4. Jenny Whiteside
5. Howard Dawson
6. Diane White
7. Wendy Marshall
8. Ross Houliston
9. Ross Houliston and Mark Peters on behalf of the Greater Hornby Residents’ Association
10. Gwyneth Carlaw

The meeting adjourned at 10.25am and reconvened at 11.00am.

11. Filip Chernishoff
12. Kay Flanagan
13. Phil Stedman, Alan Aitken and Mark Wells on behalf of the Riccarton Community Church
14. Rose Grieve on behalf of Warren Grieve
15. Kurt Hewson
16. Kurt Hewson on behalf of Ron Greaves
17. Robert Fleming on behalf of Spokes Canterbury
18. Heather Casperson on behalf of St Peter’s Anglican Church
19. Peter Simonds
20. Jolene Eager on behalf of the Templeton Residents’ Association
21. Peter Kelly

Following the public submissions, Mr Mike Mora, Chairperson of the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board, joined the table to present the Community Board’s feedback.

The meeting adjourned at 12.26pm and reconvened at 1.34pm.

7. South Express Major Cycle Route

Committee Comment

The Committee discussed the Middlepark Road section of the route, where two options were presented in the agenda. One option was for the route to continue on Middlepark Road to the Epsom Road intersection, and the other for the route to go along Taggart Place and through the Reserve. The Committee decided to approve the Taggart Place option. The Committee also requested staff to work with the Community Board regarding a planting project in the reserve, which was raised by a submitter.

The Committee also noted the submission received regarding the proposed P120 parking restrictions on Lyndon Street and decided not to approve these.
Committee Resolved ITEC/2019/00022

Part C

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:

1. Approves the South Express MCR scheme for detailed design and construction as shown in Attachment A, South Express MCR Drawings 1-56 inclusive, subject to resolutions 5. and 6. set out below.

2. Approves removal of the identified trees to allow implementation of the proposed scheme, as detailed in Attachment A.

3. Approves the purchase of land parcels required to complete the cycleway, as detailed in attachment A.

4. Recommends that the detailed traffic resolutions required for the implementation of the route are brought back to the ITE committee for approval at the end of the detailed design phase prior to the beginning of construction.

5. Resolves that the route uses the alternative option through Taggart Place as set out in Plan SK130b and requests staff to work with the Community Board around future plans for a planting project in the reserve.

6. Does not approve the P120 parking restrictions on Lyndon Street.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Templeton Carried

Councillor Keown requested that his vote against the above decision be recorded.

Meeting concluded at 2.35pm.

CONIRMED THIS 7TH DAY OF AUGUST 2019

COUNCILLOR PAULINE COTTER CHAIRPERSON
7. Victoria Street - Revitalisation

Reference: 19/692652
Presenter(s): Stefan Jermy – Project Manager

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee to review and consider the recommendations for traffic management and streetscape improvements to Victoria Street and the intersection of Bealey Avenue and Papanui Road.

2. Executive Summary

2.1 The Victoria Street transport project was originally approved in September 2016. However, since early 2017 it has been subject to delays and formally placed on hold by elected members as part of the annual plan process that year. In February 2018, the Council passed a resolution requesting staff carry out further engagement on Victoria Street, with a separate report on this to be presented to the Infrastructure Transport and Environment Committee.

2.2 Victoria Street is prioritised for walking, cycling and public transport, and it’s also a local distributor street which caters for vehicle traffic. The street is a mixed-use area which includes hospitality, accommodation, professional services and retail, and it also supports residential streets. With such a wide range of businesses and modal priorities, finding the right balance with the street design to support everyone’s needs is challenging.

2.3 The current condition of the street is poor with the asset well past its renewal date. This combined with earthquake damage to the street will be addressed if the proposed scheme design is approved as it undertakes the renewal of all infrastructure including stormwater, lighting, road surfacing, kerbs and footpaths.

2.4 Recent engagement has found the majority of Victoria Street stakeholders recognise Victoria Street is in poor condition, and something needs to be done to improve it.

2.5 Key issues raised includes the timing and impact that any construction activities may have on Victoria Street businesses. This report recommends minor improvements to the September 2016 approved plan. Staff believe this is an appropriate response considering the stakeholder feedback, the range of adjacent land uses, the objectives of the Transport Chapter of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan and the future of Victoria Street.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee recommends that the Council:

1. Approves the revised scheme design including all layout changes as detailed in option 1 of this report (Victoria Street Revitalisation) as per Attachment A.

2. Delegates to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee authority to make final decisions on all detailed traffic resolutions at the completion of the detailed design phase for this project and prior to the beginning of construction.
4. Context/Background

Context
4.1 In October 2013 the Transport Chapter was adopted into the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan. The Transport Chapter responds to earlier feedback from the community about future transport arrangements in the central city, received through the 2011 Council-led 'Share An Idea' community consultation and also later reflected in elements of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan blueprint of land-use development (adopted in 2012). The Recovery Plan is built upon a principle of achieving a compact, people-friendly core. This will create an attractive environment for people to live, work, visit and spend time in the central city.

4.2 Victoria Street is situated in a densely populated area of the central city which has a wide range of mixed-use businesses. Post-earthquake, the Recovery Plan proposed a road renewal project for this area.

Background
4.3 The Victoria Street upgrade project has been subject to delays since it was initially approved on 22 September 2016. Concerns were raised by stakeholders about the removal of on-street parking, and the necessity and timing of the works. The project was formally placed on hold by elected members as part of the 2017 Annual Plan and a report was requested on options for central city roading projects. This report was presented to the Council in February 2018 resulting in the continuation of Central City Transport Projects and the resolution that Victoria Street needed further engagement and a subsequent report back to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee.

Issues
4.4 Victoria Street sustained damage in the Canterbury earthquake sequence and has sustained continued wear and tear since. The purpose of this project is to complete a street upgrade project, which will result in improved amenity for the businesses in the area, safety improvements at intersections and crossing points, improved asset function and some improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.

4.5 Balancing the varied needs of Victoria Street businesses such as retail, hospitality, hotel accommodation and professional services – which require access and parking – as well as the needs of public transport, cycling and walking, is challenging.

4.6 Significant changes to the function of the intersections at Victoria/Montreal/Salisbury and Victoria/Durham will not be undertaken as part of this project. These will be completed as part of the Salisbury and Kilmore streets two-way conversion project currently scheduled in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan for FY2024-FY2026.

4.7 There are currently 100 on-street car parks on Victoria Street and this will be reduced to 68, with a net loss of 32, if the scheme is approved. The rationale for parking losses is to provide for intersection safety improvements at Dorset Street, Bealey Avenue, Peterborough Street and Durham Street. Additional space is also required for improved driveway setbacks, improving sight lines, installation of loading zones, modifications to bus stops and tree planting.

Opportunity
4.8 The proposed scheme design recommended by staff is viewed as the most practical and achievable balance between transport objectives and stakeholder needs for an upgrade of Victoria Street at this point in the post-earthquake recovery environment.
4.9 The recommended scheme design will address Bealey Avenue and Papanui Road intersection safety issues. The Council’s intersection safety project CPMS ID 17117 Bealey/ Papanui/Victoria is ranked 14 out of all Christchurch High Risk intersections. The scheme design will address the road safety issues by;

4.9.1 Improving the left turn slip lane from Bealey Avenue to Papanui Road by slowing traffic with a raised platform and improved surfacing for pedestrians.

4.9.2 Installing a staggered pedestrian crossing on Bealey Avenue to improve pedestrian safety.

4.9.3 Protecting pedestrian crossings at Papanui Road and Victoria Street by providing a protected pedestrian phase.

4.10 A Road Safety Audit has been carried out for the recommended scheme design. The audit was carried out by independent road safety engineers. The outcomes of the updated scheme stage road safety audit found no major issues.

4.11 The auditor’s comments are predominantly focused on line markings, road surface colour treatments for cycle lanes and coloured surface treatments at crossing points. The auditor discussed concerns about possible traffic build up – as a result of removing the slip lane on the Northwest corner of the intersection of Bealey Avenue and Papanui Road – with the project team. The scheme proposed will retain the slip lane and improve surface treatments and also provide a raised platform in the slip lane to slow traffic making the left turn movement.

Current Situation

4.12 Council staff have completed a second round of engagement fulfilling resolution CNCL/2018/00024 requesting staff to carry out further engagement.

4.13 During re-engagement, Council staff heard from stakeholders that there are still high levels of concern about the project. However, it’s noted that a very high percentage of stakeholders recognise that something needs to be done to Victoria Street as the current condition of the street is poor. The asset is 13 years past its planned renewal date. Section six of this report summarises the process and outcomes of the re-engagement.

4.14 The proposed project fully renews the civil infrastructure asset. This includes upgrading the stormwater system, road surfacing, footpaths, pedestrian areas, kerb and channel and lighting.

4.15 Once the asset is renewed, it does not limit the Council’s ability to change surface elements of the street that may affect traffic flows, public transport, cycling and walking.

Strategic Alignment

4.16 This project is identified in the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018-2028). Victoria Street breaks the CBD road grid diagonally and is a gateway to the city from the north. For a variety of reasons, the recovery of Victoria Street is well advanced compared to other areas of the CBD. The street is a hub of hospitality and commercial activity.

4.17 Under the Central City Road Use Hierarchy of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan, Victoria Street is prioritised for public transport, walking and cycling. Victoria Street is classified as a Local Distributor Street and needs to cater for vehicle traffic as well as public transport, walking and cycling.

4.18 It is noted that the street is not prioritised for car travel, with the traffic through routes within the vicinity being the Durham/Montreal one-way pair for north/south travel and Bealey Avenue providing the key east/west link.
4.19 The width of Victoria Street from kerb to kerb is 13.9 meters. This provides a challenge for the scheme design’s ability to provide for the levels of service for buses, cyclists and other vehicles requested during the re-engagement process, whilst also finding alignment with the Transport Chapter of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan.

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

4.20.1 Activity: Roads & Footpaths
   - Level of Service: 16.0.2.0 Maintain roadway condition, to an appropriate national standard - =69%

Decision Making Authority

4.21 The Victoria Street works were identified as a Metropolitan Project in the September 2016 report to the Council. Under the Delegations Register it is the responsibility of the Council to make the relevant decisions for a Metropolitan project.

Previous Decisions

4.22 On 16 September 2016, the Council resolved to approve the Victoria Street project, reference CNCL/2016/00426.

4.23 As part of the 2017 Annual Plan process, on 20 June 2017, the Council requested staff report back, on options for work on the Accessible City street projects, reference CAPL/2017/00022.

4.24 Council resolved on 22 February 2018 to approve the continuation of the Accessible City programme of work noting that the delivery of Victoria Street is on hold, subject to further engagement and a report back to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee, reference CNCL/2018/00024.

Assessment of Significance and Engagement

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

4.26 The level of significance was determined by the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy and reflects the:
   - Small project area in relation to the Christchurch District,
   - Level of community interest already shown in this issue,
   - High level of development and redevelopment along the street.

5. Options Analysis

Options Considered

5.1 The following reasonably practicable options were considered and are assessed in this report:
   - Option 1 – Victoria Street Revitalisation
   - Option 2 – Victoria Street Upgrade: September 2016 Approved Plan
   - Option 3 – Maintain Existing Street.

Options Descriptions

5.2 Preferred Option: Option 1 - Victoria Street Revitalisation

5.2.1 Option Description: The preferred option is to implement the package of traffic management changes and streetscape enhancements as indicated on the scheme plan provided as Attachment A.
5.2.2 **Option Advantages**

- Is consistent with the Transport Chapter’s vision for the central city.
- Addresses dilapidated infrastructure assets of stormwater, road surfaces, kerb and channel, street lighting, road surfacing and footpaths.
- Upgrades the urban environment with improved landscaping and public spaces including 37 new street trees.
- Facilitates an improved connection between Victoria Street, the Christchurch Town Hall, Victoria Square and the central city.
- Safety improvements to the Bealey Avenue and Papanui Road Intersection.
- Improved definition for road users with cycle lane markings, coloured surfacing, widened footpaths, raised platforms and traffic calming measures provided by widened footpaths and the installation of street trees.

5.2.3 **Option Disadvantages**

- Reduction in car parking (reduction of 32 spaces).
- Does not provide significant improvements to public transport journey time reliability (to be addressed under the Salisbury and Kilmore Streets two-way conversion projects).

5.3 **Option 2 – Victoria Street Upgrade: September 2016 Approved Plan**

5.3.1 **Option Description:** This option maintains the plan that was approved by Council in September 2016. *Attachment B.*

5.3.2 **Option Advantages**

- Is consistent with the Transport Chapter’s vision for the central city.
- Addresses dilapidated infrastructure assets of stormwater, road surfaces, kerb and channel, street lighting, road surfacing and footpaths.
- Upgrades the urban environment with improved landscaping and public spaces including 60 new street trees.
- Facilitates an improved connection between Victoria Street, the Christchurch Town Hall, Victoria Square and the central city.
- Safety improvements to the Bealey Avenue and Papanui Road Intersection.

5.3.3 **Option Disadvantages**

- Reduction in car parking (reduction of 39 spaces).
- Sharp radii on kerb build-outs/parking bays.
- Does not provide significant improvements to public transport journey time reliability (to be addressed under the Salisbury and Kilmore streets two-way conversion projects).
- Two less mobility car parks – these are on Dorset Street which were not identified under the 2016 approved plan.
5.4 **Option 3 – Maintain Existing Street**

5.4.1 **Option Description:** Retain Victoria Street in its current form and maintain.

5.4.2 **Option Advantages**
- No capital costs expended.
- Retains current parking levels.
- No disturbance to adjacent businesses from construction activity.

5.4.3 **Option Disadvantages**
- High level of ongoing maintenance required, given the current condition of the street.
- Does not provide any improvements to public transport journey time reliability (to be addressed under the Salisbury and Kilmore streets two-way conversion projects).
- Undermines the credibility of the 30km/h speed limit for the street.
- Retains difficulties for pedestrians crossing the street.

6. **Community Views and Preferences**

**Background**

6.1 The Council, which approved plans for the Victoria Street upgrade in September 2016, placed the project on hold, along with the rest of its central city transport programme, in 2017.

6.2 In February 2018, the Council decided that the delivery of the Victoria Street project would remain on hold, pending further re-engagement and a report back to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee.

6.3 Before re-engaging with stakeholders, staff undertook minor improvements to the 2016 approved plan for the street based on lessons learned. These improvements included amending kerb lines to remove sharp angles on parking bays, and trees on kerb build-outs to make it easier to access street parking and driveways.

6.4 The project team continued talking with local businesses and property owners, and had further discussions with emergency services and Environment Canterbury.

6.5 Staff have provided updates to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee in April and June 2019.

6.6 Staff also updated the Linwood, Central, and Heathcote Community Board in August 2018, and April and July 2019.

6.7 The proposed scheme design went out for public feedback from 18 April to 27 May 2019. Letters were posted to 137 stakeholders and information emailed to 363 people and organisations inviting feedback. Stakeholders included those who had previously submitted on the approved plan.

6.8 Two public drop-in sessions were organised for members of the public who wanted to discuss the re-engagement plan with project team members.
6.9 Of the 78 submitters:
- 13 (17 per cent) supported the upgrade of Victoria Street
- 39 (50 per cent) generally supported the upgrade, but had some feedback
- 25 (32 per cent) did not support the upgrade
- One submitter did not indicate a view

6.10 The re-engagement report is Attachment C, and a copy of all submissions in Attachment D.

Feedback on the re-engagement plan

6.11 Aspects of the proposed scheme designs that appealed to submitters included:
- 6.11.1 The proposed trees and landscaping
- 6.11.2 Pedestrian build-outs to help people cross the road
- 6.11.3 Wider and tidier footpaths
- 6.11.4 Better kerb design
- 6.11.5 Upgrading of the carriageway, which is in a very poor condition

6.12 Key issues raised by those who provided feedback or did not support the upgrade of Victoria Street were:
- 6.12.1 More provision required for cyclists
- 6.12.2 Not enough priority for buses
- 6.12.3 Need for safer crossing facilities for pedestrians
- 6.12.4 Too much emphasis on cars and on-street parking
- 6.12.5 Not enough parking for businesses

Feedback on proposed construction works for the re-engagement plan

6.13 Businesses who responded to questions relating to the timing and sequencing of works in the recent re-engagement, supported the following approaches:
- 6.13.1 Construction starting as soon as possible i.e. winter, or in January
- 6.13.2 Work scheduled for one part of the street at a time
- 6.13.3 Night-time work (6 responses)
- 6.13.4 At least one-lane vehicle access maintained during the day

Changes to the re-engagement plan as a result of community feedback and design review

6.14 Changes proposed to the Victoria Street and Dorset Street intersections are as follows:
- 6.14.1 Location of the pedestrian crossing has been adjusted to fit longer entry taper for the bus stop outside #157.
- 6.14.2 Driveway at #155 is removed as access from Victoria Street is no longer required. An additional car park has been provided.
- 6.14.3 Car parks outside #126 has been removed with kerb build-out. Additional cycle parking, seats and trees are provided at this point.
6.15 Changes to Victoria Street North are as follows:
   6.15.1 Kerb build-outs at #169 and #171 have been extended with an additional tree. Car park outside #169 is removed. Kerb build out and tree outside #167 are removed with retention of a car park.
   6.15.2 Relocation of the loading zone and bus stop, outside #138 to #148. Relocation of the tree outside #148 further north.
   6.15.3 Two P10 parking spaces outside #149 are changed to P$60.
   6.15.4 Raised platform outside #123 has been reduced to 6 m wide, with the addition of two parking spaces.
   6.15.5 Additional night time taxi stands on the west side outside #131 are proposed.
   6.15.6 30 km/h road marking with red surfacing added at #171 and #101. The 30 km/h signs have been moved closer to Salisbury/Montreal/Victoria intersection.
   6.15.7 Additional seats and cycle parking have been provided where possible along this section of the street.
   6.15.8 Additional green surfacing is proposed on cycle lanes around parking and bus stops.

6.16 Changes to Victoria Street South are as follows:
   6.16.1 One P10 parking space outside #60 is changed to P$60. One P$60 parking space outside #87 is changed to P10.
   6.16.2 Night time taxi stands north of Peterborough Street have been changed to three on each side of the road.
   6.16.3 30 km/h road marking with red surfacing added on Victoria Street, south of Salisbury/Montreal/Victoria streets intersection and north of Kilmore/Durham Street North/Victoria streets intersection.
   6.16.4 Additional seats and cycle parking have been provided where possible along this section of the street.
   6.16.5 Kerb build out and tree outside #72 are removed.
   6.16.6 Relocation of bus stop from #91 to #81.
   6.16.7 Additional green surfacing is proposed on cycle lanes around parking and bus stops.
   6.16.8 Buffer between cycle lane and traffic lane outside Casino has been shifted to parking side.

6.17 Changes to Montreal Street are as follows:
   6.17.1 Diagonal shoulder markings have been added along the parking spaces on the east side of the road.
   6.17.2 Additional two trees.

6.18 Changes are proposed to the Bealey Avenue/Victoria Street/Papanui Road intersection. These changes are the result of updated traffic modelling that was undertaken. They are:
   6.18.1 Removal of cycle advanced stop box in front of the right turn lane of Victoria Street. Right turn cyclists will be encouraged to use hook turn box.
   6.18.2 Retention of separated through lane and right turn lane on Victoria Street approach, and removal of bus lane to match the lane layout on Papanui Road.
6.18.3 Cycle advanced stop box has been added in front of right turn lane on Papanui Road approach.

6.18.4 Kerb of median Island on Bealey Avenue west will be adjusted to accommodate three departure lanes.

6.18.5 Retention of existing left turn slip lane from Bealey Avenue to Papanui Road. Installation of a raised platform with zebra crossing.

6.18.6 Retention of existing continuity line and hold boxes for right turn vehicles from Papanui Road and Victoria Street.

6.19 The proposed plan will also address the following intersection safety issues:

- Improving the left turn slip lane from Bealey Avenue to Papanui Road by slowing traffic with a raised platform with zebra crossing and improved surfacing for pedestrians.
- Installation of staggered pedestrian crossing on Bealey Avenue to improve pedestrian safety.
- Protection of pedestrian crossings at Papanui Road and Victoria Street by providing protected pedestrian phase.
- Installation of hook turn boxes and additional green cycle boxes near the median island to improve cyclists crossing.

6.20 Submitters have been advised of these proposed changes in the plan for approval. They have also been informed of details of the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting on 7 August 2019, and how to apply for speaking rights.

7. Legal Implications

7.1 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.

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

7.3 The legal considerations concern appropriate compliance with local government decision-making requirements and Council bylaws.

7.4 The Victoria Street project is deemed a Metropolitan Project so it is for Council to make the relevant decisions. The information in this report provides detail on community views and preferences and the requirements for decision-making in the Local Government Act 2002.

7.5 Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides the authority to install parking and other restrictions by resolution. The report proposes that Council delegates the final decision-making relating to the detailed traffic resolutions to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee.

7.6 This project forms part of the Transport Chapter of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan, which has statutory effect under the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016. The Council, in undertaking many of its functions, must not act inconsistently with a Recovery Plan.

8. Risks

8.1 Risks that have occurred, and will continue to hold an element of risk with this project, are as follows:

8.1.1 Loss of on-street parking.

8.1.2 Timing of construction works.
8.1.3 Impacts that construction works will bring to businesses along the street.

8.1.4 Communications and forward planning methods during construction.

8.2 The consequences of these risks occurring have resulted in, and may continue to result in, negative and or adverse public reaction. The project team have been working through these risks internally, and with stakeholders to mitigate the points above by:

8.2.1 Loss of on-street parking – the plan has been adjusted to include more parks where practicable and staff have provided plans explaining the rationale for parking removal, such as bus stop locations, pedestrian enhancements to intersections, urban elements and drive way setbacks. A survey on car parks was undertaken by independent consultants in 2018 to quantify the number of car parks within a 200 metre distance from Victoria Street. This totalled approximately 2500 car parks made up of on-street, off-street, public and private car parking.

8.2.2 Timing of construction works – has been communicated as a staged build process with the intersection of Bealey/Papanui first, followed by the south end from Salisbury Street to Durham Street and finally the northern section from Salisbury Street to Bealey Avenue. Each section will be completed as a standalone portion of work to help minimising disruption.

8.2.3 Possible impacts that construction works will bring to businesses along the street has been communicated as per point 8.2.2 above, with the southern and northern section being completed in smaller sections to mitigate disruption along the full length of Victoria Street. Mitigation measure include not fencing and road coning the full length of Victoria Street, limiting the time works are undertaken in front of business and completing works in smaller sections. These measure have received positive feedback from stakeholders.

8.2.4 Communications and forward planning methods during construction will follow the same process that was established with business owners in 2016. This includes a stakeholder working group where work programs will be communicated two weeks in advance, allowing business to make necessary travel planning, marketing and parking communications to clients ahead of, and during, works in front of their businesses starting.

9. Next Steps

9.1 If the Council resolves to proceed with this project the next stage will be to carry out detailed design and tendering.
### 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 – Victoria Street Revitalisation</th>
<th>Option 2 – September 2016 Plan</th>
<th>Option 3 – Maintain Existing Layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost to Implement</strong></td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance/Ongoing</strong></td>
<td>Additional $43,000/year This will need to be planned in the Transport maintenance budgets as part of the 2021-2031 Long Term Plan.</td>
<td>Additional $49,000/year This will need to be planned in the Transport maintenance budgets as part of the 2021-2031 Long Term Plan.</td>
<td>Essential repairs on Victoria Street to a level that can be maintained for a duration of 5 years without further intervention is quantified at more than $700,000. This will have to be prioritised and programmed within current maintenance budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Source</strong></td>
<td>Capex from 2018-2028 Long Term Plan project ID 18324 AAC Victoria Street Opex from road maintenance budgets.</td>
<td>Capex from 2018-2028 Long Term Plan project ID 18324 AAC Victoria Street Opex from road maintenance budgets.</td>
<td>This will have to be prioritised and programmed within current maintenance budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on Rates</strong></td>
<td>Insignificant rates increase from additional maintenance (net of any NZTA subsidy) to be factored into the 2021 - 2031 Long Term Plan</td>
<td>Insignificant rates increase from additional maintenance (net of any NZTA subsidy) to be factored into the 2021 - 2031 Long Term Plan</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Criteria 1 e.g. Climate Change Impacts)</strong></td>
<td>Does not reduce or limit car or bus travel, therefore there is no reduction of emissions under this scheme. The plan does provide for 36 new trees along the corridor.</td>
<td>Does not reduce or limit car or bus travel, therefore there is no reduction of emissions under this scheme. The plan does provide for 60 new trees along the corridor.</td>
<td>No impact to climate change as the status quo environment is maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 2 e.g. Accessibility Impacts</td>
<td>The plan provides for new LED lighting which reduces power consumption.</td>
<td>The plan provides for new LED lighting which reduces power consumption.</td>
<td>This option does not improve accessibility beyond the current level of amenity provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option provides for a total of four total mobility parking spaces. Two in the northern section on Dorset Street which are 15m from Victoria Street and two mobility parking spaces in the southern section on Peterborough Street which are 30m from Victoria Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 3 e.g. Health &amp; Safety Impacts</td>
<td>No health and safety impacts identified.</td>
<td>No health and safety impacts identified.</td>
<td>No health and safety impacts identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option is part of a larger plan to enhance and revitalise the central city. Providing infrastructure for the future generation is supported by this revitalisation. Dilapidated assets only compound impacts of maintenance and costs. This plan renews all roading infrastructure such as storm water, road surfacing, kerb and channel, paved areas and lighting. This full asset renewal does not limit Councils ability in the future to modify the asset to provide a higher level</td>
<td>This option is part of a larger plan to enhance and revitalise the central city. Providing infrastructure for the future generation is supported by this revitalisation. Dilapidated assets only compound impacts of maintenance and costs. This plan renews all roading infrastructure such as storm water, road surfacing, kerb and channel, paved areas and lighting. This full asset renewal does not limit Councils ability in the future to modify the asset to provide a higher level</td>
<td>This option would impact the future generation as the asset would not be enhanced to complement other streets in the central city revitalisation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 4 e.g. Future Generation Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Option 1 - Victoria Street Revitalisation</td>
<td>Option 2 – September 2016 Plan</td>
<td>Option 3 – Maintain Existing Layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Mana Whenua</td>
<td>This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngai Tahu, their culture and traditions. Matapopore are engaged on this project to provide cultural advice on Ngai Tuahuriri/Ngai Tahu values, narratives, aspirations and include these in the design. These will likely be in the form of pedestrian pavement designs.</td>
<td>This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngai Tahu, their culture and traditions. Matapopore were engaged on this project to provide cultural advice on Ngai Tuahuriri/Ngai Tahu values, narratives, aspirations and include these in the design. These will likely be in the form of pedestrian pavement designs.</td>
<td>No impacts on Mana Whenua identified with this option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Council Plans &amp; Policies</td>
<td>This option is consistent with Council Plans and Policies. It does not depart from the Transport Chapter of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan.</td>
<td>This option is consistent with Council Plans and Policies. It does not depart from the Transport Chapter of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan.</td>
<td>This option is not consistent with Council Plans and Policies. The Transport Chapter of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan and the Fy2018 – FY 2028 Long Term Plan identifies Victoria Street for revitalisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Victoria Street - Preferred Option
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Victoria Street upgrade re-engagement report

Background

The City Council, which approved plans for the Victoria Street upgrade in September 2016, placed the project on hold, along with the rest of the central city transport programme, in 2017.

In February 2018, the Council gave staff the green light to start re-engaging with Victoria Street stakeholders. The project team talked with local businesses and property owners about the scope and timing of the upgrade to minimise disruption. Some businesses asked for further minor changes to improve access and increase parking.

After reviewing the approved plan, the project team:

- Amended kerb lines to remove sharp angles on parking bays to improve vehicle access.
- Increased the number of parking spaces from 64 in the 2016-approved plan to 68 in the re-engagement proposal.
- Proposed 37 new trees along the Victoria Street corridor, compared to 60 trees in the 2016 approved plan.

The proposed re-engagement plan was discussed with Environment Canterbury and emergency services, and presented to the Central City Transport Liaison Group, which includes representatives from a wide range of city groups with an interest in transport.

This proposal went out for public feedback from 18 April to 27 May 2019. Letters were posted to 137 stakeholders and information emailed to 363 people and organisations inviting feedback. Stakeholders included those who had previously submitted on the approved plan.

Two public drop-in sessions were organised for those who wanted to discuss the re-engagement plan with project team members.

Public feedback

Seventy eight submitters provided responses on the re-engagement proposal. Of these individuals and groups:

- 13 (17 per cent) supported the upgrade of Victoria Street
- 39 (50 per cent) generally supported the upgrade but had some feedback
- 25 (32 per cent) did not support the upgrade
- One submitter did not indicate a view.

The changes made to the re-engagement plan as a result of community feedback and design review are in Appendix 1 below.

A summary table of responses is in Appendix 2 below.

Aspects of the re-engagement plan that submitters liked were:

- the proposed trees and landscaping – with more requested by 8 respondents
- pedestrian build-outs to help people cross the road
- wider and tidier footpaths
- better kerb design
- upgrading of the carriageway, which is in a very poor condition.
Comments in support of the project included: “Great to hear this project is going ahead” and “the revitalisation plan is excellent”.

**Key issues raised during re-engagement**

1. **General**

Of the submitters who were critical of the re-engagement plan, 11 said the plan was not as good as the Victoria Street upgrade plan approved by the Council in 2016. Eight submitters also commented that the plan was not consistent with the road user priorities in the An Accessible City transport chapter of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan.

The need to make more transport and streetscape changes to address climate change and reduce carbon levels was singled out by 13 submitters.

They have been advised that under the Central Road Use Hierarchy of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan, Victoria Street is prioritised for public transport, walking and cycling. The street is also classified as a Local Distributor Street and needs to cater for vehicle traffic as well as public transport, walking and cycling.

2. **More provision for cyclists**

Wider painted cycle lanes, separated cycle lanes and a shared street were among the recommendations made by many of the 32 submitters, including cycle advocacy group Spokes, who wanted better facilities for cyclists.

The proposed 1.8 metre painted cycle lanes were included in the 2016-approved plan. Victoria Street is not designated as a major cycle route where physical separation is provided. No roads feeding into or leaving Victoria Street have a separated cycle lane either.

3. **Not enough priority for buses**

Bus priority was an issue for 26 submitters. Suggestions included priority bus lanes or in-lane bus stops – either implemented or trialled. Environment Canterbury asked for conversion of Salisbury and Kilmore streets from one way to two way to be brought forward from the mid-2020s to improve bus priority, mainly through the location of bus stops.

Public transport benefits are limited in this scheme design. To maximise public transport benefits, modifications will need to be carried out to the intersections of Victoria/Montreal/Salisbury and Victoria/Durham to provide the ability to control vehicle traffic in peak hours. This would mitigate buses being caught up in mid-block traffic, limiting their ability to reach the bus stops and achieving priority at the entry and exiting points.

4. **Need for safer crossing facilities for pedestrians**

Twenty eight submitters asked for better facilities for pedestrians. While five submitters acknowledged that the proposed build-outs would make it easier to cross Victoria Street, 18 wanted improved crossing facilities, including zebra crossings and centre islands.

They were advised that the new build-outs forming crossing points and widened footpaths at intersections will make it easier to cross Victoria Street. Changes are also proposed at Bealey intersection to improve safety.

Five respondents referred to difficulties crossing the Victoria / Montreal / Salisbury streets intersection, which is not part of this project.
5. Too much emphasis on cars and on-street parking
Limiting through traffic and encouraging motor vehicles to use Montreal Street and Durham Street was suggested by 15 submitters to ease the existing pressure on Victoria Street, particularly at peak travel hours.

Five submitters, including the youth-led advocacy group Generation Zero, asked the Council to trial the following temporary options on Victoria Street over the next few years and measure the results:

- Different street configurations allowing for changes in cycle lane, pedestrian space and car parking arrangements
- In-lane bus stops
- Turning the street into a pedestrian mall.

Nine submitters said there was too much parking while five others called for Victoria Street to be pedestrianised.

Victoria Street is not prioritised for car travel, with key traffic routes within the vicinity being the Durham/Montreal one-way pair for north/south travel and Bealey Avenue providing the key east/west link. However, Victoria Street is a distributor street and needs to cater for vehicles. More visible signage is proposed to encourage through traffic to travel on Montreal and Durham Streets to manage access.

Traffic flow measures are also dependent on major intersection changes which are not part of this project.

6. Not enough parking for businesses
Ten respondents said there was not enough parking in the re-engagement plan to support local businesses. Some of those involved in face-to-face discussions with staff were concerned about the reduction in parking (compared to the current 100 on-street parking spaces) but generally supported the upgrade.

Construction
Businesses who responded to questions relating to the timing and sequencing of works in the recent formal engagement, supported the following approaches:

- construction starting as soon as possible ie winter (4 responses)
- work starting in January (4 responses)
- work affecting one section of the street at a time (6 responses)
- night-time work (3 responses)
- At least one-lane access during the day was another priority.

One major retailer wanted construction in the northern block to be delayed until 2021 as he said his business cannot currently afford disruption caused by major roadworks. Businesses in the southern block generally supported work starting in their section of Victoria Street.
Appendix 1: Changes to the re-engagement plan

Changes to the re-engagement plan as a result of community feedback and design review

1.1 Changes proposed to the Victoria Street and Dorset Street intersections are as follows:

1.1.1 Location of the pedestrian crossing has been adjusted to fit longer entry taper for the bus stop outside #157.

1.1.2 Driveway at #155 is removed as access from Victoria Street is no longer required. An additional car park has been provided.

1.1.3 Car parks outside #126 has been removed with kerb build-out. Additional cycle parking, seats and trees are provided at this point.

1.2 Changes to Victoria Street North are as follows:

1.2.1 Kerb build-outs at #169 and #171 have been extended with an additional tree. Car park outside #169 is removed. Kerb build out and tree outside #167 are removed with retention of a car park.

1.2.2 Relocation of the loading zone and bus stop, outside #138 to #148. Relocation of the tree outside #148 further north.

1.2.3 Two P10 parking spaces outside #149 are changed to P$60.

1.2.4 Raised platform outside #123 has been reduced to 6 m wide, with the addition of two parking spaces.

1.2.5 Additional night time taxi stands on the west side outside #131 are proposed.

1.2.6 30 km/h road marking with red surfacing added at #171 and #101. The 30 km/h signs have been moved closer to Salisbury/Montreal/Victoria intersection.

1.2.7 Additional seats and cycle parking have been provided where possible along this section of the street.

1.2.8 Additional green surfacing is proposed on cycle lanes around parking and bus stops.

1.3 Changes to Victoria Street South are as follows:

1.3.1 One P10 parking space outside #60 is changed to P$60. One P$60 parking space outside #87 is changed to P10.

1.3.2 Night time taxi stands north of Peterborough Street have been changed to three on each side of the road.

1.3.3 30 km/h road marking with red surfacing added on Victoria Street, south of Salisbury/Montreal/Victoria streets intersection and north of Kilmore/Durham Street North/Victoria streets intersection.

1.3.4 Additional seats and cycle parking have been provided where possible along this section of the street.

1.3.5 Kerb build out and tree outside #72 are removed.

1.3.6 Relocation of bus stop from #91 to #81.

1.3.7 Additional green surfacing is proposed on cycle lanes around parking and bus stops.
1.3.8 Buffer between cycle lane and traffic lane outside Casino has been shifted to parking side.

1.4 Changes to Montreal Street are as follows:

1.4.1 Diagonal shoulder markings have been added along the parking spaces on the east side of the road.

1.4.2 Additional two trees.

1.5 Changes are proposed to the Bealey Avenue/Victoria Street/Papanui Road intersection. These changes are the result of updated traffic modelling that was undertaken. They are:

1.5.1 Removal of cycle advanced stop box in front of the right turn lane of Victoria Street. Right turn cyclists will be encouraged to use hook turn box.

1.5.2 Retention of separated through lane and right turn lane on Victoria Street approach, and removal of bus lane to match the lane layout on Papanui Road.

1.5.3 Cycle advanced stop box has been added in front of right turn lane on Papanui Road approach.

1.5.4 Kerb of median Island on Bealey Avenue west will be adjusted to accommodate three departure lanes.

1.5.5 Retention of existing left turn slip lane from Bealey Avenue to Papanui Road.

Installation of a raised platform with zebra crossing.

1.5.6 Retention of existing continuity line and hold boxes for right turn vehicles from Papanui Road and Victoria Street.

1.6 The proposed plan will also address the following intersection safety issues:

- Improving the left turn slip lane from Bealey Avenue to Papanui Road by slowing traffic with a raised platform with zebra crossing and improved surfacing for pedestrians.

- Installation of staggered pedestrian crossing on Bealey Avenue to improve pedestrian safety.

- Protection of pedestrian crossings at Papanui Road and Victoria Street by providing protected pedestrian phase.

- Installation of hook turn boxes and additional green cycle boxes near median island to improve cyclists crossing.
Appendix 2: Victoria Street upgrade re-engagement responses

| Support the upgrade of Victoria Street | 13 |
| Generally support the upgrade of Victoria Street but have some feedback | 39 |
| No, do not support the upgrade of Victoria Street | 25 |
| Not specified by submitter | 1 |
| Total submitters | 78 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What submitters like about the plan</th>
<th>Number of submitter responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greener spaces, landscaping</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More trees and planting</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall concept</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetically it looks nice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidier and wider footpaths</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved street lighting, make it feel safer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will tidy up streetscape</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better kerb design – access to parking spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted cycle lane</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of some parking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calming, raised crossing areas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to cross road – pedestrian davenports/crossing points</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow lanes for vehicles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More user-friendly appearance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian buildout at Dorset Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildouts to aid crossing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier for pedestrians to cross street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better location of bus stops</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle parking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised location of Bus stop in Casino block works well</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of parking types</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised area for pedestrians to cross</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road repairs, upgrade of carriageway</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great to hear this project is going ahead.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s get on with it!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The revitalisation plan is excellent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General feedback</td>
<td>Number of submitters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not consistent with transport chapter of</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not as good as approved plan</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to consider climate change, carbon reduction</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared zone or reduce speed limit and add crossing points, cycle lanes and bus priority</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial changes eg in lane bus stops, different street configurations, shared space/pedestrian mall</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be pedestrianised with cycles</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pedestrian Mall</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More defined entry to 30 km/h zone</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to reduce speed</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slower street (10 km/h)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review spacing of raised platforms</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave as it is – just basic repairs/resurfacing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landscaping**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscaping</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More trees and landscaping</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>There is a challenge in finding the right balance to meet the objectives and needs of all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More specialist landscape lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The suggestion is accepted and will be taken into the detailed phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider footpaths/ more dining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure LED lighting does not affect residential areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A lighting specialist will advise the Council on lighting issues – including impact on residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add seats – to encourage sense of place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Change. More seats added to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain 3 Victorian poems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Existing pole wraps were a temporary project and will not be re-instated on the new street poles. However, staff are investigating how some of the wording in the poems can be incorporated in the street design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break footpath sections into individual strips and treat the surfaces differently to create interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Change: Additional paving to break up asphalt and add interest to the footpath and streetscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedestrians**

| Plan should improve facilities for pedestrians | 28 | New build-outs forming crossing points and widened footpaths at intersections will make it easier to cross Victoria Street. Changes proposed at Bealey intersection to improve safety. |

**Crossing facilities**

- Zebra crossings
- Pedestrian prioritised crossings
- Centre island
- Additional build-outs needed
- More crossings

| 7 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

- Make it safer to cross Victoria/Salisbury/Montreal intersection
- Wider footpaths for pedestrians / dining

| 5 | This intersection is not part of this project. Your comments will be referred to Traffic Operations to investigate. |
| 1 | Some footpath areas have been widened. It is up to individual businesses to apply for a licence for outdoor dining. |

**Cycles**

| Plan should make better provision for cyclists (also see general comments) | 32 | The plan for approval has 1.8 metre painted cycle lanes. |

- Need separated lanes
- Wider cycle lanes
- Extend painted lanes up to intersections
- Fully protected cycle and pedestrian movements at traffic signals

<p>| 5 | Victoria Street is not designated as a major cycle route where physical separation is provided. No roads feeding into or leaving Victoria Street are separated either. |
| 4 | The width of Victoria Street is 13.9 metres from kerb to kerb and all modes of transport need to be catered for. |
| 1 | Change. More green surfacing on cycle lanes approaching intersections. |
| 1 | Cyclists take the same phase as cars. Pedestrians protected from turning traffic at signalised crossings. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>More cycle parking</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic island on Montreal Street juts out</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change. More cycle parking added</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More priority should be given to buses in the plan</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-lane bus stops – implementation or trial</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority/dedicated bus lane</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public transport benefits are limited in this scheme design. To maximise public transport benefits, modifications will need to be carried out to the intersections of Victoria/Montreal/Salisbury and Victoria/Durham to provide the ability to control vehicle traffic in peak hours. This would mitigate buses being caught up in mid-block traffic, limiting their ability to reach the bus stops and achieving priority at the entry and exiting points.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delay in Salisbury/Kilmore 2 way conversion</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme determined by Long Term Plan and Annual plan processes.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review bus stop location</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus stop locations are located at specified distances from each other.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other bus related issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Removing bus stop outside Bl-ax Coffee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do we need buses on Victoria St?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remove diesel buses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No need for bus shelters on Victoria Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Move bus stop closer to clock Tower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace buses with tram</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No change.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria Street is a key bus route.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The buses are owned and operated by Environment Canterbury, not the City Council. Comment noted. No change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No change.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision in plan for cars and trucks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria Street should not be the main thorough route for private vehicles - encourage traffic to go via Montreal, Bealey and Durham</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria Street is not prioritised for car travel, with the traffic routes within the vicinity being the Durham/Montreal one-way pair for north/south travel and Bealey Avenue providing the key east/west link. However, it is a distributor street and needs to cater for vehicles. More visible signage is proposed to encourage through traffic to travel on Montreal and Durham Streets to manage access.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce emphasis on private vehicles</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much parking provided in plan</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove all on-street parking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More parking needed to support businesses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase some parks from P60-P120</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking - less than 60 minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide shorter term parking to increase turnover</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking availability needs to be clearly defined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Papanui Road – reinstate car parking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address issues at Bealey/Victoria/Papanui intersection - dangerous for pedestrians and scooter riders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes proposed as part of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large vehicles turning left from Bealey into Victoria Street – safety issue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars cutting corners into Dublin Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No right turn into Dorset Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove tree/buildout at No 143</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend yellow lines on Montreal St to improve visibility (Peacock St)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change already approved as part of 2016 plan resolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation process</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox Church – no parking for hearse and bridal car</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also dependent on major intersection changes which are not part of this project.

There is a challenge in finding the right balance to meet the objectives and needs of all stakeholders. Parking restrictions have been discussed with businesses and staff have tried to achieve a balance.

Removed to improve access to the Bealey Avenue intersection.
**Victoria Street re-engagement submissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>I/We</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>How could the plan be improved?</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Business/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23520</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td>Tidier footpaths, better lighting and greener spaces make for a safer feeling street. I work in the area and would much appreciate this.</td>
<td>Further look into the Bealey ave, Papanui Rd, Victoria St intersection – it’s very very busy and dangerous for pedestrians and people riding Lime scooters.</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23529</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td>Great to hear that this project is going ahead. As a land owner with several properties in close proximity to the development, I am excited about your plans for the betterment of the area. At present, after dark and late at night, it has become a haunt for antisocial drunken behaviour. With the input of your plan things will change for the better, I’m sure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>23548</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23588</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td>Let’s get on with it!</td>
<td>It’s critical, as “the driveway” to the central city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>23840</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td>I was a member of the Victoria Streetscape Committee, a group formed after the EQs and consisted of business owners and residents. We were briefed several times about the planned upgrade and were able to give feedback at that time.  I continued as the contact point for the Victoria Neighbourhood Association and have discussed the plans many times. From a resident’s standpoint, I am very positive about the planned upgrade and would like the full enhancement program to proceed. I understand from the 5 May public drop-in session that one approach is to upgrade the street on a block-by-block basis (to minimise disruption to businesses), starting at the southern end. That seems like a good idea, especially if the businesses agree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>23912</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td>The revitalisation plan for Victoria Street is excellent. I like the way that it will happen in stages so that it will not be too disruptive for business owners and residents. The planting plan is great. I love those trees.</td>
<td>My main proposal for improvement is to improve safety for pedestrians crossing at the intersection of Salisbury, Victoria and Montreuil. It’s very risky for pedestrians crossing across Victoria / Montreuil from Salisbury on the north side if the intersection. Maybe</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Allard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>1 / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>24270</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td>It definitely needs tidying up &amp; softening</td>
<td>The narrowing of Victoria Street in places will enable pedestrians to cross the road more easily.</td>
<td>a red arrow for turning cars? Or a Barnes Dance type of crossing for the whole intersection.</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>24335</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trees, calming, raised crossing areas</td>
<td>Another point I'd like to make is the the &quot;no parking&quot; yellow dotted line on Montreal Street from the corner of Peacock Street heading south is very short. The visibility, when trying to turn right from Peacock Street out onto Montreal Street, is very limited. Especially so, if there is a large SUV parked at the edge of the yellow lines. I usually have to just take an educated guess as to whether there is a car on Montreal heading north as I can't see the left hand lane on Montreal at all.</td>
<td>Jaaden</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>24649</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some more islands to stand on for pedestrians as we are often crossing the road (live nearby)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>24693</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td>After viewing the plan, and realizing the impact of the upgrade will have little impact on overall costs of a simple repair, I fully support this upgrade. Pedestrian safety has always been paramount for others living in this area and for the elderly living in the local rest home. Although there is no central safety island the raised section and the limited 30 km speed will help in this regards.</td>
<td>The trees and beautification are fully supported, more important I believe for local businesses, than the loss of a few carparks. There are a large number of carparks available in this area, if they are all available for public parking in the weekend this should help businesses.</td>
<td>Improving the crossing for pedestrians at the CNR Victoria, Montreal and Salisbury street. The lights need to be improved to allow pedestrians to cross safely as both the one way system, turning into Montreal and pedestrians crossing Montreal have the green light at the same time. The chance of death will be further increased once the hotel is up and running and tourists are not aware of this. As well as a red turn left filter, decreasing speed to 30 km for all traffic would help. Prevent any LED signs, advertising businesses in Victoria street intruding into the residential area in Montreal street, further impacting on the quality of life for local residents.</td>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Hallstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>24696</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td>As from the earlier submission the Victoria Neighbour Association, representing some 170 residents living close to Victoria street, agreed at a recent AGM to continue to support the upgrade of Victoria Street. Their concerns were: 1. A strong desire for pedestrian safety 2. a more user friendly crossing at the Victoria/ Montreal/ Salisbury intersection 3. Opposition to turning Victoria street into a pedestrian mall in weekend evenings 4. Support for adding more trees and other beautification measures 5. Concern LED signage creeping into the residential area, this is commercial intrusion into a residential area 6. Difficulty for residents turning into Montreal street</td>
<td>Raised areas slowing traffic allowing improved pedestrian crossing Trees and beautification</td>
<td>Improving safety issues and residential amenity further see points above. 1. Slowing traffic 2. Better and safer crossing at Montreal street 3. Banning bright LED signage that intrudes into residential areas at night 4. Increasing length of no parking areas in Montreal street</td>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Hallstone (Chair VNA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 63 | 24707 | Yes - support the upgrade | Help us make Victoria Street amazing. In our submission we will be calling for:  
a. Pedestrian prioritised crossing facilities to allow employees, residents and visitors to cross the road safely, perhaps zebra crossings on the speed bumps;  
b. A lowered speed limit to signal to cars, as well as people on bikes and scooters, that the street’s primary function is to cater for the employees, residents, and visitors of the area; and  
c. A plan to allow short term, temporary testing, showcasing and measurement of the effects of different potential future changes to the street, such as:  
In-lane bus stops which let buses keep their place in queues of traffic when dropping off/picking up employees, residents and visitors;  
Different street configurations which allow for subtle changes in cycle lane, pedestrian space and car parking arrangements;  
 Turning the street into a shared space/pedestrian mall like Oxford Terrace, Cashel Street or High Street.  
We don’t think any of these are unreasonable things to ask for. If you agree with us, please take 15 minutes to write a submission on the current proposal.  
Additional comments submitted (#4)  
I don’t think you’re going far enough in providing some leading edge solutions, while perhaps radical to some, may be exactly what we need.  
anything that will make it less of a through street and more of a pedestrian friendly place for residents to relax and enjoy.  
Additional comments submitted  
More pedestrian and bicycle friendly...space for cafes to have tables on footpaths...make it less car-centric...please  
Have some courage and don’t let big money and retail businesses intimidate you. Those opposing some changes fear that their business will suffer. In reality, if CCC has courage to make some bold changes then more people will hang out. Just take a look at the Terrace to see how retail businesses there have profited from the development there. Be daring. Think of future generations. Make our Victoria Street something really special and not just a place for cars to drive through. Remember that there are many of us who live in the city centre who want some vision coming from our council.  
Additional comments submitted  
Make it less friendly for cars with wider footpaths for pedestrians and room for cafes to have tables. Have courage and do something creative and innovative without caving into big moneyed interests. | Larry | Beck | Align International Recruitment Ltd. |
| 81 | 24767 | Yes - support the upgrade | The Nelson Diocesan Trust Board, which owns 66 Victoria Street supports your proposal to upgrade Victoria Street.  
Trustees are encouraged with improved street lighting, repairs to the road, and a proposal to lay cobblestones on the footpaths. Whilst we are sorry to note some car parks will go, the replacement landscaping including trees will enhance the “look” of the street.  
Given there has been uncertainty as to the eventual configuration of Victoria St, we see merit in the timely communication of Council’s plans and the completion of | | | |
## Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee
07 August 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>I / We</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</th>
<th>How could the plan be improved?</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Business/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23501</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>the proposed work. If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.</td>
<td>The timing of these works and the phasing of them needs to be looked at closely. 2019 has been challenging for all retail businesses and we cannot afford to have the street out of action. I am not exaggerating that with business confidence at an all time low, and terror attacks, we will not survive as a business if we have works that are similar to Manchester or St Asaph. We had 2 weeks of works with electrical cabling upgrade right outside 137 Victoria Street recently and our foot traffic was down 60%, and sales down 45%.</td>
<td>It could be delayed until 2021, and the businesses should have a seat on the project committee. I see no value in having a project committee that does not have those immediately impacted by the works on it. We should be able to hold contractors and Council accountable for meeting timelines.</td>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>HAMILTON</td>
<td>CORCOCADO FURNITURE &amp; HOMEWARES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23502</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Vehicles continue to drive over the 30km/h speed limit, so what is being done to slow traffic down? This is a designated bus priority route, but private vehicles continue to use it as a thoroughfare, so what is being done to discourage using this route as a thoroughfare and encourage using alternative routes?</td>
<td>Better kerb design. Better location of bus stops. Inclusion of cycle parking facilities - though not enough, as non-bicycles get parked there too (e.g. mopeds/motorised and electric scooters, etc.). More trees.</td>
<td>More bicycle parking facilities in safe locations (where drivers can’t mount the kerb and hit the bikes). Wider cycle lanes - the &quot;standard&quot; width is not wide enough, especially when drivers are incapable of parking within the designated areas due to incompetence or driving large vehicles. Also, when traffic is backed up, the &quot;standard&quot; width cycle lanes make it difficult for faster cyclists to overtake slower cyclists.</td>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>Bennetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23503</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Not a lot of actual change here - its mostly going to be whinging about lost carparks and the long term effect of tree roots.</td>
<td>Its about time! I just want to cross the road easier - Its quite hard to get over sometimes, so the pedestrian dairymen will help, as long as they have lowered kerb/curb edges</td>
<td>Needs dedicated space for rental scooter parking, as opposed to Lime’s method of dumping them on the footpath. The traffic island on Montreal Street just north of Salisbury Street means bikes have to ride in the lane when coming from Montreal or Salisbury. This needs to be wider, or have the whole lane painted green/sharrows. To address the parking whiners, threaten to remove all on-street parking completely, and &quot;acquire&quot; some of the vacant land as a council carpark (NOT A WILSONS CARPARK!!!)</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Falconer</td>
<td>Verizon Connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23507</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>It will tidy up the street-scape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/ Organis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23526</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>This is a disappointing plan, nowhere near as good as the original and would do little to attract me to see this street as a destination. For that matter I am so annoyed by the businesses on this street from their lobbying against the original plan that I stopped supporting them. Same goes for Ferry Road. There are much nicer destinations in Christchurch CBD now.</td>
<td>A few extra trees.</td>
<td>Go back to the original plan, reduce the traffic flow, reduce the car parking, priority bus lane, safe cycling, make it a nice place to go instead of a sewer for cars.</td>
<td>Olly</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23559 (32 )</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>The original plan was much better. More priority should be given to cyclists and pedestrians. Cars do not need to be here, Durham/Montreal are perfectly good alternatives. Should be less car centric and more like the original original plan. Should have a separated cycle lane and reduced on street parking. Victoria St should not be a car thoroughfare, they can use the one ways.</td>
<td>Nice landscaping Nice landscaping. Some removal of on street parking</td>
<td>Provide a separated cycle lane and remove all on street parking Remove more on street parking. Restrict car turns in and out. Reduce the speed limit to 20 km/h.</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Ascroft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>23560</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>I support the upgrade of Victoria Street, but only under the condition that safe cycling infrastructure is included. Motor vehicle use has been solely subsidized through single-use infrastructure for too long in this city. In light of climate change we need safe alternatives, such as cycling, to give the next generation a chance at their turn on this planet. Streets are public spaces, not just subsidized car storage, so please do make them safe for all users including cyclist.</td>
<td>Include separated, safe cycling infrastructure in any upgrade of Victoria Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Volker</td>
<td>Nock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23562</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Please improve the cycle infrastructure, it really is not a nice road to cycle on. I actually avoid it. With improving I would like to see safety and comfort such as regular crossing points and safe cycle parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Vanhecke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>23563</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>The cycle lanes appear to stop at the end of this section of road in the new plan. Cyclists continuing on from the cycle lanes outside of this area will still need to move through the street. It would be best to mark these lanes on the road to assure cars remember to pass safely, as they often &quot;forget&quot; to pass safely without road markings and can get agitated when they have to drive behind a vehicle different from their own.</td>
<td>Smoother pavement is always welcome. Cycle lanes could be included.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Dopleach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23565</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Hi there, currently Victoria street feels unsafe as a cyclist because it is narrow and has lots of car doors opening and people crossing across the cycle path. I realise there’s limited width to the road, but is there a way to make the cycle wider?</td>
<td>It’ll be great to have the road resurfaced, especially near the Peterborough St intersection. Wider cycle lanes to enable cyclists to avoid opening doors from parked cars.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Pennington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23566</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>I work on Victoria Street. The narrowing is needed to slow down traffic and make it much more pedestrian and cycle friendly. It’s currently hard to cross Victoria Street sometimes and drivers almost never give you a gap. They feel it’s their space.</td>
<td>Landscaping to soften the very blunt and unshaded street environment. Less on streets car parking. There is plenty already on the side streets and we should not be encouraging car use in the 4 Avenues. More pedestrian and cycle facilities, it should feel safe and like drivers should integrate with the traffic. A shared street context would be appropriate to encourage rerouting away from Victoria Street, so it’s a destination and people want to go there and spend money. People spend money, not parked cars. A bolder threshold treatment at the top of Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>23724</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>60 minute parking is insufficient, whilst I can see it is encouraging the turnover of customers, it is very off putting for lunch meetings. If it is introduced I will not be coming to the area again, it needs to be 120 mins minimum.</td>
<td>The softened entry to the parking spaces, the trees.</td>
<td>Street to reinforce the entry to the core, even overhead or stronger side features.</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>23775</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>I support the overall aims/intentions of the upgrade plan. However, the plan misses out two important things I consider important to making the street safer and more attractive to pedestrians (see below).</td>
<td>1. There should be a ‘half-way’ island located about where the old Spag’s pizza place exists. This was something that the VNA has lobbied for over the years yet the present plan does not have it. A safer crossing (half the street at a jump) would make it easier for shoppers and others to cross what is often a very busy street. 2. The intersection of Vic St, Salisbury St and Montreal St is very difficult to negotiate if you are a pedestrian. To improve it requires a major re-think of the traffic flow and how people can safely cross from one corner to the other. Perhaps a Barn’s dance signal would be best. This would allow all pedestrians to cross at once in any directions and not be delayed by long waits at two lights to get from one side of a street to another. 3. Another matter I would urge the Council to reject is to make Victoria Street a closed pedestrian mall in any shape or form for any hours of the week. It was once proposed to make it a mall on weekends after dark, thus turning it into a pub crawlers’ playground. This would have serious adverse effects on the densely surrounding residential areas and most likely to the non-hospitality businesses-on the street as well.</td>
<td>robert</td>
<td>manthei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>23557</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>We are generally supportive of the proposed upgrade scope but have some natural concerns about the impact on foot traffic/parking/access to area. Questions; 1. What is the extent of underground works (drainage/electrical reticulation)? 2. What is scope of work for carriageway? Mill&amp;mix or full reconstruction? 3. The traffic management requirements to facilitate the works will also create a wider disruption footprint than just the work itself. It would be useful if you could provide some visibility around what might be required and how it might impact on traffic flows in the area. 4. Do you have a draft staging proposal at this early stage for comment?</td>
<td>Latest proposal appears more sympathetic to business activity (balances transportation with commerce) than first draft tabled. Upgrade of carriageway is desperately needed to fix safety concerns for cyclists. Cycle lane is not a kerbed lane but a painted zone. Traffic calming (I assume this is to be raised thresholds) is to be employed to manage vehicle speed.</td>
<td>Remove the blip and tree outside lane east of 143 Victoria St. The tree will block view of retail in 143 and the tree will clash with veranda outside 143 Victoria. Why is there an L2 outside 143 Victoria St?</td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>Florist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>24120</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but</td>
<td>Well we all know that the street surface itself needs to be redone, so this is a good start and obviously essential. I feel that modernizing it to keep inline with As discussed with the project manager when he came into our store with the plan, I feel that there is no need for bus shelters on the street. I can understand it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicola</td>
<td>Martinovic</td>
<td>Martinovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/ Organs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>24201</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>I have concerns regarding the time it will take to complete the upgrade and how the scheduling of the work will occur. I also believe the upgrade needs to plan for the city tram loop to be extended ideally from Park Terrance down through Peterborough Street across Victoria Street or down Victoria and remove the planned accommodations for the dirty buses. If we are truly planning for the future then unsustainable diesel buses should not form any part of that.</td>
<td>The overall concept and the fact it will be done. Victoria Street is a show case gateway to the city centre and needs to reflect that in the quality of the access.</td>
<td>Remove the buses and replace with an extended Tram service as above.</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Bergin</td>
<td>Exceptional Jewellery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>24260</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Overall it will be nice to have the street looking better. However the removal of so many carparks is a great concern to a number of residents as just recently the street is finally starting to look more vibrant and busy with some new shops arriving here. These are the sort of shops people do not walk to and the owners are all working together to market each other and have joint events and showcase the street and other business' so any removal of carparks will be exceptionally detrimental to these stores and business' (ladies fashion, footwear, homeware and beauty and hair) so we do not wish to see the street go backwards when it has taken to long for it to go forwards. Please consider adding back as many parks as you can for these tenants. As landlords we are providing a large number where we can and allowing them to be used by the public after hours when our tenants are not using them during the day but they are not always available during shopping hours when these people need them so we need to be very mindful of this.</td>
<td>The fact that it will tidy up the street which is very uneven and badly damaged will make it look a lot nicer.</td>
<td>I have some concern for the intersection at the Bealey Avenue end. My office overlooks this intersection so every day I see a lot of issues. One major one being if any large vehicles are to turn left into Victoria St from the West bound lane on Bealey Ave then anyone in the right turn lane on Victoria St (Facing towards Papanui Rd) must reverse in order to let the large vehicles turn and I am sure you do not need me to explain to you the hazards around this. This happens at least once a day if not more. My other area of concern is any narrowing of the road in Victoria St at all with set outs as this will cause accidents as cars will not be able to safely pass anyone on a cycle so will hold up the traffic and cause frustrations for others which in turn will lead to further accidents. People also quite frequently turn right from Victoria St into Dublin St and cut the corner which is exceptionally dangerous so something needs to be put there (not sure what, maybe a tiny curb or something) to stop this.</td>
<td>Adele</td>
<td>Childs</td>
<td>Countrywid e Property Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>24309</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Removing the bus stop opposite Blax Coffee Shop will seriously inconvenience residents of Conference &amp; Beveridge Sts (including Council Flats) who can walk through lane way by Verizon connect building. The reason given is that the new stop outside the Town Hall means that the bus stops must be regularly distanced from it. While we recognize there must be bus parking at the Town Hall, it would mostly be used by tour buses, and not city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Lowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/ Organis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>24322</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>visitors to the Town Hall, as there is no return stop handy. Town Hall passengers would have to walk to Manchester or Salisbury Streets to return to bus station. It is not good enough to use the excuse that ECAN has all the say regarding buses. This is City Council's Plan and considering we are using the buses from this stop, it is up to Council to support regular bus users.</td>
<td>It's meant to be a bus route but only 1 pair of bus spaces is put at the north end. What about the south end? A bus stop has actually been removed. So although it's meant to be a bus route, it's worse. Too many parking spaces and trying to make everyone happy. In the end the design will not do anything but continue car reliance and a large whopping carbon footprint.</td>
<td>Some crossing points with buildouts (not enough). Narrow lanes for vehicles</td>
<td>Add another pair of bus spaces/add another pedestrian raised crossing opposite 108 Victoria St where all the restaurants are. As there will be a lot of foot traffic between these places and a desire line. I have eaten at Mexicanas nad tried to cross the road several times to reach the other side. Not safe with all the parking. Extend the build-outs where no parking and remove more parking. Have some parking areas less than 60min. Why all 60min? Increase turnover. Lots of indurations - widen to accommodate more peds.</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>de verteul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>24457</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Plan is fine. 2 major issues... 1. Timing of works 2. Do we need buses on Victoria St? There is quite a lot of traffic congestion on Victoria St. Removing buses may help this. I asked this question in the drop-in sessions. I was told ECAN have research to say bus customers get off &amp; work/shop on Victoria St. I find this very hard to believe. None of my staff use the bus and very few of my customers, if any, use the bus.</td>
<td>Will tidy up the street as road surface &amp; footpaths in need of repair. Also changes will make it easier for pedestrians to cross street.</td>
<td>The plan itself is fine (apart from removing buses). Implementation (in terms of minimising disruption) will be the key. Any work needs to be done with a sense of urgency &amp; not roll on for months on end.</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Procope Coffee House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>24575</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Make sure there are some separated cycle lanes along here please!!</td>
<td>More trees and plantings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Parkinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>24634</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Very much needed</td>
<td>The landscaping making the road look nice</td>
<td>To make the street more pedestrian, cyclist and public transport friendly: 1. Zebra crossing on the speed bumps 2. Lower speed limit, 30km/h would be appropriate 3. Adding to the plan a temporary trial to test different possible changes to the street: - In-lane bus stops - Different street configurations allowing for changes in cycle lane, pedestrian space and car parking arrangements - Turning the street into a pedestrian mall.</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Shmakov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>24657</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but disagree with the priority given to cars under the latest design.</td>
<td>I agree that Victoria st should be upgraded but strongly disagree with the priority given to cars under the latest design.</td>
<td>it will look better</td>
<td>less cars more active &amp; public transport priority</td>
<td>steven</td>
<td>muir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>1 / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 54 | 24663  | generally support the upgrade but have some feedback | I would prefer to see  
a. Pedestrian prioritised crossing facilities to allow employees, residents and visitors to cross the road safely, perhaps zebra crossings on the speed bumps;  
b. A lowered speed limit to signal to cars, as well as people on bikes and scooters, that the street’s primary function is to cater for the employees, residents, and visitors of the area; and  
c. A plan to allow short term, temporary testing, showcasing and measurement of the effects of different potential future changes to the street, such as:  
In-lane bus stops which let buses keep their place in queues of traffic when dropping off/picking up employees, residents and visitors;  
Different street configurations which allow for subtle changes in cycle lane, pedestrian space and car parking arrangements;  
turning the street into a shared space/pedestrian mall like Oxford Terrace, Cashel Street or High Street. | Victoria Street needs to get away from being a car-centric street. Who wants to patronize retail premises in a street jammed with cars. Design needs to cater better for pedestrians and cyclists. Buses also need improved provisions. Feel revamped design sidesteps these issues. | Roy Sinclair  
Co. Writers | Roy  
Sinclair |
| 55 | 24664  | generally support the upgrade but have some feedback | I’d like to see Victoria st be pedestrian only. With some bike lanes | It prioritises cars, not pedestrians  
Zebra crossing. Bike lanes. Buses only. No parking lots, no cars | Marian  
Krogh | Marian  
Krogh |
| 56 | 24674  | generally support the upgrade but have some feedback | I was born in Christchurch and grew up there. I visit regularly with my children and husband. Recently the Christchurch City Council took a historic decision to declare a climate and ecological emergency. Yet this street upgrade looks no different to any other street plan of the last ten to twenty years.  
Raised traffic calming areas may slow traffic but they give pedestrians no legal priority crossing the road that would be given to them with an actual zebra crossing.  
Placing cyclists inbetween parked cars and moving traffic is the most dangerous place for them to be. So many of the sites in the photo used to show the plan on have off street parking, why is the council providing on street parking while putting people’s lives at risk. As someone whose primary transport into Christchurch is a car I can tell you the most dangerous place to park is on the side of a road and something I avoid at all times, to the point of paying for off street parking if need be so that I or one of my | The number of trees included.  
At the most there should only be parking on only one side of Victoria Street with more safe crossing points. Restrict trucks to those delivering only, no through traffic, and only before 8am.  
Prioritise the movement of people not vehicles. The safety of people walking, cycling or using public transport should be put above the movement of private cars and on street storage of private cars. | Catherine  
Kilgour | Catherine  
Kilgour |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>I / W</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</th>
<th>How could the plan be improved?</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Business/ Organis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>24684</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>I support generation zero's proposal, not only is reduced car access better for the environment, pedestrians and cyclists are more likely to stop by local businesses than cars going at 50km/h. Experiment closing down the street to car access during the summer and I'm sure you will see people actually prefer it without cars.</td>
<td>Aesthetically it looks very nice.</td>
<td>Reduced car access, especially during summer.</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>24687</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>There are lots of places to eat and drink on Victoria Street and people are often on the pavements, or accessing the street by public transport, bike or foot. The current plan seems to be trying to maintain the street as a fast moving zone designed for cars rather than a slower more shared space which would seem appropriate for the function of the street, especially given how close it is to pedestrian and cycle friendly parts of the centre of town.</td>
<td>Addition of trees</td>
<td>Either make the whole street a shared zone, like Oxford terrace, or reduce the speed limit and add crossing points and cycle lanes. Bus priority like Manchester street would also be good.</td>
<td>Kirstie</td>
<td>McHale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>24699</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Have you totally forgotten? When Christchurch residents were asked what kind of city they wanted, the vision was clear. Modern, pedestrian and cycle centred and low rise. Victoria street is uniquely located to become a pedestrian mall. In the old Christchurch it had the types of retail that suited a pedestrian mall. Maybe a cycleway as well? But you have designed the old way.... where car is king. sorry I do not like it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>24706</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>This proposal would mean Victoria Street stays a street primarily dedicated to moving cars, with little regard for people who want to walk, cycle, scoot or ride the bus. The new proposal contains no pedestrian crossings, it contains no protected cycle lanes, it contains no bus priority. But it does contain 70 car parks and maintains full car access. I don't consider this good enough. We have the opportunity to redefine Victoria Street into a real destination which would provide long term benefits to current and future businesses, employees, residents and visitors of the area, as well as move us closer to becoming a carbon-neutral city.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I call for the following changes to Victoria St: a. Pedestrian prioritised crossing facilities to allow employees, residents and visitors to cross the road safely, perhaps zebra crossings on the speed bumps; b. A lowered speed limit to signal to cars, as well as people on bikes and scooters, that the street’s primary function is to cater for the employees, residents, and visitors of the area; and c. A plan to allow short term, temporary testing, showcasing and measurement of the effects of different potential future changes to the street, such as: In-lane bus stops which let buses keep their place in queues of traffic when dropping off/picking up employees, residents and visitors; Different street configurations which allow for subtle changes in cycle lane, pedestrian space and car parking arrangements; Turning the street into a shared space/pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Downward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>24710</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>I cycle and walk daily in this area and it still looks really dangerous. I would like a wide shared cycle/pedestrian path, even if it's only on one side of the street. Dodging around the planter boxes is going to be dangerous.</td>
<td>Any upgrade as it is really scruffy.</td>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>24712</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>This submission is made on behalf of Generation Zero Christchurch - the local body of a nationwide youth-led advocacy group with a vision to see New Zealand achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. Generation Zero Christchurch, in general, conditionally supports the Victoria Street upgrade. We were in strong support of the first designs from 2016, and are disappointed at the lack of ambition in this current design that could have fundamentally changed the street for the better of the employees, residents, and visitors through better infrastructure catering towards people on foot, bikes, and buses. However, we recognise that other parties have opinions which differ from ours, and so agree to support some minor changes to the street now on the condition that the city spends a small amount of time and money exploring and measuring the results of some alternative schemes down Victoria Street in the coming years. Note that first and foremost we do have significant concerns with this design. People on foot wanting to cross the road will still have to wait to dash across when they find a break in traffic. People on cycles will be riding in the ‘door zone’ without any protection except some paint. People in buses will remain stuck in traffic, except when they pull over to pick up or drop off their passengers and get overtaken by a stream of cars. Cars will still be king in this design, with most car parks remaining and all vehicle access permitted. But we are an organisation which is getting tired of making the same submissions asking for the same simple things - active and public transport improvement to work towards a low emissions future (among other things). So this time our primary ask is for the city to try several different temporary options on Victoria Street over the next few years to showcase and measure what happens. With this kept in mind, our four requests, which we consider to be very minor, for this project are: 1. Pedestrian-prioritised crossing facilities to allow employees, residents, and visitors to cross the road safely (perhaps zebra crossings on the speed bumps);</td>
<td>- Be bolder! - More focus on the Victoria Street of the future, rather than the historical and present use of the street - More focus on the people who will appreciate the space (employees, residents, visitors) rather than those who use it as a car thoroughfare - Safer cycling routes (e.g. separation from car parks/car doors) - More cycle parking to allow more flexibility in where cyclists can park securely - More efficient bus routes by prioritising buses over cars (e.g. in-lane bus stops) - Allow for some temporary measures to be put in place to allow Victoria St to act as a showcase for other city streets. This will hopefully show those who are financially invested in the results, and thus may be more risk-adverse, that future-proofing our city can have positive effects in the present.</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>McNeill</td>
<td>Generation Zero Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Additional cycle parks to give employees, residents, and visitors something to conveniently secure their bikes to;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Something to signal to cars, as well as people on bikes and scooters, that the street’s primary function is to cater for the employees, residents, and visitors of the area rather than a thoroughfare (perhaps a lower speed limit and further traffic-calming measures);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. A plan to allow short-term, temporary testing, allowing the effects of different potential future changes to the street to be measured and showcased. Such temporary changes could include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Different street configurations which allow for subtle changes in cycle lane, pedestrian space and car parking arrangements;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) In-lane bus stops which let buses keep their place in queues of traffic when dropping off/picking up employees, residents and visitors;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Turning the street into a shared space/pedestrian mall like Oxford Terrace, Cashel Street or High Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We hope that our fourth request will be a low risk way to show people in Christchurch, and New Zealand, that we are in fact not different to any other city in the world who has created tangible benefits for businesses, residents and landowners in areas which have been made desirable through creating walkable destinations. We are happy to work with you on the creation and implementation of this plan. Victoria Street is an ideal place to make bold changes, because of the sheer potential of the location. It has an array of hospitality and retail businesses, and a busy night life as well as a day life thanks to being near residential apartments and a number of bars. It is also on a number of public transport routes and is situated close to attractions such as Victoria Square and the city centre. These factors mean that it could be a truly vibrant place with a few forward-thinking changes to make it a modern, people-focused area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We want people to realise that cycling and public transport facilities can do the same thing as road space and parking but in safer, nicer, and more efficient (in terms of physical space, travel time and environmental impact) ways, that more pedestrian friendly areas attract more people who spend more money, and that these results will lead to businesses performing better, neighbourhoods becoming more desirable and land prices increasing. We want people to want these infrastructure improvements, not lobby to get them stopped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many other cities around the world have improved their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>24715</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>citizens quality of life by creating options for citizens to walk, ride a bike, or take public transport, and removing the significant competitive advantages for cars. Most leaders in our cities acknowledge this, and this is reflected in our citywide plans and goals, but when it gets down to the implementation we are failing at creating meaningful change as we give much more weight to the here and now than the future. Our current consultation process requires people to reach out and submit, and people currently invested in the area, mainly through living or owning a business or property there, are much more likely to submit, as they are the ones who stand to gain or lose. Listen to them, but understand that they are one group, whereas we represent a different group. Our people are highly unlikely to engage yet as they are potential future residents, future employees, future visitors. We represent opportunity, and lots of it. We do not visit Victoria Street much currently as we do not like the area and have difficulties accessing it. Enable us to safely cycle and efficiently bus there, give us nice areas to walk between shops, bars and restaurants, and we will visit, and we will spend. It is as simple as that. We hope for a new approach which will show those who still believe the car is the way of the future, and submit in that manner, that there is a better way, and that the rewards are closer than they think.</td>
<td>Limiting speeds / adding pedestrian-focused interruptions, etc, discourages driving. I liked the pedestrian-only proposal a lot, but many didn't so this seems like an okay compromise.</td>
<td>As a non-driver I am definitely in favor of more dedicated crossings (zebra or traffic lights) - pedestrians have equal right to make cars wait as cars have to make pedestrians wait. Currently crossing from the corner where Diner 66 is for example in that triangle either way (clockwise or counter-clockwise) doesn't have a pedestrian crossing / signal. The closest to that at Bealey which is too far. Maybe I'm just too lazy... Is there enough traffic to justify a test of a shared bus / carpool lane to discourage single-person cars on Victoria Street and all the way up Papanui Road? Just a thought, not sure if it would work to improve traffic flow / reduce total number of cars.</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>24720</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>This street would serve better as a closed/shared road. To support pedestrian and soft transport into the city from key areas of Papanui/Merivale to the Town Hall/Central City.</td>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>More access for cycles/scooters/pedestrians to walk along the road freely.</td>
<td>Rosaria</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>24723</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Doesn’t really achieve the objectives for Victoria Street as set out in the Recovery Plan in providing any priority for public transport, walking or cycling. This plan allows for unrestrained traffic movements and prioritises on-street car parking over active and more sustainable modes or transport.</td>
<td>Trees and landscaping</td>
<td>Not increasing the number of on-street car parks and retaining more open space to meet the objective of Creating an environment that supports Victoria Street as a destination. It is not difficult to get an on-street car park on Victoria Street as it is time restricted and metered parking and there are not that many</td>
<td>Gemma</td>
<td>Dioni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/ Organis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>24724</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Introduction Abley is located at 137 Victoria Street. Many of our staff cycle to work. We have a basement car park and cycle parking facility accessed via the driveway to the north of our building. Our staff walk on Victoria Street during the day to visit local cafes etc. We regularly hear staff comment on the issues they experience crossing Victoria Street including; heavy traffic (lack of gaps), high speeds (= destinations along the corridor remaining at this time. It is more difficult to park sometimes because of the large amounts of on-street free parking around that it means that people are parking all day and limiting the availability of kerbside parking for visitors to the area. In particular, on Salisbury Street where it is more difficult to park to access Hagley park. Why can’t Council introduce more on-street paid parking around this area? One car park is located outside 122 and 126 Victoria Street yet it is clear from the aerial that parking is provided on-site for these uses off-street so why include this space when it could be used for seating, more bike parking, trees or artwork? Likewise, at 155 why can’t the build out be extended across the driveways to create more space. At the southern end, aside from the intersection works at Peterborough Street, there are no enhancements because of the retention of all the parking, so how does this meet the objectives? This is a key cycle route, so having long sections of on-street parking adjacent to an on-road cycle lane is not going to appeal to the target users of key cycle ways in central city. There are no dimensions on the plan but the cycle lane looks narrow in parts. Does this meet Council’s minimum requirements of 1.8 metre in width? And are the buffers at the southern end in addition to the 1.8m or part of the 1.8 metres? Is there a reason why the cycle lanes can’t bypass the bus stops? As a key bus route, having buses stop in the lane would afford them some priority and cyclists would not need to mix with these larger vehicles. Has this been considered? Vehicles rarely travel at 30km/h along this route so the raised tables will help slow traffic but without any changes to reduce traffic volumes it will still be just as difficult to cross the road. Has any priority been considered to actually improve the pedestrian environment? The project also seeks to upgrade the stormwater system to reduce the flooding risk, does this include any rain gardens and more sustainable urban drainage systems? What we like: The addition of trees within kerb buildouts; the addition of more pedestrian crossing points and associated buildouts; the addition of speed calming measures to support the 30km/h speed limit; good amount of cycle parking (some of our visitors arrive by cycle and comment on the lack of on-street cycle parking); the mixture of parking types. How could the plan be improved? We have identified a number of improvements that could be made to the plans as outlined below. The attached plan mark ups indicate the approximate location of each of the improvements. 1. The existing speed limit change points should be consistent with the central city design used at the other 30km/h transitions. It’s amazing how many</td>
<td>Ann-Marie</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Abley Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# | Sub ID | I / We | Feedback | What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street? | How could the plan be improved? | First name | Last name | Business/ Organis. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>30km/hour and parked cars blocking visibility. Our overall vision for Victoria Street is a high-quality pedestrian environment where our staff, visitors and other Victoria Street users feel safe and comfortable. YES we generally support the upgrade of Victoria Street but have some feedback. Feedback • Generally, we like the plan, however we think a better ‘sense of place’ and pedestrian environment could be created along the street with some alterations to the plans. For example, there are already some public seating areas along Victoria Street and with well placed buildouts there will be opportunities for businesses to create outdoor seating areas. See below for suggestions to improve the plan • We haven’t commented on the Bealey/Victoria Street intersection as the plans show the limit of works stopping before this intersection • We haven’t commented on the Salisbury/Montreal/Victoria intersection as the plans show the limit of works stopping either side of this intersection</td>
<td>people that work on the street and travel it each day are unaware that the speed limit is 30km/h. 2) Spacing of raised platforms – there is a flush platform detail at the northern end of Victoria Street and all the other platform details are raised. This could be used to create a gateway treatment and could incorporate the speed change. There is a larger spacing between the Dorset Street raised table and the raised table proposed outside 123 Victoria Street. We would recommend an additional raised platform between these ones. There could be a raised platform outside 135, near where the cycle parking is shown. Then the larger raised table is narrowed and moved south and additional parking could potentially be installed in this area to mitigate the loss caused by the additional raised platform. This platform could act as the gateway treatment and also a pedestrian crossing point. 3) There is an existing bus stop outside 131 Victoria Street. This has been removed in the proposed plan. This section of Victoria Street is a night-time hub area with a high concentration of restaurants and bars in this area. Providing a bus stop in this area is beneficial to these users. There are a number of retirement village developments occurring to the west of Victoria Street, these may include pedestrian accesses to Victoria Street in the future. A bus stop in this location would greatly assist residents of the retirement village. A combination taxi/bus stop could be introduced to cater for evening transport needs. 4) There are a lot of cycle stands shown but no other street furniture like seats. Adding seats could create a sense of place for Victoria Street and with the addition of the trees could make an inviting place to stop and rest for pedestrians. 5) The area at 108 Victoria Street is popular with workers to eat their lunch and have coffee. It would be ideal to have two buildouts aligned outside this space to help pedestrians cross the road. The raised platform proposed in point 2 above would cater for this. 6) Cross Sections – the cross sections shown in the public drop in session showed different dimensions across the road. For example the Peterborough to Salisbury Street cross section showed 3.9m parking on one side and 2.2m parking on the other side. We would recommend making the dimensions more consistent so the parking could be 2.0m and 2.1m. Likewise on the other cross section the traffic lanes are 3.3m and 3.1m. We would recommend making both lanes 3.2m. 7) P60 parking time limits – on Friday to Sunday the P60 limit extends to 8.30pm. This time overlaps with the dinner times at the restaurants along Victoria Street. Generally the only businesses open between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 75 | 24732 | generally support the upgrade but have some feedback | I strongly support the Generation Zero submission, namely that:  
a. Pedestrian prioritised crossing facilities to allow employees, residents and visitors to cross the road safely, perhaps zebra crossings on the speed bumps;  
b. A lowered speed limit to signal to cars, as well as people on bikes and scooters, that the streetsâ€™ primary function is to cater for the employees, residents, and | 5.8.30pm would be the restaurants and bars which would likely have a longer turnover time than 60 minutes.  
8) Kerb indentation outside 171/169 Victoria Street. Why is the kerb indented? We would recommend maintaining the kerb line in the built-out location as there is no parking proposed at that location.  
9) Bus Stop outside 159 Victoria Street. It doesn't appear like a bus could access this stop due to the sharp kerb return on the approach.  
10) Accessible parking on Dorset St. Dorset Street is a constrained environment for angle parking. Are the accessible bays appropriate at this location given some users will unload from the rear which would block that lane. Also kerb cutdown would have to be provided for direct access onto the footpath  
11) Parking outside 126 Victoria Street. Would P10 be more appropriate in this location given the close proximity to the coffee shop at 132 Victoria Street.  
12) Parking outside 149 Victoria Street. Would this be better as P60 given the type of shops that it is outside?  
13) Pedestrian crossing points are provided between Montreal and Peterborough Street either side of the Peterborough Street east intersection. Another pedestrian crossing point approximately outside 66/70 Victoria Street to give access to the link through to Salisbury Street at 72a Victoria Street would improve the pedestrian crossing environment. A kerb buildout could be located between the on-street parking and the bus stop.  
14) P10 parking outside 60 Victoria Street -- would it be better to have one P10 park on the west side and one on the east side? The west side has a coffee shop and sushi shop which generate short term demand for parking. In addition it is recommended that wayfinding signage in the central city is reviewed to ensure Victoria Street is not identified as a through route for northbound traffic. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Business/ Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Berrill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 77 | 24740  | generally support the upgrade but have some feedback | visitors of the area; and  
  c. A plan to allow short term, temporary testing, showcasing and measurement of the effects of different potential future changes to the street, such as:  
  In-lane bus stops which let buses keep their place in queues of traffic when dropping off/picking up employees, residents and visitors;  
  Different street configurations which allow for subtle changes in cycle lane, pedestrian space and car parking arrangements;  
  Turning the street into a shared space/pedestrian mall like Oxford Terrace, Cashel Street or High Street. | - Its potential as a very pleasant walking route to the city (via Victoria Square and Cultural Precinct/Cathedral Square or Victoria Square and river bank to Oxford Terrace cafes and City shops) for both residents and guests from the many hotels, motels, I would like to see the 3 Victoria Street poems retained somewhere in the street, individually or as a group. I think the existing displays get lost in the busy street environment and probably won’t fit the new design - but how many streets in NZ are fortunate enough to have their own poem, and Victoria Street has three!!! I think they are fabulous poems, to be celebrated, along with the street - their wording often runs through my mind. | Barbara | Moorhouse |
| 79 | 24742  | generally support the upgrade but have some feedback | Thank you for the opportunity to submit feedback on the upgrade of Victoria Street. This submission is from the Public Transport team at Environment Canterbury.  
  The Victoria Street upgrade is a project that is part of the delivery of the An Accessible City plan. This plan was developed after the Christchurch earthquakes by a number of partners, including both the Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury.  
  This plan sets out how different roads within the four avenues will be prioritised for different modes of transport. Victoria Street is prioritised for public transport, walking and cycling. The plan also sets out that Victoria Street will be redeveloped as a ‘main street’, with enhanced streetscapes that support retail and mixed-use development .  
  The plan states “these streets will be prioritised for walking and cycling and they will be slowed to a maximum of 30km/h. Main Streets that are public transport routes will contain appropriate public transport priority measures.”  
  The An Accessible City Plan also sets out how Salisbury and Kilmore Streets will be changed from one-way to two-way | - The revised stop placement in the Casino block works well. While only a northbound bus stop is required in this block initially a southbound stop will also be needed when Kilmore St becomes two-way (to replace the interim bus stop on Salisbury Street). | Edward | Wright | Environment Canterbury Public Transport |
<p>| | | | | It will also not be possible to provide the most appropriate public transport network in this part of the central city until these one-way street changes are made. The current use of both Salisbury and Kilmore Streets means that bus stops for northbound and southbound bus services are quite some distance from each other. For example, provision for bus stops has been made on Kilmore Street outside the newly reopened Town Hall. Bus services are able to stop in a northbound direction close to the Town Hall, but the closest corresponding southbound bus stops are currently on Salisbury and Manchester Streets. As well as the distance these stops are apart, the separation on different roads creates confusion for potential passengers, and reduces public transport attractiveness as a transport option. | | | | Environment Canterbury advocates that the Christchurch City Council brings forward the Salisbury and Kilmore Street one-way to two-way changes so that these are delivered without further delay, and that the full potential of the plans for Victoria Street can be realised. | | | | This consultation has proposed a number of specific |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>I / We</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</th>
<th>How could the plan be improved?</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Business/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23509</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>The provision of on-road unprotected cycle lanes is unacceptable in a world moving towards a vision zero approach to road safety. NZ is well behind world best practice which is exemplified by: <a href="https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2019/04/protested-bike-lanes-traffic-safety-cambridge-bicycle-plan/586876/">https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2019/04/protested-bike-lanes-traffic-safety-cambridge-bicycle-plan/586876/</a> <a href="https://www.planetizen.com/news/2019/04/103778-new-bike-infrastructure-standard-set-cambridge">https://www.planetizen.com/news/2019/04/103778-new-bike-infrastructure-standard-set-cambridge</a> And cities like Abu Dhabi where fully protected movements for pedestrians and cyclists at traffic signals are also provided (i.e. no filtering traffic).</td>
<td>Protected cycle lanes. Fully protected cycle and pedestrian movements at traffic signals.</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23525</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>This upgrade is not consistent with the Accessible City blueprint and will act against achieving the objectives we need from our transport system. The trees look nice.</td>
<td>Victoria Street is one of the most important bus routes in the city. The Accessible City states it will be prioritised for bus travel. To do that it needs to encourage or require through-traffic to use the adjacent Bealey Ave/Montreal/Durham arterials,</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Morahan</td>
<td>Talking Transport Blog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/ Organis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23527</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>This section of road currently carries a frequent and highly used bus route (Blue Line). Council has expressed wishes for a future-proofed transport network, which requires a mode shift away from private vehicles and to mass transit, walking and cycling. The previously proposed upgrade of Victoria St would have supported this shift, by giving priority to bus movements and cycle safety. Under ECAn’s proposed future bus network, this section of roadway will carry not only the Blue Line, but also another frequent route to the airport. This, combined with increased frequencies to the Blue Line, will result in a bus every 4-6 minutes. This level of frequency turns the bus routes from Victoria St to the interchange into true turn-up and go lines, where people easily travel from Victoria St to/from the central interchange without needing to check timetables. This level of service provided by the timetabling can only work if complemented by infrastructure to support it. The proposed plan features very little bus prioritisation - only small sections at either end. To enable efficient movements of buses the plan must feature one of two things: (a) very little motor traffic, or, (b) continuous bus lanes. By restricting vehicle movements from using the entirety of Victoria St and thoroughfare, the original plan would have resulted in (a), allowing for good movements of buses. The proposed plan does not do this, and nor does it offer (b). The proposed plan caters for those individuals who choose to drive, who can use any other street coming into the CBD, and ignores the needs of those individuals who travel into and out of the CBD by bus. It is important to note the availability of parking very nearby Victoria St in a variety of new parking buildings, and the availability of alternate routes to drive down. There is no evidence to suggest removing on-street parking hurts businesses (provided there are alternatives nearby, which there are), and in fact it is observed that giving more space to more efficient transport modes like cycles and buses results in more patronage for those businesses along the</td>
<td>The roadway and footpaths are certainly in need of a physical upgrade. However, the urban design and transport layout, and mode prioritisation also require a re-think, and this plan fails at that.</td>
<td>Bus prioritisation. Cycle prioritisation. Removing Victoria St as a through-route for cars but rather a destination for people.</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Granger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12 | 23531  | No - do not support the upgrade  
I have a number of comments to make as follows;  
1. The reduction of any car parking in Victoria will be detrimental to the retailing and commercial activities and so should be avoided at all costs. The rationale is simple. Let's assume a car park is used only from 9 am - 9pm daily. So no use outside these hours whatsoever despite the presence of many restaurants and bars. If a car park is used by only 2 persons per hour then it represents a reduction of 8,736 customers pa for that one park. (12 hours x 2 persons = 24 pd x 365 = 8,736pa). You are proposing to remove 20 car parks and add 4 new ones so a net loss of 16. Apply the customer loss of 8760 pa =139,776 potential customers pa to this small precinct.  
This will have a detrimental impact on business in general and some businesses in particular such as those that rely upon customers who use their cars for whatever reason. The reasons car parking is so important for retailing is that we live in a city with four seasons and variable weather, it is often cold, wet, dark and dangerous. People use their cars to collect items and as a security factor. Christchurch is a radial city which is expanding outward from the centre. The bulk of citizens live remotely to the CBD and use cars because of the convenience. How else would they get into Victoria St by public transport from say Halswell or Rolleston.  
The last your city planners want to lay the seeds for an area to die a slow commercial death because someone has decided we need a nicer looking streetscape at the expense of parks. Eventually as we segway into EVs we will still need car spaces.  
2. It is possible to include additional trees and landscaping without losing car parks. The junction between car parks could have a small extension from the footpath to allow a tree to be partly planted on the edge of the footpath and also on the small extension. In this way parks are retained with both pedestrian space and the unused corner of the car park used for tree scaping. This is widely used overseas in major European cities. Footpaths do not need to be universally of the same width and could allow for slightly narrower sections to accommodate trees and street scaping. In this way the spaces become more intimate and could be enhanced in a sectional way with different cobbles to create interest.  
3. Any jut outs should be angled otherwise they will become an obstruction as they have become in many parts of the city where these sharp angles have been put in without consideration for vehicles. The streetscape designs... | As per comments | Ernest | Duval | Property owner 161 Victoria Street |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>I / We</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</th>
<th>How could the plan be improved?</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Business/ Organ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>need to be functional and not only decorative because we need only look at what’s happening in Victoria square to see a nice looking design wasn’t really thought through from a maintenance perspective and so now is costing rate payers hundreds of thousands of dollars to fix (hopefully not repair in the same way but make a practical design) Another example of poor street design is at Aynsley Terrace where numerous attempts were made to improve the street scape only to be damaged by motorists. Make it practical, make your first cost your last cost and save the rate payers the burden of having to fix decorative but non-functional design. There are many more examples. Eg outside the police station vehicle exit etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Break the footpath sections up into individual strips and treat the surfaces differently to create interest and assist retailers to have more of an individual feel. The retailers pay the rates on buildings (through their opex) and employ staff and add to the life an vitality of the city. There is a unique opportunity to do something special for this street without compromising commercial outcomes. If the retailers prosper then capital values will be sustained and rates will enhance and jobs will be created. It will be a better environment for all. Block by block of even part sections of the block should be treated differently to create identity. As they have done in Wellington why not provide some historical plaques about the history of the street. In a city that has changed so much in such a short space of time there is a lot of history that people are oblivious to and it’s the history of their city and this part of town. Small historical snippets will add a lot of interest to the street. This history should be the type of history people can relate to such as “The site of the first stables in 1857” or “The site of the old so and so pub in 1987”. These are culturally and historically relevant for Christchurch and give connection to our heritage whilst at the same time bringing a street to life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>23532</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade of Victoria Street</td>
<td>OK The council can fix pavements and tidy up holes inroad perfectly well. do not screw with the parking the lanes or any part of the road system it works now and we don’t need it ruined for all but the exclusive select few nutter on bikes. Don’t need more trees don’t need landscaped areas fixing street lights is a no brainer knock em off on Saturday Victoria st does not need to be a destination in ccc eyes as that denies access to 84% of the population by screwing the roadway into a moronic maze Got it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>McBride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/ Organis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23537</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>I recall I did make a submission initially where I suggested leave Victoria St as it is. I have worked from 382 Montreal St for a number of years, usually cycling to work from Papanui Rd direction. I note that Victoria St is a relatively quiet street from 10 am - 4 pm, hardly any traffic so it is not that busy. All that needs doing is resurfacing the road &amp; cycle way. I don't see any need to reduce parking spaces either. Why not keep it simple &amp; low cost. Just a nice wide street/boulevard. No cycle lanes either. It is a 30 km/hr street so quite safe. (In fact, cycle lanes on some roads give a false sense of security, I have been knocked off my bike on cycle lane in Papanui Rd). For a start, try the simple approach of a nice smooth road only &amp; see how it compares to the rest of the city (which is an obstacle course for cars &amp; cyclists anyway).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Mitton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>23544</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>Our customers must be able to park on the street. There are very few places to park at our end now &amp; your going to make it less. Bad move &amp; stupid. Our businesseis will suffer &amp; its already hard times for most.</td>
<td>Nothing. It's a one sided push to get Bus &amp; Cycle lanes put in. You have ruined Riccarton road &amp; St Asaph street, now you want to do the same here. All these businesseis suffered alot when you were changing the roads &amp; its not much better now because of the lack of onstreet carparks.</td>
<td>Just tidy up the roads &amp; footpaths. Have more onstreet parking &amp; let the traffic lights stay green for a longer period. Traffic is often very backed up &amp; needs to flow better at both ends.</td>
<td>Emilios</td>
<td>Kotzikas</td>
<td>Carlton Butchery Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>23553</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>We operate our flag ship store on Victoria St and we have multiple cafes around the city. I support the patching up of the street, the roads need resealed and so on. However, it is SO SO SO important that vehicle access and parking is priority. It is not a huge pedestrian street, it will never be as it is not in the heart of the city. If vehicle access is restricted in favor of walking or say a minority / micro transport such as bicycles, it will have dier consequences like other areas of the city. I / we operate many cafes around Christchurch, hospitality is at the heart of a social culture of a city. Christchurch will loose / continue to have a weak culture if the CCC does not read submissions like this with complete seriousness. The city is a driving city - it is so spread out and modes of transport such as lime scooters, bicycles &amp; bus are fine, however it is a micro sect of the population that use these modes. WHY? because these modes of transport are down to age, health, weather, circumstance and so on.</td>
<td>That the roads will be resealed.</td>
<td>Just reseal the roads - cars need priority.</td>
<td>Elias (Bink)</td>
<td>Bowler</td>
<td>Black &amp; White Coffee Cartel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/Organis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 28 | 23893   | No - do not support the upgrade | Example: People with families (majority) needs cars - they need to drop kids to school, pick them up after, drop them to sport etc etc. Public transport and biking is not an option.  
My point - the majority of the population drive cars - it is how it is and it will not change! So please please please look at this realistically and re do the street with actual majority lifestyle in mind.  
This means - accessible for cars and good parking with normal pedestrian access (normal footpaths).  
WITH THIS MONEY THAT BEING INVESTED IN CYCLE WAYS AND REDESIGNING / FIXING WHAT IS NOT BROKEN - JUST SUBSIDIZE ELECTRIC VEHICLES - that would be called win win.  
The council lowers emissions realistically.  
In summary - if vehicle access is restricted it will have dire consequences on our stores on Victoria St. The current pedestrian access is right size and in perfect proportion, it is normal and can sustain growth. The accessibility for cars (primary mode of transport) is so good right now.  
I am deeply concerned about the delusional view of the CCC’s road planning dept. The city is becoming very hard to access, live in and operate business in due to the road planning (cycle ways, lack of on street parking etc). BUILD THE CITY BASED OF MAJORITY AND NOT FOR MINORITY. Rebuild a city that works.  
Electric Vehicle Subsidies is the middle - not cycle ways, they have failed. | The wider footpaths and greenery are nice. | Actual changes to transportation down this road. The first plan that stopped through traffic except for buses made more sense. Victoria street does not need to be for cars, there’s plenty of one-ways for that. | Blake       | Quarterly |                  |
| 29 | 23895   | No - do not support the upgrade | This plan is pointless now. The first plan would have made significant improvements to cycling and public transport. Now it’s just a ‘beautification’ project with no real outcome. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Bus lanes and maybe dedicated cycle ways. | Alex        | Bailey    |                  |
| 33 | 23940   | No - do not support the upgrade | I do not support this plan for Victoria Street because it does not have the best priorities for Christchurch as a whole or the local business area.  
This is a major bus route, with approximately 300 buses travelling this stretch of road each day. Currently the traffic congestion is high causing delays to the buses. This is a factor limiting the growth in public transport for the region. We need to be decreasing our reliance on personal cars in order to cut our carbon emissions, as well as increasing our levels of activity to address health and wellbeing. This plan needs to be changed to increase bus | Not much | Implement the original plan. Refer to http://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/The-Council/HYS/2016/may/AAC-Consultation-Number-5-A4-Booklet-v2-WEB2.pdf | Arthur      | McGregor  |                  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>I / We</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</th>
<th>How could the plan be improved?</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Business/ Organis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>24271</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>Papanui Road traffic, heading for central city will need to divert to Durham Street as Victoria Street will be slower.</td>
<td>Finally some progress!</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>24278</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>This scheme far removed from the original proposal. It seems that it has been altered out of recognition following consultation with a singular group of people only - ie business owners. The plan is not safe for cyclists does not prioritise public transport in any meaningful way and does not seek to change how cars use the street to get from A to B. It does not fit with the accessible city plan. I have selected that I do not support the upgrade, because I don’t in its current form. I did support the original proposal which was far superior in every imaginable way. If council words on climate change are to mean anything they need to be backed up with actions. This scheme does nothing to discourage car use or encourage public transport and active transport modes and would be a complete waste of money as it is. It resembles a big long car park. Research and experience from around the world has shown that restricting motor vehicles and making a pedestrian friendly street environment hugely benefits local business and streets a place where people will spend more time. Just because local business wants the status quo as they have no vision to look beyond that scenario does not mean it is correct to change the objectives to suit that particular group. In addition the plan available for this particular consultation is woefully inadequate and does not make it easy to see what is planned, how and why it has changed.</td>
<td>Not a lot.</td>
<td>Make it comply with the accessible city objectives. Remove on street parking to facilitate a safe and welcoming environment for cyclists and pedestrians. Close the road to through motorised traffic. Make the street a public transport priority route. Design the street for the future, not the past and present and with only one group of stakeholders input.</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>24459</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>I am totally opposed to the removal of the car parks under the proposed plan. The businesses along Victoria Street need people to be able to get to them relatively easily, otherwise they will continue to abandon the central city in favor of the suburban malls which have plenty of car parking. In winter your vision of a pedestrian and cycling utopia fades in the face of the Easterly wind and southerly rain lashing Christchurch - so for 3-6 months the conditions in Christchurch are not conducive to pedestrians or cyclists. Any work needs to be undertaken quickly, efficiently and with the minimum disruption for the businesses in the street. Unlike every other set of work in Christchurch where the same section is filled in and dug up multiple times, how about planning to get everything done in each section before sealing over and finishing it in one go? Your tick boxes above are biased as they are missing one for “generally do not support your plan but do have some feedback”. Whilst I support getting the street and footpaths fixed I am opposed to some major parts of your plan, (but not all of it). I am given no option but to tick the “do not support” the upgrade which is not completely correct.</td>
<td>Fixing the road and footpath surfaces in their existing footprints and adding more trees within the existing footprint.</td>
<td>Re-irstrate the parking you have taken away and simply fix the road, services and footpath within their existing footprints. Ensure that each section is worked on once with everything done then move on to the next section. Minimise disruption to the businesses along the street by working mainly at night and throwing enough resources at the work to get it completed quickly and efficiently!</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>24462</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>I am unsatisfied with the consultation process Christchurch City Council has undertaken from 2015 to 2019 to reach a suitable outcome for the upgrade of Victoria Street. In 2016 I spoke at the consultation hearing in support of better cycling infrastructure on a street that is currently dangerous to ride a bike down. Following the consultation hearing to the current proposed new plan, I have not seen council engage with any of the cycling community before releasing their new and current plan for public consultation. (Current member of Spokes Canterbury) I am aware that heavy consultation has been undertaken with businesses and residents in and around Victoria to understand their needs and desires. No other stakeholders have been contacted. (An unfair “democratic” process). The “share an idea” vision for the central city was as a shared space where people on foot or bicycle would feel safe and engage in the community. - Victoria Street is narrow and must serve many modes. A designated pedestrian route, proposed bus priority and safe cycle route into the city. (Current cycle mode share along Victoria street is up 188% in 2 years. CCC Road cycle counters. Average of 200 one direction users daily at Bealey Ave/Victoria St intersection). ISSUES FOR BIKE RIDERS: - A dedicated cycle route offers people on bikes narrow 1.7m painted lanes which often simply end along on-street</td>
<td>Currently, Victoria is a dismal looking street with poor quality road surface and bad lighting and no atmosphere. Any streetscape enhancement is justice to the area. Considering the current conditions of the Street I rarely spend time or money on Victoria Street.</td>
<td>In the original City Council proposal, you intended to divert “car commuter” traffic flow away from Victoria Street and into main arterials such as Montreal and Durham Street. This needs stronger emphasis to reduce car traffic down to a minimum and prioritise alternative transport options.</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Bebbington</td>
<td>Action Bicycle Club Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item No.: 7**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>I / We</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</th>
<th>How could the plan be improved?</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Business/ Organis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 48 | 24481 | No - do not support the upgrade | parking at Salisbury and Victoria. Car parking gets 2.1m on both sides of Victoria. 
- 1.7m cycle lanes hard up against 2.1m on street parking and will not appeal to the "interested but concerned" cyclists. (Council advises "interested but concerned riders detour up to 3km to use a MCR). As designed, experienced cyclists will take the lane, unsafe when riding with buses and cars. 
- Parked and parking cars will protrude into the painted bike lane. The car door swing area of 0.9m will reduce the cycle lanes to 0.8m. 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 0.1m of space when dodging a car door opened into their path. 
- Congestion will be increased by on-street parking with a 60-minute limit assuring frequent lhs and outs to interrupt traffic and further reduce safety. | City Council MUST think ahead and plan for the future!!!! Since the 2016 consultation I attended with upset business owners operating on Victoria Street a good amount of them have moved to new premises or shut down whereas alternative road users such as cyclists have increased numbers. Pedestrian users will increase in time with the Town Hall and Convention Center. 
City Council must include all stakeholders in their consultation process. As a member of Spokes Canterbury, who advocate for safe cycling infrastructure we are rarely contacted for input! | Provide more car parking | Paul | Chaney |
| 50 | 24605 | No - do not support the upgrade | We are the owners of Rabobank Building 12 Papanui Road, prior to the earthquake we had three car parks outside our building we request these parks to be reinstated with the Victoria Street upgrade plan. Customers picking up takeaways from the Carlton Courts previously used these parks. Now we are having constant issues with them entering our property in Derby Street and blocking our tenants car parks. | We are the owners of Rabobank Building 12 Papanui Road, prior to the earthquake we had three car parks outside our building we request these parks to be reinstated with the Victoria Street upgrade plan. Customers picking up takeaways from the Carlton Courts previously used these parks. Now we are having constant issues with them entering our property in Derby Street and blocking our tenants car parks. | Provide more car parking | Wayne | Boyd |
| 66 | 24713 | No - do not support the upgrade | I accept the need for an upgrade to Victoria St, but I am not impressed with what is proposed. As a cyclist I avoid Victoria St, whenever possible, because there is very little space for cyclists and the upgrade doesn't seem to improve the situation much. The provision of so much on-street parking is totally outdated. | I accept the need for an upgrade to Victoria St, but I am not impressed with what is proposed. As a cyclist I avoid Victoria St, whenever possible, because there is very little space for cyclists and the upgrade doesn't seem to improve the situation much. The provision of so much on-street parking is totally outdated. | Priority should be given to public transport and low-carbon, more active means of transport. The speed limit should be 30 km/h. | Dave | Evans |
| 68 | 24719 | No - do not support the upgrade | Spokes Canterbury is a local cycling advocacy group with approximately 1200 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. 
**Public Sentiment and City Transport** Share an idea found wide support for a city inviting to people on foot and bicycles. The ‘Accessible City Plan’ and Regenerate Christchurch’s 2017 ‘Central City Redevelopment Transport Planning’ both designate Victoria Street as a priority route for pedestrians, bicycles and buses. It is not prioritised for cars or parking. 
The vision for the central city was as a shared space where people on foot or bicycle would feel safe and engage in the | Spokes Canterbury is a local cycling advocacy group with approximately 1200 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. 
**Public Sentiment and City Transport** Share an idea found wide support for a city inviting to people on foot and bicycles. The ‘Accessible City Plan’ and Regenerate Christchurch’s 2017 ‘Central City Redevelopment Transport Planning’ both designate Victoria Street as a priority route for pedestrians, bicycles and buses. It is not prioritised for cars or parking. 
The vision for the central city was as a shared space where people on foot or bicycle would feel safe and engage in the | An Easy and Obvious Solution
To comply with Council’s Cycle Design Guidelines for a local cycle way in this setting the project would need to implement section 5.2. (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. | Dirk | De Lu | Spokes Canterbury |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>I / We</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</th>
<th>How could the plan be improved?</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Business/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</table>

Many residents are already showing their support for a people centred city. The Papanui Parallel MCR averages approximately 500-600 daily. Cycle use on Victoria has increased 388% in two years. What happened to produce this plan which fails on all counts?

**Plan Background**

1. Originally approved and near to start of construction in 2016 the plan was halted in the face of merchant opposition
2. June 2017 “An Accessible City – Victoria Street Detailed Design Safety Audit” (not for the actual proposal now being considered)
3. In 2018 Council staff began consultations with the merchants and residents in the area. No other stakeholders were contacted.
4. May 2019 and this plan focused on preserving on street parking is opened to consultation to non-privileged parties. (There are 2,500 car parks within 200 meters of Victoria Street and current on street parks achieve 74% uptake.)

**The Setting and Specific Examples**

Victoria Street is narrow and must serve many modes. A designated pedestrian route it offers footpaths 2.8m-2.9m wide. As it must accommodate buses vehicle lanes are 3.25m wide. Car parking gets 2.1m on both sides of Victoria. A dedicated cycle route yet it offers people on bikes narrow 1.7m painted lanes which often simply end along on street parking as at Salisbury and Victoria.

1.7m cycle lanes hard up against 2.1m on street parking will not appeal to the “interested but concerned” cyclists Council claims to target. This unsafe design will have experienced cyclists taking the lane to incur the wrath of drivers. This plan makes a mockery of the Accessible City Plan’s designation of Victoria Street as a cycle priority route.

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 0.8m, 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. This is unsafe, irresponsible and potentially lethal design.

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.

Victoria Street is a local cycle way as dictated by The Accessible City Plan – Transport chapter. Council must present a better, safer and more workable plan. This plan must be rejected.

**Conclusion**

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. Speed could be further limited to 10km/h as has been proposed for High St. Cycle lanes removed as people can now cycle in the traffic lane with all road users alert to share the road. Footpaths could be widened. Landscaping increased to soften this urban scene.

Those who wish to drive to a short term on street park will have that option. Parking off of Victoria Street will be encouraged. Buses will retain their route.

**Benefits**

Patrons of motels along Bealey Avenue would be encouraged to walk to the centre city, noting the dining and shopping options, thereby benefiting Victoria Street merchants.

Merchants will further benefit by offering a tree lined space with reduced car congestion conducive to strolling, shopping and dining. The current design leaves people to be replaced by fumes and noise with some left to witness the grim outcomes of unsafe road planning.

Pollution is reduced and the area made far more attractive.

**On Consultation**

The Council undermined the community when it handpicks some stakeholders for early inclusion and allows them to set the focus for plans. This plan is a prime example of the failure a narrow focus achieves. Current consultation disempowers the community as plans are rarely open to significant, if any, real change. Minor adjustments may be accommodated, but even this level of responsiveness is generally limited.

Consultation is undermined when documents and designs provided do not include basic information including cross sections for each lane treatment specifying widths for all modes. Safety audits need to be included online with all projects. This is basic information required for informed comment and consent. That it is not undermines Council’s credibility. Setting basic requirements for consultation documents is clearly needed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>I / We</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</th>
<th>How could the plan be improved?</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Business/ Organis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>24721</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>During the course of the 3 years since the upgrade of Victoria Street planning began, this project has changed considerably, to the future detriment of our city in my opinion. Share an Idea, The Accessible City Plan and The Central City Redevelopment Transport Plan all describe the future of Victoria Street to be prioritising pedestrians, bicycles, and buses. This plan does not do that at all. There is very little that has changed that will make the street feel any safer for those who ride a bike. Incredibly disappointing.</td>
<td>30km speed limit (10km limit would be better). Hopefully the road surface will be better.</td>
<td>By diverting all non-local traffic via Montreal Street, Durham Street and prioritising those two routes for vehicles, instead of causally expecting that those who ride bikes (and with to do it in safety) reroute their journey several blocks away to the Paparangi Parallel. This is not acceptable at all, for a city that is proudly declaring a climate change emergency, and leading the country with a network of quality infrastructure for bikes, scooters and other active transport options.</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>24725</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>As a business owner, I do not need the disruption to the street and also losing car parks of which will seriously affect my business. I would support minimally fixing the road and footpaths, more car parking, NO right turn into Dorset St from Vic St and car parking outside Vics maybe 30 mins max.</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>As above, more car parking, 30 k speed limit, no right turn Dorset St.</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Perrem</td>
<td>Vics Cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>24731</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>In 1958 when I was elected on office bearer in Knox Church, the big debate at that time was the widening of Victoria Street. The Council at that time proposal to take the back portion of Knox Church from the first pillar to the west wall and demolish it so Victoria Street could be widened and a new church built on the site using part of Armstrong &amp; Farr property next door to the south side of the church. After much debate and consultation the idea of widening Victoria Street was abandoned but since then our church access to Victoria Street and Bealey Avenue has been encroached upon that today there is no room for a Hearse &amp; Mourners cars no room for a bridal car when there is a wedding for on both occasions the front door of the church is an essential part of both services. Knox was built a long time before this widening was thought about but no move has been made to take the new building back from the road side to widen the street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>24737</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>1. Share-an-idea clearly directed the city to develop in a more pedestrian and cycle friendly manner. 2. Victoria Street has been identified as a priority bus service route. 3. Christchurch City Council has declared a climate emergency. 4. Micro personal transport options e.g. lime scooters are now commonly used in the city. These points do not appear to be addressed in the plan for Victoria Street. The plan focuses on car traffic and parking of cars. It does not contain appropriate quality cycle infrastructure. It will</td>
<td>Reducing the speed to 30km/h</td>
<td>Directing through traffic to the established through traffic streets (Montreal and Durham). Build dedicated quality bus lanes. Remove street car parking as necessary to accommodate such. Building quality pedestrian areas and quality separated bike lanes. The reduced through traffic will assist in the creation of a Victoria Street community. It will become a destination as opposed to a thoroughfare.</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Dobbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Sub ID</td>
<td>I / We</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>What do you like about the upgrade of Victoria Street?</td>
<td>How could the plan be improved?</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Business/Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>24741</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>I think the current design is a regrettable step back from the original vision of the Accessible City Plan, in which Victoria St was identified as a pedestrian, cycle and public transit priority route, not a parking area. Given the vast contributions of emissions to the carbon budget of Christchurch, and the fact that almost all roads are in fact &quot;car priority areas&quot;, it would be nice if this vision of an environmentally friendly street design would be followed through in light of the climate emergency. I think this would make sense for local businesses there as well. As a potential customer of Victoria St, there is nothing that attracts me to a street that prioritizes motorized traffic and parking over pedestrians and cyclists. The current car-traffic design turns our household off from going to Victoria St to the extent that we actively avoid the area and go elsewhere in the CBD. While not particularly pretty with the amount of parked cars, St Asaph St is a much more inviting destination in the CBD than Victoria St because it has a people-centric, not a car-centric design. If I have to take my car to the CBD, I do not expect to find parking right in front of the business I am going to. I am however less likely to attend a street which is unsightly due to an excess of parking and unsafe to ride one because the cycle lanes are not separated and likely to incentivize close passing and force people on bicycles to ride in the door zone of parked cars. I am concerned about the way this plan came into existence. There is no empirical evidence that sub-par cycling facilities and the prioritization of parking are good for businesses, yet the Council has allowed anecdote-driven businesses to dictate the plan by handpicking them for early consultation. Victoria St is a street for all citizens of Christchurch, and it should be designed as such, not as a street based on what select businesses anecdotaly think is good for business (more parking, more cars).</td>
<td>The trees are an improvement to the current tin and concrete wasteland</td>
<td>Ranked from most desirable to least desirable: 1) Close the street to car traffic altogether, get ride of unsafe cycle lanes, encourage cyclists to take the lane 2) allow through-traffic, but no parking allowed and a 20 km/h speed limit, get rid of unsafe cycle lanes, encourage cyclists to take the lane 3) allow through-traffic but less to no parking, widen cycle lanes 4) separated cycle paths on the left side of parking</td>
<td>Jan Jakob</td>
<td>Bornheim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>24744</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>Accessible city plan and Central City redevelopment transport planning both designated Victoria Street as a priority route for pedestrians, people on bikes and PT. The current upgrade DOES NOT support that. Also with the declaration of a climate emergency, all transport works especially in Central City should reduce reliance on cars and promote better cycling and walking infrastructure.</td>
<td>Remove car parking on one side to make a separated cycleway and more bike parking, or reduce the street speed to 20 km/h.</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Ching</td>
<td>Action Bicycle Club Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicated by submitter</td>
<td>In summary, would like to see the street being more pedestrian and bus friendly. Less and slower cars moving on and off a congested Papanui Road. Pedestrian crossings and a plan to give buses more priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ailsa</td>
<td>Milner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Submitter ID</th>
<th>I / We</th>
<th>If you own or operate a business along Victoria Street, when would you prefer the construction works to commence?</th>
<th>If you own or operate a business along Victoria Street how would you like to see the works sequenced to avoid too much disruption?</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Business/Dog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23529</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td>Mostly done at night</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Bennett Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23588</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td>Yes. As soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td>Rhodes &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>24270</td>
<td>Yes - support the upgrade</td>
<td>I work in a business and anytime is good</td>
<td>I work in a business &amp; as long as one lane is always working, that would be fine.</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23501</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Must be sequenced so that only elements of the works are conducted on one part of the street at a time (ie so as a business we have 3 intense weeks with works outside doing everything, rather than the entire street shut off for months)</td>
<td>ANDREW HAMILTON CORCOVADO FURNITURE &amp; HOMEWARES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>23557</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>I do not own a business but I work down there. Time of day is irrelevant to me.</td>
<td>I do not own a business but I work down there. Honestly smash it all out at once. Don’t mess about like Riccarton Road trying to keep the traffic moving which blows out the duration by a factor of 10-fold. This project should be done in months not years.</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Falconer</td>
<td>Verizon Connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage could be done in stages from late summer/autumn...then kerb/footpath work to be undertaken in Winter (May to August) when trade is slower...then mill &amp; mix in the following summer once all work behind the kerb was completed.</td>
<td>Staging and sequencing are major concerns for our business. If the works were staged in small segments, one side of the road at a time, and each stage completed before the next stage is commenced then this would have less impact on the businesses in the area. Even if this model takes a little longer then it would be ok. I guess you need to balance this with other businesses requests but we rely on foot traffic for trade so if you kill foot traffic you kill trade.</td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>Court Florist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>24120</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>For us January is usually the quietest month. Many people from the city go elsewhere for the holidays, also many of the professional offices around us are closed during this time, so the foot traffic is less. So therefore January would work for us.</td>
<td>Stefan explained that the works would be done in 'chunks' therefore always allowing for 1 lane to remain open, this seems like a sensible option to me.</td>
<td>Nicola Martinovich Martinovich Exceptional Jewellery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>24201</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>As soon as possible i.e. over winter</td>
<td>Rather than trying to complete the whole strip in one massive effort it should be broken into component parts and planned to be completed so that any disruption is short and sharp. A stage managed approach that is worked on 24/7 until done.</td>
<td>Tim Bergin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>24260</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>As soon as possible.</td>
<td>Yes that would be appreciated. We own and manage a number of properties in the street with a mix of retail/hospitality and business tenants so if once section could be completed in its entirety before moving to the next section I think that would help considerably. I am sure with some good co-operation between all contractors that each section could be completed very quickly so that the whole project does not take very long at all.</td>
<td>Adele Childs Countrywide Property Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>24457</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>Immediately post Xmas until end of January is the best time of year as many businesses closed and quietest time of year in terms of trading. Any work needs to be done with a sense of urgency</td>
<td>At night is best for us. Weekends also better than during the week.</td>
<td>Jason Harris Procope Coffee House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>24459</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>Any work needs to be undertaken quickly, efficiently and with the minimum disruption for the businesses in the street. Unlike every other set of work in Christchurch where the same section is filled in and dug up multiple times, how about planning to get everything done in each section before sealing over and finishing it in one go?</td>
<td>Re-instate the parking you have taken away and simply fix the road, services and footpath within their existing footprints. Ensure that each section is worked on once with everything done then move on to the next section. Minimise disruption to the businesses along the street by working mainly at night and throwing enough resources at the work to get it completed quickly and efficiently!</td>
<td>Mike Sheppard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Contact Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>24706</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>While it is important to consider the needs of businesses in this process I feel that far too much weight is being given to the needs of businesses in this city, and not nearly enough to residents and visitors to the area. This results in our streets becoming places for cars instead of places for people.</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Downard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>24724</td>
<td>generally support the upgrade but have some feedback</td>
<td>January, after the standard Christmas break but before school starts again.</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Ann-Marie</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Abley Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>23544</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>Just do it the fastest way possible. Limit the pain.</td>
<td>Emilos Kotziakas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlton Butchery Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>23553</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>Late December - January.</td>
<td>Major works do not need to take place - just fix the roads and we are good.</td>
<td>Elias (Bink)</td>
<td>Bowler</td>
<td>Black &amp; White Coffee Cartel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>24725</td>
<td>No - do not support the upgrade</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Overnight only</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Perrem</td>
<td>Vics Cafe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. Transport Unit Bi-Monthly Report

Reference: 19/684775
Presenter(s): Richard Osborne, Head of Transport

1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee on the activities of the Transport Unit. The report details current network performance metrics together with a status update on the major projects, maintenance and operations.

2. Executive Summary
   2.1 Consultation on the projects to mitigate the effects of the Christchurch Northern Corridor is open until Monday 19 August 2019.
   2.2 On 1 July 2019, the maximum daily-capped parking rate at Lichfield Street Car Parking Building increased from $10 per day to $15 per day. This was to provide some additional short-stay capacity within the building to further support the Retail Precinct.
   2.3 The bi-monthly report now includes a section on climate change which will outline the work the transport unit is undertaking to help council meet its climate change obligations.

3. Staff Recommendations
   That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:
   1. Receive the information in the attached report.
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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.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Report
The purpose of this report is to update the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment (ITE) Committee on the activities of the Transport Unit. The report details current network performance metrics together with a status update on major projects, maintenance and operations, and strategic transport.

2 Network Performance
2.1 Percentage of network affected by TMP:
The percentage of network affected by TMPs continues to indicate a long-term gradually reducing trend.

2.2 Monthly Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes:
CAS data indicates monthly variation but not a definitively changing long-term trend in accidents for the last 12 months. This may reflect seasonal variation. The last month’s data may not be complete as NZTA’s target to process fatal and serious injury crashes is 1 day and 1 month respectively.
2.3 Christchurch Transport Operations Centre (CTOC)

June 2019 Dashboard: In general, all of the peak periods’ network performance have improved from last month. Data for the last route in Chart F2 (next page) has been missing for several months now, which results in its performance looking worse than reality. The Belfast to Central Business District route has deteriorated this month, likely impacted by Christchurch Northern Corridor roadworks. Public transport delays in June for all peak periods stayed relatively the same as the previous month. Public transport stop reliability improved for all peak periods.
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3  Major Projects

3.1  General

Construction is continuing in the new financial year on a number of key projects across the city. Highlights include:

- Works along Riccarton Road are progressing well with renewal of the sewer main well underway. Communication and engagement with stakeholders by Christchurch City Council and Fulton Hogan is ongoing and a high priority.
- Sumner Village upgrade started in March and is continuing to progress well. The contractor is regularly engaging with local businesses and the community and encouraging people to call into their site office weekly to discuss any issues they may have.
- Works on the Coastal Pathway between Sumner Surf Lifesaving Club and Shag Rock are progressing well with the rock revetment works on the construction of the shared pathway now well underway.
- Work is progressing well on MCR Quarrymans Trail (Halswell to Victors Road) and MCR Heathcote Expressway in Ferry Road are nearing completion. The contractors are regularly engaging with local stakeholders.
- Work has been completed on the new signalised crossing outside Te Waka Unua School in Ferry Road and the crossing is operational.

3.2  Major Cycleway Routes Programme (MCR)

The status of the 13 MCR routes is:

- three open: Little River Link, Uni Cycle, Papanui Parallel
- three partly open: Quarrymans Trail, Heathcote Expressway and Rapanui to Shag Rock
- two sections under construction
- detailed design is being undertaken on one route and a section of another route

The rest are in various stages of development as below:

**Avon - Otakaro Route**
The early stages of route selection and definition have been undertaken and is pending decisions on the regeneration plan. Funding for the project is scheduled for 2025.

**Heathcote Expressway Route**

- Charles Street to the Tannery is largely completed, with the Cumnor Terrace section progressing. Ferry Road between Fitzgerald Avenue and Moorhouse Avenue is under construction and is scheduled for completion in August.
- Heathcote Stage 2 from the Tannery to Martindales Road is programmed for construction in FY20. One section of Cumnor Terrace requires additional consultation for a proposed one-way treatment.

**Nor’West Arc Route**

- Detailed design is completed for section 1 (Cashmere Road to Hillmorton) and section 2 (Hillmorton to University). Funding is allocated for 2020 through 2026 for construction. Tendering for the first section will be underway in September.
- Section 3 is in the early stages of route selection/definition. Route selection early in the overall programme delivery cycle is important to ensure that interconnected routes all meet at logical points.

Transport Unit Bi-Monthly Report —
Northern Line Route
- Detailed design is completed.
- A small section along Restell Street has been constructed. This connects two existing sections of the cycleway and completes the link between Harewood Road and Langdons Road.
- The remainder of the route is progressing with KiwiRail to agree land access and design issues; this is ongoing.

Opaawaho River Route
No work has started on this route. The team is working with the Land Drainage project to ensure design solutions are integrated. A preliminary route selection will be undertaken soon.

Papanui Parallel Route
This route is approximately 5.5 kilometres and is complete with construction on the last small section in Grassmere Street now completed following purchase of the land for the cycleway.

Quarrymans Trail
Construction has completed for section 1 (Moorhouse Avenue to Victors Road). Section 2 is in construction and planned for completion in September.

Rapanui - Shag Rock Route
Delivery of this project is in three sections:
- Section 1 (Fitzgerald Avenue to Aldwins Road) opened in December 2017.
- Section 2 (Aldwins Road to Dyers Road) opened on 13 July 2018.
- Section 3 (Dyers Road to Ferry Road): Route assessment, scheme design and consultation are completed and the route was approved in March 2017 by the ITE Committee for design and construction. Progress is currently pending the need for a resource consent with required environmental studies and appropriate peer reviews.

South Express Route
This route is now progressing with detail design and was approved by the ITE Committee on 22 July 2019.

Southern Lights Route
Scheme design is completed but consultation with the community is yet to occur.

Wheels to Wings Route
Route selection is completed and undertaking preliminary scheme design to confirm the facility type.

3.3 Travel Demand Management and Road Safety Education

Cycle Safe
The Cycle Safe schools programme completed 2019 with 3,533 students taking part and 100% school satisfaction. Cycle Safe is a two-day course run at schools. The team has begun increasing the proportion of the course that is conducted on-road, in alignment with national “BikeReady” recommendations.

School travel planning
Ao Tawhiti, Shirley Boys and Avonside Girls’ schools have completed travel plans and progress will be monitored. Focus continues to be on schools moving locations or with major rebuild programmes. Currently this includes Redcliffs, Wharenu, Burnside High and Banks Avenue Schools.

Workplace travel planning & cycling promotion
The Council-led City Travel Planning programme has been delivered to staff at CDHB and Yoobee School of Design. The team plans to work with Spark, Pegasus Health, Verizon Connect and Riverside Market in the coming months, with more engagements planned with CDHB. The project’s 2019 financial year
delivery targets for new customers and re-engagements were all met. City Travel Planning is a Greater Christchurch Partnership initiative.

**Road safety education**

Council’s Road Safety Education programme is prioritised in the annual Christchurch City Road Safety Action Plan.

Council has recently launched a new road safety campaign “Onto it at intersections”. The campaign covers known local issues that relate to crashes at intersections, including driver distraction and yellow/red light running. Channels include outdoor media, online and radio. The campaign’s activity is primarily over July and August, with focus moving to education for motorcyclists and active travel from spring.

### 3.4 Riccarton Road Bus Priority

Works to replace the sewer main and water main continues with good progress being achieved by the contractor. The installed hoardings are proving to be a positive safety aspect of the works. They provide a substantial barrier protecting workers and construction plant from potential clashes with traffic. They also provide a barrier to pedestrians who may attempt an unsafe crossing of the road through the construction site (had the hoardings not been in place). The hoardings are covered with printed Council artwork and contain messaging to inform the public that businesses are open, directions to parking areas for shoppers, other wayfinding messages, etc. An innovation from the contractor was to include a progress line on the hoardings providing the public with up to date information on the overall progress of the works.

The water main replacement crossing Matipo Street remains outstanding pending approval of the temporary traffic management plan. The details of the temporary traffic management plan are being finalized and we are discussing the potential impacts with major stakeholders.

Fulton Hogan and Council staff continue to have regular drop-in sessions with the community. These sessions are structured to inform the community of the progress of the work, upcoming changes to construction activities, changes to temporary traffic management, and answer questions raised by the community regarding the construction works. Stakeholders attending these drop-in sessions have been complimentary about the progress of the works and have expressed appreciation of the high level of communication. Fulton Hogan’s communications team also makes daily visits to businesses to deal with any day to day issues or concerns that may arise.

### 3.5 Central City Projects
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Antigua Street
Investigations are underway to look at the option of including the installation of interim cycle facilities as a temporary solution during the period of the Metro Sports Facility construction.

Colombo Street
The project is looking to provide cycle infrastructure between Bealey Avenue and Kilmore Street to connect the Papanui Parallel Major Cycleway Route to the cycling infrastructure in the Central Business District. Draft schemes have been completed and some additional options are currently being investigated as to how they could provide more amenity. It is expected this additional work will complete in August.

Ferry Road
This project has re-commenced. Initial issues engagement was undertaken with key stakeholders in May 2019. A revised scheme plan is currently undergoing a road safety audit. Staff will provide a briefing to the Committee and relevant Community Board prior to public consultation.

Hereford Street (Manchester – Oxford)
Detailed design of the Hereford Street Upgrade has continued. Further site investigation work has been completed to inform the design. The current programme indicates completion of the project being late 2020.

High Street (Hereford – St Asaph) and Tram Extension – High Street
Public consultation on the scheme plan finished on 10 June 2019. A Hearings Panel will consider submissions at its meeting on 15 August 2019.

Slow Core
Implementation on this project is completed.

St Asaph Street
A memorandum will be submitted to the Committee and Council outlining recommendations for improvements to St Asaph Street. This will also include recommendations from staff related to urban design improvements and upcoming maintenance.

Victoria Street
Re-engagement with stakeholders has been completed. A report on the outcomes of the re-engagement will be presented to the Committee on 7 August 2019.

Wayfinding
- Installation of four Variable Messaging Signs that display live carpark data is anticipated in the second quarter of this financial year.
- City-wide vehicular Advanced Directional Signs detailed design is complete. Staff are looking to expedite installation in the four avenues.
- A cultural and heritage wayfinding strategy is being developed.
- Cycle wayfinding is currently in detailed design.
- Additional wayfinding plinths will be delivered this financial year.

3.6 Sumner Corridor

City Side
All of the works are complete at Wakefield Avenue, Moa Bone Cave and in Shag Rock Reserve. On Deans Head, the risk reduction works were completed approximately two years ago but a small retaining wall was required below #32 and #36 Kinsey Terrace to prevent future undermining of the cut face. This retaining wall construction is currently underway and completion by December is expected. This is a 50:50 cost share with LINZ who are managing the works.
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Lyttelton Side
Works are complete and the road is open for public use. Transition continues back to pre-earthquake usage of Sumner Road by the public and heavy vehicles that previously used night-time tunnel closures provided by NZTA.

Preparations are underway for planting fifteen thousand native plants above Sumner Road as required by resource consents.

3.7 Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC)

NZTA has approved the inclusion of a HOV lane, which will be in one of the southbound lanes commencing north of the Waimakiriri Bridge through to south of the QEII interchange. It includes the widening of the existing Waimakariri Bridge to provide for a third northbound lane and a third southbound lane.

Over the last three months with the mild winter, there has been good progress across the site:
- Widening of the Waimakariri Bridge with 18 of a total 34 bridge spans in place and a new concrete bridge deck poured over 16 of the spans.
- Construction of the shared use path and shaping of swales and bunds including planting.
- Removal of surcharge fill material is progressing now that most settlement targets are being achieved.
- Pavement construction is now on hold until September.
- Each of the eight new bridges are at various stages of construction; Belfast Road overbridge is open to traffic.
- A new pedestrian/cycle underpass at Winters Road and extensions to the existing underpasses at Grimseys Road and Hills Road are now open.
- QEII Drive traffic has shifted onto the new pavement on the north side to allow for construction of the southern side lanes, which is progressing well.
- At the Hills Road end of QEII Drive, construction is progressing on the conversion from two to four lanes through to east of the QEII Drive/Innes Road roundabout.
- Mercury contaminated soil has been located in the South-West Retention pond areas of the Cranford Basin and has had to be removed.
- The left out lane of traffic from Philpotts Road and Grimseys Road to QEII Drive is now operating successfully.
- Progress continues along Cranford Street with the reconstruction of kerbs, footpaths and associated works with a concentration on the Cranford/Innes Road intersection area. The challenge here is fitting the new drainage items in and around the existing utilities.

Council continues to progress the work on the downstream effects with further consultation on the proposed transport projects being consulted on until 19 August.

3.8 Coastal Pathway

Fulton Hogan is progressing well with construction of the section of the Coastal Pathway between Shag Rock and Sumner Surf Life Saving Club. Work started on site on 15 October 2018, and a 12-month construction programme is anticipated. Works over the last two months include:
- Commencement of the footpath connection between the wooden boardwalk and Memorial Walkway.
- Completion of the wooden boardwalk between Memorial Walkway and along in front of the Sumner Surf Lifesaving Club.
- Installation of the pre-cast concrete panel at the Sumner Surf Lifesaving Club.
- Continuation of the shared pathway construction, including installation of heritage lights, along the length of the project.
- Continuation of stormwater and drainage work along the length of the project.
- Completion of stone cutting for the three sets of concrete steps between the shared path and the beach.
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• Installation of handrails on the three sets of wooden steps between the shared path and the beach in front of the car park.
• Commencement of landscape planting along the rock revetment.
• Site tidy up and removal from the Bridge Street depot. A stockpile of rock remains on site for use by the Estuary Edge project.

Project notices are posted at each end of the construction site, and both the contractor and Council send out regular project updates.

4 Maintenance and Operations

4.1 General

• Budgets and forecast spend profiles have been distributed to the contractors for the financial year 2019/20 and a Council consistent reporting structure developed to ensure better transparency of spend and commitments.
• Holding strategies will increasingly be deployed to maintain the network, essential waterproofing to prevent and slow down further deterioration of the asset.
• In financial year 2018/19 double the length of footpath renewals were delivered compared to financial year 2017/18. There is capacity for more in financial year 2019/20 and we will deliver approximately 35km.
• A far more significant proportion of the overall road maintenance budget has been allocated, within the respective bottom line, to pre-seal repairs; $2.3 million or 23.5% of carriageway spend (versus 8.0% in financial year 2018/19). This is necessary to enable a larger chip-seal renewal programme. The tension on repairs is also increased to achieve the greatest coverage appropriate for the hierarchy/use of the road.

4.2 Maintenance (OPEX)

Opex budgets for financial year 2019/20 do not facilitate much leeway to improve the network and are just maintaining the status quo. The winter weather will be a big determinant in how the network holds together. A wet winter with frequent frosts will create a high level of failures that will quickly get worse. The lack of waterproofing, directly linked to the minimal levels of resurfacing undertaken since 2011, means that our assets are far more volatile to predict, and failures progress far more rapidly.

The allocation of a greater amount of funding for pre-seals to deliver a larger chip-seal programme does put pressure on business as usual ‘running’ repairs. Similarly, the overall budget pressure has meant that contingencies for small weather events cannot be carried. Such money has to be allocated to cover basics.

There will continue to be a high focus on good basic drainage maintenance across the network, including the rural network, clearing/re-instating table drainage, leaf collection, sump cleaning and sweeping.

The results of Council’s auditing of works and impact on measuring contract performance has meant that we have deducted dollars from many of the contractors to generate the required performance.

Through winter, the focus is on prioritising and monitoring areas most at risk due to increased rainfall. Our ability to be proactive in this space is limited due to funding and inability to carry out adequate permanent repairs due to cool, damp conditions.

Core services, potholes, sweeping, cleaning sumps, make safe response, and inspecting jobs/CSRs remains the core focus for performance monitoring.
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4.3 Maintenance (CAPEX)

Carriageway Resurfacing
The 2018/19 programme has been delivered. Staff have finalised the 2019/20 programme and issued this to Council’s maintenance contractors. Works will be scheduled for the summer construction season and pre-seals (i.e. advance repairs) can be planned/undertaken similarly.

The 2019/20 programme focuses on maintaining waterproofing, aiming to maintain asset integrity. We address roughness (i.e. smoothing) issues in the most pressing cases. The programme will deliver approximately 15km of asphalt and 70km of chip-seal; (based on the 2018 LTP budgets).

Council has a three-year forward programme, which is available in map form on the public website via the following link. This will be updated to reflect the 2019/20 sites.


Footpath Renewals

Footpath Renewals

The 2019/20 programme has been finalised and issued, and will be updated via the map on the public website. The key focus has been areas with significant trip hazards, cracking, tree roots, or vehicle crossing issues. High activity (schools, malls) and vulnerable user (elderly, school-children) use remains the higher priority. Approximately 30km of footpath will be delivered.

4.4 Parking Operations

On 1 July 2019, the maximum daily-capped parking rate at Lichfield Street Car Parking Building increased from $10 per day to $15 per day. This was to provide some additional short-stay capacity within the building to further support the Retail Precinct.

In the months prior to the increase, the average number of parkers staying for six or more hours was around 460 per day. Since 1 July, this number has almost halved to 240 per day.

5 Climate Change

The Transport Unit is taking a proactive approach to assisting the organisation in meeting its climate change goals. The Unit is setting up a Transport Environment Working Group that is a staff-led working group that will inform and guide the Unit on initiatives that will assist the organisation to meet its climate change goals.

Other initiatives undertaken by the Transport Unit include:
• support for electric vehicles through provision of chargers in Lichfield St Parking Building and in Akaroa
• LED streetlight replacement
• new bus stop seats are now made from recycled plastic
• over 50% reduction in its use of glyphosate
• ongoing support of active modes through provision of safe infrastructure
• travel demand management initiatives.
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6 Strategic Transport

6.1 Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan (CTSP)

The CTSP is under review, with the intention of updating the document to align more closely with the key themes of the 2018 Government Policy Statement on Land Transport: integration of transport and land use, technology and mode neutrality. The updated CTSP will also align with the Christchurch Spatial Plan and PT Futures business case. Staff expect to report a draft Plan to the ITE Committee mid-2020.

6.2 Central City Parking Policy

The Central City Parking Policy project scope is being developed, investigating the current issues, engaging key stakeholders for early input into a draft policy.

6.3 Public Transport Futures Business Case

This is a joint project between Council, ECan, Selwyn District Council, Waimakiriri District Council and NZTA. It is currently being carried out under the oversight of the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee.

The first stage of the NZTA’s business case process, the ‘Programme Business Case’ (PBC), was completed in 2018. The PBC drew on all the significant investigations done over the past few years on the future of public transport in Greater Christchurch, as well as collating new data and drawing on wider stakeholder and Elected Member input. The PBC concluded by identifying three main ‘packages’ to be progressed to the next stage:

- **The Mass Rapid Transit** will explore route and mode options for a future Mass Rapid Transport system (e.g. heavy rail, light rail, and/or bus ways, or other emerging technologies).
- **The PT Foundations** package will explore options for significantly improving the existing network of ‘core’ public transport routes/services with a view to achieving a transformational level of patronage growth.
- **The Rest of Network** will explore options for providing public transport on the remainder of the network.

A Steering Group of transport managers across the relevant partners has been established to lead the next phases.

The Steering Group is considering recommending combining the ‘PT Foundations’ and ‘Rest of Network’ packages into one business case stream, while progressing the Mass Rapid Transit package as a distinct project (to be closely integrated with Council’s future strategic land-use planning).

The next phases of the process have been launched, called the ‘Indicative’ and ‘Detailed’ Business Cases, in which the three broad packages identified in the PBC will begin more detailed investigations into options. The outcome of this work will be a set of preferred options and a timeline for delivery for both Mass Rapid Transit and Foundations/Rest of Network that the stakeholders agree on and can commit to progressing to implementation.

The next step is a scoping workshop (scheduled for early August) for the partners to agree the specifics of what will be included in the next phase of investigations. It is envisaged the scope will include (but not be limited to):

- Preferred routing, mode choice, indicative costs and implementation timeline for a Mass Rapid Transit system in Greater Christchurch, including integration with future land-use patterns.
- Analysis of bus service frequencies, vehicle types, routes, journey time and reliability improvements, passenger facilities, public perception issues, and options for transformational levels of improvement across all these areas.
- Travel Demand Management options.
- Innovations for reducing emissions and providing service in difficult to serve areas.
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In anticipation of this, Council transport specialists are well underway gathering and analysing key data and information about the public transport network and issues/options for significantly improving the system.

Completion of the key aspects of the work is planned in time for consideration in the 2021 Long Term Plan. Input from Elected Members and key stakeholders will be sought at workshops and via the PT Committee.

6.4 Brougham Street/Moorhouse Business Case

This is a joint project that is underway between Council and NZTA looking at these two corridors, the surrounding areas and the corridors that feed into them.

As the first part of the NZTA’s business case process, the draft Strategic Case report was prepared and circulated among stakeholders for comments and is currently being updated.

The next phase of the business case is development of the economic case, looking at developing options:

- Two workshops with key stakeholders are completed and six packages were developed focussing on optimisations, travel demand management measures and infrastructure upgrades.
- All six packages were recently evaluated considering agreed investment objectives, social, cultural, environmental and economic criteria.
- Travel demand management (public transport and other alternative modes), community liveability and infrastructure upgrade packages have been selected as the preferred packages and will be developed in detail as part of the next stage.