

Full Name:	Organisation (if applicable):	What are your overall comments on the Accessible City draft chapter?	Are there any proposals in the draft Accessible City chapter that you particularly like?	Are there any proposals in the draft Accessible City chapter that you particularly dislike?	Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Accessible City chapter?	Please remove my name from my comment before it is released and record it as 'anonymous' in the summary of comments.
Chris Abbott	ABBOTT HOUSE SUMNER B&B	Principles look good	Emphasis on biking and walking over cars.		The devil will be in the detail of encouraging cyclists and walkers to come into and around the city centre. Predictable phasing of lights will help, as will AUTOMATIC cycle sensors to inform light phasing so that cyclists do not need to stop and press a crossing button (such as from Hagley Park to Fendalton Rd). <input type="checkbox"/> Plastic separation posts to keep cyclists and motorists apart help, and are non-confrontational	
Dr. Susan Krumdieck	Advanced Energy and Material Systems Lab, University of Canterbury	The title is "Accessible City" - but there are no real metrics of accessibility. We can all remember how accessible or not the old city was. Can't you calculate the accessibility for different activities for the old city, and then again for this plan or for variations of it to show how this city plan is actually more accessible? Abley Transportation and the University have developed and used for other cities an accessibility model that can easily be developed with data for the re-development plan and they have the GIS data from the old city. This needs to be supported with analytical analysis. <input type="checkbox"/>	Addressing the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. That is essential as the demand for walking and cycling should be high if the residential areas are built, and as fuel prices will continue to be high and higher. However, the vision seems to have a very large number of trees in the mobility areas. This is ok as long as the ground level design is very careful. All those trees mean limited visibility between people moving in different modes. Lots of trees is fine as long as everyone is walking. But if walkers have to be mixed with bus and bike and car, then the points of their intersection need to be very carefully designed and - unfortunately for accessibility - limited. Don't try to make every street everything for all modes. A walking street is a walking street.	Parking. You want to make some areas slow and basically make them more useful to people by moving the cars to the main flow paths. That is fine. BUT - the cars will go where ever they are allowed if they think it will get them to their destination. So - you will have high numbers of cars trying to squeeze down the streets that are supposed to discourage them BECAUSE you have put the parking there! The parking should ALL be directly on the main distributor streets. It is only 500 m from the main distributors to the centre. You are aware that all major airports expect people to be able to walk at least a km? Put one big parking structure on each Montreal, Durham, Madras, Barbados, Tuam, Kilmore. These Super Parks have a whole floor for parking of bikes and where one can rent a bike (as in most nice cities) and where one can rent a small push cart (Kiwi designed) if shopping is your day, or if you have a load to carry to work. If you work in the city, then you can drive to one of the Super Parks (ok, you don't have any other option) pick up your bike from the bike park and ride the rest of the 1 km max, or walk. All the streets are going to have these covered walkways anyway, and it is this foot traffic that generates business. It is old-school thinking that you have to have car parks everywhere. These carparks become the attractor and so you have traffic everywhere.	Transport is all about going between origins and destinations. Where are all the people coming from and going to? Again, I think you need some analytical treatment here. If there is going to be more living in the CBD, then it totally changes the travel demand patterns from the old city pattern. Call Stacy Rendall, he can model this for you.	
Ritchie Wilson	Beckenham Neighbourhood Association	A positive approach to making central Christchurch a more attractive place to visit.	The proposals to make cycling in the city safer and more pleasant in the transition phase between the present heavy personal car use and the future mix of far fewer cars, more public transport and greatly increased bicycle use. <input type="checkbox"/> The obvious presence of street-trees in the illustrations is pleasing. This has been beneficial in other cities in making them more attractive to visitors and residences.	No	1. Covered bicycle storage in many parts of the city <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Trees on all city streets. <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Kiosks selling papers, magazines, fast food, flowers etc etc open until very late at night to provide a presence on all streets, especially at night, to make entering the city at night safer by stopping unobserved attacks. As in Melbourne the kiosk operators would need a licence to operate which obliges them to be open until, say, 11.30pm.	
Kenny Corrigan	Canterbury Branch NZCF	We like the plan but are aware that it is effectively a 'wish list' at present and funding will be required. However, there is an opportunity to expect with some of the anchor projects, the cost could be shared.	Attempting to keep main traffic flows along the existing one way streets. <input type="checkbox"/> The key will be ensuring the pasing of traffic lights is monitored as the volumes are likely to increase and 'grid lock' is a possibility doesn't portray the right image to visitors !!		We believe that there is an opportunity to get better utilisation from the existing Tram which hasn't been highlighted in the plan. Whilst it is recognised as a tourist attraction, greater efficiencies could be achieved by strategically locating car parking adjacent to the Tram route. This would encourage customers to park at one location and if they needed to visit other areas, they could take the tram. This may require adjustment to price structure to promote CHCH residents to ensure better 'take up' but minimise drivers travelling from precinct to precinct when there is an infrastructure already in place. <input type="checkbox"/> Would be great to see the introduction of 'Park & Ride', using hopper buses.	
Phil Ashton	CDHB				Riccarton ave to be part of the cycle route to the hospital	
Paul Lonsdale	Central City Business Association	We have spoken with Michael Blyleven and he has given the business association until Monday to submit due to a meeting he attended with the association on Thursday.				
Stuart Waddell	CHILL Studio & Inner City Resident	The slow 30km zones are very positive and the focus of the plan around the inner city core is a priority for ensuring safe people access in the inner city. However, local inner city residents in the areas connecting to the main distributors have not been considered and remain a risk when walking and cycling, such as around Montreal St and Durham St (North).	Designated cycle ways with kerbs protecting cyclists from vehicle traffic and pedestrians are good for main cycle routes. Mixed use pedestrian and cycle ways are also good on other streets, and could be extended for safer access on the main distributors (Durham / Montreal/ Madras / Barbados).	The designated bus route down Victoria St is not necessary given use of Montreal and Durham St (North) as main distributors. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Both Montreal and Durham (and the other main distributors) require consideration for cyclists. Similarly there is not recognition of safe cycle trails on the 4 Avenues. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The main distributors run fast and busy, they break the city and its people up particularly for inner city residents, and more needs to be done to put people first.	The main distributors remain high risk for people using them on foot and bicycle, there needs to be 'safe' access for cyclists on these roads and consideration of pedestrians. Suggest a specific cycle lane with protected kerbs or mixed use foot/cycle paths. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 40kms speed zone through the rest of the inner city, inside the 4 Avenues. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Cyclists travel across town, more so now than prior to the Feb earthquake, to get to work, sport, shop etc. A safe cycle lane with kerbs or mix use foot/cycle path on each of the 4 Avenues would be a good initiative and worthy of including in 'An Accessible City'	
Derek Andrew Anderson	Christchurch Heritage Ltd	Support in principle but the one way streets will severely disadvantage commercial activity in or near the frame.	The pedestrian friendly core area	See above - the oneway streets are a real setback.	There is no provision for a parking building in behind the Lower High Street area which is the SE gateway whereas Victoria Street(northern gateway) has provision for one - why the difference?	
Fiona Haynes - Director - Learning Environments	Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology	Over all the plan is admirable. There are a number of aspects that increase ease of access to the CPIT Madras street campus. <input type="checkbox"/> Increased cycle accessibility is an advantage to CPIT students. It is disappointing that neither Madras Street nor Barbadoes Street has been changed to Two-way traffic. This continues to cause restrictions in on-site movement.	The location of the bus exchange in Tuam Street could encourage more students to use public transport. Being able to access the Madras Street campus diagonally through the Green frame is excellent. <input type="checkbox"/> A positive and pro-active approach to signage around the city is excellent.	The retention of one-way streets is a concern. The change of Tuam Street to One-way has the potential for problems around the bus exchange if it is set up in a similar way to that used when the exchange was in Lichfield Street.	It is evident that the majority of car parks are locate in the north and West of the CBD. CPIT would be interested in discussion of a partnership approach to further parking in the South East in proximity to the Madras Street campus.	

Janet Reeves	Context Urban Design	Clearly and concisely presented			Under Policy 7.9.7. Central City Lanes - I would like to see further reference to what is appropriate and more supporting assessment matters. I am concerned that there could be a conflict between encouragement of lanes and CPTED principles. The words 'where appropriate' need further explanation. The assessment matter 3.2.25 relates only to height and width of lanes (I do not know if there is any means of assessing the suitability of lanes anywhere else in the plan provisions). It is important that lanes are only created where there is likely to be sufficient activity and overlooking at all times of day and night (or they can be closed off when not busy). Successful lanes rely on high levels of activity and there is a real danger of creating too many lanes and spreading street activity too thinly.	
Max Robitzsch	Cycle Action Auckland	It is a good document - we hope the particular positive sides (as discussed above) will be brought through to be constructed. It seems however to lack a bit in thought about how the city core is connected to the outer suburbs. Few designs are shown (or considered?) more than 1-2 km outwards.	The proposals to improve cycling. We support the proposals for high-quality cycle routes into and around the city. We suggest that the "rumble strip" design for cycle lanes shown in the plan is not sufficient to really provide the safety and comfort cycling in Christchurch should have - please provide a kerb-protected / Copenhagen Cycle lane model wherever possible (or provide good-quality off-road paths). We support the traffic calming (speed reduction) in the central city.	There should be less emphasis on car parking, especially car parking buildings.	More thought about the mid-distance connections, especially to ensure good cycling connections from surrounding residential suburbs into the city centre.	
Philip Haythornthwaite	Disabled Persons Assembly	Good. HOWEVER, MY SUBMISSION IS NOT YET COMPLETED AND I WOULD BE GRATEFUL FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEKEND TO COMPLETE IT.				
Therese Minehan (Chair)	ICON inner city west neighbourhood inc	Christchurch Central Recovery Plan: Draft for consultation "an accessible city" 1. Public transport (p 14, 15): The network is designed towards the east of the center of the city rather than central which is remote from the icon area. "Initiative .. reintroducing shuttle services" (p 14) is to be supported and encouraged as soon as possible. It is noted that while Walking is encouraged, the size and scope of the inner-city living area / central city, is vast and beyond walking distances, particularly for elderly and disabled. Public transport for these people is vitally important. 2. Walking (p 8, 9): This to be supported and given greater importance. Separation between vehicles and pedestrians is essential. 3. Car Travel / distributor streets (p 16, 17): ICON expresses concern over the continued use of Montreal / Durham Sts as distributor roads. The amount of heavy vehicles and speeding thru traffic remains conflicting with residential zone. 4. Road rebuild: It is a concern that roads / services are progressively being repaired, without co-ordination or cost understanding. Roadworks are often reworked many times before completion. Co-ordination is required to achieve a satisfactory completion.	Iconic strongly supports making the core a pedestrian priority area. We also support the siting of parking buildings within the centre of blocks.	We are opposed to the site chosen for the bus interchange which involves the demolition of the heritage listed former City Council Offices and possible threat to several heritage buildings on Lichfield. The present bus exchange is located just across Colombo St from the proposed site and contains no buildings of heritage value. There is no apparent justification for shifting the site a block to the east. It would be only marginally less close to the proposed stadium whereas the present location is closer to the hospital and to the proposed Metro sports facility, both of which would generate more regular bus use than the stadium. CCDU director Warren Isaacs is quoted in the Press (15 November 2012) as saying that Manchester St and Tuam St will be widened, though this does not seem to be clearly stated in the plan. Iconic is greatly concerned at the impact that any such widening could have on the future of surviving heritage buildings on either of those streets, which include the Category 1 Trinity Congregational Church, the retained facade of the Excelsior, the Majestic Theatre building, the facade of the Odeon Theatre and the Lawrie and Wilson building. IConIC totally opposes any widening which would threaten these buildings.	Consideration needs to be given to the potential for future development of commuter train services from outlying centres such as Rolleston and Rangiora in the longer term and how that would link with the network set out in this plan.	
Lynne Lochhead	IConIC	IConIC supports the increased emphasis on cycling and walking with the accompanying reduction in speed limits and the proposed enhancement of the streets with a high standard of landscaping and surface treatment.	Iconic strongly supports making the core a pedestrian priority area. We also support the siting of parking buildings within the centre of blocks.	We are opposed to the site chosen for the bus interchange which involves the demolition of the heritage listed former City Council Offices and possible threat to several heritage buildings on Lichfield. The present bus exchange is located just across Colombo St from the proposed site and contains no buildings of heritage value. There is no apparent justification for shifting the site a block to the east. It would be only marginally less close to the proposed stadium whereas the present location is closer to the hospital and to the proposed Metro sports facility, both of which would generate more regular bus use than the stadium. CCDU director Warren Isaacs is quoted in the Press (15 November 2012) as saying that Manchester St and Tuam St will be widened, though this does not seem to be clearly stated in the plan. Iconic is greatly concerned at the impact that any such widening could have on the future of surviving heritage buildings on either of those streets, which include the Category 1 Trinity Congregational Church, the retained facade of the Excelsior, the Majestic Theatre building, the facade of the Odeon Theatre and the Lawrie and Wilson building. IConIC totally opposes any widening which would threaten these buildings.	Consideration needs to be given to the potential for future development of commuter train services from outlying centres such as Rolleston and Rangiora in the longer term and how that would link with the network set out in this plan.	

<p>Monica Reedy, Jenny Smith, Raylee Kane, Frank Lad</p>	<p>Inner City East Neighbourhood Group (ICENG)</p>	<p>It is disappointing that the plan has changed so much from the original CCC draft plan. The current edition appears as a pale replacement of the original. It lacks some of the creative options that were proposed originally, and it seriously lacks community input. We are particularly concerned that we as affected neighbourhoods and stakeholders, have not been included in developing what is a plan for our neighbourhoods.</p>		<p>1. Bus routes currently run East-West along Cashel, Worcester, Gloucester and Armagh Streets. This provides easy access for residents both to the city and outward suburbs. The routes also service the commuter traffic. The new plan limits access to buses and funnels them along only two congested streets, Gloucester and Hereford (not currently a bus route). For many years this community has opposed bus route changes that limit access, and we continue to do so. A further concern is the plan for many buses on a widened Manchester Street while there is no apparent plan to widen the bridge. This is potentially hazardous to cycles and foot traffic. □ 2. We are opposed to the retention of the one-way system on Barbadoes and Madras streets. Two-way streets enhance the living environment. An overall aim of planning post-earthquake must be to attract people into the inner city to live and work. This plan potentially creates three sets of "traffic drains" in the one-way designations: two sets run north-south, Madras and Barbadoes, and Durham and Montreal; the other set runs east-west, St Asaph and Tuam. However there is no clear indication about how traffic can be shared within the four avenues. There are no east-west roads off Madras from Tuam all the way to Hereford. Moreover, the outlet off Tuam Street traffic hits a wall at Fitzgerald Avenue - another funnel. The only possibilities are left on Fitz or the dogleg onward onto Tuam. Flow here is extremely limited. We suggest this is retrograde, and will spill traffic onto other streets such as Stanmore Road. The reduction of on-street car parking if these streets remain one-way will further erode the living environment for residents and visitors. □ 3 We are concerned that there is no apparent planning for on-site parking for the Anglican Cathedral and the proposed Stadium. Latimer Square must not become a car park even for special events.</p>	<p>We fully accept the inner city east is a buffer zone between the CBD and the suburbs. Our overall aim is that the traffic and buses should be fairly combed through the neighbourhood rather than funneled down a couple of streets. Prior to the earthquake we had a vibrant shopping centre at Stanmore Road connected to all residents in the area and serving as a community hub for residents and workers. We are concerned that this plan does not take account of the existing community and will chop up the neighbourhood rather than connect it. There are no apparent ideas or concepts to attract people to inner city living. The plan is overly car-focused, and does not take enough account of the residential aspects of the neighbourhood. □</p>	
<p>John Brouwer</p>	<p>Knox Presbyterian Church</p>				<p>Knox Church would like to see the small lane between the Church complex and the car park, "Knox Lane", also made a fixed 30kph zone. □ The CCC had already previously provided for a 30 sign at the lane entry/exit with Bealey Avenue but this was removed by vandals pre quake. □ The 30 limit is important for safety of person moving between church and carpark, many elderly and forgetful. This lane is only for entry and exit to carparks at the end of the lane and a 30 limit is no burden. There is limited visibility.</p>	
<p>Meg Christie</p>	<p>Living Streets Aotearoa</p>	<p>Feedback from Share an Idea asked for a sustainable green city with good active and public transport, good retail experience and cafes and a green city. We feel this plan delivers on all these. Congratulations! Living Streets hopes you will take up our suggestions below of how to better deliver these hopes and aspirations.</p>	<p>There is much to like in it regarding pedestrian needs: □ •Having priority streets for walking and public transport. We would like to see these extended further within the central city network and beyond □ •The 30km an hour slow core. For safety, speed really does matter: only 5% of pedestrians would die if struck by a vehicle travelling at 30kph or less where as at 50 kph the chance of a fatal injury is 40% □ •Pedestrian paths along the Avon. Please build these to allow comfortable distance between vulnerable people on foot/on small wheels and people on bikes who generally travel faster □ •Improved way-finding signage. We look forward to seeing more signage on the streets and in large parks such as Hagley Park. This is long overdue □ •Encouraging through traffic to the four avenues. Done well, this will create a more pleasant walking environment for people on foot within the four avenues. □ □</p>	<p>•We feel that the plan, while addressing walking, cycling and public transport, continues to portray private vehicle transport as the dominant mode and will result in continuing our populations' dependence on it. Unfortunately this plan makes it too easy for people to use their private car to get anywhere they need to go (the emphasis on the 16 inner city car parking being a case in point). We need to shift this mindset and create urban design that makes walking, using public transport and cycling the easy and convenient choices- for economic reasons, health, the environment and people's ongoing resilience from an early age right up until advanced age. □ □ •We found the plan potentially weak on delivering an accessible city to people with disabilities. While it addresses some of issues around those with mobility restrictions there was little other regard for people with visual and hearing impairment. Creating a walking environment that is excellent for people with disabilities will ensure a superb experience for everyone on foot. □ □ •For those longer trips, we support any plans that encourage people to travel by bike. We are concerned at the plan's view that distributor streets will not always provide for people on bikes. □ □ •We are very keen to see less on-road car parking, especially in low speed routes. These areas will possibly be congested with people on bikes and vehicular traffic- an unpleasant experience for pedestrians. □ □ □ •Building 16 parking buildings is an expensive exercise and sends the message that taking a car into the CBD is convenient. □</p>	<p>•Living Streets would like to see planners try something different for Christchurch and make it a city where active and public transport really is the easy and obvious choice. We strongly believe that the city's planners and leaders should be using this rebuild opportunity to proactively assist the community in shifting from unhealthy, expensive and unsustainable transport to sustainable, healthy, active transport options. We have near perfect topography and climate for this. □ □ •We would like to see all the streets designated as walking streets (p4) to be car-free. Evidence from all over the world- and in our own RE-Start Mall- points to these sorts of streets being popular and consequently economically viable. Central city, open malls create a pleasurable experiences for residents who are more inclined to linger, spend and return, and are a draw card to visitors to our city. We would like to see the use of retractable bollards to allow service and emergency vehicles access. □ □ •While we support a slow core in principle, 30 kph will still be fatal for 5% of pedestrians who are hit by vehicular traffic, while dozens more will sustain horrific non-fatal injuries. A true slow core will be one where cars travel at the speed of pedestrians. This will further deter all but those who have no choice but to be driving within this space, while creating a safer environment for the young, the elderly and those with disabilities, particularly those with vision and hearing impairments. □ □ •We would like to see the return of pedestrian Barnes Dances to the busier intersections. □</p>	

<p>Robert Alexander Dewhirst</p>	<p>RDCL</p>	<p>I like the pedestrian friendly, cycle friendly city street concept and the use of tree.</p>			<p>I read the word version of Christchurch Central Recovery Plan - An Accessible City and the Map of the new central city access routes. □ The major gaps that I see in the plan are: □ 1. The central city appears to be treated as an island. The transport links to other important areas are not clear to me. For example the new areas of business (Addington area and near the airport) and the developing shopping area in Sydenham will need good links to the Central City are not mentioned. Also transport links to the airport itself as many visitor will come directly to the central city. There are also probably other important areas that I have not thought of. □ 2. The use of trains is not discussed in the report. Many people will move from CHCH to live in Rolleston and north to Rangiora and also possibly the Darfield area. Many of these people will work in the city many in the CBD and the business area in the Addington area. Many of these people will come to the CBD for shopping, sports, entertainment and to the medical precinct. I think the rail network with a passenger service would be ideal for these people and reduce road users. It should be included in the Recovery plan. □ In summary I feel the plan is too narrow and focused on the CBD alone and does not considered city accessibility on a wider scale or optimise the use of the existing rail network.</p>	
<p>Paul McNoe</p>	<p>Red Bus Ltd</p>	<p>Overall the Accessible City recovery plan is a well considered and forward looking plan that forms a very positive framework for transport recovery within the central city.</p>	<p>•The streetscape proposal for Manchester Street with clear separation between walking, cycling, PT and motor cars. □ □ •RB supports the transport hub concept p13 with set down and pick-up provision for Taxi's and long distance coaches in addition to the primary PT service function. It is our view however that these functions need to be specifically separated from the PT passenger arrival and departure stops to maintain operational efficiency of the PT interchange. Long distance coach travellers typically have baggage which would impinge on PT access if allowed to flow into the interchange. Ideally a separate coach area with baggage capacity would be available adjacent to the coach stops. □ □ •Bus pre-emption is strongly supported at all intersections on PT routes. □</p>	<p>•The lack of bus stops between the interchange and the next superstop at Hospital and Manchester St respectively. While the desire for broad network efficiency is understood and accepted our view is that the customers' needs should take priority within the central city so that customers have good access options to the central city. Older travellers may find the walking distances to long when carrying purchased goods with the proposed limited stops. The current distance between the interchange, Hospital and Manchester St are 840m and 400m respectively. On Manchester Street we suggest in lane stops near Cashel and Armagh Street intersections and near Durham St Cnr on Tuam Street. □ □ •While understanding the rationale for having the Westward return from the interchange along St Asaph street Red Bus proposes a reformation of Tuam Street with no parking with two one way eastbound traffic lanes on the south side and two opposing lane exclusive bus lanes between the hospital Superstop and the interchange. There may also be benefits in extending this street.</p>	<p>•Verandah Clearance on building requirement. In the past building verandahs have created impact hazards for buses and this has been exacerbated by deep gutters and road camber causing buses to lean towards buildings when pulling into bus stops. If double deck buses were ever to be used in Christchurch, which seems very likely, design parameter for roading and building verandahs will be necessary to ensure that bus to building impact hazards are not replicated on any rebuilt or new buildings. □ □ •Turning circle for buses/coaches within the slow centre. Turning areas and corner should provide adequate curvature to allow easy access without impediments or step-outs that require these larger vehicles to cross the centre line to negotiate street corners and intersections. The maximum allowable turn diameter (NZTA) i.e. wall to wall is 25m and a 3 axle urban bus or coach will be very close to this limit (Typically around 24m). □</p>	
<p>Alexander Wright</p>	<p>Smash Palace (Trading as Goodbye Blue Monday Ltd.)</p>	<p>The Plan is bold and as an avid cyclist I am pleased (as Rodger Sutton no doubt is) that there are more provisions for cycling. There are some provisions in the transport plan that I like and some that I think are silly and should be reviewed or dropped altogether.</p>	<p>As I mentioned before, the provisions for more cycleways are pleasing as Christchurch has always been a cycling city due to our flat geography. Better access for pedestrians is also a positive step. I am lukewarm on some of the ideas for bus lanes but overall it's ok. I think having less cars and buses in the "core" will be overall positive.</p>	<p>There are a couple of proposals I dont like. □ 1. The loss of lane ways. I am saddened that many lane ways are going to be lost. One of the things that I love about Melbourne is it's fantastic network of lane ways, it's wonderful to walk down a lane and find a quirky shop or an interesting "hole in the wall" type of bar or restaurant. One of my favourite areas of the city pre-quakes was Poplar Lane and Ash St which had an interesting array of boutique shops and bars/restaurants (Twisted Hop, Vespa Room and Goodbye Blue Monday for example) sadly these businesses will not likely to be able to return as the rents will rise dramatically through the creation of the core.</p>	<p>Provisions for not only cycleways but small electric powered vehicles like Yikebikes and Segways. □ Finally I commend the CCDU for allowing public submissions on the transport plan. I am disappointed that submissions haven't been allowed for the Central City Plan as there are areas of that plan I am not happy with. Ultimately residents, not planners and bureaucrats will make Christchurch a great city again. Organic growth must be allowed to occur as this is what makes cities interesting and not generic like the suburban shopping malls. □ Thank You for this chance to comment on the strategy. □</p>	
<p>Natalie van Looy</p>	<p>Student University of Canterbury</p>	<p>It is an improvement on the original CCRP but it still lacks detail.</p>	<p>Slow zones within the city core. The large number of cycle boulevards leading into the city, particularly that along the Avon-Otakaro river. Cycle and pedestrian priority at intersections and crossings. The encouragement of mixed mode transport e.g bike and bus but buses must be capable of carrying more than two bikes.</p>	<p>The widths of pedestrian and cycle paths are not clearly stated. Neither are the surface types which is particularly important for cyclists as they must provide adequate grip in wet conditions. The assumption private vehicles will increasingly be valued as the primary means of transportation for citizens and the incorporation of that assumption into the plan evidenced in the plan to increase the number of parking facilities. Private vehicle use must be discouraged if we are to achieve sustainability objectives and to ensure the success of public transport initiatives.</p>	<p>The reintroduction of the tram in the core to increase speed between locations with additional trams. Decrease or subsidize the price of the tram to make it affordable for everyone as it is more attractive than the previous yellow shuttle system. Car parking facilities could include cycle lock up facilities and potentially showers or change rooms for commuter cyclists. □ •Extend the cycling route at Kilmore/Fitzgerald/Avonside intersection to the east of Fitzgerald Avenue along Avonside Drive. □ •The proposed two-way Salisbury Street provides a much needed east/west cycle commuter route for the north east corner. The route located on the northern side of the Avon River will be popular with recreational cyclists and should remain. □ •Be certain to provide regular connections to the south side of the Avon River Corridor for easy central city access. The river path must be well connected to the wider cycle network to allow recreational and casual cyclists easy access without having to drive or bus. □ •Further south is probably the busiest cycle route in Christchurch along Armagh Street and through Hagley Park. Designate Armagh St as an east-west cycling route. □ •The proposed contra flow cycle lane on Tuam Street unnecessarily congests pedestrians, cyclists, cars and busses on a 50 km/h arterial. Move the cycle lane to Oxford Terrace and through to Lichfield Street. This easily ties into the cycle routes on High/Ferry, Antigua, and Hagley. □ •Convert the eastern side of Madras to separate contraflow cycle lanes and footpaths with a 30 km/h limit. With CPIT, the stadium and residential planned for this area safety and capacity.</p>	

Meg Christie	The Canterbury District Health Board Bicycles User Group (BUG)	<p>The Canterbury District Health Board Bicycles User Group (CDHB BUG) was established in mid 2012 and currently has 107 members. A key reason we convened was that members were concerned that the rebuild would exclude the needs of people on bikes. We were considerably relieved to see the draft plan does address all transport modes. □</p> <p>Being from the health sector, we have a special interest in wanting to see active transport options made easier. This included people being able to use Public Transport. We realise that the built environment often has more influence on people's ability to have physical activity for optimum health benefit than anything the health service can provide. Therefore we thank the authors of this plan for their contribution to making Christchurch a healthy city in which to live. □</p> <p>We would like Christchurch to be a city where active transport and public transport are the easy and obvious choices. The City's planners and leaders should be using the rebuild to assist the community in shifting from unhealthy, expensive and unsustainable transport to sustainable, healthy, active transport. We have near perfect topography and climate for this. □</p> <p>It is encouraging to see a plan that takes cycling, walking and public transport seriously. How well it accommodates them will be an indicator of how well Christchurch will function as a sustainable, healthy, inclusive, accessible and economically viable city. □</p>	<p>The CDHB BUG strongly supports: □</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •the Central City Road Use Hierarchy (p.4). We like the Plan's proposal for priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport: □ •a 30km/h slow core in the Inner Zone and along the Avon River Precinct (p.6) □ •pedestrian and cycle routes along the Avon and through the Square and in the Frame (pp 8-11) □ •designing intersections along cycling routes to ensure priority and safety for cyclists (p.10) □ •the provision of cycle parking (p.10). We strongly support the proposal to have secure cycle parking at the Bus Interchange and at the "super stops" □ •a "super stop" near the Hospital (pp.13, 14) □ •the encouragement of through-traffic to the four avenues and to one way streets and out of the central city (pp16,17). We support plans to create Tuam Street as a one way street and having Lichfield two way □ •improved way-finding signage around the City, including signage for cycling routes. □ 	<p>The CDBG BUG is concerned that the Plan allows three routes within the slow core to be 50kmph. Speeds of 50km/h will counteract the so called pedestrian friendly core; signposting of speed transitions will add to confusion and clutter. Please keep the entire slow core to 30km/h. □</p> <p>We note the proposal that Tuam Street will be a key road for all four modes. This type of road will not encourage new or unconfident cyclists to ride. □</p> <p>We note on page 18 that "off street parking building will be provided... either on the perimeter of or the outside of the core". However, the map contradicts this with over half of the parking buildings shown in the inner core (p 17). The "Share an Idea" process found that people wanted parking buildings to be on the periphery of the central city. Wherever they are, 16 parking buildings seems an extraordinary number given the clear call to make Christchurch a cycle- and walking friendly city. Making parking too convenient will not encourage people to cycle or take a bus to the central city. We are concerned that so many parking buildings will cause congestion, be expensive to build, maintain and staff, and will militate against the vision of a pedestrian- and cycle-friendly city. □</p> <p>We found the plan potentially weak on making the City accessible to disabled people. While it addresses some of issues around people with mobility restrictions there was little other regard for those with visual or hearing impairment. We should be creating a walking environment with convenient routes and wide footpaths that is excellent for people with disabilities. □</p> <p>CPIT is poorly served by walking and cycling routes. We strongly suggest a pedestrian crossing mid block on Madras Street. If on-road parking is prohibited on the eastern side of Madras Street there will</p>	<p>All cyclists appreciate, and are encouraged by, routes which are attractive, consistent, continuous and safe. Interrupted, indirect and unsafe routes are undesirable. The Plan does not acknowledge that there are different types of cyclists. Confident cyclists are generally happy with on-road cycle lanes, with comfortable distance from parked cars, advanced stop boxes at intersections for safety, convenience, visibility and so on. However, unconfident and new cyclists usually prefer separated car and bike lanes. Only the routes following the Avon and through Hagley Park are separated at the moment and we request that some north/south and east/west through-routes have separate lanes as well. We support Spokes Canterbury's call for neighbourhood Greenways, through routes for pedestrians and cycles, but not for vehicles. □</p> <p>There is inadequate provision for commuter cyclists coming to the Public Hospital area from the east. We would like to see the Oxford Terrace/Lichfield Street route be made a priority east/west cycle commuter route. This would take the cycling traffic heading west off Tuam Street which is currently also designated a key public transport and car route. □</p> <p>The CDBG BUG would like more details about where bike parking facilities will be, and some commitment to putting in bold measures such as the bike corrals as seen in Portland, USA. Up to 20 cycles can fit in a space for one car. This is smart use of land, and shows that planners are serious about prioritizing active transport. The burden of providing cycle parking should not just fall on employers. □</p> <p>While we support a slow core in principle, 30km/h will still be fatal for 6% of pedestrians who are hit by vehicular traffic. □</p> <p>Our Trust is a partner with the Christchurch City Council and Christchurch Tramway Ltd in providing the Heritage Tram service for Christchurch. □</p> <p>I am disappointed to see the report almost dismiss the tram as not being a tool for making the city accessible. The tram is primarily a tourist attraction but it can also provide a local role to get people between the precincts it passes through. □</p> <p>Christchurch Tramway Ltd have provided a local annual pass that is very affordable for people to travel regularly on the service. □</p> <p>With the ongoing reconstruction and other disruptions to the city the tram can provide an important link between areas such as the Museum/ Botanic Gardens, New Regent St, and Restart Mall precincts. □</p> <p>We believe that consideration should be given to adding another leg to the tramway at the intersection of Cashel and High Sts to allow the trams in the interim to turn north from Cashel St back toward Cathedral Square providing the link with the restart mall and other developments that will occur around Hereford, Cashel and Lichfield Streets. □</p> <p>We believe that the plan should reflect the vision the Christchurch City Council has for the Tramway and the imminent start to repairs to the infrastructure. The route of the tramway including the partially built extension and future extension should</p>
David John Carr	The Heritage Tramways Trust	<p>The focus on making the city more accessible to modes other than the motor car is to be commended. Getting people walking cycling and using public transport will make the city centre a more attractive place to visit. □</p> <p>The lack of long term vision to cater for future rail transport to the CBD is disappointing. As many overseas cities have proven in recent times there is a swing back to rail based commuter transport be it heavy or light rail. With predicted future shortages of fossil fuels such transport will become a necessity to move people to their places of work, study or entertainment. □</p>	<p>We are pleased to see that there is some mention of the Heritage Tram in the chapter.</p>		<p>Christchurch Tramway Ltd have provided a local annual pass that is very affordable for people to travel regularly on the service. □</p> <p>With the ongoing reconstruction and other disruptions to the city the tram can provide an important link between areas such as the Museum/ Botanic Gardens, New Regent St, and Restart Mall precincts. □</p> <p>We believe that consideration should be given to adding another leg to the tramway at the intersection of Cashel and High Sts to allow the trams in the interim to turn north from Cashel St back toward Cathedral Square providing the link with the restart mall and other developments that will occur around Hereford, Cashel and Lichfield Streets. □</p> <p>We believe that the plan should reflect the vision the Christchurch City Council has for the Tramway and the imminent start to repairs to the infrastructure. The route of the tramway including the partially built extension and future extension should</p>
Rex Verity	VIVA!, a local organization of approx. 300 people passionate about living in central Christchurch in sustainable urban villages	<p>We wish to thank the CERA/CCDU staff for their work and for the opportunity given to us to contribute to the planning process. □</p> <p>The 21st Century presents new circumstances and new challenges. Not only must the people of Christchurch repair and rebuild the city, they must, along with most people worldwide, alter habits and patterns of being to live in ways that do not further degrade the natural world's capacity to sustain life. In short, we must build back better. □</p> <p>The rebuild and functioning of Central Christchurch must provide an infrastructure that supports such a changed way of living at the same time as it meet the needs and desires of the people who want to live there, those who want to work or operate businesses there and the population of wider Christchurch that want the cultural and specialist retail and commercial services and the entertainment and excitement that only a vibrant city centre can provide. □</p> <p>A key part of this infrastructure is transport. This draft plan, An Accessible City, contains some tentative steps in this direction but fails to grasp the nettle of what is required to achieve these goals. Grasping the nettle means encouraging slow movement within the central city to enhance street life, street culture, which will attract more people and advantaging local businesses. The transport priorities must be walking, public transport (including, especially, the return of an enhanced shuttle service) and cycling. The hazard, noise and</p>	<p>•Discouraging through traffic from using the local distributor roads. (This needs to be enhanced and extended.) □</p> <p>•The slow core, which will improve safety, reduce noise levels and make the streets more pleasant places to be. (The slow core also needs to be enhanced and extended.) □</p> <p>•Priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport. (This provision also needs to be strengthened.) Having priority streets for active and passenger transport will make the journey through the central city pleasant and safe while providing streets well suited to outdoor café facilities and the development of an attractive street culture. Such streets will assist with Christchurch's economic recovery. Too much vehicular traffic will kill the possibility of pleasant and vibrant street life. □</p> <p>•Pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon and the South and East Frames. □</p> <p>•Intersections along these key cycling routes designed to ensure priority and safety for cycling. □</p> <p>•Separated cycle ways on both sides of the road. □</p> <p>•Cycle parking at the bus exchange and "super stops". (The Square, businesses and public facilities such as the convention centre, library, museum and stadium will also need adequate and quality cycle parking.) □</p> <p>•Improved way-finding signage. □</p>	<p>•The plan's timid acceptance of the rhetoric that car dependence is and will remain the dominant transport mode. This is a position that is not based in evidence – where alternatives are provided they are used. □</p> <p>•The retention of the one-way streets, especially Madras, Barbadoes, Tuam and St Asaph which are only one or two blocks from Fitzgerald or Moorhouse Avenues, but also Durham street adjacent to the river which will lower the amenity of the river spaces. □</p> <p>•The creation of very difficult and complicated access and exit scenarios for the bus exchange and the emergency response vehicles in the justice precinct due to the one way system along Tuam and St Asaph. □</p> <p>•Allowing vehicles other than public transport to transit through the central city from one side to another via Manchester, Madras and Hereford Streets. □</p> <p>•Having a 30km/h speed limit in the core (the zone inside Kilmore, Durham/Cambridge, St Asaph and Madras). Car drivers will attempt to drive at closer to 38km/h. Because this is the priority zone for people walking, cycling and "footpath life" the speed limit in this core zone should be 15km/h. A young or elderly cyclist could be comfortable with cars and buses travelling at no more than that speed, even where there is no physical separation of modes, although that separation is far preferred. The presence of many more bicycles and pedestrians on the streets (a consequence of the lower speed limit) will more effectively keep drivers within that limit. □</p> <p>•Retaining any 50km/h streets east of Hagley Park within the Four Avenues, especially those passing residential, retail and cultural activities (i.e. especially Madras St.). Having any 50 km/h limit in the inner core is likely to confuse, or worse, encourage, drivers to exceed</p>	<p>•Strongly prioritize pedestrians and cycling, and strongly discourage through-traffic and move it out to the Four Avenues, by putting strong breaks into the inner city streets and having a 15km/h inner core (the zone inside Kilmore, Durham/Cambridge, Tuam and Madras) and a 30km/h limit everywhere else east of Hagley Park inside the Four Avenues. Have through-access for pedestrians and, on at least some streets, for cyclists and public transport. Delivery vehicles should be encouraged, and in some areas required, to enter only outside of peak people hours. □</p> <p>•Encourage cars to the Four Avenues and improve the avenues' vehicle capacity and flow by closing some cross intersections and providing only "left in/left out" side roads. □</p> <p>•Limit parking in the core to disabled, short stops (5 minutes) and taxis. The Transport Interchange, the retail and hospitality zones, the Convention Centre and the Performing Arts precinct do not need any more provision for parking than this. The exception is accommodation businesses in the zone, which could provide in-building parking for their guests only. The aim is to discourage vehicles from the area and support a shift in transport mode. □</p> <p>•Consider shared /mutualised carparking for business during the day, residents after hours and weekends – under new buildings □</p> <p>•Provide frequent inner city shuttles both for in-town travel and from parking on the perimeter. □</p> <p>•In addition to changing to a 30km/h speed limit, further calm / slow Tuam, St Asaph, Madras and Barbadoes Streets by making them two-way. Vehicles travelling across town have a multi-lane avenue only one or two blocks away. Madras St particularly needs this treatment, as it transects CPIT, and abuts the Innovation Precinct, the Stadium, the demonstration urban</p>

Peter Creevey and Margaret Lovell-Smith	Workers' Educational Association (WEA)	<p>1. We are disappointed in the limited routes proposed for public transport. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2. We see the plan as unfriendly to pedestrians. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Our organization the Workers Educational Association (WEA), provides adult education courses throughout the year, with about 2,000 enrolments per year. In addition our facilities are used by a large number of community groups. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Many of our courses are held during the day and are attended by retired people, many of whom travel to the WEA by bus. The effect of the proposed bus routes, will force such people to walk much longer distances to and from their bus stops. In some cases this will prevent them from attending our courses. We wonder whether any consideration has been given to the time it takes an elderly person to walk five blocks. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	We are pleased that greater provision is being made for cyclists, as many of our participants also come to the WEA by bicycle.	<p>1. The removal of bus routes from the city centre and their re-location to the periphery, and the consolidation of bus routes to only a few streets. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2. The impact this will have on elderly pedestrians. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3. The side-lining of the bus exchange to the periphery. The plan seems designed to discourage use of public transport with the central four-five blocks – bounded by Kilmore, Manchester and Hereford Streets and Rolleston Avenue – designated as a no bus area. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Many bus users will have a long walk to reach popular destinations such as the Museum, Botanic Gardens, Arts Centre, Art Gallery and the WEA, (which is situated on Gloucester Street near the corner of Montreal Street). It will be even more difficult for our participants to reach the WEA if Gloucester Street is blocked off between Colombo Street and the river, as appears to be the case. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Take the many bus routes from the north, and north east of the city for example: Our participants currently travel into the city to a stop in Durham Street where they have less than one block to walk to reach our building. They leave the city from a stop on Montreal Street which is even closer to our building. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The proposal is for all these buses to come into the city on Manchester Street: thus adding another three blocks to their walk – more if Gloucester Street is not open to pedestrians. This will be too far for some people. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>1. Better provision of public transport to the 'Arts Precinct' where the Art Gallery, Museum and Arts Centre are situated. This north west part of the city centre is overlooked in the plan, which speaks of the location of the bus exchange as providing 'convenient walking connections to the southern half of the Core, the South and East Frames, and the Stadium'. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>It is a major disincentive if bus users have to make connections with a second bus service. Yet this would seem inevitable for people wanting to reach the bus-stop in Hereford Street closest to the WEA. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>We also question why this bus route is on Hereford Street and not on Gloucester Street, as it was before the earthquakes. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2. A free inner-city shuttle bus: We see no provision in the plan for a free inner-city shuttle bus. Why has this been discontinued? <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3. Fewer car parks: The plan seems to encourage use of cars by providing multiple car parks, while discouraging pedestrians and the use of public transport. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
Aaron Jones		Good but links to a train station from bus exchange for commuter rail have to be essential?!	Accessibility		Commuter rail on Existing rail corridors planned for. It must be included to future proof this city. From Lyttelton to city, Rolleston to city, Rangiora to city. With shuttle links from city rail station to central bus exchange. This would assist on reducing road loadings from satellite towns and suburbs.	
Adele Geradts		<p>Environmental impact <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Redeveloping a transport infrastructure is a rare opportunity to develop a long term sustainable and energy efficient transport system CERA needs to seize not ignore this opportunity. The Plan needs a much greater focus on improving bus services, safeguarding future options such as light rail and better provisions for cycling and walking. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Economic development <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>CERA's plan needs to recognise the importance of good public transport to economic development in reducing congestion and allowing easy movement in and around the city. Businesses need much more than easy parking. They need to move goods in and out of and around the city efficiently and people need to be able to access the airport, ports and other parts of the region easily. This should be included in the plan. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Bus users <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>CERA's plan cuts the number of bus routes from 40 routes to 7 core routes, but the frequency on these core routes is said to increase. Passengers are expected to travel to "hubs" in suburban centres, then transfer to a core route to the central city. This decrease in routes increases the number of bus changes that people will have to make in order to get into the central city. This is likely to be difficult for elderly passengers.</p>		<p>Community vision <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The draft CERA plan has almost no vision of what the city should be like, nor has it had any community input. This is a huge missed opportunity. The CERA recovery plan should help implement the Christchurch City Council (CCC) Transport Strategic Plan instead of ignoring it. The CCC plan has a real focus on how a transport system can promote cycling, improve health, create community, lead to a more compact urban form, address inequality and ensure resilience. CERA's plan needs much more focus and a clear agenda for how transport is to be improved instead of the current vague and waffly statements.</p>	<p>Ease of use of public transport for young people getting to school and for adults getting to work should be a priority. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I want to see more public involvement/ opportunities for people to be involved in making Christchurch a sustainable and assessable city. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>There needs to be clear definable goals that can be measured by the public.</p>	
Alan Ingram Phillips		Generally clear and thoughtful	pedestrianisation of large areas in the CBD	It appears that car parking is seen as a problem rather than something to be embraced	I strongly recommend that Parking charges are not used to deter people wishing to park (or as a means of managing the number of people wishing to park). Keeping car users as far away from the centre as the current South City Mall area is good but then there needs to be a large number of free or very cheap parking spaces at that sort of distance from the centre. Public transport for someone living as far away Diamond Harbour is often not convenient but I don't want to be put off coming in to Christchurch by high parking charges. One of the attractions of malls is the free parking and coming in to the Christchurch Centre should be just as attractive for car users. Good public transport is not a substitute for enough car parking spaces.	
Alastair Baldwin		I think that this is a great leap forward in the way people will travel in the future! I love all the cycling aspects of the draft. Cycling is an easy and green solution to soooooo many problems we face today!!	Cycling. Cycle routes, cycle roads and everything cycling. As long as the solutions are green (no fossil fuels), then I'm happy!	I think affordability shouldn't play a major role. We should be committed to producing an environmentally sustainable transport system, without worrying about going over budget. This is one of the most important things to get right, so it's important we invest heavily in sustainable practices...	Make Cycling and Green public transport the soul of the transport systems. Fossil fuels are a thing of the past. Sustainability is vital for future success, and low environmental impact.	

<p>Alice Shanks</p>	<p>I am relieved and hopeful that there is so much emphasis in the Accessible City draft plan on active transport - cycling and walking - as well as public transport and improving traffic flow patterns into and out of the central city. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I don't think this Plan has enough detail to show your commitment to increasing the number of people choosing to cycle in the City. It seems to me to be anticipating only a modest increase in cycling. This is our chance to leap-frog ahead of other cities and to get it right for the next generation. This is not a time to replace what we had. After all businesses and the residents have adapted to the changes in work-places, road layouts and closures and we are doing quite well without a City centre. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Wellington has its buses, Auckland had its motorways, let's make Christchurch the cycling city of the Southern Hemisphere. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>As a motorist and commuter cyclist I commend the 30 km an hour slow core to ensure a safe city for everyone.</p>	<p>The lack of dedicated off-road cycle tracks in the pictures and plans. This is our only chance to get them in place. Green paint on roads wears off and still puts cyclists a metre away from death by car. I feel that the Have Your Say consultation clearly and loudly declared that Christchurch residents want to cycle more and they want safe off-road routes. The cycle plans in this outline are not bold enough to meet those expectations.</p>	<p>1. It is important that the Central City cycling paths link with cycle routes to and from the suburbs. This is the one and only time in the cities life that we can superimpose off-road cycle trails onto the traffic networks of our whole City. I personally use and enjoy the Tennyson Street cycle way that keeps me a curb away from cars. I would like to see this treatment on other wide street to link up a network off-road cycleways eg. Antigua Street, Strickland St, Birdwood Ave. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2. As well as pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon don't forget that the Opawaho Heathcote Linear Park plan includes a cycleway from Colombo Street to Hanson Park. Although this project is on hold due to the removal of its budget from the City Plan I hope that eventually the City will be able to afford to start this project. It would be prudent to plan cycle paths from the City to link in with this future cycleway. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3. There needs to be more connections from the City to destinations, for example, the Main Hospital has a pool of bikes that their staff can use to cycle to Princess Margaret Hospital. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4. There has to be a cycle connection through the Square to the shops to the north-the Conventions centre-Townhall. Also, there needs to be a cycle path marked along Riccarton Ave to get to the Riccarton shops. I usually use the path in the Gardens but that mean I have to cross several lanes on Riccarton Ave outside the Garden Entrance gates which is not ideal. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>6. The scariest cycling experience I have had was on Blenheim.</p>	
<p>Alison Downes</p>	<p>I ask please please keep cycle lanes separate from cars. Also please don't put in a cycle lane that suddenly finishes then starts further down the road. For the future of a vibrant city, to reduce traffic, safe cycle lanes are imperative. As per a study carried out at Canterbury University more people will cycle if the cycle lanes are safer. At present they are too close to cars and frequently feel unsafe.</p>				
<p>Alison Margaret Evelyn Ford</p>	<p>I am favourably impressed with the consideration for walkers and cyclists and the desire to make the city assessible and safe for these groups.</p>	<p>I like reduction in speed to 30km per hour in the centre <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I like especially having kerbs on the cycle lanes to keep cyclists safe from cars as so often cars and buses will pull in right in front of cyclists causing many near accidents. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I like the cycle routes into the city to encourage this transport <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I like the square being only pedestrian and cycling <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I love the plantings to improve city scape</p>	<p>I don't like the main streets not having cycle curbs- motorists are all too likely to open doors in front of you. I would also like to see parking times on these streets severely limited so that we don't have to increase the dangers by going round cars into the main traffic.</p>	<p>I would like to see the main routes into the city that link to the cycle routes across the city also having separate kerbs as it is no good being safe around the city centre if it is not safe to cycle there! Would like to see this bigger picture considered in any roading improvements. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>To see a safe cycle link going from the southern motorway extension right into the city. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>With an aging city how are the people on mobility scooters supposed to access the city... as pedestrians? as cyclists? I think this is the opportunity to consider this increasing group. They can go quite fast and increasing distances so I would expect people to use them for longer trips in the future. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Lots of creative funky looking cycle stands(works of art in themselves) in lots of places around the city centre so bikes can be left to shop, explore, walk etc.</p>	
<p>Amy Smit</p>	<p>Love it!! I like that a variety of people's requests for the city centre have been taken into consideration namely cycleways, more pedestrian focussed areas, parking for vehicles etc. Good to see!</p>	<p>I especially like that you're keeping the majority of the one way streets running and at 50km. Because the city is so big and sprawling these one way streets provide an easy/fast way of getting across the city. I especially also like that there will be a large quantity of parking spaces close to the city core. Because Christchurch is so big, it takes effort heading into 'town' and if I have to search for hours or pay large amounts of money for a park then I'm not particularly encouraged to head into town. My local malls are Riccarton and Barrington - both provide all the shops I need and ample parking. So to have a city centre that will provide a different more refreshing shopping environment without the hassle of parking will be fantastic!</p>	<p>You're probably not planning this but I don't want to see more standard/cheap/concrete slab/undesigned buildings go up like the one's that have just appeared on Moorhouse Ave where Animates used to be. I appreciate buildings where thought has gone into the design of them and that are built for more than hosting people so businesses can make money. I'm sure you're going to put effort into the key buildings like the stadium etc but also keeping an eye out for the smaller buildings that are being built by companies would be great. Hopefully people will understand the need to build beautiful buildings, not just a space to make money.</p>	<p>Good work team! You're doing a great job!</p>	

<p>Andrew Donald Cluny TROUP</p>	<p>I think the new plan wastes an extraordinary, unprecedented opportunity. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> It makes cautious moves in a slightly new direction, which is frankly a shame, given we have the first modern city which has to be substantially rebuilt.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Here's what I think we COULD choose to do:<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Build a city which sits lightly on the land<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Build a city which will over time improve rather than degrade the health and happiness of the citizens<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Turn New Zealand into a nation which shows the world how things could be, rather than how things used to be.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Details are included in the following solely to suggest that solutions are possible. They do not pretend to be optimal, some may not be realisable, but some variation on them will certainly be.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Points 1 and 3 above can be supported by:<input type="checkbox"/> a) Lightweight services: <input type="checkbox"/> i) devolve power generation, sewage treatment, stormwater buffering and other such supplies to the most LOCAL level possible<input type="checkbox"/> ii) instead of entombing services which DO have to remain centralised or joined up, make lightweight roadways</p>	<p>The general look of the proposed roadways is great. <input type="checkbox"/> We just need to make what's underneath look as well thought out as what's above. An accessible city needs accessible services.<input type="checkbox"/> And minimal disruption (and cost) while they're being accessed.</p>	<p>A stadium near the inner center seems completely without merit.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> When in use, it is only vital on the inside. At such times it presents to the outside world a parking-dominated, opaque-walled, urban wasteland. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> At all times, it is a complete deadweight on the surroundings (and on the city's finances)<input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>I would like to see the conference centre's scope expanded to a facility which was ALWAYS in use by citizens, attending festivals, events, markets,<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> ... generally a vibrant multiple-use complex, where we wrapped ourselves around and through people from other parts of the world attending conferences, to the benefit of both groups.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Otherwise, refer my "Overall Comments" above. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I envisage the ideas being initially applied to a small core around the Square, but with a published timetable whereby that core (and the lessons learned) would be gradually expanded to eventually embrace the entire city within the "Four Avenues", which would hopefully morph gradually into Boulevards. <input type="checkbox"/> No vehicles during daylight hours within them; only lightweight service vehicles at night.</p>	
<p>Andrew Laurie</p>	<p>I think there has been some consideration to encouraging cycling but this needs to be expanded. There needs to be more thought put into developing routes that enable cyclists to travel safely from any part of the city into the CBD. For routes that are not amenable to developing separated cycling lanes there should be more clearly delineated lanes on the roadside designed to avoid the danger of opening car doors and left turning traffic. There should be lots of cycle stands to lock bikes to and cars should be discouraged from the CBD, perhaps by having shuttle-only access.</p>				
<p>Anne Scott</p>	<p>I strongly support cycling facilities for Christchurch, preferably separated from traffic. People cycling more</p>	<p>The cycling, bus and pedestrian facilities. It should be easy to get around the city on foot through the buildings and alleyways that</p>	<p>Not sure about the assumptions that the traffic will stick to the areas designated. Certainly cyclists will go to the destinations they need to</p>	<p>Some commitment to equal funding to facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. The council has always had a few people with good</p>	
<p>Anthony Field</p>	<p>It's exciting, what a wonderful opportunity to create a people friendly transport network.</p>	<p>->The 30km an hour slow core.<input type="checkbox"/> ->Pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon. <input type="checkbox"/> ->Having priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport. (I would also like to see them extended further within the central city network and beyond) <input type="checkbox"/> ->Encouragin</p>	<p>The plan's backward looking view that vehicle dependence is and will remain the dominant transport mode well past mid-century. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The emphasis on expensive inner city car parking :(<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The lack of commitment and details provided for cycle infrastructure including lane widths, intersection treatments, connection to existing or 'desire line' cycle routes, how routes prioritised for multiple modes will work, and cycle parking details.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The plan's unstated but evident view that commuter cyclists can either put up with inadequate or non-existent infrastructure on high speed arterials and distributor streets or congested low speed routes shared with pedestrians and vehicles.</p>	<p>Keep cars and parking on the periphery. Provide shuttles to and around the central city. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Save us from high rates by making active and public transport the easy, safe and fast choice. Building 16 parking garages is simply too expensive.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Use this rebuild opportunity to proactively assist the community in shifting to sustainable, healthier active transport options.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> High quality cycling infrastructure with separated or off road paths to get everywhere easily. Work with and connect to CCC's network.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Prioritise Armagh Street as an east-west cycling route.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Convert the eastern side of Madras to separate 2-3 metre contraflow cycle lanes and footpaths with a 30 km/h limit by CPIT and the stadium. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Tuam Street cycle lanes to both the east and west and hook up with network or prioritise St Asaph Street for cycling per CCC's plans.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Provide separated pedestrian and cycle paths along the full length of the Avon/Otakaro well linked to the city and to wider networks.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Provide multiple direct and unobstructed routes to encourage</p>	

<p>Barnaby Bennett</p>		<p>I would like to congratulate the CCDU for opening this important document to public consultation. This is a crucial part of any planning process, and is really the minimum amount required to consider it a legitimate document. I realise the time constraints on the processes at the moment, and thank you for giving the public the ability contribute to this discussion.</p>	<p>I think the general vision for the city is sound, the concept of having a pedestrian friendly city is crucial, as is the integrated planning of all the other transport modes.</p>	<p>I think the overall vision is being betrayed by the some of the contents of the report, and especially the roading plans. You cannot have pedestrian friendly parts of the city with 50km one way streets running through them. I am an architect and planner and this is basic stuff. These roads work to get people through the city quickly, this is in conflict with the idea of a pedestrian friendly place. At best they get people to the city, but even this is somewhat flawed as the plan needs to be developing Christchurch as a place people want to live in. Where they want to have their apartments and houses. These one way roads, especially the roads on Tuam, Madras and Montreal are a disaster for this. This is a once in a generation chance to try a different vision for transport in this city, and this plan goes back to a slightly improved version of the status quo, which isn't working. You only need to wander down Madras at the moment with its fast one way street cutting it the polytech off from High Street to see what is wrong with retaining this plan. It is a fallacy to follow the directions of the traffic engineers and modelling for making long term planning decisions as the models and rules of thumb they follow are not sophisticated enough to account for the complex changes that happen to cities as they evolve. The decision to keep the one way roads entrenches the role of the cars and their negative impact on the streets, and the businesses that operate on those streets. If the streets are made two way a little bit slower the road traffic will adapt and people will find other ways of moving around in their cars or otherwise, if the streets are left with fast cars and one way, people will adapt by shopping, living, and walking in other parts of the city, most probably outside of the central city.</p>	<p>The bicycle plans look simplistic at best, I think this needs to be more seriously considered. Christchurch is the perfect place to have large scale bicycle activity like Amsterdam or Melbourne and should be planning appropriately. This is a no brainer as it is better for public health, the global and local environment, and it is a much cheaper form of infrastructure for the city, that is also easy to adapt. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I would like to see the adaptability and future proofing of the transport vision taken very seriously, the city is going to grow in unexpected ways and the traffic plan needs to be able to adapt quickly to that. We are going to see profound economic, technological and environmental changes in the next 30-50 years, the city plan is foolish if it doesn't plan for change and transition in this time.</p>	
<p>Ben Wilden</p>		<p>Its ok. I think the larger issues to address are how people get from an increasingly sprawling city to the down town area with limited improvement to main roads and the new motorway really only assisting truck transport to Lytleton Harbour rather than assisting with traffic to the inner city.</p>		<p>I feel that Christchurch being a flat city is perfect to make greater use of bicycles as a means of transport. I would like to see the development of cycle only cycleways from the surrounding neighbourhoods to the down town area. At present there are a couple of token paths through Hagley, but the majority follow roads and will be shared with cars. I would not ride on a road shared with a car, its just a horrible experience due to the stupidity of most drivers. How much better would it be to develop cycle only arterial routes into the inner city. Perhaps people would be required to cycle a distance of road to reach these routes, but once on it, it could be a car free great way to travel into the city. How popular are cycle ways through out New Zealand become, from the Rail Trail in Central Otago to the new trail being built from Lawrence to Beaumont (these are the two im aware of), people love this because there are no cars hurtling past belching fumes. The answer for me is 100% cycle only cycle ways.</p>		
<p>Betty Shore</p>		<p>The title "Accessible City" says what I would like, but the plan does not deliver it, in that it treats "access" as for cars, more than people in our varied forms of transport, and it deals with the central city in isolation rather than connecting to surrounding suburbs where people live. <input type="checkbox"/> I want a central city in which priority is for people-walking, cycling, on public transport, coming in from suburbs for quality time in the cultural, recreational, and shopping aspects of a healthy, vibrant core. The draft seems to me to support more cars and traffic that work against that vision.</p>		<p>More car parks and roading are not sound use of our funds because they only encourage more cars and they actually take away from provisions for walking, cycling, and public shuttles, which we as citizens asked for clearly in "Share an Idea". Our plans need to shift priority from cars to people as already requested. Good provision for walking, cycling, and public shuttles would be healthier and more economical, as well as creating a city that would genuine pleasure to come into, like some overseas models.</p>	<p>The full plans of the CCC Transport Strategic Plan, and the CCC plans that emerged from "Share an Idea" give clear vision and practical steps for a city moving into the future. The specific recommendations for safe walking and cycling, have been offered by a range of groups. They include things like shifting the through traffic onto the ring roads, setting speeds at 50kph for ring and 30kph for central city, parking cars on the perimeter and providing walking and cycling lanes and shuttle service within the core, raising crosswalks to street level to slow traffic and ease pedestrian movement, safe lanes and intersections for cyclists (this means NOT sharing cycle and bus lanes as these require very unsafe weaving of cycles and buses together), car parks in suburban bus exchanges, frequent buses with good connecting points so people can connect during the whole day not just at rush hours. The public have been clear in our previous requests for a more people-friendly city, and the recommendations have been made that would be healthy for people and long-term economy. I urge you to implement these fully as we take this opportunity to build for our present and future.</p>	
<p>Brian Edward Neill</p>		<p>Easy to follow. The plan does not disregard traffic plans that had been implemented in the past - just adapted and improved upon for the new environment that will be Christchurch City Central.</p>	<p>Correct emphasis on all modes of transport that, if implemented, will serve the city well. I support a speed limit regime for the central city and generally agree with the demarkation lines that have been drawn. However, having spent a lot of time on research and participating in the drawing up of the current national speed limit guidelines I would question the advisability of introducing a 30 km/h limit on some of the streets nominated in the plan. If the proposed streets and shared spaces are all engineered to the standard of Seaview Road in New Brighton, then yes, otherwise a 40 km/h may be a better proposition and certainly better respected by motorists and cyclists who will be using these streets. My experience has been that if motorist don't need to constantly check their speedo they are more likely to, given the right environment, slow to an average speed of around 40 km/h when the street is clear of hazards (people and other traffic) to nearer 30 km/h at times when these hazards exist. Engineers should consider average, rather than 85 percentile speeds in urban areas where the default speed limit is 50 km/h. A maximum limit of 40 km/h would be self policing with high compliance. 30 km/h would require more effort on the part of the Police and may, in my experience, encourage speeds to increase over and above those experienced under a 40 km/h limit.</p>	<p>Not on the face of it. As an ex-professional traffic and transportation engineer working at CCC up until retirement I have views on implementing some aspects of the shared roadspace that will no doubt be fleshed out by others during the implementation stage.</p>	<p>Not in this document. I would expect that the implementation plan that will be peer reviewed will include detail cannot be answered at this time.</p>	

<p>Cathleen Murphy</p>		<p>That I am disheartened by it. <input type="checkbox"/> One-way streets are racetracks, you only have to stand at the corner of Barbadoes and Bealey to watch the starters gun effect they have on traffic. <input type="checkbox"/> This traffic tsunami rolls through residential, corner shops, a primary and secondary school, a retirement home, an historic cemetery and also three blocks of commercial activity. <input type="checkbox"/> One-ways set drivers up to become impatient boy racers of all ages. They expect the clear run right through the city. What is wrong with meandering traffic? I thought we were living in the future and the 1950's were long gone. <input type="checkbox"/> Where is the detailed research/data that shows inner-city living and business will blossom with one-way systems. It was not like that before the quake, the city felt feral at night, more people are needed to live inside the four avenues and the transport plan must use this as their guide to creating streets that will attract young and old and families too. The land outside the city is being carved up for subdivisions and yet the most fantastic place to live in (and what attracted me) is right here inside the four avenues. It needs to be improved and wasn't that the whole idea of the CCDU - to use the opportunity that the earthquake has given the city. I mean to say you use the words 'environmental' and 'sustainable' 'liveable' 'enhance' 'quality of life' - how does this relate to speeding traffic. Two-way roads naturally go slower. Traffic in the central city on two-ways before the quake were always travelling at 30kms or less - think of Colombo, Hereford, Gloucester, Armagh etc. (I know, because I biked and still do, all around the city, my children went to school above the bus</p>				
<p>Charlotte Vanhecke</p>		<p>I am pleased that overall there seems to be a genuine strive to better the accessibility</p>	<p>slowing down to 30Km/h, although that is still faster than bicycles so not slow enough</p>	<p>new car park buildings, this just invites the car, is expensive and short sighted.</p>	<p>I believe not enough is done to ensure safety of children biking to school: adult commuters can choose routes, but children really need the cycle lanes from home to school, not some main axes through town. I would really like to see a continuous effort to get all kids on bikes through safe streets without mixed traffic: true separate cycle lanes.</p>	
<p>Christopher Michael Spanton</p>					<p>My main comment is that for people coming in from outside Christchurch can we please have park and ride or park and cycle ie a safe place where we can leave cars and cycle or bus the rest of the way into town - I come from Rangiora so somewhere around Belfast some sort of are where I could park and then cycle the rest of the way. <input type="checkbox"/> At present I wouldn't know where I could leave my car safely so I have to drive in and pay car parking charges and add to congestion. <input type="checkbox"/> Thank</p>	
<p>Christopher Morahan</p>		<p>I like it a lot and can imagine it providing a very successful framework for our future transport needs in the cbd.</p>	<p>Lots! <input type="checkbox"/> The approach of separating out walking, cycling, driving and public transport networks. <input type="checkbox"/> The focus on streamlining vehicle movements onto certain streets and ensuring parking provision is on these streets, and therefore reducing vehicle circulation on other streets. <input type="checkbox"/> The provision of a bus hub. <input type="checkbox"/> The retention of the 2 sets of north-south one-way streets. I regularly use these to drive across town, and often stop on the way through to go to the shops or cafes.</p>	<p>I would like to see the bus exchange closer in to the centre of the city. It was always a very vibrant place and it seems an opportunity lost to put this out on the fringe of the core. I realise it's only a ~5minute walk away from Cathedral Sq but it would be nice to have it right in the midst of everything (eg. bordering Cathedral Sq). <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>I would like to see mandatory provision of showers in new buildings to encourage cycling and walking into work. As far as I could tell from the District Plan Provisions Appendix, cycle parking is required but there is no mention of showers. A lack of showers will prohibit many people (especially those living more than 3-4km away) from cycling to work and all the focus on providing cycle lanes and parks will be wasted. I know I personally wouldn't cycle more than about 3-4km into work if I couldn't have a shower when I got to work, regardless of how good the route was. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> A specialist pedestrian link between the bus exchange and the stadium would be quite important, and should be pencilled in. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Christopher Thomson</p>		<p>p10: <input type="checkbox"/> "Prioritised intersections along these routes will have improved safety for cyclists, especially from turning vehicles". <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> As a cyclist, I've found the plastic lane marker posts that have been introduced at the corner of Strickland St and Brougham St, and on Kotare St to be very effective. They should be used more where there is no cycle lane separated by a kerb, and particularly to protect cyclists around intersections. The pressure on drivers to form two lanes (using the cycle lane to do so) has now been alleviated at Strickland St/Brougham St with the addition of the marker posts. I think if you are creating cycle lanes with rumble strips only and no kerb, the use of these markers at a certain frequency to remind drivers the lane is there would be worth testing. I believe the bottom left photograph on p10 of 'Separated cycle lane in Melbourne, Australia' shows this type of marker post usage. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Aside from the use of markers, please make sure that cycle lane planning considers the entry and exit to cycle lanes carefully, as so often we have lanes that simply end or disappear where the road is narrower. The integration into the existing system just needs to be implemented in a cycle aware manner. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> p11: <input type="checkbox"/> Although it is on the fringe of the central city plan, I would like</p>				

Christopher Webster	I see little point in creating these open air spaces with roads, even though they will have low speed limits, when the noise pollution from modified car exhausts is unbelievably intrusive. I have just spent some seven weeks in Hiroshima, Copenhagen, Paris and Barcelona where legislators seem to have been able to create laws that prevent one individual from saturating a city block with exhaust noise by having effective rules about modified exhausts - you can't do it. All these cities had open space environments but they were quiet. There is little point in creating beautiful places, and allowing one person to wreck it for everyone else.	More separated cycleways.	I dislike the idea that the bus terminal is not located with or adjacent to the former rail station. The idea that buses will stream through an area which would otherwise be free of that level of noise seem stupid, and we must also position for the eventual use of light rail, ON TRACKS WHICH ALREADY EXIST to satellite communities.	
Claire Waghorn	I found this difficult to reconcile with what currently exists, what the CCC has proposed and what is actually being proposed in this plan. It is almost too vague to give detailed feedback on, for example, it takes a "where possible XYZ could happen, but in reality that's quite hard for anyone to fairly comment on. □ Overall, I'm not particularly pleased with the plan. It could be improved with real commitments to better public transport services, and separate and safe cycle lanes, but at the moment I don't really trust that is what the plan is about.	Any mentions of improving the safety for cyclists I support.	I'm really worried about the public transport system. There aren't enough details in the plan for me to know how it will really impact on the people of Christchurch. For example, there was mention in The Press of cutting down the number of bus routes - I think this will discourage people from using the bus, and I'm particularly worried about the elderly having to walk further or change buses more frequently. □ I think we need to look at what people want - which was clear in the share an idea campaign, as well as reflected within the CCC transport plan. People want a really good public transport system -one that has good routes and reliable services. □ I also am worried about the lack of committed language around cycling, it seems to be less of a priority, like maybe cycle lanes will happen if there is budget left. □ I would like to see a really forward thinking transport infrastructure prioritised over the proposed new developments (stadium and convention centre) so that if money does run out, it is the unnecessary items that miss out, not our transport infrastructure.	More thought put into the experience for disabled and elderly people. We know we have an ageing population, these people won't always be safe to drive and will rely on good public transport. Let's think about the future, and incorporate it into this plan. □ Our future should be a healthy one, and encourage more people to cycle as a means of commuting. It'll lead to a healthier society which will save costs in other areas in the future. □
Clifford W. Read	I would like to see a central Rail station or light Rail in the transport infrastructure to encourage public transport. I.E. railcar or light rail allowing local and people from greater Christchurch, together with new tourists access the new key building without have to use a car or bus.		no central station. see above	
Coll Harvey	The absence of the light rail option the people of Christchurch asked for shows a lack of foresight by the planners, this ruins the whole plan. The rail tracks are already there to get started. The inclusion of more linked cycling and pedestrian access is great.	The inclusion of more linked cycling and pedestrian access is great. The reduction of the speed limit is good.	The absence of any provision for light rail. The proposal in undesignated cycle roads to not have cycle tracks physically separated from motor vehicles.	Trucks should only be able to service the inner city at night. Provision for light rail, its' never going to get any cheaper and every decent City needs a light rail system, lets do it now while we can. I would like to see the very centre of the city free from private cars, lets have satellite parking and public transport to the city centre, so that it is actually pleasant to walk and cycle in, relax and eat in and light outdoor entertainment can be enjoyed without sound and air pollution.
Darren Tatom	Its looking great, I applaud the reduction in the sheer number of streets and intersections, the 'main street' concept is great. Hopefully the people wedded to car transport will have enough parking close to where they need to be. □ One concern is the new Tuam st one way which seems to cut straight through the green frame (I may be wrong!). Do we really need the extra West east one way or could it be routed along St Asaph which appears to be outside the frame.			Not strictly to do with the central city, but what arrangement is being made for cyclists to get to the accessible areas from the suburban areas. being a cyclist myself I hope that the cycling network extends to the city as a whole with cyclist priority much of the time. At present cycle lanes 'disappear' when the road narrows or cyclist access areas rely on the cyclist having to give way to all motorised traffic at multiple points (e.g. at the Heathcote/port hills rd underpasses)
David Stoner	I welcome the opportunity that the rebuild gives to make the most of the river and parks. □ Multiple benefits from cycling including future health benefits. □	Cycle friendly, needs to given careful consideration. Separation of cycle paths and motor traffic welcomed. □	no	Linwood avenue and Bealey Avenue are currently horrible to cycle down despite being broad beautiful avenues. Please consider making central cycles main routes between the trees, this would allow arterial cycle access to many parts of the city and achieve separation of cyclists from motor vehicles. Cycle lanes could be traffic lighted across main junctions. I imagine a cycle path winding through the avenue of trees. Visibility of the path by motorists would encourage more of them to use the paths particularly if the cyclists are making biter progress as well as having fun and exercise. □ Also use of under utilised corridors for example the Heathcote river avoiding Ferry Road.
Don Babe	This is a great plan, huge step forward in terms of offering alternative transport options to city residents and visitors	The identification of streets to cater for different modes of transport.	The exemption from providing visitor cycle parking for activities with no street setback. These places will still be visited so the building should be designed to allow cycle parking. Consider the Forsyth Barr building on the corner of Colombo and Armagh Streets, the retailers on the ground floor had visitors and provision needs to be made for cycle parking. The lobby leading to the stairs and lifts could be used for this function. There are also good electronic cycle parking garages that are extremely efficient and do not take up much street frontage that could be incorporated into these buildings.	How are cyclists and pedestrians going to get across the extremely busy 4 avenues and the one way system. Having good cycle networks are not advantageous unless they are linked to where people live and work. Major roads break these links.
Donald Spicer	The Public Transport is too shortsighted and too much focus on motor cars.		No mention of any form of light rail for rapid transport	Light Rail for the inner city, and Suburban Trains for transport into the City.

Dora Roimata Langsbury			2-way on Salisbury	No public transport options for inner city residents - I have mobility challenges and made extensive use of the FREE inner city shuttle as an Orbiter option to get to work and to do my grocery shopping. I now have to use my car to travel the short distance to work as there is no public transport available. When this new plan is implemented I will still need to drive the 6 blocks to work - as there will not be an inner city shuttle service to help me to get to work and/or buy my groceries. Public transport has been designed to get people in and out of the inner city - but no one has considered the public transport needs of those of us who are already residing in the inner city - and choose to live here because we had use of an inner city public transport shuttle. I think cost is a terrible reason to discontinue the "free" service. I would pay to use the shuttle in preference to using my car to drive 6 blocks to work each day.		
Eroica Ritchie		☐ Really excited that we have an opportunity to create a transport network that is people friendly! Bring on the cycle ways!!	-The 30km an hour slow core.☐ -Pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon!!!☐ -Having priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport. (I would ☐ also like to see them extended further within the central city network and ☐ beyond)☐ -Encouraging	-The plan's backward looking view that vehicle dependence is and will remain.☐ the dominant transport mode well past mid-century.☐ -The emphasis on expensive inner city car parking :(☐ -The lack of commitment and details provided for cycle infrastructure.☐	-Keep cars and parking on the periphery. Provide shuttles to and around the ☐ central city.☐ -Save us from high rates by making active and public transport the easy, safe ☐ and fast choice. Building 16 parking garages is simply too expensive.☐ -Use this reb	
Faye Thompson			I like the idea of cycle storage. It would be great to see this at other hubs. ☐ I also like the idea of intercity buses and taxis using the exchange and making bus movements through the exchange more efficient.	I am concerned about the proposals for the public transport network in the central city. The Bus exchange has moved even further away from the centre of the city. We should be taking this opportunity to create a bus exchange right in the heart of the city next to the library and shops. Most of us have to walk several blocks from home to get to a bus stop, we don't want a long walk at the other end.☐ I am also concerned that the bus exchange and the larger stop in Manchester Street do not appear to be in very good areas security wise at night. When I take the bus into town at night I do not want to be walking blocks through doubtful or deserted areas of town on my own to get to the exchange.☐		
Felix Collins		The spirit of the document in making the central city more pedestrian and cycle oriented is good. Car must be taken to ensure that this actually translates into dollars spent.	The idea of making many of the streets slow zones.		Christchurch should be pitching itself as the best city in the world for cycle commuting and backing it up with actions in this plan. We have close to the best climate for cycling commuting and the terrain could not be flatter. Cities like Portland in the USA have done it. We should do it better.☐ ☐ The cross section of a cycle lane and road on page 10 seems to show parallel parked cars adjacent to the cycle lane. Neither rumble strips or a curb will stop doors opening into the path of cyclists. This is a perennial problem with the current painted bike lanes (I refer to them as car door opening lanes). I personally know four people who have been injured by car doors opening unexpectedly. On of who almost bisected his bicep muscle. If cars are to be parked adjacent to the bike lane the curbs should be wide enough to accommodate a open car door or high enough to stop it opening.☐ ☐ I'd also like to see more attention paid to different types of cyclists. Commuters who are on a mission to get somewhere quickly should have safe lanes to travel at speed much like cars get motorways. There should also be the option for low speed cyclists to travel in pedestrian areas where they become more like pedestrians.☐ ☐ One way streets are a menace for cyclists where they intersect with multi-lane roads like the intersection of Moorehouse and Durham St. Care should be taken in the design of these streets to provide for right turning and straight through cyclists. <i>Allocate cycle coloured and rumble strip protected cycle lanes</i>	
Graham Batchelor		Overall favorable especially for cycling which I think has to have a lot more priority than it has had in the past and this opportunity for eco friendly transport has to be encouraged.	The cycle paths look well designed separating cyclist from car (and pedestrians) I could not quite see the detail but it is important if riding the cycle path that it is possible to do so OUTSIDE the parked car door opening range as passengers in cars, in my opinion, are more likely to fling doors open suddenly than driver (who have been partly trained not to do so)	The slow streets (30kph) are a good idea but I still think that cycle/vehicle separation is needed. A lane in these area (as per many streets now) would be much better than no lane as it directs cars away from cycle areas and also gives the cyclist a good indication where they should be on the road (which is on the outside of the lane to avoid car doors)	I know that this is looking at the central area BUT in the west we now have huge traffic volumes and very little cycle provision. Roads around the university are dangerous to cyclist as are many other roads in the area. Can we at least have some cycle lanes that continue on established routes. And there needs to be a dedicated cycle path from the university directly to the city separated from vehicles.(if you want students to access the city)	
Jackson Green		It looks like a good vision overall. It is great to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport into the central city. The more people who travel by these means, the fewer vehicles will enter the central city, and the more pleasant the city will be for everyone, drivers and pedestrians alike.	- The low speed central core. However, having an even lower speed limit for many street (perhaps 10 km/hr) would help to encourage people to leave their cars outside the core unless they really needed them. Such a low speed limit would reduce stress and	- The amount of car parking within the central city. Motorists should be encouraged to park on the periphery and walk or take public transport into the central city. Perhaps the tram could be revitalised as inner city transport that is actually useful!	A clear statement that the goal of the redevelopment is to create an environment where pedestrians, cyclists, and public transport have priority, and private vehicles are allowed but are not any more convenient than walking from the periphery.	

<p>James Adams</p>	<p>The Draft Transport Chapter has many proposals to be commended, especially the provisions on speed limits, public and active transport and the 'people friendly' sentiment. However, the provisions in the parking section of this Chapter will not encourage people to bus, bike or walk to the central city.</p>	<p>[1]In general, the move to make the city centre more "people friendly" [2](pg 6)- 30km/hr speed restrictions in inner core [3](pg 8)- "some streets may be for pedestrians only". Though I would like this to be confirmed [4](pg 10) - safe crossing points of the four avenues for bikes [5](pg 10) - covered bike parking- Though it should be free and not ugly [6](pg 12) - all 'main street' proposals [7](pg 14) - concept of super-stops (could park and ride to/from here be added?) [8](pg 18) - on street parking will be reduced - Though it needs to be significantly reduced and the strategy needs stronger language to ensure this happens [9](pg 18) - move towards smaller parking buildings - though that doesn't mean build more! □</p>	<p>[1]There should be no car parking buildings in the inner core- keep them on the edge. In the day, people can use public or active transport to get to the city, and in the night, people should be allowed to park (on-street) in bus lanes. [2]While we have an opportunity, the amount of short and long term car parking available should not return to pre-earthquake levels. See reasons given in [1]. [3]Provision of parking buildings should not match demand, but manage it.</p>	<p>[1] A commitment to all streets where cyclists are permitted having bike lanes, not only those specifically designated for cyclists [2] As above, provision for on-street car-parking at night in the unused bus lanes [3] Commitment to pedestrian only streets/lanes [4] Commitment to re-instatement of the tram</p>	
<p>James Ellis Holmes</p>	<p>Overall the accessible city draft charter is quite positive. I'm pleased that thought is being given to prioritising streets for cyclists and pedestrians, however the detail of how this will be achieved is lacking. This makes a submission harder than it needed to be.</p>	<p>I live in New Brighton so I really like the proposal to make the Avon Okataro a safe cycling route to the central city. Providing safe, segregated cycle routes will encourage many more people to cycle to and from work. Christchurch is such a flat city that cycling should be an integral part of our transport network. The rebuild has given us the opportunity to reinvent Christchurch as a green city; sustainable energy efficient transport infrastructure will go a long way to achieving that.</p>	<p>I think the draft accessible city plan places too much emphasis on the use of the car. I would like to see Christchurch become the Copenhagen of New Zealand. To that end I would like to see the central city become as car free as possible, with car parks on the outskirts and good public transport and cycling / walking infrastructure a priority. Our dependence on the car as the only viable form of transport has to change. □ I don't like that the number of bus routes will drop from 40 to 7, I believe this will lead to an increase in the number of bus changes required to complete a journey to the central city. Making bus use more difficult will lead to less people using the service meaning even more reliance on cars. More people cycling or using public transport is needed to prevent gridlock of our city.</p>	<p>There is no mention of light rail in the plan; all forms of public transport should be considered. As oil prices continue to rise our reliance on cars needs to drop. □ There is not enough information in the plan as to how cyclists will be kept safe on main arterial streets. The separated routes like the Avon Okataro route are a great way to keep cyclists and cars apart. I would like to see more segregated cycle lanes, neighbourhood green lanes for pedestrian and cycle use and convenient secure cycle parking throughout central city. I also think that more detail on how safe cycling will be provided along the four avenues and throughout central city is needed. □ I would like to see central Christchurch become a car free zone with public transport, cycling and pedestrian access prioritised. The Christchurch City Council Transport Strategic Plan has a real focus on how a transport system can promote cycling, improve health, create community, lead to a more compact urban form, address inequality and ensure resilience. CERA's plan needs much more focus and a clear agenda for how transport is to be improved and should implement the CCC plan for a green central city.</p>	
<p>James William Carr</p>	<p>The intention to encourage cyclist and pedestrians is commendable, though the plan does lack detail here. The inclusion of more trees is also good, though these will of course need to be deciduous so as to provide summer shade and let in light to buildings and the street in winter. The leaves will need to be dealt with, but that is a small price to pay. □ The bus plan is concerning. The stated intention of encouraging the use of public transport is good, but the reduced number of routes will make buses less accessible for many. The people most dependant on buses are the very young, the elderly and the disabled. These people cannot walk far to a bus stop, and walking is generally the only way they have to get to a bus stop. With no buses in the central city the only way to get around the central city without a vehicle is on foot, and Tuam Street to Armagh Street is a long way with a walking frame. With all routes only running to a central hub, many, perhaps most bus commuters will be compelled to transfer, taking considerably more time and likely costing more too. With the frame greatly increasing central city property values and many businesses now tied to suburban locations, a central city hub for all bus routes is probably not likely to reflect the reality of Christchurch commuter routes for many years. If bus commuting is inconvenient then it will not be adopted as long as alternatives (such as private cars) remain an option. A culture of using public transport will eventually make further advances (such as light rail) economic, but if we do not</p>	<p>The focus on cycling and walking, the inclusion of street trees, the separate cycle and pedestrian routes. (See above)</p>	<p>The changes to bus routes, their centralisation and becoming fewer. □ The (implied) possibility of road widening (the proposed cross sections for Tuam and Manchester Streets) and the consequent threat to remaining heritage buildings. (See above)</p>	<p>More detail on cycling and pedestrian routes, especially the intended physical details. □ Reassurance that the arterial and distributor roads will not be further optimised for motorists, and that heritage buildings on these routes will not be destroyed to make way for the proposed changes. Included here is reassurance that new transport infrastructure projects (such as the new bus exchange) will incorporate rather than replace heritage buildings standing on the proposed sites. (See above)</p>	

<p>Jan Cook</p>		<p>I grew up and lived in the Central city for many years. I now live on the Peninsula but visit Christchurch regularly and prefer to spend my time and money in the central city area, travelling by car or cycle depending on my errands. I also cycle in Christchurch for exercise/recreation, using Hagley Park and the railway cycleway. I rarely use public transport as it does not suit my needs, but I would occasionally use a train service to Rangiora, Rolleston, etc if available.</p>	<p>Support 30km/hour zones Support the retention of one-way streets, in particular the change from Lichfield to Tuam. Neutral on Salisbury and Kilmore becoming two-way. Strongly support provisions for cycleways and safer cycling, however this MUST be supported by more cycleways coming in to the city centre. Currently safe off-road cycleways are limited to Hagley Park and the railway cycleway to the north. There is no point in just having cycleways in the central city. Currently cycle parking is almost non-existent throughout Christchurch. There needs to be many more public cycle parks and new buildings must be required to provide cycle parking. As long as public transport and cycling are being strongly promoted and well provided for, I also strongly support the provision of public car parking in the central city. Lack of parking space is a major cause of congestion and general mayhem. I believe the promotion of Public Transport and cycling needs to focus on commuters so that parking space is freed up for the shorter term visitor. This will help attract customers away from the suburban malls.</p>	<p>Large diesel buses were the most off-putting aspect of the City Centre previously. The central bus exchange was a disaster. I would like to see large buses kept out of the central core as much as possible, with smaller, cheap electric shuttles running around the city from the Exchange. With the provision of 'Super stops' the exchange should be located much closer to Moorhouse Ave to integrate with future provision of passenger rail - see below</p>	<p>I am very disappointed that passenger rail has not been factored into this plan. The existing rail line is very well placed to service the rapidly growing communities to the north and west. If we are ever to be serious about reducing our reliance on the private car and easing commuter congestion, then commuter rail must be provided. I understand that this is costly but so is cars, roads and the enormous waste of people's time stuck in traffic (whether in their car or on a bus). I do not support new light rail routes within Christchurch as this is not needed - what is needed is reliable, faster access for the dormitory suburbs. Because of the high cost of fares the Heritage Tram will never be anything more than a tourist attraction which contributes very little to public transport needs.</p>	
<p>Jasmine E Bullen</p>		<p>It's exciting, what a wonderful opportunity to create a people friendly transport network.</p>	<p>-The 30km an hour slow core. -Pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon. -Having priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport. (I would also like to see them extended further within the central city network and beyond) -Encouraging th</p>	<p>-The plan's backward looking view that vehicle dependence is and will remain the dominant transport mode well past mid-century. -The emphasis on expensive inner city car parking. -The lack of commitment and details provided for cycle infrastructure.</p>	<p>Keep cars and parking on the periphery. Provide shuttles to and around the central city. -Save us from high rates by making active and public transport the easy, safe and fast choice. Building 16 parking garages is simply too expensive. -Use this rebuild opportunity to proactively assist the community in shifting to sustainable, healthier active transport options. -High quality cycling infrastructure with separated or off road paths to get everywhere easily. Work with and connect to CCC's network. -Prioritise Armagh Street as an east-west cycling route. -Convert the eastern side of Madras to separate 2-3 metre contraflow cycle lanes and footpaths with a 30 km/h limit by CPIT and the stadium. -Continue Tuam Street cycle lanes to both the east and west and hook up with network or prioritise St Asaph Street for cycling per CCC's plans. -Provide separated pedestrian and cycle paths along the full length of the Avon/Otakaro well linked to the city and to wider networks. -Provide multiple direct and unobstructed routes to encourage people to commute by bicycle. -Acknowledge and provide for the 30+% of non-cyclists who</p>	
<p>Jasper Aorangi</p>		<p>I have to agree with many commentators that it is worrying that the CCC 30 Year transport plan hasnt been included verbatim, then add some! Why? I use all three major modes of transport and am worried on all fronts. This [the CERA] plan is woefully lacking!</p>	<p>The ideas seem good, the devil appears to be in the details. Rumble strips separated bike lanes are a great idea if the follow up of having them clear of debris is also realised (and the bike lanes are where they need to be)</p>	<p>The lack of realistic cycleways, as based on research on cyclists patterns. It has been shown to be easy to encourage cycling by at least 150%! Lack of consideration for faster than 30kmh cycling. Had a look at the Strava stats around the city? Folks are moving pretty fast, and want to go faster! Tools like strave provide you with an amazing no effort database of actual trips ppl are taking through the city. Use it! Reducing the number of bus routes, and more importantly increasing the number of transfers seems insane in such a small city! Our bus system has grown organically and is probably close to as good as it will get and is more congestion limited than anything else! 30km/h zones in the central city? Who will this help? As a cyclist for transport (i.e not recreation) I expect to be going faster than this on a bike. Cycling through slow congestion is in my experience more dangerous than swiftly moving well organised traffic. Congestion has limited speeds, and motorists stop at traffic lights. Its a nice idea on paper that leads to more traffic offences and an unusable central city for car based transportation. Why have cars in the central city at all? Instead you could provide free parking along the periphery and efficient transport modes within. The many benefits are obvious!</p>	<p>The CCC 30 Year transport plan for a START! Consultation with concerned groups - This is a detailed technical document requiring expert commentary, and the groups able to provide this should be consulted. All comments from groups such as spokes (as an example of concerned, rational, group) A commitment to increasing the efficiency of cycling, bussing, and walking throughout chirstchurch. By this I mean not some idle gesture, but concrete plans, including lobbying for the national transport infrastructure budget to have cycling and walking as a higher priority than intercity trucking.</p>	
<p>Jennifer Jill Nuthall</p>		<p>The plan is a good start. You have listened to the people's wish for more cycling and walking and in pleasant circumstances.</p>	<p>Marvellous to see an emphasis on a walkable city.</p>	<p>1. For those living inside the four avenues eg Park Terrace and west of Mantreal, the distance to the main bus routes is too great -it takes 20 minutes to walk to Manchester street, more to get to Tuam/St Asaph so walking needs to be supplemented by a shuttle bus or other frequent public transport. 2. No reference to having traffic lights favour walkers. As a frequent walker around the central city I have always been frustrated at having to wait so long at lights eg crossing Manchester Street. Notice the difference in cities that really take care of pedestrians eg Amsterdam.</p>	<p>Yes. 1. A firm plan to include frequent public transport inside the four avenues. 2. An undertaking to allow more time for pedestrians to cross at lights. 3. An explanation on how buses, which seem to be the form public transport will take, will be able to move at more than a snail's pace yet to have more people use public transport, it must be faster than the car, reasonably priced and frequent.</p>	

Jessica Fergusson		At first it didn't appeal to me purely because of the driving limitations. However, as I continued to read it, I can understand why a plan like this would work for Christchurch. I'm not a fan of public transport, but I like the idea of the pedestrian priority and cycling options. Not only will this plan encourage Cantabrians to exercise, it will help deter people from driving into the city - public transport will be crucial to the central business district. This new plan will encourage tourists back into the city and this is never a bad thing!	The pedestrian priority in the CBD. Many places overseas use this initiative - always good to keep up with other countries!	Limited driving accessibility - depending on how I look at it, this could either be a good thing or a bad thing. Cars are important if you want to get somewhere quickly without having to wait for a bus/shuttle/walking/cycling etc.. BUT without driving accessibility, people visiting the CBD will be encouraged to use public transport or exercise.		
Joanne Scott		I don't like the retention of any one way streets. It is incomprehensible to me that we should think this is a way to revitalise the inner city when numerous cities around the world have abandoned one ways. How is it that the modelling that has been done to support their retention runs contrary to the modelling done in other cities? I don't believe the modelling has been made available and think that it should be audited. If the one ways proceed I will personally be attempting to boycott the inner city because there will be only two explanations for such a mindless act - inept traffic engineers or corruption by the dominant power group who misguidedly continue to favour one ways. I will not be investing insurance monies in a city that favours one ways.		I particularly dislike the one way streets because they 1) segregate relatively small areas and users 2) are ugly and unfriendly, both to locals but particularly to tourists who are unnecessarily challenged in finding their way around a strange city 3) make life difficult for vulnerable users such as cyclists, pedestrians and children, 5) have a well-documented adverse effect on businesses located on them and 5) reduce the rates collected from those businesses, to the detriment of all ratepayers and residents.□	Friendly, safe two way streets that create vibrant communities for residents and vibrant businesses.	
Jocelyn Pappill and Caroline Syddall		It is pleasing to see an emphasis on active transport as a way of getting people in, out and around the central city. The proposed speed reduction to 30KPH within the core is progressive; we have felt much safer as pedestrians in cities elsewhere in the world where similar speed restrictions are enforced. We also note that CERA and the CCC are 'committed to making Christchurch a place for everyone by ensuring that accessibility check are incorporated into building consent processes ...'(p5) but not enough mention of universal design principles and accessibility for all is made throughout the document. It is not just buildings that need to be accessible but the whole streetscape so that those in wheelchairs, mobility scooters, pushing prams or blind or deaf can easily navigate around the central city.	We particularly like the way finding (p19) proposal, but we are interested to know whether the information will also be available in braille (or verbal) for the blind or (where relevant) be scan-able (smart phone app?) so that those who speak neither English or Maori can understand them. The addition of interpretation panels to inform people of sites of significance to tangata whenua is also laudable.□ We applaud the enhancement of streetscapes along main streets (p12) - this could ameliorate the worst effects of the easterly winds but the design will also need to be cognisant of the needs of those in wheelchairs or blind (i.e. avoid trip hazards by ensuring the transition from footpath or seating/parking areas are not stepped).□ The emphasis on provision of cycle parking facilities (p10) is welcomed with the suggestion that covered facilities be also provided at the central library.	1. Parking (p18) - while we understand the need to provide some public parking facilities within the central city the desire to return to pre-quake levels seems contrary to the over all vision desired by Chch people to have a pedestrian, people friendly central city. In other cities where car parking has been reduced over time economic recovery has been neither compromised nor hindered. Decisions at the local level can help boost citizens' adoption of car alternatives and this is what the Accessible City plan should aim for. The revenue from parking charges should be targeted at continual improvements of public spaces for people and in supporting an efficient public transport system. If our central city is rebuilt as a dynamic residential area as well as a commercial/office area then the customers for the retailers will be available 24/7 - it is important we ensure our city does not return to the dead centre, 'donut' it had become before 2010.□ 2. One way system: we are concerned that retaining Durham & Montreal as one way within the 30kph zone will make it dangerous for pedestrians - different traffic speeds make street crossings more complex to judge for many people. If part of this plan's aim is to prioritise pedestrians & change the 'car culture', we need to be prepared to control traffic speeds even on one way streets.	We believe that the needs to be more focus on changing transport behaviour. We have the opportunity now to signal our citizens that our renewed and rebuilt central city will truly be accessible for all, be safer for pedestrians, cyclists, skaters and be a city future proofing itself for the post-carbon future. In its current form the plan is less than bold in its vision and remains wedded to an increasingly outmoded 20thC car-centric view.□ Be bold - reduce the number of short car trips to the centre rather than maintain a large number of parking spaces. With looming increased fuel costs, now is the time to be making the shift away from car travel. The pedestrian/cycle/public transport plans in this draft are too bitsy; re-think the plan wearing the pedestrian/cyclists/buses glasses then see how cars fit in with that. □ Note:Appendices p28-29 - the minimum number of cycle parking spaces provided by each activity should be increased to encourage more cycling, particularly schools (will improve health outcomes, too).	
Joe Connolly		The plans are world class and create exactly what is needed for the 21st Century - accessibility for all. It is an example to the rest of the country and most of the world.	Splitting out walking and cycling routes from main arterial and distributor routes and limiting the speed to 30km/h in the core. Segregating cycle lanes from car traffic and keeping car parks out of cycle lanes.	No	Develop this plan into national policy for all of New Zealand's cities.	
John & Jos Rand		Over all ..very well thought out.	The emphasis on designating various CBD streets and laneways towards cars/or public transport/or cycleways/or pedestrians is very good.□ Creating Nth/Sth laneways through large city blocks is particularly pleasing.	We dislike the 'whole' block bounded by Colombo/Lichfield/Manchester and Tuam streets being designated for the total bus interchange.□ We would advocate for the bus interchange to be split into 2 much smaller parts. One on the East side of Colombo St servicing East,Nth East and Sth East bus services.□ And; one on the West side of Colombo St,(where the current temporary bus terminal is)servicing West,Sth West and Nth West services.□ Join the two terminals by airbridge over Colombo St□ ADVANTAGES:□ 1) Less dominant use of the Colombo/Tuam/Manchester/Lichfield block ...Allowing for Entertainment development to occur at its Eastern end.□ 2) Remove bus traffic across and along Colombo st and keep Colombo St even more pedestrian friendly and with less traffic volume.□ 3) Offers improved bus entrance and exits to and from the two exchanges. □ 3)Colour identify Western buses from Eastern buses.□ 4) Clarity for public transport users ...West travelling or East travelling!□ 5) 'Future proof' the possibility of light rail or trams, at some future time, travelling along Colombo St by offering the potential for North bound or South bound trams/light rail to divert into the appropriate exchange. □ 4) A true bus INTERCHANGE,not just a "bus stop",would be the result.□	Allow generous Nth/Sth laneways immediately behind the Colombo St retail strips (Both sides of Colombo,between Lichfield and Tuam sts) for....□ a) Pedestrians,alfresco dining,weekend markets, inward facing retail and ,perhaps, time limited courier/goods delivery	

<p>John Joseph Carter</p>		<p>Again the focus on Walking and Cycling will make or break Christchurch in the future, I think this plan is a great starting point and believe when people see how easy it is to switch from private vehicles to cycling or walking (if the actions to encourage cycling and walking are consistently followed through.) Public transport also will benefit greatly from the pedestrian friendly city. □ I really like the way-finding and signage for pedestrians and cyclists, having recently travelled I think we would be terrible hosts to not provide a great coverage for tourists and also locals, as it's easy to lose your way, with such great change in the city.</p>	<p>The inner city 30 km speed zone and focus on creating a space that favours pedestrians and cyclists. It was one thing stood out as ruining the inner city prior earthquakes. □ The connections to parks and the Avon, for walkers and cyclists, including through Hagley Park and the soon to be developed Frame. □ The focus on 'streetscapes' designed to allow for trees, outdoor seating and also I like the idea of separating cyclists and the general traffic. □</p>	<p>There is quite a big focus on Parking in the Appendix. I truly believe Christchurch has more than its fair share of car parking. We cater well for cars in this city, I have read in CCC documents 19 in 20 cars have a sole occupant driver, and I think it shows that despite the topography and climate of Christchurch we currently only have one viable option of transport, for many differing reasons. I disagree with keeping the One way system on Durham and Montreal, as I feel it cuts the CBD off from the Arts Centre and Hagley Park. I think the 30 km zone should cover an even larger area, that includes the Arts centre and Museum, and in the East, CPIT. I think Barbadoes and Madras should be Two-way or at least have wide pedestrian space with contra flow cycle lanes. Cashel St could also be part of the inner core, as it could link the East- all the way to Eastgate. □ With the changes in the plan, and possibly the changes I suggested more people may take to other modes of transport.</p>	<p>Rail, and light rail. Rail is a seriously overlooked admission in this transport plan. It seems to have been dismissed and given lip service only, where it exists already, and is regaining popularity all over the world (and even in NZ). Christchurch needs to cater for those without motor vehicles, people with disabilities who cannot cycle and those who realise that taking the bus is never going to beat the traffic. Re-establishing the southern rail link from Rolleston to Lyttelton would be fantastic, with hubs at Hornby, Addington, Sydenham, CPIT (or Wilsons Rd), Woolston and possible Heathcote. □</p>	
<p>John McDermott</p>		<p>The plan has great ambitions for improving the mix of transport options. I am optimistic that achieving these goals will make the city more attractive for living and working. □ My particular interest is to encourage greater use of cycling as a preferred transport mode. Christchurch has great potential for reaping the benefits of fewer car journeys and increased cycling. However there needs to be specific objectives and means of achieving this.</p>	<p>The consideration of the necessary road designs to accommodate mixed transport options is welcome. The emphasis on encouraging cycling and providing the necessary infrastructure is very welcome. □ I am concerned that there is insufficient detail to ensure that these objectives will be met though. □ I would like to see greater explanation of: □ 1/ specific measurable objectives of goals for increased cycle use, e.g. number of journeys, frequency of use, type of journey, purpose of journey, etc. There needs to be goals and timeframes for these, so that implementation is accountable. □ 2/ specific design details and recommendations for route construction, so that there are hard rules of promoting preferred transport options for cycling. The explanations in the Transport Plan are somewhat vague, with greater detail provided for vehicle routes compared to cycle routes.</p>	<p>Victoria St is described as a Main St, however cycling is still considered to be secondary and sharing road use with vehicles. This conflicts with the plan objectives. Cyclists should be provided equal, but where required - different - access to the city. Putting cyclists in a shared environment on what are described as main access routes will not encourage or incentivise reduced vehicle use. As an example, allowing car street parking, where this removes the option for separated cycle lanes, is particularly unfortunate. There are plenty of off-street parking options, and the provision of a small number of on-street car parks, e.g. Merivale or Victoria St, puts cyclists in conflict with cars/trucks/etc when the benefits of such parking is extremely marginal. If retailers saw the increased passing traffic from pedestrians and cyclists, the supposed convenience of on-street parking would quickly be seen as illusory.</p>	<p>I propose that typical cycle personas are developed and consideration made whether the routes and infrastructure enable and support cycle use for these types. e.g. 12yo child, 25yo CBD resident, 40yo commuter, 65yo retiree. □ Prioritised routes for cyclists should be protected for only cyclists. The use of 'shared' roads should be disallowed, as any single obstruction on a route is likely to dissuade individuals from adopting cycling as a preferred transport mode. □ I would like to see the Northern Cycle way adapted so that a more direct route to the CBD is provided. This is an excellent, but underused, facility. The current exit to Fendalton Rd and across Hagley park is inconvenient for travellers from around Merivale area going to the CBD. □ Further, to encourage cycling I would like to see comments in the plan that extend to the suburbs. In order to encourage a greater use of cycling it is clearly necessary to redesign the infrastructure system. Therefore, as well as the CBD plan, it should be necessary to consider how suburban residents can access the cycling network. For instance, the Northern Cycleway 'terminates' in Redwood, without any provision to connect to other nearby suburbs, in particular Belfast. Hence consideration of 'feeder' routes to the cycling network is needed. □ To repeat, I would like to see specific measurable objectives for transport mode use, and detailed rules on infrastructure design that accommodate cycling as an encouraged mode of transport.</p>	
<p>Jonathan Davidson</p>		<p>The Accessible City draft chapter seems to be very well prepared and professional. It is neatly separated into the 4 main types of transport that people are expected to use. It still seems, however, to be very general and lacking in specific details.</p>	<p>I particularly like the clear distinction made between an "inner zone" where motor traffic will be slow(30 km/h) or not present, and the main arteries which will allow steady flow of traffic. I hope that this distinction will be clearly emphasised on the ground, with the slow streets being narrowed and perhaps even a rare speed bump introduced. I also like that thought has been put into parking space for vehicles of people who wish to come and enjoy the inner zone by foot, although</p>	<p>I feel like there could have been more detail into the way cycling will be integrated into the street. It seems to me that making cycling safe is a major desire of most people in the city. The plans shows cyclist sharing some roads with vehicles, and when there is a cycle path separate from the road, it is place right next to parked cars. Why not completely convert one East-West road to bicycles only? This is an opportunity for a major change in how Christchurch integrates cycling with everyday life, and the the city centre can serve as a "testing ground" for ideas that might spread to the whole city. □ I would also avoid having any parking space inside the "inner zone". I think that the parking should be restricted to places next to the major arteries, to avoid bringing any trafficand congestion into the slow core of the city.</p>		
<p>Julia Morison</p>		<p>I commend the idea to give prioritise the pedestrian over the vehicle but don't think it goes far enough. It is not demonstrated in the plan.</p>	<p>The dedicated cycle lanes.</p>	<p>The retention of the one-way streets. They are confusing, not socialable, used as fly-overs and bad for business as one tends to give up reaching the destination.</p>	<p>Convert all one-way streets to two-way. □ More dedicated cycle-lanes - not just in the Frame. Christchurch's flatness is ideal for cycling but it isn't safe. We should have cycle lanes to match those of Amsterdam. □ The pedestrian paths should be designed to be level (no kerbing) so that strollers, cycles, can move with ease.</p>	
<p>Julie Newell</p>		<p>I believe this is a unique opportunity for Christchurch to develop an environmentally friendly and people friendly public transport system with an emphasis on efficient and reliable public transport, as opposed to a car friendly city. Christchurch is an excellent place to develop strong support for walking and cycling</p>				

Katarina Te Maihoroa		A bit vague in detail. It still lives in a world where the 'car' is the more important aspect.			<p>I would like to see more plans toward being a bike friendly environment ie not competing with cars on a 'typical main street', the 'typical main street' needs cycle lanes at least (they're not in the picture) or have no cars on that area. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>It needs to include having own bike lanes (away from road).<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Separate bikes and cars!!! Car's are so scary! Try biking down Bealy Ave to work, it's a very exciting (death wish?) ride.<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Chch needs heaps more bike parking.<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The innercity public transport section lacks completion. There needs to be plenty of coverage across the city for public transport. More than proposed for time efficiency and minimal exchanging of buses.<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Would be good to have more walking only areas.<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Have you seen the lessons of A Convenient Truth: Urban Solutions from Curitiba, Brazil?? <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>http://mariavazphoto.com/curitiba_pages/curitiba_dvd.html<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This is what Chch should be looking at!! I back this.<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Thanks<input type="checkbox"/></p>	
Katie Scott		Scrap the one-way street system in Christchurch. But if you feel like driving around in circles, then go ahead and implement it.				
Ken Rapson		<p>I agree the 30 kph limit for motor traffic is good for the central city but believe this would be best in conjunction with a city wide speed limit of 40 kph on all sub-main (not artery) roads. Cycling and walking are habit that need to be followed in the whole city. I believe that the uptake of walking/cycling in the central city is pie in the sky and doomed for failure unless <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1. helmets are made non mandatory for adults citywide. (Some people tend to be very sanctimonious about cyclists use of helmets but cost/benefit analysis shows there is a negative health benefit to the community of cyclists wearing helmets and a positive benefit to the community of motorists wearing helmets!)<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>and 2. There is a reduction of speed limits city-wide on sub-main roads from the present unenforced 50 kph (read 60 kph) to an enforceable 40 kph. This would enable cycling and walking to become the most efficient and healthy transport option for all age groups</p>		<p>I do not like the provision of cycle only paths as part of the plan. This is based on the belief that commuting cyclists (rather than recreational cyclists) will travel to get on to cycle routes when in fact they naturally prefer to go the quickest way. Cycleways such as the present one alongside the northern railway line do not encourage cycle use and are a waste of money.</p>	<p>1. parking needs to be affordable as long as the major transport into the city is by car. Present parking costs in town are too expensive and do not encourage people to come to town.</p>	
Larissa Moeller			<p>The idea of rumble strips between cycle lanes and car lanes BUT make sure that the rumble strips are not a hazard for cyclist and don't get dislodged as easily as the current ones.</p>	<p>I don't rate having the cycle lane separated from the normal traffic by a kerb as that could cause harm to the cyclists</p>	<p>park and ride - used extensively in Europe where the parking is further out of town near major roads and then there is a free shuttle but taking people into the city - would ease congestion and parking stress.</p>	
Laura Scrimgeour		<p>It's exciting, what a wonderful opportunity to create a people friendly transport <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>network.</p>	<p>-The 30km an hour slow core. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>-Pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>-Having priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport. (I would: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>also like to see them extended further within the central city network and <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>beyond) <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>-Encouraging th</p>	<p>-The plan's backward looking view that vehicle dependence is and will remain <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>the dominant transport mode well past mid-century. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>-The emphasis on expensive inner city car parking <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>-The lack of commitment and details provided for cycle infrastructure: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>inc</p>	<p>-Keep cars and parking on the periphery. Provide shuttles to and around the: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>central city. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>-Save us from high rates by making active and public transport the easy, safe: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>and fast choice. Building 16 parking garages is simply too expensive. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>-Use this reb</p>	
Lois Florence Wells		<p>City looks compact but I fear there may be traffic jams espec on Sat. nights when crowds are going to sports events, performances, etc. Also, the large area of the car-free zone raises the question of safety at night, with the Bus Interchange being on the periphery & not all buses going through it. Waiting at bus-stops might be risky.</p>	<p>Compactness</p>	<p>Too large a car-free area for the very young, elderly & disabled to walk to buses in safety. They may already have walked to a bus to reach the city. Bus Interchange should be right in the middle of the CDB, i.e. in Cathedral Square. As it is, it is too far from Hagley Park, Isaac Theatre, Arts Centre, The Strip, etc.</p>	<p>A shuttle bus & taxis for the elderly & disabled plus a reduced car-free zone. Otherwise, a whole section of the community may be deterred from shopping by day or coming out at night, because walking to and from buses will be too difficult and hazardous by night. Also, all buses should go through the Bus Exchange.</p>	
Luke Herbert		<p>Its very good all round.</p>	<p>Prioritised Bus and Cycle routes are the right idea they just need to be implemented properly. New Bus exchange acts a transfer point to the city Airport.</p>	<p>Cycle lanes are still beside the roads. They should be stand alone. Prioritised areas for Buses should dedicated Bus lanes. Wayfinding signs need to be in foreign languages for tourists who don't speak English.</p>	<p>The Christchurch Railway Station returned to the CBD.</p>	

<p>Margaret Lynne Christie</p>		<p>Overall, I was encouraged as I believe Active transport is the way forward- for health, for sustainability and for economic advantage. I would like to see a Christchurch where active transport and public transport are the easy and obvious choices. Cycling, walking and public Transport all got a good hearing. How well the plan ends up accommodating them will be an indicator of how well Christchurch will function as a sustainable, healthy, inclusive, accessible and economically viable city. However, cynically, I feel that when this plan is implemented it will deliver a "top heavy" result in favour of cars. <input type="checkbox"/> This plan still invites cars through the CBD even if they are not stopping. And if they do stop, the multitude of car parking buildings available make it easy. <input type="checkbox"/> Driving personal motorcars is unhealthy, expensive and unsustainable.<input type="checkbox"/> We have a pretty perfect climate and topography to make Christchurch a real city for cyclists.<input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Are there any proposals in the draft Accessible City chapter that you particularly like?<input type="checkbox"/> I like the Plan's proposal for priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport as outlined in the Central City Road Use Hierarchy (p.4). <input type="checkbox"/> The 30km/h slow core in the Inner Zone and along the Avon River Precinct is great (p.6), as is the pedestrian and cycle routes along the Avon and through the Square and in the Frame (pp 8-11) I support designing intersections along cycling routes to ensure priority and safety for cyclists (p.10) I agree with providing cycle parking (p.10) and I support the proposal to have secure cycle parking at the Bus Interchange and at the "super stops"<input type="checkbox"/> I agree having a "super stop" near the Hospital (pp.13, 14) as too many people have difficulty finding a car or bike park, currently. It would be great if more people took the bus to that end of town.<input type="checkbox"/> I like the concept of through-traffic to the four avenues and to one way streets and out of the central city (pp16,17). I like the plan to make Tuam Street a one way street and having Lichfield two-way.<input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>I really don't like the fact that three routes within the slow core are to remain at 50kmph. The whole core should be a uniform 30km/h.<input type="checkbox"/> Tuam Street is marked as a key road for all four modes- not good for new or unconfident cyclists.<input type="checkbox"/> There are too many off street parking buildings in the core even though the plan also says that they will be on the perimeter<input type="checkbox"/> 16 is too many in any case and making parking too convenient will not encourage people to cycle or take a bus to the central city. Anything you do to make it easy to drive will only cause congestion. Besides, parking buildings are expensive to build, maintain and staff.<input type="checkbox"/> The plan needs to have more thought put into it as how to make it more accessible to disabled people. While it addresses some of issues around people with mobility restrictions there was little other regard for those with visual or hearing impairment. We should be creating a walking environment with convenient routes and wide footpaths that is excellent for people with disabilities and therefore good for everyone. Christchurch has an aging population with the oldest average age in the country- lets provide good facilities for them to get around!<input type="checkbox"/> CPIT remains a bit of a traffic island and a trap for people walking and cycling. A pedestrian crossing mid block on Madras Street will help. No on-road parking on the eastern side of Madras Street will make room for a 2-3 metre wide contra-flow cycle lane. At present, pedestrians have to share the footpath with cyclists who otherwise have limited access to CPIT from the north-west. There also needs to be a safe and convenient way for cyclists heading south from Madras Street to get onto Casson Street (currently they are not provided for).</p>	<p>I would like to see some strong east/west and north/south on road cycle lanes for confident cyclists wanting to travel swiftly from a-b. I would like to see the Oxford Terrace/Lichfield Street route be made a priority east/west cycle commuter route. This would take the cycling traffic heading west off Tuam Street which is currently also designated a key public transport and car route.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> But there also needs to be some strong off-road cycling routes for people who are not confident riding in traffic and who want to/can only ride slower. Having the meandering off-road path by the river and in Hagley path is not enough. These cyclists actually want to get places, too! These sorts of off road facilities will be wonderful for generating economic activity and tourists who are not necessarily used to our terrible drivers would probably appreciate these too).<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> As a Spokes member, I strongly support our call for neighbourhood Greenways, ie through-routes for pedestrians and cycles, but not for vehicles.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Marjorie Manthei</p>		<p>Positive about the emphasis on safe cycleways. I live in inner city and [used to] walk or cycle to and within the CBD all the time. Would like even better cycle access than what is in the Plan, though. See suggestions in last panel. <input type="checkbox"/></p>		<p>The plan does not recognise or deal with the more specific transport needs of inner city residents. We need an easy, safe way to cycle into and around the CBD and a direct walking route. Also the former yellow shuttle buses were great and used extensively by those in this area.</p>	<p>For cyclist, widening Tuam St would be good, as well as a more direct east-west route, rather than what looks like winding around the river. Some people I've talked with prefer Peterborough St as the primary cycle route.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> It has always been very difficult to cycle on streets such as Bealey Ave, but sometimes there is no alternative. While overseas, I saw a similar street which had the cycle way RIGHT DOWNN THE MIDDLE of the median strip. It was great, and could be done on Bealey and probably the other avenues.<input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Mark Radford</p>		<p>Needs more emphasis on cycling and cycle infrastructure. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I am in full support of the submission that SPOKES has made and suggest these are considered.</p>	<p>Separate off road cycle lanes <input type="checkbox"/> 30 kmh speed</p>	<p>Lack of cycle infrastructure planning.</p>	<p>Block off through roads for cars in central city. Separate non-shared cycle paths. What SPOKES has suggested</p>	
<p>Martin Selwyn Fraser</p>			<p>improved cycle access and facilities, however when the developers say they have built these cycle parking spaces ect someone from the council or CERA has to physically inspect them to ensure they really are there and not just sign them off and take their word for it.</p>		<p>Thought has to be given as to how people will access these inner city cycle ways, currently only the very competent cyclists are able to get to the inner city from the suburbs as the feeder roads like Lincoln rd, papanui rd, ferry rd ect are so hopeless to cycle on that for someone starting out in cycling it could take years before they feel they have the ability to tackle such dangerous routes.</p>	
<p>Melanie Witbrock</p>					<p>I think we need to have more right turning arrows at intersections.<input type="checkbox"/> Particularly now with the change in the Give Way rule (where previously right turning traffic only had to wait for the straight ahead traffic and not the vehicles turning left into the same street)<input type="checkbox"/> Too many times only one vehicle has the opportunity to turn right each light change, and generally this is running an orange or even red.</p>	
<p>Michael A Ball</p>		<p>There are now four authorities involved with transport in Christchurch, CCDU ECan, CCC and NZTA. It is about time we had one authority to govern transport issues in Christchurch such as TIL in London and AT in Auckland. Only then will we get a holistic approach to transport, in line with the wishes of the public.<input type="checkbox"/> The basic issue I have with this plan is that it is car centric. When so many countries are returning their cities to their citizens by expanding enormously, public transport and cycling facilities this can only be seen as a backward step.<input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The proposed streetscapes and the increase in emphasises on cycling and walking is good but doesn't go far enough. As a long time cyclist I am acutely aware of the limitations of this plan. For cyclists to get to the city centre they will have to negotiate a pretty unfriendly traffic environment which will have a detrimental effect on the numbers on cyclists going there. Hence my comments to the first question.<input type="checkbox"/> The plan to reduce speed limits to 30kmph in a good idea but doesn't go far enough. All streets should have this restriction except the main ones. This is part of a worldwide trend. Those streets that continue to have 50kmph should have dedicated and separate cycle lanes.<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The sidelining of the City Tramway is I think that I think is a big mistake. Trams such as this are proven promoters of development. One has only to look at the San Francisco F Line to see how this works. This approach is now being copied by dozens of cities in America with plans for "city circulars" that combines tourism with commuters. The proposed expansion into the Poplar Lanes area is even more important now that the area needs to be completely rebuilt.</p>	<p>There is no mention of Light Rail in the plan and this needs to be addressed. Yes it is expensive but it also long lasting. London Underground is celebrating 150 years of operation this month and they are still using the same tunnels and many of the original stations. I would also like to say that the cost estimates for Light Rail often quoted in the press seem to be inflated for political purposes and have been challenged by organisations that have a more realistic idea of the true costs involved.</p>	

<p>Michael Andreassen</p>		<p>This plan falls down badly with the mixing of different speed limits within the one area. This will lead to confusion and misjudgement by both slow and fast traffic, and thus accidents and injury.. This condition is brought about because cross-town traffic is being inserted into central city traffic using the existing one way system.□ □ CBD traffic is slow, often pedestrian and cycling while vehicle traffic is largely searching for parking or delivering goods, all somewhat meandering.. Cross town traffic is fast, directed and focused on the end destination.□ □ A much better and safer solution would be to clearly separate the two traffic types so that there is neither confusion nor overlap between them. This can easily be done by establishing a Ring-Road around both the CBD and Hagley Park.. The route is fairly obvious: Bealey Ave, Fitzgerald Ave, Moorhouse Ave, Deanes Ave, and Harpers Ave. It should preferably be one way, clockwise or anti-clockwise although two way would be possible even if it meant widening all roads. This ring-road would be the limit of 50kph with all inside streets being 30kph. The light commercial area north of Moorhouse and west of Barbados would hardly suffer from a reduced speed limit.□ □ Riccarton Rd, from Deanes to the hospital should also be closed or restricted to emergency vehicles buses and taxis only at 30kph.□ □</p>				
<p>Michael Robinson</p>		<p>Since the EQ,s of 2011, the people of Canterbury have changed their retail habits to the outer suburbs such as Northwood, Northlands, Hornby,Barrinton circular route. Now is an ideal opportunity to link these hubs with central city by light rail or even Trams on a circular route also including the palms,eastgate and new Brighton. Giving the people of Christchurch easy , accessible transport linked to the city would show great vision and be a legacy for many years to follow.</p>				
<p>Murray Robertson</p>		<p>It looks good overall</p>	<p>I like the cycle ways in the inner city, but my concern is that to get to the CBD to enjoy them you have to take your life in your hands riding along busy city streets which is a major disincentive, as they have no separate cycle ways.</p>		<p>There appears to be no provision for commuter rail links from places like Rolleston, Rangiora and Lyttelton, which seems to be every short sighted and goes against global trends, although the government seem to be making it quite clear they don't like railways.</p>	
<p>Murray Sarelius BRITT</p>		<p>I have found the Accessible City draft a generally positive contribution to our recovery with a couple of what I think are very important elements that need further consideration: traffic speed and light rail(see below).</p>	<p>I like the tree lined access roads that provide for a mix of transport types: walking, cycling, private car, and public bus systems. I like the inner zone maximum speed limit of 30 km/h.</p>	<p>It is my view that the 50 km/h speed limits within the current 4 avenues zone is unhelpful. I live close to Barbadoes St just south of Bealey Ave. While the speed limit along Barbadoes St is currently 50 km/h, few vehicles travel within this limit certainly from Bealey Ave to Kilmore St. Many travel in excess of 60km/h (some even at 70 km/h plus) without being apprehended by traffic police. Seldom do I see traffic police along this part of Barbadoes St which is quite a contrast to Harper Avenue where for example, this morning at 10 am, 4 police vehicles lay in wait for speeding drivers. I note also that Barbadoes St is treated by many drivers in Christchurch as a city by-pass. Why would anyone create a by-pass so close to a city that is being designed in a way to attract visitors to Christchurch? □ □ In my view, a sensible solution would be reduce the speed limit along streets, roads and avenues etc currently within the 4 avenues to the same as that within the inner zone viz 30km/h. And if for some reason this were not possible, please give more thought to replacing the 50Km/h with a limit of 40 km/h within the 4 avenues. Such solutions are simple and straightforward for most motorists. I sincerely hope that you will give a lot of thought to this issue re traffic speed and feel sure that others will support the views I have expressed here.</p>	<p>I know that the issue of light rail has been raised earlier and summarily canned by government but I think it should be reconsidered - at the very least light rail corridors should be identified.</p>	

Nick Butcher		I like it - it presents a generally forward thinking vision that I think will bring life to the central city and make it a more attractive place to live and work.	<p>- The physically separated cycleways.□</p> <p>- The slow core streets with reduced allocation for vehicles and increased pedestrian areas - these, more than anything, will make the central city a social/leisure area rather than simply a place to buy what you can</p>	None	<p>Yes: I think that, considering the time frames under discussion, it is important to account for the likely role of autonomous vehicles in both the central city and suburban transport mix. These have the potential to dramatically change peoples transport options and choices. While they are often perceived as a distant future technology they are in fact already in operation. Google have amassed approx 500,000km of driving on streets in California, including dense urban areas, under fully autonomous control (i.e. vehicle drives itself with no human intervention whatsoever). Towards the end of this decade these vehicles may well be commonplace (California has a law requiring suitable legislation to be in place by 2015).□</p> <p>Autonomous vehicles have the demonstrated capability to increase lane capacity by close to an order of magnitude (2000 vehicle/hour -> 20,000 vehicles per hour) and also allow massively increased vehicle utilization (and hence reduced need for parking, especially in heavy traffic areas such as central cities).□</p> <p>Given the potentially transformative impact of these technologies, they should be considered in the development of both transport and building infrastructure (especially car parks). Otherwise the city may find itself in ten years time with a large number of assets which are somewhat redundant.□</p> <p>Beyond this, Christchurch could adapt its transport plan to become an early mover in the field. This could create economic opportunities (as an early adopter and future centre of excellence) beyond the mere transport system benefits.</p>	
Oliver Harrow		Overall it's a well thought out plan however I'm disappointed there is no consideration for a light rail transit network. The city has the perfect opportunity to put in place corridors for such a network. Christchurch needs to be progressive and innovative with its future public transport infrastructure. This will let the city's urban settlement patterns evolve around light rail corridors and ensure we have an environmentally sustainable transport system for the future. It would also make Christchurch a much more livable place and inspire new immigrants from overseas and domestically.			<p>Provision for light rail corridors. For example, city to airport via hospital, riccarton rd, university, memorial ave. Also city to Belfast via Victoria sq/Victoria St, papanui rd. City to Hornby via hospital, riccarton rd, sockburn. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>Other corridors should be considered for Shirley/Marshlands, New Brighton, Sumner, Cashmere/ColomboSt, Halswell.□</p> <p>□</p> <p>A comprehensive city wide network could take decades to complete due to cost but the consideration for corridors must be made now.</p>	
Owen Sanders		Deficient in its total ignoring of the role rail transport might play in the future city.		Reliance on cars and buses to transport people to and around the city is very backward looking. There are now few cities that do not include urban rail schemes as part of their transport plans. Christchurch is ideally set up to do this with existing rail lines radiating out to the south, west, southeast and north.	<p>The suggestion that buses are able to attract people out of their cars is a rap this planning group has fallen into. Wellington people know it already and Auckland is just discovering it. In Australia urban rail development is currently a major factor of all four major centres. As a resident in Rangiora I do not use the bus to go to Christchurch. It is slow, the seating is most uncomfortable (worse than cattle class on the airlines). A fast rail service to Christchurch would be more attractive and would I believe get people out of their cars, be more environmentally friendly, and reduce the huge sums being spent on road development and maintenance.</p>	
Pamela Gibbons					<p>The draft plan is very idealist and lovely. However as a walker and bus user I am sure it will take more to encourage people to get out of their cars. Especially in winter.□</p> <p>Something I feel very strongly about is people living close to their work place. Many big organisations that have more than one branch in the city e.g. banks, the AA, employ people to work in Christchurch and they can be moved around branches at any time. While I appreciate that different skills and personalities are needed to make teams work I think transport planners need to work with Human Resources professionals to ensure that proximity to work is added into the criteria for placing staff in branches. What is the sense in moving someone from a nearby branch, walking distance, or a branch they could reach with a single bus ride from home, to a difficult to reach branch? Everyone has to work together to make the future more sustainable - it isn't just about paths and bus routes.□</p>	
Peter Gibson		I think that it has been reasonably well thought out, bearing in mind that a lot of businesses that were formerly located in CBD have moved away, and are probably unlikely to return to CBD. eg James Trichelor Optician formerly in Hereford st, now at Northwood.□ Also shopping habits have changed, Suburban Malls, online shopping.	all appear OK	<p>No reference to any future proofing for public transport with Light Rail.□</p> <p>Bob Parker seems to have gone dead silent over this.□</p> <p>Also nothing stated on any future for heavy rail commuting.□</p> <p>Are we to continually encourage the use of private cars for work commuting.</p>	<p>No comments at all about a possible future for rail in Chch area.□</p> <p>Whilst the cost of light rail may preclude it in the near future, I think now is the time to safeguard some future corridors for light rail vehicles.□</p> <p>I also see a benefit in using the existing heavy rail corridors between Rolleston and Rangiora for park and ride options. There must be some redundant trains available when Auckland converts to electric MU trains.□</p> <p>Two short sighted moves in the past would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the removal of the original leg of the Addington railway triangle when the new overbridge was constructed.□ 2 the placing of the new Chch station in such a restricted site.□ <p>And possibly, the singling of the rail line to Rolleston (could be reinstated).□</p> <p>A possible site for a new station would be on the old saleyards site, with a possible inner city station site also protected.□</p> <p>I think planners need to look to the future more.□</p> <p>Some arterial roads, such as Main North rd and Marshland rd are seriously congested at peak hours.</p>	

Philip Richards		I think it balances the many demands on the space available	It makes provision for motorists to come into the city and to park. It makes good provision for buses and takes them off Colombo Street in the main. I like the idea of widening Manchester Street into a Boulevard	Unclear whether the loss of onstreet spaces will be compensated for by more off street spaces. Also wonder if allowance has been made for stopping (as opposed to short term parking) I car pool and we drop people off as we drive through the core. If there is nowhere to pull off into this will hold traffic up.	It does not show the street that far, but Colombo Street is an important car route between Brougham and Milton Streets. It is a real bottle neck because Durham Street does not run through to the South. Could it be widened to provide more lanes and can longer time be given to cars turning right into it from Brougham. Would you widen Tuam Street into a Boulevard as well?	
Prudence LeCren Edmond		Share an Idea found that the community's vision for the new city was a green residential, and commercial haven where pedestrians, people on bicycles and community came first. Cars were to be kept to the perimeter and smaller shuttles conveyed people. Only a rather limited version of that vision is found in the plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Having priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport, and would like to see them extended further within the central city network and beyond. <input type="checkbox"/> The 30km an hour slow core. <input type="checkbox"/> Encouraging through traffic to the four avenues. <input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon. <input type="checkbox"/> Designing intersections to ensure priority and safety for cycling. <input type="checkbox"/> Cycle parking at bus exchange & super stops. We will need more. <input type="checkbox"/> One-way streets with separated cycleways on both sides. <input type="checkbox"/> Improved way-finding signage. Long overdue, please expand. 	<p>The plan's backward looking view that vehicle dependence is and will remain the dominant transport mode well past mid-century.</p> <p>The emphasis on expensive inner city car parking subsidised by already overburdened ratepayers.</p> <p>The lack of commitment and details provided for cycle infrastructure including lane widths, intersection treatments, connection to existing or 'desire line' cycle routes, how routes prioritised for multiple modes will work, and cycle parking frequency, form, adequacy.</p> <p>The plan's unstated but evident view that commuter cyclists can either put up with inadequate or non-existent infrastructure on high speed arterials and distributor streets or congested low speed routes shared with pedestrians and vehicles.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Keep cars and parking on the periphery. Provide shuttles to and around the central city. <input type="checkbox"/> Save us from high rates by making active and public transport the easy and obvious choice. Building 16 parking garages is simply too expensive. <input type="checkbox"/> Use this rebuild opportunity to proactively assist the community in shifting to sustainable, healthier active transport options. <input type="checkbox"/> High quality cycling infrastructure with separated or off road paths to get everywhere easily. Work with and connect to CCC's network. <input type="checkbox"/> Prioritise Armagh Street as an east-west cycling route. 	
Rae Hughes-Willis		This proposal generally addresses the locally community's desire for 21st century city where the predominance of transport is focussed on cycles, walking and car travel slowed to 30 k/hr, increased attention to people not the car.	Much higher focus on planting, trees, and seating.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No inclusion of how a future rail links to wider Canterbury region will link into the central city. 2. A lack of serious consideration of how increased inner city living can be sponsored by transport, particularly beyond the green belt on the eastern area between the eastern green belt and Fitzgerald Ave. 	<p>1. I wish to make a detailed submission on the potential of converting the area bounded by Kilmore St, Fitzgerald Ave Moorhouse Ave, and the eastern green belt into well thought out building of affordable inner city housing targeted at young people 23yr+, wanting to live and work in the city, young families, singles and 50+ people who wish to live in a dynamic intergenerational community.</p> <p>There are Catholic three existing community facilities Chch East School, Elim Cathedral of Hope, Catholic Cathedral College; and Chch Anglican Cardboard Cathedral, to act as anchor communities to work collaboratively to draw young innovators, who perhaps lack capital, but vision and drive to organically grow an affordable community to live in with all the best of future technologies to create truly sustainable living.</p> <p>The critical need to create such a community over the next 20 years in this area is to remove Madras and Barbadoes St as one way streets. Through traffic should move out to Fitzgerald Ave, with some re alignment of Moorhouse/ Fitzgerald conr, and the Barbadoes railway over bridge.</p>	
Richard Houghton		A suitable mix of all transport modes	Separated cycle facilities	the omission of Riccarton Ave and Armagh Streets as key cycle routes. The retention of the one way streets	greater use of 4 avenues as a ring road with less traffic signals	
Richard Parker					Major commuting cycleways that are completely separate from roads like they have in Denmark.	
Richard Suggate		<p>Community vision</p> <p>The draft CERA plan has almost no vision of what the city should be like, nor has it had any community input. This is a huge missed opportunity. The CERA recovery plan should help implement the Christchurch City Council (CCC) Transport Strategic Plan instead of ignoring it. The CCC plan has a real focus on how a transport system can promote cycling, improve health, create community, lead to a more compact urban form, address inequality and ensure resilience.</p> <p>Environmental impact</p> <p>Redeveloping a transport infrastructure is a rare opportunity to develop a long term sustainable and energy efficient transport system. The Plan needs a much greater focus on improving bus services, safeguarding future options such as light rail and better provisions for cycling and walking.</p> <p>Economic development</p> <p>The plan needs to better recognise the importance of good public transport to economic development in reducing congestion and allowing easy movement in and around the city.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Having priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport, and would like to see them extended further within the central city network and beyond. <input type="checkbox"/> The 30km an hour slow core. <input type="checkbox"/> Encouraging through traffic to the four avenues. <input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon. <input type="checkbox"/> Designing intersections to ensure priority and safety for cycling. <input type="checkbox"/> Cycle parking at bus exchange & super stops. We will need more. <input type="checkbox"/> One-way streets with separated cycleways on both sides. <input type="checkbox"/> Improved way-finding signage. 	<p>The plan's backward looking view that vehicle dependence is and will remain the dominant transport mode well past mid-century.</p> <p>The emphasis on expensive inner city car parking subsidised by already overburdened ratepayers.</p> <p>The lack of commitment and details provided for cycle infrastructure including lane widths, intersection treatments, connection to existing or 'desire line' cycle routes, how routes prioritised for multiple modes will work, and cycle parking frequency, form, adequacy.</p> <p>The plan's unstated but evident view that commuter cyclists can either put up with inadequate or non-existent infrastructure on high speed arterials and distributor streets or congested low speed routes shared with pedestrians and vehicles.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Keep cars and parking on the periphery. Provide shuttles to and around the central city. <input type="checkbox"/> Save us from high rates by making active and public transport the easy and obvious choice. Building 16 parking garages is simply too expensive. <input type="checkbox"/> Use this rebuild opportunity to proactively assist the community in shifting to sustainable, healthier active transport options. <input type="checkbox"/> High quality cycling infrastructure with separated or off road paths to get everywhere easily. Work with and connect to CCC's network. <input type="checkbox"/> Prioritise Armagh Street as an east-west cycling route. <input type="checkbox"/> Convert the eastern side of Madras to separate 2-3 metre contraflow cycle lanes and footpaths with a 30 km/h limit by CPIT and the stadium. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Tuam Street cycle lanes to both the east and west and hook up with network or prioritise St Asaph Street for cycling per CCC's plans. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide separated pedestrian and cycle paths along the full length of the Avon/Otakaro well linked to the city and to wider networks. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide multiple direct and unobstructed routes to encourage 	

<p>Richard Wesley</p>		<p>Community vision☐ ☐ The draft CERA plan has almost no vision of what the city should be like, nor has it had any community input. This is a huge missed opportunity. The CERA recovery plan should help implement the Christchurch City Council (CCC) Transport Strategic Plan instead of ignoring it. The CCC plan has a real focus on how a transport system can promote cycling, improve health, create community, lead to a more compact urban form, address inequality and ensure resilience. CERA's plan needs much more focus and a clear agenda for how transport is to be improved instead of the current vague and waffly statements.☐ ☐ Environmental impact☐ ☐ Redeveloping a transport infrastructure is a rare opportunity to develop a long term sustainable and energy efficient transport system CERA needs to seize not ignore this opportunity. The Plan needs a much greater focus on improving bus services, safeguarding future options such as light rail and better provisions for cycling and walking.☐ ☐ Economic development☐ ☐ CERA's plan needs to recognise the importance of good public transport to economic development in reducing congestion and allowing easy movement in and around the city. <i>Businesses need much more than easy parking. They</i> ☐</p>				
<p>Robert Fleming</p>		<p>It appears to be a comprehensive description of requirements to develop an accessible city. I don't however believe that it is weighted sufficiently in areas of facilities for pedestrians and cyclists to create the type of city that the participants of "Share an Idea" placed emphasis on . I would like to see more creative proposals that would reduce the amount of vehicular traffic over time , in the form of subtle advantages for cyclists, pedestrians , and those using public transport, and behaviour modifying incentives for motorists to easily change their pattern of car usage .</p>	<p>There is certainly an impression that this plan has the potential to create a liveable and enjoyable city that is accessible to all . However the rebuild of Christchurch now has the opportunity to do more than that by creating points of difference . Ask any person what they most dislike about cities and many will say it is the traffic congestion . I like the public transport routes and provision of streets with 30kph speed restrictions . I wonder however if this is enough to actively get motorists to reconsider how they get around the city .</p>	<p>It is disappointing I think that the 4 avenues could not be transformed into slow traffic boulevards to be shared by cars , cyclists and pedestrians . I wonder how it is going to be attractive to those considering living close to the CBD when 2 and 3 lane roads feature so prominently . The same goes for the one way streets . I would dearly love to reside much closer to the CBD but unless traffic flows can be reduced it will not be sufficiently desirable .</p>	<p>☐ I think that it is time to get more proactive about reducing traffic volumes . There are proven schemes in operation overseas that can do this . I particularly like the idea of graduated car parking charges according to how full a parking site is . I would like to see parking fees be divided according to the number of passengers per car , ie full price for 1 person , half price for 2 and so on . Schemes such as this need to be talked about now , they could save a lot of money in infrastructure costs for the short term, at the same time encouraging travellers to use public transport and cycles more . The flow on effect of this is less money required for future road development and more money available for "people projects" . This plan does not go far enough in my view to addressing age old problems , it is largely more of the age old thinking .</p>	
<p>Robert Pickard</p>				<p>The total lack of public transport to the new Hagley Out patients block at Christchurch Hospital. The nearest bus stop going EAST is about 300 metres away. It would be so simple to place a bus stop outside the Dept.☐ The new Bus Timetables may look good on paper. To get to the Hospital from Bryndwr now means taking THREE BUSES. More thought should be given to people visiting the Hospita. Parking is non existent and it costs \$ 28 for a taxi from Bryndwr ie \$56 return.</p>		
<p>Robin John Pawsey</p>		<p>Very interesting. Main concern is the style. We are in a period where there is no distinct architectural style. Many cities that have a viable vibrant centre have their own unique style that attracts people. Napier was rebuilt during the Art Decor period and attracts many visitors because of its unique style. Christchurch was a Victorian-Edwardian Cathedral City with a Neo-Gothic Cathedral that soured above the city sky line. Insensitive post war redevelopment has largely destroyed the unique character of our city. The Cathedral has not soured for more than thirty years. In England I have only seen one city that reminded me of Christchurch, that is Harrogate. Today Harrogate is a unique Victorian-Edwardian that has a vibrant people friendly centre. If a cathedral is again to become the central feature and icon of the city then both it and the rebuild of the city must augment each other.☐ There is little point in improving accessibility if the centre lacks the accessible human element.</p>	<p>The plan as far as it goes seem people friendly.</p>	<p>The plan lacks any guide on style. The danger is that commercial rebuild will be sterile, lacking in ambience. The Victorian-Edwardian period was characterised by detail and craftsmanship. There was a strong human element. Current commercial buildings lack this human element. Unless there is a strong human element in the rebuild then no matter how accessible the city centre it will fail to attract. With the development of suburban shopping malls and the sterilise redevelopment suburban residents were making few a few visits into the central city. Nice open green spaces will not be enough.</p>	<p>Concerned about the provision for light rail. There are two possible light rail systems--☐ (a) Using the current rail system.☐ (b) Using and extending the tram system.☐ The two systems have different gauges, so the systems need to be separate.☐ Priority should be given to developing light rail on the rail system. A loop from the main railway needs to connect with the bus exchange system. The loop could run up Columbo Street along Tuam Street and back down Manchester Street. The light rail should commence as soon as possible from Rolleston and later should be extended as far as Ashburton. Light rail could also be run to Lyttleton.☐ Provision needs to be made for creating a rail link from the main north line to the east (direction towards Lyttleton) giving access to the central bus exchange.☐ When the link from the Northern Line to the Lyttleton Line is created then the light rail link can be extended to Rangiora and later to Amberley.☐ Later on consideration should be given to extending the tram system. First the tram could come from the Papanui railway station down Papanui Road passing all the Motels then linking up with the central tram circuit in Victoria Square. Later the tram could be extended to Riccarton and possibly to the University.☐ First concentrate on light rail from Rolleston and Rangiora connecting with the Central Bus Exchange.☐ Later consider extending the tram system to Papanui and Riccarton (and perhaps the University).</p>	

<p>Robyn Farrell</p>	<p>I think this plan is a huge step forward for not only Christchurch but New Zealand. Christchurch is so flat that it's obvious it should be a mecca for cycling, and I think this plan is a testimony to that. I know so many people who would love to cycle but are too fearful for there safety, and parents who would rather drive their kids to school than risk their lives on the roads. I think this is also very good because it will lower emmissions, creating a more sustainable future for the city. As a 21 year old girl who wants to cycle, i love it!</p>	<p>I really like the cycle lanes, I think they're a genius idea. I think people across all ages, who have had hesitations with cycling before (myself included) will take full advantage of them. I would hope the cycleways were implemented in the suburbs too.</p>	<p>It's not that I particularly dislike it, but I am a little unsure as to whether cyclists will be able to travel across the (traffic free) pedestrian zones.</p>	<p>Just that the cycleways be implemented in the suburbs too. Anything to lessen motor use.</p>
<p>Rosa Hughes-Currie</p>	<p>The aim of the council should be to discourage cars as the main form of transport to access the city centre by making car travel inconvenient and traveling by bus and bike vary easy. The chapter has some good suggestions for this, but prioritising cycle routes and pedestrian facilities in the central city needs to be emphasized much more.</p>	<p>The introduction of slow core streets and streets prioritised for cycling with separated cycleways. However, well-defined cycleways are needed on all streets in the city centre and all major streets in the entire city.</p>	<p>Too many car parking buildings and on-street parking. Driving in the central city needs to be strongly discouraged if the pedestrian core is to be successful. Decreasing the number of bus routes is a very bad idea that will discourage people with cars from using public transport, which will lead to traffic congestion around the city centre.</p>	<p>If the council is serious about supporting people to use environmentally friendly and healthy transport options, well-defined cycleways are needed on all streets in the city centre and all major streets in the entire city. Christchurch has an excellent geography for cycling, but it desperately needs more safe cycleways.</p>
<p>Ryan Reynolds</p>	<p>Jill Bradley's lengthy submission/report neatly conveys my own reaction, and I would like to second her comments. The stated aims of the Accessible City chapter are admirable, but there is much in the plan that implicitly or explicitly contradicts those aims.</p>	<p>I would love to see a safer and more inviting city for cyclists. The short cycling chapter states some aspirations, but the level of detail is minimal so it is very hard to comment on anything in particular in a meaningful way. The proposed main cycling routes need to have a separate bike lane - and the will only be successful if they are supplemented by cycling lanes and intersections on all other roads.</p>	<p>I dislike that the one-way streets are still a predominant feature through the central city. □</p>	
<p>Ryan Scott</p>	<p>A bit old fashioned □</p>	<p>Cycle lane ideas show potential.</p>	<p>*Too many one way streets. There should be NO one-ways in The CBD. One-ways make for an unpleasant place to shop and cycle/walk. The CBD should feel like a self-contained area without the need for focus on through traffic. They make for difficult areas to do business and all areas in the cbd should be conducive for business due to the limited space. □ *30km/ streets are unnecessarily confusing. There should be a larger 30km/h Zone instead comprising of most of the CBD. It makes no sense having a 30km/h road then a small side street at 50km/h. □ * The cycle network needs to be more comprehensive. Cycling should be a prioritised form of transport for christchurch and the CBD. Most streets should have cycle lanes and be easily accessible. some of the main routes do not run from good access points for cyclists into the cbd.</p>	
<p>Samuel James Lochiel Stockwell</p>	<p>Could you please put in more cycling infrastructure? This will have many benefits for the health of the citizens, reduce congestion, reduce pollution and make the city a generally more pleasant place to be. It will help to increase tourism and moral of the city.</p>			<p>More cycle lanes.</p>
<p>Sarah Campagnolo</p>	<p>It's exciting, what a wonderful opportunity to create a people friendly transport network. □</p>	<p>-The 30km an hour slow core. □ -Pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon. □ -Having priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport. (I would □ also like to see them extended further within the central city network and □ beyond) □ -Encouraging th</p>	<p>-The plan's backward looking view that vehicle dependence is and will remain. □ the dominant transport mode well past mid-century. □ -The emphasis on expensive inner city car parking :(□ -The lack of commitment and details provided for cycle infrastructure. □</p>	<p>-Keep cars and parking on the periphery. Provide shuttles to and around the central city. □ -Save us from high rates by making active and public transport the easy, safe and fast choice. Building 16 parking garages is simply too expensive. □ -Use this reb</p>
<p>Sarah Wylie</p>	<p>Great to see you acknowledging cycling as the way of the future - Christchurch CBD has the potential to be a great place for cyclists with the right design and commitment. Wherever possible, it would be great to have cycles separated from motor vehicles, and well-catered for with parking. Inadequate attention in plan paid to wheelchair accessibility and disability friendly design.</p>	<p>Connectivity to cycle ways into city</p>	<p>Lack of acknowledgement of wheelchairs as a mode of transport - photos, section in report etc.</p>	<p>Accessible for all - not just able-bodied.</p>
<p>Scott Menzies</p>		<p>*I like that intercity, airport transfers and taxis are included within the Bus Interchange. This makes for a much better welcome and farewell for visitors to our city and is more efficient for everyone.</p>	<p>*The proposed 50km/h speed on Montreal, Durham and Tuam within the Inner Zone. If 30km/h is considered best to ensure pedestrian safety' on other Inner Zone streets I fail to see why these streets should be treated any different, particularly given the number of intersections with slower local streets they have. 50km/h is fine on them outside the Inner Zone but please lower it to 30km/h within the Zone. □ *Cranmer Square has been neglected so far in the draft. This greenspace is at the heart of a residential area and at the mid-point between the reduced CBD and Hagley. I recommend including it on a key walking route along Chester St West, diverting Montreal St traffic to a cut-and-cover tunnel under the Square, and turning the existing road on the eastern edge into a softer 'shared space'. □ *I'm not a fan of having a bus route on Hereford St between Manchester and Montreal. This is a high-volume pedestrian zone, densely populated during the day, and a relatively narrow Core street that will have over 1,000 workers in the Telecom building alone, the Ibis hotel, the replacement Strip development, other offices, retail, cafes, the Council chambers etc. Squeezing noisy, smelly, high-frequency buses along it will not make for a pleasant or safe street. This was a key street already being improved prior to the quakes and it shouldn't be spoiled by buses please. I recommend changing the route to Gloucester St between Manchester and Park Tce, with a tunnel under the Convention Centre where it crosses Gloucester. □ □</p>	<p>*Move the Manchester St 'super station' to the block between Gloucester and Armagh so it is closer to the children's playground, the theatre precinct, New Regent St, and the convention centre. Move bus route from Gloucester St to Armagh St from Manchester heading east (can always turn back onto Gloucester after Barbadoes or Fitzgerald) □ *Create a 'super station' at the intersection of Salisbury and Victoria to serve the retail, hospitality, office and residential community in this vibrant 'Main Street' area. The Jubilee Clock Tower could be a focal point of the station □ *Designate Armagh between Hagley and Colombo as a key cycling route as it's easier to go straight ahead out of Hagley towards the city and there will be fewer pedestrians than Worcester St. Plan intersection of Armagh and Park Tce and Armagh and Montreal (tunnel) to ensure cyclist safety □ *Ensure cyclists on the Manchester 'boulevard' have separated cycle lanes to avoid buses, pedestrians and cars. □ *Ensure cyclists have separated lanes with kerbs (not rumble strips) on all routes where they coincide with bus routes. □ *Ensure cycle lanes are continuous within the central city rather than intermittent, to ensure greater and safer usability. □ *Designate 'shared spaces' where vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians share the space with minimal signage or road marking and must respect each other. These are becoming common in European cities including some in UK. Armagh between Colombo and Oxford, at Victoria Square and Convention Centre, would make a good one, as would Hereford between Manchester and Oxford and Hereford between Cambridge and Montreal. Consider the same for Colombo</p>

<p>Scott Menzies</p>					<p>(This is in addition to my other submission on Accessible City) <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>*Please include a commitment in the plan to include public art in the design of all key routes and bus facilities. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Public art has an ability to 'inspire and strengthen the human spirit' and can 'connect with local communities' as Warren Feeney, chair of Arts Voice Christchurch and director of the NZ Academy of Fine Arts wrote in the Press (29/1/13 p. A11). <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The use of public art - both humorous and serious works - will act as a further incentive, another magnet, for people to travel on the key routes and travel into the central city. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I recommend including representatives from the City Council's public arts team and the city's arts community (such as Mr. Feeney) in the design of the key routes and bus facilities so opportunities to include art in various forms are not missed. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>*Ensure transport designs address the needs of the 'silver tsunami' set to hit New Zealand demographically. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Refer to the Project for Public Spaces website: http://www.pps.org/bracing-for-the-silver-tsunami/ <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This runs the gamut from things like handrails at pedestrian crossing wait points and plenty of public seating to clear, large typefaces on wayfinding signs and information. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Serena Koziarski</p>		<p>Does not really seem that innovative or exciting come on this is an opportunity to build a really new exciting city! This is important because once the streets are laid we cannot go back and change them so then the transport decisions have to follow..we dont all want shopping malls and huge stadiums for sport..this city plan is for the people, business or the tourists not just the ole boys network whom like sport.</p>	<p>Walk ways..cycle ways yes..not just around the city but within it. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The fact that the idea of some rail within our city has been axed shows me that if/when our city expands in population then we will have even more traffic, more roads to fix, more congestion than we already have, I live close to the city and its so boring..cars..cars..cars..trucks trucks etc along with a scattering of frightened cyclist weaving in and out of the cars and trucks. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Our bus system is antiquated, with stressed bus drivers trying to meet demanding time deadlines, driving shabby buses, we could have electric buses squirting out less pollution!</p>	<p>More Green spaces within the centre of the city, areas of outdoor around individual cafes and boutiques, arty shops, spaces within the very centre for performers, day time musicians..come on does the govt want the youth to be part of this city or not.. perhaps we could cycle or walk only within these areas only with free parking in the weekends etc its not just about business!!</p>	
<p>Simon Marshall</p>		<p>I think there are some good ideas although some of them could use some further thought. It is important to encourage people back into the central city so that public transport can be better used to take more in and out. It is not really working too well at the moment with everyone driving across town to scattered work places and more businesses in the city will help it to thrive.</p>	<p>I like the low speed zones, however they would be best done as much as possible though environmental design eg. shared space as opposed to legal restrictions to avoid a clutter of signs. I think it is important to maintain access for vehicles but make sure that pedestrians are dominant in these areas. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I like the provision of trees in the streets as shown in the cross sections. This will help make the city more friendly to walk around.</p>	<p>I don't like the current layout of the Tuam/St Asaph Street one way system. I think it would be better to have Tuam Street as wider two way street, carrying on from Riccarton Ave with the tree lined theme continued into the city. This would make a more attractive and straightforward entrance into the city and would be more direct for public transport using this route. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>I would like to see more consideration for connecting roads between the inside and outside of the 4 avenues. There are a lot of places where main roads turn into local roads such as Colombo Street to the south and most of the roads along Bealey Ave. This requires traffic to turn on and off the avenues when it doesn't need to. It would be good if the main roads could be continuous so that the network is simpler for traffic to use. The number of intersections on the avenues could also be cut down helping them to flow better. One possibility could be to look at extending Manchester Street to Cranford Street above Bealey Ave to create a more direct route into the city from the north. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>There is also opportunity to use the tram to do loop routes from the transport centre to various attractions in the city. In that way it could be a functioning part of the transport network as well as a tourist attraction. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Consideration should also be given to providing additional width in Tuam and Manchester Street for dedicated public transport routes in the future as they are connected to the transport centre. Tuam Street could also be used as an across town transport link connecting New Brighton/Linwood/Sumner to Riccarton/Canterbury University/Airport.</p>	
<p>Stephen John Beuzenberg</p>		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission on the "An Accessible City" consultation draft plan. I am generally in favour of this plan, although it is so lacking in detail that there is little to actually comment on. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Cycling <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>My cycling interest mostly relates to commuting, since I generally have little reason to go to the centre. I'm sure it goes without saying that coaxing Christchurch residents back onto bikes will benefit everyone, and I'm glad this has been recognised in the plan. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>My daily commute is from Huntsbury to the university, so does not pass through the centre. Your plan does not show cycle lanes for the many commuters who travel from the southern part of the city towards the university. The safest route is along Riccarton Ave incorporating the shared use path on the edge of the park, which I believe should also be identified as a cycle corridor in the plan. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>My wife, who cycled daily as she grew up in Denmark, is too scared to cycle here after some near misses with traffic. Her route would take her the length of Madras Street, so she might be convinced to try cycling again if this is made a cycle friendly route as planned. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I offer the following observations regarding the proposed</p>				

<p>steven muir</p>		<p>The proposed transport initiatives appear to offer a significantly improved CBD over pre-earthquake conditions with some very welcome improved facilities for walking and cycling. Private cars still seem to dominate the transport options too much which will put many hesitant cyclists off and detract from what could be achieved by keeping cars out of the slow core.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The slow core of 30km/hr is good.□ •The proposed separated cycleways on page 11 are very good.□ •Reducing the number of routes that buses take into the CBD is good, as long as overall service to the wider area is not reduced. □ •Priority public transport measures are good.□ •The bus 'super-stops' at the hospital and Manchester st are good.□ •The secure cycle parking facilities at the bus interchange and the super-stops are good.□ •The encouragement of adequate cycle parking facilities around the CBD is good.□ •The main walking routes on page 9 are good and the wider footpaths and 'living streets' in other areas are good.□ •The closing of Oxford Terrace at the Hospital and routing traffic onto Tuam St is good.□ •Changing Tuam St to a one-way is good.□ •The contraflow cycling and walking routes along the south side of Tuam Street is good.□ •The change of Salisbury and Kilmore to two way streets is good.□ •The reduction on on-street parking and prioritising on street parking for disabled access is good.□ 	<p>I am concerned by the number of car park buildings in the CBD area, particularly the six within the frame. This is likely to encourage the CBD to become too car-dominated. I would prefer to see most parking buildings located outside the frame and have free shuttles within the frame to move people around who can't walk or bike. Exploring the possibility of free rickshaw shuttles would be a fantastic idea and fit much better with the sustainable city that Christchurch residents want to live in. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>•I would like more details on the number of on-street parks. I prefer to greatly reduce the number of on-street parking spaces to a few disabled parks and loading zones, but to encourage all other parking into carpark buildings located at the edge of the frame. This frees up a lot of space for wider walking and cycling provision. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>•The typical main street layout shown on page 12 shows bikes sharing with cars in one lane. While the 30km/hr speed limit makes this safer than at 50km/hr there is still a huge problem with cars and delivery trucks blocking the road completely when stopped at intersections and not allowing any space for cyclists to pass. Painted cycle lanes should be provided on all routes where separated cycle lanes are not provided, to encourage traffic to leave space for cyclists. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>•I would like to see the heritage trams and tram tracks removed completely from Christchurch. While they provide a small tourist attraction, they are an appalling safety hazard for cyclists, and tourists would be far better served by an extensive bike hire network to reclaim Christchurch as one of the best cycling cities in the world.</p>	<p>•I would like to see a separated cycle lane along the length of Armagh Street. The Hagley Park/Armagh st intersection is the busiest cycling intersection in Christchurch, and having to detour to Worcester St to get onto a East/West cycle route through the CBD is too far out of the way. □</p> <p>•A brief statement on the width of the separated cycle lanes would be nice to check that the design is adequate to allow cyclists to pass each other without conflict. □</p> <p>•Details of how the cycling routes pass through Cathedral Square would be helpful to check they will allow an efficient through route and not be bogged down in obstacles. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>•Details of cycle crossing priority would be helpful, particularly along the Southern frame. It is important that the cycling route along there will be able to cross efficiently at every intersection and not have to wait for 5min every 100m for traffic to pass. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>•Details of any cycling provision on the four Avenues would be helpful. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>•One way Streets should have provision to allow cyclists to travel against the flow of traffic. Ideally this would be a contraflow cycleway but could also be a shared cycleway/walkway. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>•Any left turns or T-intersections controlled by traffic lights should have a by-pass/give-way option for cyclists. □</p>	
<p>Susan Edwards</p>					<p>I would like to see a bus that does a circular route around the CBD, could be a free bus. For example: Salisbury street, Barbadoes street, St Asaph St, Montreal st. The public could come in by bus and then hop on the city circular bus to get around the city especially if they were older, disabled etc. The Christchurch Bridge club is located on Barbadoes st and more members would use public transport if it was more convenient. The route suggested would pass many places where the public would go, eg. polytech, new sports stadium, art centre, close to the hospital, victolia street cafes, shops and many others.□</p> <p>The public who drive could park on the outer edge of the CBD especially if there was parking provided (maybe at a cheaper rate than in the CBD to encourage using this bus route.</p>	
<p>Terry Howard Thomsen</p>		<p>I approve all steps taken to make this a more pleasant and safer city for pedestrians and cyclists, through the use of traffic calming measures.</p>		<p>I dislike the retention of Durham St/Cambridge Tce and Montreal St one-ways as 50 km/hr, should be 30 km/hr. These streets are well used by pedestrians walking along them. Both streets are also crossed by pedestrians (including many tourists) when walking between the CBD and the Arts Centre/Botanic Gardens/Museum area - this is the most pleasant walking area in the central city, and the fast traffic down Montreal St and Durham/Cambridge detracts from this. Additionally, these streets pass through the Victoria St area (which looks like it will recover as a significant precinct in its own right). Montreal St passes around Crammer Square, which would be a lot more pleasant if traffic is calmed.</p>		
<p>Thomas Frederick John Taylor</p>		<p>The Central City cannot be considered in isolation and it is unfortunate that CCDU's remit does not encourage looking at the City as a whole by splitting responsibilities between different agencies with different 'masters'. CCDU's actions should be integrated with what is happening outside the Central City by cooperating with and working with other agencies, such as Christchurch City Council and its UDS partners, to ensure the best outcomes for Greater Christchurch. □</p> <p>"Share an Idea" showed that the people of Christchurch want a city that is not dominated by private cars but provides effective alternative transport options, yet the plan proposes extensive car parking which would encourage car use and does not, at any point, mention travel demand management. □</p> <p>The plan also mixes different speed limits within the central city area by trying to cater for both traffic accessing the central city and traffic on the one way system which drivers will use primarily to cut across town rather than get to the central city i.e. there will be little change from the present pattern of use. Central City traffic is slow, often pedestrian and cycling while vehicle traffic is largely searching for parking or delivering goods whereas cross town traffic is fast, directed and focused on the end destination.□</p> <p>This will do little to make the central city more accessible: the one way roads will continue to constitute a barrier and danger to pedestrians and cyclists (under the proposals the Botanic Gardens, Museum, Hagley Park and the Arts Centre will still be cut off by Durham and Montreal Streets). □</p>				

<p>Thomas James Young</p>	<p>Thank you for the Avon Otakaro cycle paths and separated paths for cycling on streets. Wide cycle lanes are good, too, but opening car doors are a problem. I am OK with sharing slow spaces with pedestrians, even with cars, if they have to go slow and yield to other road users. I think some car drivers will become impatient as they see speed limits as targets, not limits. <input type="checkbox"/> I would like to use a bicycle for my shorter trips. The main thing holding me back is concern. Too many cycle routes in Christchurch are on again off again. How will I, and my children, get to the Avon Otakaro path if it is not well connected to safe cycle routes so we can use it? The same goes for shopping and socialising in the new inner city. I know that this plan is only for the central city, but let's make it the model for making cycling the choice we will all want to make. <input type="checkbox"/> The cycle routes appear to be shared with other priority routes. How will this work? They also seem limited and indirect. Armagh Street and through the park is a favourite route, but it is not shown. <input type="checkbox"/> Putting the car parking on the outskirts and providing a 'shoppers shuttle' makes a lot of sense. When one has to drive we can pay for the parking. When walking or bicycling we will feel safer as there will be so many fewer cars on the roads. We will also want to have lots of convenient bicycle parking. The footpaths will be clogged with people and bicycles on poles and such if we don't have good cycle parking. Part of making cycling attractive is offering better parking options than cars have. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>•Having priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport, and would like to see them extended further within the central city network and beyond. <input type="checkbox"/> •The 30km an hour slow core. <input type="checkbox"/> •Encouraging through traffic to the four avenues. <input type="checkbox"/> •Pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon. <input type="checkbox"/> •Designing intersections to ensure priority and safety for cycling. <input type="checkbox"/> •Cycle parking at bus exchange & super stops. We will need more. <input type="checkbox"/> •One-way streets with separated cycleways on both sides. <input type="checkbox"/> •Improved way-finding signage. Long overdue, please expand. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The plan's backward looking view that vehicle dependence is and will remain the dominant transport mode well past mid-century. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The emphasis on expensive inner city car parking subsidised by already overburdened ratepayers. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The lack of commitment and details provided for cycle infrastructure including lane widths, intersection treatments, connection to existing or 'desire line' cycle routes, how routes prioritised for multiple modes will work, and cycle parking frequency, form, adequacy. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The plan's unstated but evident view that commuter cyclists can either put up with inadequate or non-existent infrastructure on high speed arterials and distributor streets or congested low speed routes shared with pedestrians and vehicles. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>•Keep cars and parking on the periphery. Provide shuttles to and around the central city. <input type="checkbox"/> •Save us from high rates by making active and public transport the easy and obvious choice. Building 16 parking garages is simply too expensive. <input type="checkbox"/> •Use this rebuild opportunity to proactively assist the community in shifting to sustainable, healthier active transport options. <input type="checkbox"/> •High quality cycling infrastructure with separated or off road paths to get everywhere easily. Work with and connect to CCC's network. <input type="checkbox"/> •Prioritise Armagh Street as an east-west cycling route. <input type="checkbox"/> •Convert the eastern side of Madras to separate 2-3 metre contraflow cycle lanes and footpaths with a 30 km/h limit by CPIT and the stadium. <input type="checkbox"/> •Continue Tuam Street cycle lanes to both the east and west and hook up with network or prioritise St Asaph Street for cycling per CCC's plans. <input type="checkbox"/> •Provide separated pedestrian and cycle paths along the full length of the Avon/Otakaro well linked to the city and to wider networks. <input type="checkbox"/> •Provide multiple direct and unobstructed routes to encourage people to commute by bicycle. <input type="checkbox"/> •Acknowledge and provide for the 30+% of non-cyclists who would like to cycle, "the interested but concerned". <input type="checkbox"/> •Cycle parking which is secure, frequent, plentiful and well located. <input type="checkbox"/> •The slow core is a good start, but 30 km/h may be too fast for comfortable and inviting shopping, dining, cycling and meandering. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Timothy Charles Taylor</p>	<p>Overall there are some positive very aspects of the draft chapter. Thus I'd just like to make a couple of small suggestions</p>	<p>The slow core area and the push for clearly separated and promoted cycling infrastructure.</p>	<p>I think that retaining Montreal and Durham Streets as 2 lane 1-way streets will be a mistake. Keeping them 1 way might be alright, but they need to be narrowed to 1 lane through the core, as well as slowed, to stop them from being used as motorways through the city. Already they are back to really detracting from the pleasure of being in that part of town (the only nice bit left) on foot or bike. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The slow streets concept is good. But sitting at a cafe table next to the fumes from old NZ cars on slow streets is not a great improvement from faster streets. I think that in areas where outdoor dining and public spaces are to be developed, the transport routes really need to not have any cars through them at all. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>I think that lack of any link with the rail system is a big mistake. How will future commuter trains (which we must need for Rangiora, Rolleston etc) link with the central city. This might not be built immediately, but please consider providing provision for the future. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I would like to see that the walking and cycling routes (marked yellow and green in the hierarchy) are closed to cars during the day. Vehicle access should just be for loading and deliveries during the night.</p>	
<p>Timothy Hogan</p>	<p>This is a good concise starting document. It is regrettable that this was not produced before/at the same time as the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan (July 2012). <input type="checkbox"/> References some of the outcomes of Share an Idea. <input type="checkbox"/> This draft is compromised by the arbitrary placement of dubious anchor projects. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The removal of some one way streets. <input type="checkbox"/> The intelligent treatment of new parking structures. <input type="checkbox"/> The provision for dedicated/ protected cycle ways. <input type="checkbox"/> Slow Core street treatment (page 8)</p>	<p>That all one way streets have not been made two way. <input type="checkbox"/> The draft recognises the conflict of one way streets with residential amenity. It should be expected that the area to the east (not just the north) of the city will have a high residential content see CCDU New Urban Village and central city playground project. At the very least this calls into question the suitability of Madras and Barbadoes remaining one way. I doubt that the proposed speed limit of 50 km/hr will be enforceable. The one way system by its efficiency creates racetracks. It is disappointing that these routes will still encircle one side of Latimer Square, Cranmer Square and the Avon River (although the draft on pg 6 does state some streets may be managed at a slower speed to fit with the surrounding environment). Furthermore if we are able to retain/restore the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament <input type="checkbox"/> (Barbadoes Street) and the former Canterbury Provincial Government Buildings (Durham Street) do they not deserve a more appropriate architectural setting with a two way 30km/h pedestrian focussed road. <input type="checkbox"/> Would need further information to be convinced of the bus super stop in Manchester Street.</p>	<p>Some discussion on a lane way network. <input type="checkbox"/> Link to heavy rail or other intercity connections. <input type="checkbox"/> Possibility of designations for future light rail or Bus Rapid Transport. <input type="checkbox"/> Should have made some preference for the heritage tram routes.</p>	
<p>Ting Powell</p>	<p>It has some promising ideas, but there are still not enough provisions for safe and convenient cycling and too much car parking in the core. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The plan does not integrate well with the Christchurch Transport Plan or allow for future light rail.</p>	<p>Contra flow cycleways on the one-way streets <input type="checkbox"/> The slow core</p>	<p>Too many carparks in the core <input type="checkbox"/> Not nearly enough cycle priority routes <input type="checkbox"/> Too little detail on designs of the pedestrian priority and cycling priority streets or main streets. <input type="checkbox"/> The retaining of the one way system <input type="checkbox"/> The 50km/h zones, especially Montreal street cutting through the slow core. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Align the priority cycle routes with the Christchurch transport plan. <input type="checkbox"/> Priority cycle routes on Harper Ave, Riccarton Ave, Amagh St. <input type="checkbox"/> Some more carfree streets, for example high street. <input type="checkbox"/> No public car parks inside the green frame. <input type="checkbox"/> Details of future corridors for light rail. <input type="checkbox"/> 40km/h around the periphery of the slow core.</p>	

Ulrich Bergler		Is a very detailed plan with many sensible ideas	Lots of trees and considerations for bicycle traffic.	I think the vision does not sufficiently account for changes we will see over the next 10+ years in transport technologies. Specifics are: <input type="checkbox"/> charging stations for e-vehicles <input type="checkbox"/> increase in small and micro size vehicles reducing individual car parking space <input type="checkbox"/> dominance of shared and public transport <input type="checkbox"/> increase in parkig space for bicycles <input type="checkbox"/> access restrictions for cars that do not meet low emissions criteria <input type="checkbox"/> removal of most traffic controls in slow speed shared areas <input type="checkbox"/> low noise road surfaces (most of the above is happening at lest in EU)	the above states alot of what I would like to see more. In addition, Chch has a grid layout which is particularly difficult to manage in terms of traffic flow and has given raise to the term "grid-lock". We tend ot implement more and more localised traffic lights to handle our traffic 'volume' and the issues that come with it on local intersections. This is however creating a much bigger issue as we tend to not control 'flow'. This is a very important distinction for everyone who knows about queuing theory. By locally optimising a constraint (e.g. intersection) the overall capacity (i.e. flow) is sub-optimal. What Chc needs is a city wide traffic mamanagement system that takes traffic flow into account and dynamically manages routes through the city. No localised system can achieve this!! and it has to start in the most difficult part of town, the grid designed inner city and the preferential routes that this plan is defining. Then it is to be rolled out city wide. If you want examples go to e.g Munich where traffic flows despite a much much higher volume of cars. The second aspect I would like to see is the prescribed implementation of low noise road surfaces, not just in the CBD, but city wide. The new southern motorway has a good surface, so does Curletts road and so had a bout 5 years ago Maidstone Rd in Ilam. The latter was then resurfaced using old spray on grid type surfacing and it is unacceptably noisy, especially given the high traffic volume. Again the CBD with its future building structure will be particularly susceptible to road noise, so start here and make it a CHCH generic specification item for roading.	
ANONYMOUS		Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission on the "An Accessable City" consultation draft plan. I am generally in favour of this plan, although it is so lacking in detail that there is little to actually comment on. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Cycling <input type="checkbox"/> My cycling interest mostly relates to commuting, since I generally have little reason to go to the centre. I'm sure it goes without saying that coaxing Christchurch residents back onto bikes will benefit everyone, and I'm glad this has been recognised in the plan. <input type="checkbox"/> My daily commute is from Huntsbury to the university, so does not pass through the centre. Your plan does not show cycle lanes for the many commuters who travel from the southern part of the city towards the university. The safest route is along Riccarton Ave incorporating the shared use path on the edge of the park, which I believe should also be identified as a cycle corridor in the plan. <input type="checkbox"/> My wife, who cycled daily as she grew up in Denmark, is too scared to cycle here after some near misses with traffic. Her route would take her the length of Madras Street, so she might be convinced to try cycling again if this is made a cycle friendly route as planned. <input type="checkbox"/>				
ANONYMOUS		I offer the following observations regarding the proposed I strongly support the overall vision and think it is a great opportunity to make the central city a more people-friendly place that is no longer dominated by vehicles.	I like the slow core and the new road hierarchy that gives priority to pedestrians and cyclists in the inner city. I support the concept of encouraging through traffic to use the four avenues and designating certain streets for public transport with priority measures to make them attractive and reliable. The concept designs of the streets, with less onstreet parking, wider footpaths and more trees and seating, are very appealing and I look forward to seeing them in action.	I would like to see the 30km/hr speed zone extended over the entire inner zone, including the one way streets. The travel time difference between 30km/hr and 50km/hr will be minimal for the vehicles travelling this short distance, but it could make a big difference for pedestrians and cyclists in the area. It will also add confusion for motorists if there are different speeds on different streets - it would be much clearer and easier to enforce if the same speed restrictions applied to the whole inner zone. <input type="checkbox"/> I would also like to see fewer car parking areas in the inner city. The plan sends mixed messages at the moment - slow speed zones try to deter traffic from the inner zone but the indicative parking facilities on page 17 will attract drivers to those areas. The main car parks should be restricted to the main distributor roads where the traffic will be travelling and should not be located on any key walking and cycling routes.	I would like to see stronger pedestrian and cycling links to the residential areas within and beside the four aves. A lot of people used to walk from these areas but there were some very difficult roads to cross or unpleasant roads to walk along. This is a good chance to improve that situation. It used to be easier to cross one way streets such as Salisbury and Kilmore Streets as there were fewer phases at the traffic lights. If these are made two way, it will become slower and more dangerous for pedestrians to cross. This needs some consideration so people living within the central city can still get around safely and sustainably. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> like the proposal for a new central city public transport interchange and clear bus routes feeding into it. I would like to see good cycling facilities incorporated so it could also become an active transport interchange. Cycle lockers and cycle shops could be located nearby to encourage people to bike and bus. The cycling facilities at the old Bus Exchange were very poor and this is a great opportunity to improve these links.	X
ANONYMOUS		I really like it, if it is implemented well I am sure the CBD will be even more accessible than it was pre-earthquake.	The proposals for public transport and the way the plan promotes more walking and cycling.	No, I read through the whole thing and I don't dislike anything in it.	No	X

ANONYMOUS		Fantastic apart from 1 key area- the 1-way systems should be removed.	There are many things I like about the proposal. Cycle routes, river zones, 30km/hr speed limit.	The 1-way systems must be removed. They only serve the needs of fast traffic movement- not pedestrians and not the retailers. Morehouse and Fitzgerald deal with large volumes of traffic. Slicing the inner city with 1-ways allows the car to still dominate. <input type="checkbox"/> a/ 1 ways around the squares (Latimer and Cranmer)creates a barrier to pedestrian use of the parks. This is does not work now and needs to change. <input type="checkbox"/> b/ having a 1-way along Montreal between the art gallery and arts centre is unnecessary and creates a barrier for pedestrians in this key area. <input type="checkbox"/> c/ Keeping St Asaph and Tuam 1 way means that these will stay as raceways and prohibit retail activity. It will also create a barrier to pedestrian access to the new southern green belt- this is a fundamental mistake and undoes the positive possibility of this new activity area. <input type="checkbox"/> The idea of the blueprint was to create green belts with retail and activity looking onto the the positive new (green)zones. The connectivity between the retail and residential and public zones lining the green zones is critical. The proposed 1 ways cuts this link and undoes all the positive possibility of the blueprint- your blueprint. <input type="checkbox"/>	All good- just remove the 1 way systems and it will be perfect	X
ANONYMOUS		I think it need public input first before implementation.	I believe there should be separate route for pedestrian and cyclists for safety reason. Want total ban use of skateboards in CBD sector. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Due skateboarders often abuse at toward pedestrians and the traffic as too much damage everywhere that cost money.	The bus routes within CBD far too limited really as should be widen as much of CBD. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Need Greater coverage of the CBD rather than fewer routes.	Would like to see to give pedestrian right of way be made compulsory. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Restore Free Bus Shuttle service to cover most of CBD.	X
ANONYMOUS		Very good.		Seems strange to route public transport along Selwyn St instead of Hagley Ave.	Space for future link between rail by Moorhouse Ave and public transport interchange eg along Manchester St	X
ANONYMOUS		I think whats been done here is really good. However, the glaringly obvious missing section is about rail. There is no mention whatsoever of a heavy rail or light rail connection into the central city.	Very happy with all proposals.	No	I think its extremely foolish not to include planning for a future rail connection from the current railway line alongside Moorhouse Ave into the central city. While I agree that currently a connection is not needed, I think it would be incredibly stupid not to designate a rail corridor NOW for the future when it may be required. It would not be hard given the empty spaces now to include a rail corridor, perhaps running alongside Madras St on the edge of the new Frame park. If its not needed in the future, it can always be revoked and sold off. This is my only criticism of the plan. Otherwise it looks fantastic.	X
ANONYMOUS		Basically good, I like the slow streets concept for the inner city; this makes the roads more useable for pedestrians. <input type="checkbox"/> This is used successfully in Wellington. <input type="checkbox"/> The city would function better overall without the one way streets, and be better for residential developments and businesses actually in the city. <input type="checkbox"/> Those who want to go past the city can go round it on the arterial roads. <input type="checkbox"/> This makes better use of the city roads for city activity and not transit traffic, which makes no contribution to city activities. <input type="checkbox"/>	The Arterial Ring roads using the Avenues. <input type="checkbox"/>	The one way streets.		X
ANONYMOUS					If the one way streets are to be retained, then the roads through Latimer and Cranmer Squares should be straightened. <input type="checkbox"/> With Latimer Sq, the square could be moved to the west using Frame land.	X
ANONYMOUS		Thank you for the Avon Otakaro cycle paths and separated paths for cycling on streets. Wide cycle lanes are good, too, but opening car doors are a problem. I am OK with sharing slow spaces with pedestrians, even with cars, if they know they have to go slow and yield to other road users. I know that I don't usually cycle at 30 kilometres an hour and I think some car drivers will become impatient as they see speed limits as targets, not limits. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Putting the car parking on the outskirts and providing a 'shoppers shuttle' makes a lot of sense. When one has to drive we can pay for the parking. When walking or bicycling we will feel safer as there will be so many fewer cars on the roads. We will also want to have lots of convenient bicycle parking. The footpaths will be clogged with people and bicycles on poles and such if we don't have good cycle parking. Part of making cycling attractive is offering better parking options than cars have.	The pedestrian only spaces really need expanding. Give us a place where families can mingle and meander, shop and dine without always having to watch and worry about cars colliding with children, or adults. This would really make central Christchurch a great outdoor alternative to malls. Malls are inside with no cars, no worries. I would love to have an outdoor space offering similar comfort. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The cycle routes appear to be shared with other priority routes. How will this work? They also seem limited and indirect. Armagh Street and through the park is a favourite route, but it is not shown. (And it would tie in the Avon Otakaro paths beautifully.) I feel like I am being asked to comment on a plan without having the information. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I would like to use a bicycle for my shorter trips. The main thing holding me back is concern. Too many cycle routes in Christchurch are on again off again. How will I get to the Avon Otakaro path if it is not well connected to safe cycle routes so we can use it? The same goes for shopping and socialising in the new inner city. I know that this plan is only for the central city, but let's make it the model for making cycling the choice we will all want to make. <input type="checkbox"/>	What happened to letting the community suss out what we want? X This is the first I have seen seeking community comment. Where were the community meetings? Is it true that no meetings are planned? Share an Idea made me think that government was finally prepared to engage with us. I am very disappointed. I would really like to see the community involved here. We are not all just argumentative and/or dim. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I imagine that you have all worked really hard on this. Thank you. Please try to make it a better plan in line with mine, and others' comments. We wanted a new city for the new century, one where people come first and cars are not the dominant force on the street or on the block in ever present parking garages. Green spaces, trees, plazas, squares, walking, cycling, and community, please. <input type="checkbox"/>	X
ANONYMOUS					Those planning bus schedules need to establish a service from the Central Station to the CPIT Trades Innovation Institute on Sullivan Avenue so that those doing trades can get to/from the Institute at the required times. This service appears to have been over-looked, especially for those coming from Halswell. Public transport to this destination is essential given that it is now so hard to obtain a restricted driving licence.	X

ANONYMOUS	Overall the plan seems to be well thought out, and give priority to some of the things Christchurch people have asked for, like cycle lanes.	30km/h speed limit areas <input type="checkbox"/> Streetscaping looks much more modern and people friendly	It really doesn't look like parking will be easy. This may make it difficult for businesses to return to the central city, as they will need their customers to be able to visit. Not everyone has a lot of time spare to catch a bus in and out. <input type="checkbox"/> The thing I strongly disagree with is contraflow cycling on Tuam St. Pedestrians and cyclists will get damaged. I work at the hospital, and even the current small contraflow cycle lane at the hospital end of Tuam St causes constant near misses. Pedestrians are aware the vehicle traffic is one way, and don't look the opposite way when crossing the cycle lane. I have seen several near misses there. The proposed plan would be worse, unless there are very limited places where pedestrians can cross. <input type="checkbox"/>	Please do not put in pressure sensitive pedestrian crossing activation. The one opposite Christchurch hospital has been there for many years, and even many staff still do not understand it (they push the button and stand off the mat). Also it stops working when it's cold.	X
ANONYMOUS ANONYMOUS	Very Disappointing Terrible. Not enough specific details about cycling and too car-friendly. This says it all. Just do this stuff, like every decent European city does. <input type="checkbox"/> http://cyclingchristchurch.co.nz/general-a2b-by-bike/what-do-cyclists-want/#commentsttp://	Walking and cycle tracks along the river	One way streets need to go	Cycle lanes on all main streets	X X
ANONYMOUS		1. Focus on improving safer and easier cycling. <input type="checkbox"/> From a personal point of view I think it would be great to increase the number of cycle lanes on roads and off-street cycle-ways. I often feel unsafe cycling on busy roads or roads that are narrowed by parked cars. I therefore tend to avoid cycling unless I know there are cycle-lanes on all major roads on my route. Negotiating right turns can also be dangerous at multi-lane intersections (ie moving from the left hand side of the road towards the middle). I think the coloured bike lanes/spaces help alert cars to bikes. <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Super stop near the hospital <input type="checkbox"/> I think this will help reduce parking congestion for staff and patients however I feel the buses themselves need addressing (see below)		1. ?A free park-and-ride shuttle to reduce congestion in busy locations (eg hospital, cbd etc) <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> From a professional (and personal) point of view (I work with people who have disabilities): <input type="checkbox"/> 2. ALL buses and public buildings to be buggy/walking frame/wheelchair accessible (ie shallow gradient ramp or lift). The majority of people with a disability struggle to leave their own homes. Most people are part of or are aware of the Total Mobility Scheme but despite this most still struggle to afford taxis regularly (as majority are beneficiaries). A lot of people only use taxis for essential trips (eg a hospital/gp visit). There are few people who meet funding criteria or can afford their own wheelchair accessible vehicle. Therefore because there is no reliable cost-effective, accessible public transport a lot of people are unable to access their community (not all buses 'kneel' for walking frames/wheelchairs/buggies). <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Most people/parents who have used push-chairs/buggies realise the frustrations of trying to access public transport and public buildings, however this is a short term problem for them and often the child is light enough to be carried. This is not the case for a young person or adult with a life-long disability. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I think the following would be helpful to start making Christchurch an accessible city <input type="checkbox"/> - ALL public buildings have wheelchair access <input type="checkbox"/> - ALL buses can 'kneel' and have space for wheelchairs to be discontinued on board (as discussed at the front end of the	X
ANONYMOUS	This draft plan fails to address the public's desire for better cycling infrastructure. The people of Christchurch strongly indicated the desire for this infrastructure and yet I see no great changes in this current plan.		The lack of quality cycling infrastructure - no separated paths covering the main access points into and out of the city. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	High quality cycling infrastructure with separated or off road paths to get everywhere easily. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Keep cars and parking on the periphery of the CBD. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Provide separated pedestrian and cycle paths along the full length of the Avon/Otakaro well linked to the city and to wider networks. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Provide multiple direct and unobstructed routes to encourage people to commute by bicycle. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledge the benefits (health, emissions, fuel savings) of having more people commute via cycle. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Create cycle parking which is secure, frequent, plentiful and well located.	X
ANONYMOUS	I am broadly in favour of the draft chapter - combines pragmatism with some of the more visionary desires expressed through "Share an Idea".	Slower traffic speeds, shared cyclist/pedestrian/motorist routes, some dedicated cycle routes that are separated from motorists by more than a white line painted on a route.	I think that the continued use of one-way streets on the perimeter of the central city will block the connection of the shrunken inner city to the rest of the surrounding area. I am particularly concerned with keeping Madras Street as a one-way street. I would be keen to invest in new residential property to the east of the proposed eastern frame. Surely this type of residential property will be targeted at young professionals who live, work and recreate within the inner city? Personally, I would not want to live on a one-way street that conducts cars in a manner similar to a motorway especially when it is bounded by the Frame on the other side. The one-way street will cut off the access of residents to the inner city and will add to the sense of isolation within the (too wide) eastern frame. Pedestrian/jogger safety within the Frame will be compromised by fast (destination-orientated) traffic moving along Madras Street. You need slower moving traffic to connect drivers with pedestrians in this part of town and add to its sense of being populated rather than being a slightly seedy traffic corridor.	I was disappointed to see the disappearance of light rail/electric tram or similar even as a potential mode of transport for the future. The tram was brought in to Montpellier in France (similar population to Christchurch) amid similar skepticism as occurs in New Zealand and was so popular within two years that it has now been widely extended. It is a mode of transport that allows a city's inhabitants to feel proud of its achievements and to get out of their cars and use it. <input type="checkbox"/>	X

<p>ANONYMOUS</p>	<p>Share an Idea was very clear in asking for a sustainable, green city with good active and public transport. We were glad to be asked to share our collective wisdom and insights. Please listen to them. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The quakes took away much. Let's seize the opportunity to build a city which acknowledges the new conditions and constraints of our changing world. Let's design a city for the future. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Shopping, dining in cafés and living in the central city will be more attractive without the hazard, noise and pollution of vehicle traffic. In addition, active transport has significant physical and mental health benefits. A cycle-friendly city will be an attractive and affordable place to live that supports people's health and wellbeing now and into the future.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Having priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport - I would like to see them extended further within the central city network and beyond. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The 30km an hour slow core.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Encouraging through traffic to the four avenues.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Designing intersections to ensure priority and safety for cycling.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Cycle parking at bus exchange & super stops.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> One-way streets with separated cycleways on both sides.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improved way-finding signage.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The plan's backward-looking view that vehicle dependence is and will remain the dominant transport mode well past mid-century. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The emphasis on expensive inner-city car parking subsidised by already overburdened ratepayers. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The lack of commitment and details provided for cycle infrastructure, including lane widths, intersection treatments, connection to existing or 'desire line' cycle routes, how routes prioritised for multiple modes will work, and cycle parking frequency, form, and adequacy.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Keep cars and parking on the periphery. Provide shuttles to and around the central city. The old yellow shuttle in the inner city was great! <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Save us from high rates by making active and public transport the easy and obvious choice. Building 16 parking garages is simply too expensive. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Use this rebuild opportunity to proactively assist the community in shifting to sustainable, healthier active transport options. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> High quality cycling infrastructure with separated or off-road paths to get everywhere easily. Work with and connect to CCC's network. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Prioritise Armagh Street as an east-west cycling route.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Convert the eastern side of Madras to separate 2-3 metre contraflow cycle lanes and footpaths with a 30 km/h limit by CPIT and the stadium. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continue Tuam Street cycle lanes to both the east and west and hook up with network or prioritise St Asaph Street for cycling per CCC's plans. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Provide separated pedestrian and cycle paths along the full length of the Avon/Otakaro, well linked to the city and to wider networks. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Provide multiple direct and unobstructed routes to encourage people to commute by bicycle. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledge and provide for the 30+% of non-cyclists who would like to cycle but are concerned about the safety of it - with separated, continuous cycle routes, they can gain the confidence to start cycling. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Cycle parking which is secure, frequent, plentiful and well located. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>X</p>
<p>ANONYMOUS</p>	<p>With regard to policy 7.9.3 Public Transport into the Central City <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I note that the aim is to promote the use of public transport to and within the city central - I would ask you to review the changes made so far in CERA's pursuit of this goal. I used to have a bus that took me from close to my home in Somerfield early in the morning to pretty close to the hospital, where I work. With minimal walking involved. Having this reliable bus service helped me make the decision to go back to full time employment and move myself off of the domestic purposes benefit - it made working and parenting a viable combination. Now, since the change in the bus route I have a 10-15 minute walk through the local park (which is flooded in bad weather especially in the Autumn/Winter) and graveyard to get to a bus stop at a mall to catch the bus to work. As the year progresses and it becomes darker this is really not a safe option. On my return journey at the end of the day I have to do the same in reverse and if I miss a bus at the hospital I have a 30 minute wait - in the elements. Previously I could catch any bus to the exchange and had a choice of buses to get home - so if I needed to get home quickly I had options. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Fellow passengers (who would be on the bus that was axed) have either decided to take their cars or get a lift in someone else's car (an option I too would take if I knew someone starting work at 6.30am as I currently am). One chap is having to catch 3 buses to get him to South City. <input type="checkbox"/></p>		<p>I would like the bus service outside of the central city to be accessible to all - instead of a 'blue line' or a walk to a mall to get a bus. The people living between these points need to be catered to - after all they are not all physically able, young athletes!</p>	<p>All bus shelters to be built which will actually shelter all passengers in inclement weather - the current bus stops do not do that.</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>ANONYMOUS</p>	<p>My major concern is with the parking facilities for both patients, visitors and staff coming and going to Christchurch Hospital at hours that do not work in with public transport or could be a safety issue cycling (ie late shifts). Please make sure there is ample parking provided for.</p>				<p>X</p>
<p>ANONYMOUS</p>	<p>It is vague and commits to little of any real meaning, containing regular use of the words "possible" and "potential". It generally is a disappointment considering what the CCC and share and idea had come up with in terms of what the city wants. This strategy represents a missed opportunity to really provide a modern and effective transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Pedestrian areas in the centre are great, however claiming this as a new idea is daft, there were already pedestrian areas before the earthquakes.</p>	<p>Cycling in the city has been given lip service, at most - this is hugely disappointing. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The suggestion that cycles can share narrow roads with cars in the "slow" core is ridiculous, a car travelling 30km/hr is still doing to injure cyclists. There should be no reason why there aren't dedicated cycle lanes all the way through the city. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There has been no attempt to separate cyclists and main arterial routes, such as Ferry Road (a deathtrap), by providing alternative cycle friendly routes. I don't believe that rumble strips or kerbs to protect cyclists will be installed as the plan is very non-committal. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The plan suggests that there will be less bus routes, this is going to almost guarantee more road use, which is going to increase congestion and pollution. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>I would like to see more attention paid to the people of Christchurch, and the City Council. Most of all, I would like to see a modern, healthy, accessible city, that isn't locked into what looks like an American model of having to drive everywhere because public transport is poor, and cycling is too dangerous. The proposed tram system was a great idea, and considering how much money is being proposed for nonsensically large convention centres, not hugely expensive. Christchurch used to be a city of cycles, it's flat and has low annual rainfall, it's basically perfect for cycle commuting - why aren't we looking at this more?</p>	<p>X</p>

ANONYMOUS		I like the enhancement to the streetscape with trees. <input type="checkbox"/> The city will remain principally dominated by the car. <input type="checkbox"/> It has some nice ideas.	The rumble strips separating cyclists from cars are excellent for commuting cyclists. I like the priority of the intersections being given to cyclists - thanks! I really like the one way streets having separated cycleways on both sides. <input type="checkbox"/> I like the pedestrian and cycle paths along the Avon, but these are for recreation, not commuting. <input type="checkbox"/> The cycle parking sounds great too, will this be available in all the car park buildings?	The cycle paths are not any more extensive than current (apart from the Avon river park), which is disappointing. <input type="checkbox"/> Ideally cycling commuter routes should be separated from the cars, what about trees doing this along the one-way areas?	Bike parking in more places, please. <input type="checkbox"/> There needs to be some provision for Northern inner city cycle commuting - the avon park loop wont accomodate this. Could Armagh or Kilmore streets have the separated cycling rumble strip as well please? <input type="checkbox"/> St Asaph Street should be the cycle priority street for the southern side commuters. The return journey could be along Tuam street. <input type="checkbox"/> It would be great to have Durham street one way south made cycle safe and Madras one way north also cycle safe to give options.	X
ANONYMOUS		The general ideas are great. I think some of the details are inconsistent with the city's vision and some which are not adhering to recent transportation research.	I like that walking and cycling is encouraged. By shopping trends people are choosing malls, which are car free. Shopping and living within the CBD without worrying about vehicles would make it far more attractive. <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporating the river into the city and transport is fantastic. Having stretches with wide pavements for cafes/bars to spill onto making the river front and city more vibrant and attractive will make it a fantastic place to live.	Minimum parking requirements under 7.6.1 is imposing car based transport. It should be at the discretion of the property developer how they provide for transport.	Future Proofing <input type="checkbox"/> The city should identify and appropriately use land which has the potential to be developed for improved public transport without major disruption to systems existing at the time of the upgrade. <input type="checkbox"/> The plan should at least acknowledge light rail, which was a component of the 'Share an Idea,' even if only to say that provision will be made so it remains an option for the future. <input type="checkbox"/> Speed limit and roads <input type="checkbox"/> For clarity, all the roads within the frames should be 30kph. Too many speed changes will be confusing. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the roads which span one side of the city to the other, but are not designated as main access roads, should be divided to prevent thoroughfare for cars, but maintain access for cyclists and pedestrians. <input type="checkbox"/> Parking buildings <input type="checkbox"/> Parking buildings should only be located on arterial, main distributor, and local distributor roads (not minor roads). <input type="checkbox"/> Commuting Cyclists <input type="checkbox"/> The major cycle routes into the city should be given priority when intersecting roads, e.g. use of zebra crossings. <input type="checkbox"/> The major cycle routes identified should merge smoothly into the major routes connecting to the four ave's, for continuity. Existing routes do not achieve this e.g. Blenheim-Moorhouse intersection, eastbound and Riccarton ave- road west bound.	X
ANONYMOUS		It's good to see a lot of thought has gone into making the city accommodating for progressive transport modes such as cycling, walking and public transport. It's disappointing to see so much of the focus is still set on cars and parking.	-The 30km/h speed limit on many streets. <input type="checkbox"/> -Some effort to separate cyclists from other traffic. This should make cycling feel safer and encourage more users. <input type="checkbox"/> -"Super" bus stops. It's great to see the success of the central bus exchange replicated in o	-A lot of language about cycle infrastructure is vague and non committal. Eg <input type="checkbox"/> "Other streets MAY also have improved, safer cycle facilities". <input type="checkbox"/> "will be separated IN MOST PLACES from walking" <input type="checkbox"/> "Building developers will be ENCOURAGED to provide cycle park	-There is no commitment to an adequate width of cycle lanes. <input type="checkbox"/> -There is no indication of how cycle traffic will pass through Cathedral Square. Cycle lanes are directed to this spot and then stop. <input type="checkbox"/> -I'd like to see a commitment to build cycle, walking and	X
ANONYMOUS		I appreciate the complexity of trying to develop a plan that accomodates the needs of many and that any comments I make are without a full understanding of the issues involved.	Consideration of all options walking/cycling/cars/public transport	Christchurch is not a European metropolis. The images used remind of mediterranean holidays - which is not representative of 9 months of the year in Christchurch. The plan seems a little idealistic. The reality for many people is that the city centre is 1) somewhere they travel through as quickly as possible to get from one side of town to the other, 2) that for the majority of people public transport/buses is the last possible option they would use because it's not convenient or the hassle:cost ratio isn't favourable, 3) people like being able to drive and park where they are wanting to go 4) people want to go into the city, but the hassle makes it unappealing. We are lazy and like things to be easy.5) buses are yuck.	I'd like to see some consideration for Park&ride type options. Big, hulking buses are horrible in narrowed city streets. They stink and are noisy. Sitting outside a cafe or shop sounds appealing until you imagine our current buses using smaller streets choking smoke. <input type="checkbox"/> I'd like to see hubs on the edge of the frame that the larger buses travel to, and then smaller buses/trams doing circuits every few minutes within the frame on the key routes to keep big buses out. Parking could also be focused on the edge of the frame to accomodate workers and shoppers and they are collected by smaller buses or trams that run very frequently and cheaply. The same smaller bus/tram networks could be used to connect inner city suburbs with the frame - Sydenham, Lincoln Rd, Victoria street etc... <input type="checkbox"/> For those that travel in from Rolleston/Rangiora etc...reality is that public transport is invariably not convenient. Where would they park if they were working in the frame? Where would they park if they were visiting? I think if they could travel most of the way to a hub and then park and ride into the frame it would be much more appealing. <input type="checkbox"/> I think I am typical of many working people in Christchurch - that the city centre had become too hard, especially in winter, as malls were easier - even though I hate the malls!	X

<p>ANONYMOUS</p>		<p>St John has to provide responses to emergencies as soon as possible but under 8 minutes for purple and red calls. A key to achieving this is the location of ambulance stations and an accessible efficient roading system to allow us to respond to the scene and transport the patient to definitive care and return to a location on our deployment plan (known as our job cycle). <input type="checkbox"/> Currently Canterbury workload is circa 45,000 jobs per annum. This sees us having to respond to the emergency within the 8 minutes and then transport patients to definitive care. This can be a GP surgery of the 24 hour surgery, but the bulk of this work is to CHCH Hospital ED. <input type="checkbox"/> In order to complete our total job cycle, the total time the ambulance is not able to respond again includes transporting the patient to hospital, accessing the hospital ED and exiting the hospital. <input type="checkbox"/> If we are able to have the job cycle time more efficient, this allows us to have the ambulance available to respond to the next patient/emergency more effectively. <input type="checkbox"/> Like the other emergency services, we all respond to calls that need us to get there as quickly and safely as we can. Unlike the other services, our completion of the job cycle sees us then having to transport the patient through the city to the centrally based hospital or other pathway. This can be upwards to 140 times per day to ED and any delays in</p>	<p>Not applicable to this submission</p>	<p>Tuam street is currently 2 way and is the main route into hospital for ambulances coming from the north east and east. Under this proposal they will need to travel St Asaph to Hagley Ave and then try to get onto Riccarton Road at Hagley Park with traffic and bus congestion. This could be an issue for a time critical patient to get to ED <input type="checkbox"/> The 30 km/hr zones for walking/cycling delay emergency responses and street narrowing could see congestion with the two way traffic having nowhere to go if an emergency vehicle needs to get past. <input type="checkbox"/> In 50 km/hr zones using lights and sirens we are usually able to achieve approx 60 km/hr or a kilometre per minute. If due to congestion or passive slowing of traffic, this will decrease our response zones and increase our job cycle times. <input type="checkbox"/> Ambulances are 2.4m wide, 2.4m high and 6m long. There are concerns that trees planted could hit the vehicles and turning circles making access and egress to parts of CBD difficult. <input type="checkbox"/> Our command unit is 2.4m wide and 7.5m long <input type="checkbox"/> St John would be happy if the vehicles size design was ammended to fit New Zealand Fire Service specifications as our vehicles are smaller than these. <input type="checkbox"/> Bollards and extended curbs to passively slow traffic can cause damage to our vehicles as their turning circles are more than cars and affects our ability to get to parts of the CBD.</p>	<p>Ability for emergency vehicles to be able to access all parts (e.g cyclist or walker having a fall or meical event), we need to be able to get to them. <input type="checkbox"/> Ability for cars/other traffic users to be able to get off the road to allow us to pass if we need to get to a job</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>ANONYMOUS</p>		<p>Good consideration of the main issues including public transport, vehicle access, cycle transport, pedestrian access etc. Also move to emphasis the physical beauty of the central city with green spaces, trees etc.</p>	<p>Accessibility proposal Pedestrian access areas</p>	<p>Nil</p>	<p>I understand the draft is 'big picture' but just want to flag some issues for consideration as the detail is developed. These are related in particular to accessibility for people with brain injury (stroke, traumatic brain injury, other neurological problems) who have a range of physical, cognitive, visual/perceptual and emotional difficulties. Aspects to consider include: 1. Wheelchair accessibility including smooth pedestrian surfaces, minimising camber and inclines where possible on footpaths etc. This also includes having kerb cuts for road crossing and minimising kerbs or having kerb cuts at disability parks. 2. Accessibility of the public transport (bus) system for people with reduced mobility including people who use wheelchairs, walking frames, walking sticks for mobility. This includes having availability at all times on all routes buses with the ability to lower their height to be closer to the kerb and buses with ramp access. It also includes having sufficient dedicated space within the bus for people to position their wheelchairs, walking frames etc. These needs are shared by others in the population including parents/caregivers of children in buggies/prams etc. A wider issue in terms of accessibility is the approach of operators and people employed within the public transport system in communicating with people with physical, cognitive and communication impairments. A common experience reported by patients within the Brain Injury Rehab Service is of bus drivers who appear impatient with people who have difficulty with mobility, or with communicating their needs clearly - this is a barrier to people using the service - a supportive approach is required. On occasions this has included bus drivers driving the</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>ANONYMOUS</p>					<p>Walking precincts such as the Avon River area should be kept free of all Vehicles all the time. No courier / delivery access at all. Developers of the area should provide delivery options that do not require access to the properties from the Walk area. Delivery lanes / tunnels must be accessed from the back or sides.</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>ANONYMOUS</p>		<p>It looks great. I am excited about the improved cycle access. Biking to my new job in the central city from New Brighton is a great way to get exercise. Improved cycle lanes will make this safer and easier.</p>	<p>Yes. I really like the idea of the cycle lane with the curb. I think this will be the safest option as long as they are made wide enough to be able to pass other cyclists.</p>	<p>Yes. I particularly don't like the fact that there are no cycling routes for the arterial roads eg Bealey and Fitzgerald. These are very popular cycle commuting roads. I think for the plan to effectively encourage cycling to work, these essential roadways should be made safer for cyclists.</p>	<p>Cycle lanes on the main arterial roadways.</p>	<p>X</p>

<p>ANONYMOUS</p>		<p>I am writing this submission on behalf of people with Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (hereafter referred to as CFS/ME). <input type="checkbox"/> The pre-earthquake Christchurch CBD shopping experience was ideal for those with CFS/ME. I refer to it as the "park and shop" model because long stay parking was available close to most locations in the CBD. <input type="checkbox"/> Shoppers could park in the Lichfield Street car park building and, with a quick trip down in the lift, be very quickly shopping in Ballantynes. Most types of facilities were a short distance from Ballantynes: a book shop and chemist across the mall, food options, banks, and several clothing and shoe shops. If shopping parcels became too heavy to carry it was easy to make a quick trip up in the lift to lock parcels in the car and Cashel Mall contained plenty of seating for times when a short rest was required before continuing to shop. <input type="checkbox"/> Contrast this model with the planned post-earthquake model which I refer to as the "park, walk, and shop" model. Vehicle traffic and parking is restricted and the CBD area is reserved for walking and cycling. Parking buildings will be confined to "distributor streets" some distance from the CBD shopping area. This necessitates a walk from parked cars to the shopping area which is likely to be too demanding, all purchases must be carried for the whole trip around shops and the distance back to the car, and the whole experience will take longer. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				<p>X</p>
<p>ANONYMOUS</p>		<p>Too encouraging of cars and not enough pro-cycling, pro-walking, and pro-public transport initiatives. Too much lip service paid to these without hard statements or details that can be used to rank progress against.</p>	<p>I suppose I could say it didn't completely ignore cycling, walking, and public transport, like the council has done for the past few years. That's kind of a "like", I guess.</p>	<p>The acceptance that car usage will increase in future and that this must be simply catered for. The whole point of you town planners is to make the city follow best design practice. You're supposed to be ahead of the curve on this stuff. It's not rocket science - it's already being done overseas with spectacular results. Just copy what amazing and beautiful cities overseas have done already by actively discouraging car usage.</p>	<p>Hard details. Don't be scared of saying things like "congestion charges in the city centre" etc. It's got to happen if we are to get through the next 50 years of rising energy costs due to peak oil occurring 2 years ago and town planners need to step up and make the uninformed public face reality. Saying things like "where necessary", "other streets may have" when talking about cycling initiatives sets you up for inevitable failure-to-deliver</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>ANONYMOUS</p>		<p>Great first effort, but doesn't go far enough towards making our city a world leader in utilising our natural beauty to reduce car use. Feels like the god of flow has been the first priority - turn that upside down and encourage people out of their cars, not into them. People choose chch for the lifestyle, lets capitalise on that. <input type="checkbox"/> Share an Idea was very clear in asking for a sustainable green city with good active and public transport. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Neither the central city blueprint nor this transport plan have supported community needs and expressed desires, nor capitalised on the huge amount of community goodwill and energy currently available. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> People want shopping and café dining and to live in the central city. These are more attractive without the hazard, noise and pollution of vehicle traffic. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> If Christchurch is to tap into the \$40million creative class, even to retain and attract the people we need, we must offer them a city designed for the future. An affordable and attractive city which meets people's real needs first.<input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The goal for an accessible city for all is admirable. It feels like 'greenways', walking and cycling corridors in areas of natural beauty, will be a possible legacy of this beginning with priority streets for cycling, walking and public transport, and I particularly like 30km an hour slow core and pedestrian and cycling paths along the Avon. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>16 carparking buildings and retention of one-way streets ringing (and therefore cutting off) the cbd. <input type="checkbox"/> cycleways on the roads instead of shared with the footpaths, and the lack of 2-way cycleways. <input type="checkbox"/> the lack of connection to community projects already under way like the coastal pathway, and other potential greenway links, and the lack of connection to council projects already underway like the main-rd ferry rd masterplan. Talk to each other!!!! <input type="checkbox"/> the lack of a very clear connection out to the CPIT and the University. Get these students to and from the city as easily as possible, so that they can live there and give it a 24 hour vibrancy. <input type="checkbox"/> The Tram. Use it for public transport, not just for tourists. Turn it into a proper shuttle! <input type="checkbox"/> Still feels like it might become a faux centre ringed by roaring traffic. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The plan's backward looking view that vehicle dependence is and will remain the dominant transport mode well past mid-century. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The emphasis on expensive inner city car parking subsidised by already overburdened ratepayers. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The lack of commitment and details provided for cycle infrastructure including lane widths, intersection treatments, connection to existing <input type="checkbox"/> I don't like the number of parking buildings indicated on your map. They should not be needed on slow streets where you are discouraging cars. Parking should be kept to the edge of the city and as minimal as possible so more people walk, bike or bus to town. <input type="checkbox"/> I don't think there should be any 50km/hr roads within the 'slow core'. This is confusing and only shows a halfhearted commitment to making a pedestrian friendly city.</p>	<p>Better connections to the suburbs and the potential greenways...-Keep cars and parking on the periphery. Provide shuttles to and around the central city. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> making active and public transport the easy and obvious choice. Proposing 16 parking garages is outrageous. <input type="checkbox"/> Use this rebuild opportunity to proactively assist the community in shifting to sustainable, healthier active transport options. <input type="checkbox"/> High quality cycling infrastructure with separated or off road paths to get everywhere easily. Work with and connect to CCC's network. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide separated pedestrian and cycle paths along the full length of the Avon/Otakaro well linked to the city and to wider networks. Connect this to the Coastal Pathway. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide multiple direct and unobstructed routes to encourage people to commute by bicycle or walk/run/rollerblade. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Start talking to the community. We must be involved, empowered even, at every level and step. Freely sharing information and ideas will improve all of our skills and expertise. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Take up the opportunity to provide cycle commuter and recreation routes early on to pioneer central city revitalisation<input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>X</p>
<p>ANONYMOUS</p>		<p>Really like the priority being given to pedestrians and cyclists in the inner city.</p>	<p>I like the slow roads in the centre of the city so it is easier to walk around. Hopefully this will divert more traffic to the four aves as intended. I like the idea of having more segregated cycle lanes so it is safe to bike around the city.</p>		<p>Good pedestrian and cycle links are needed to the residential areas in the CBD. The emphasis always seems to be on people travelling into the city from the suburbs, but it also needs to be attractive for people to live, work and play within the city.</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>ANONYMOUS</p>		<p>Overall I like it. More greenery and more emphasis on cycling/walking are my desires. Fewer car accessed streets and pedestrian/cycle only will encourage shopping in town and not a malls.</p>	<p>I love the Tim Church photos. Those pedestrian laneways are fantastic and I'd love to see heaps of them all over the central city each with their own unique vibe but Christchurch would become known for them collectively. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Kerbed off cycle ways.</p>	<p>Cycle ways with rumble strips and bollards. Bollards are just a cop out and an easy way to fence off an existing cycleway, essentially they're a permanent road zone. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> If you're rebuilding the street may as well use a kerb but they'd have to be wide enough for three bikes. They'd encourage more cyclists but the quicker cyclists would encounter slower bikers and need ample opportunity to pass safely. Tight passes with a barrier on your right could get messy. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Forget about the Tram.</p>	<p>More trees and a restore of New Regent St. That was a highlight of the city pre quake. Also ban tilt slab, we can do better.</p>	<p>X</p>

ANONYMOUS		I like the overall approach, particularly the priority given to cyclists and pedestrians on some routes, but think that more is needed to achieve the goal of making the central city a more enjoyable and safe environment, where the use of cycleways and walkways increases. Currently the CBD is dominated by fast moving cars and buses and is not a particularly nice place to walk or cycle in.	As above, I like the road use hierarchy, and prioritisation of some routes for cycling and pedestrians. In particular, the cycleway and walkway along the banks of the Avon River is a great idea, makes good use of a wonderful city feature, and if it continues along the entire length of the river will provide a great way for people living in Eastern Christchurch to cycle to work.	Designating some routes for both public transport and cycling - these are not compatible unless there is a completely separate cycleway on these routes. This seems unlikely given the width of these roads, and its likely that cycling will be undesirable on busy public transport routes. This is not an improvement on the existing situation. I think there is still much emphasis on providing for cars in the central city. I think a reduction in cars travelling through central city needs to be encouraged, or the central city will never become a desirable place for walking and cycling.	car free zone in central city, with parking provided on the fringe, and cycle/walkways and/or shuttle buses into the CBD.	X
ANONYMOUS		I am happy to have the opportunity to voice my opinion on this matter, congratulations on conducting a democratic process and involving the public in the decision making that affects our city and us living in it. The decisions made on transport, public, vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian are absolutely fundamental to creating a vibrant and economically successful central city.		I am concerned with the draft's proposal to revert back to a significant amount of one-way streets. I feel like that important change to abolish one-ways established in the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan has been somehow lost. <input type="checkbox"/> The retention of five existing one-way streets and the conversion of Tuam Street to a one-way street would be a grave mistake, if implemented I believe this could be the single biggest lost opportunity in the redevelopment of central Christchurch. There is a mountain of international research and precedents that I know had been presented with other submissions that reinforce the notion that one-way streets are detrimental to the appeal, liveability and character of a city. <input type="checkbox"/> While car speed and traffic volume is greater with one ways, the time it takes for motorists to reach their destination is no faster. And if we take a step back we have to question the design criteria that place traffic speed and volume above the raft of other qualities, which make a city a nice place to be. <input type="checkbox"/> 'Cities are to get to not get through' <input type="checkbox"/> I recently had a conversation with someone involved in the Accessible City draft and asked him about the one-way streets, he felt that Montreal and Durham as one ways was a bad move and was disappointed to see that having remerged and felt like it would be to the detriment of the pedestrian traffic and therefore the vibrancy of that area. <input type="checkbox"/> I'm also personally really concerned about Tuam Street, the frame is		X
ANONYMOUS				I think retaining the one-way roads is terrible. They are not efficient, as I often find myself going around in circles trying to navigate my way around the city. <input type="checkbox"/> They are bad for the businesses located on them. <input type="checkbox"/> Vehicles seem to travel significantly faster down the one ways, and as such are not very nice for pedestrians. <input type="checkbox"/> Please return the roads to a two-way system.		X
ANONYMOUS			an increase in cycling provisions		The increased cycling in the central city is a good start, but most commuting in the city will be getting to and from work. Most businesses are not in the CBD and a lot of which is in areas not favourable to cyclists (heavy traffic, trucks cars parked on road sides). I think a big focus should be making it accessible for people to bike to work as this is what will help ease congestion and get people on to their bikes on a regular basis. I know a lot of people who don't feel safe biking to work, yet get stuck in traffic for long periods during their commutes	X