

**Parnell Cycleway and Residential Parking Zone
Civic Trust Auckland Feedback
23.12.16**

1. What do you like about the proposed design for the Parnell cycleway?

(a) CTA supports a comprehensive network of cycling routes across Auckland and we appreciate that cycling facilities are being provided throughout the city.

(b) The placement of the cyclepath between parked cars and the footpath is safer than immediately adjacent to moving traffic, the buffer increasing this safety.

2. What would you change about the proposed design for the Parnell cycleway?

(a) The design of any cycleway should be sensitive to the amenity of the area. In an area such as Parnell, Auckland's oldest suburb, changes to the streetscape need careful planning. The look of the cycleway should not detract from the streetscape character. For the Parnell cycleway to be "high quality" and "attractive," its elements need to fit in with how Gladstone and St Stephens Ave currently appear.

(b) We are not of the view that all cyclepaths should use the same template and look the same. There are many overseas examples of attractive cycleways which could inform Auckland cycleway design. Many cyclists are just as interested in enjoying the view along their route as in getting from A to B by their preferred means of transport, or going as fast as they can on two wheels. Whilst there is an apparent conflict between cyclists, pedestrians and cars, there are distinctions that can be drawn between. It needs to be remembered that not all cyclists cycle for the same reason: some for commuting, some for sport and some for recreation.

(c) CTA's submission on the proposed K' Road cycleway used the word "garish" with regard to some aspects of that design, and we would apply the same word to the use of the green colour proposed for this cycleway. If a colour must be used (though we don't see why colour is needed) we would prefer a more natural green, compatible with the colour of grass or trees in the area. Not all cycleways are currently green, and the designation of the lane's purpose with a painted figure of a cyclist is not beyond the comprehension of cyclists.

(d) We propose that a cycleway just on one side of the streets concerned, with a cycle lane going in each direction, should be considered. This works successfully in other parts of the city, for example on Quay Street, and also on dedicated cyclepaths, such as the Grafton Gully cycleway and the north western cycleway. Positioning a two-way cyclepath to one side of the carriageway allows the retention of a reasonable level of carparking.

(e) Streetscape amenity is important and it would seem that there are opportunities to consider trees and planting, as well as undergrounding power lines, alongside the provision of a cycleway in this area.

(f) Some of our members regularly cycle the St Stephens Ave - Gladstone Rd route and have signalled that there are some vulnerable spots for cyclists which do not seem to be addressed in the cycleway proposal. We note that safety is not so much of an issue for a group of cyclists, but a single cyclist is less visible to motorists coming from the opposite direction. These trouble spots are at the intersections of:

- Brighton Road / St Stephens Ave

- St Stephens Ave / Gladstone Rd
- Gladstone Rd / The Strand.

(g) CTA encourages the consideration of a lower speed limit on the streets concerned as an alternative means of achieving safety for all users of the area.

3. Do you have any other comments?

(a) CTA appreciates that feedback has been sought to help improve and refine the design for the Parnell cycleway before progressing to the next stage of the project, that flyers about the proposed cycleway were delivered to letterboxes in the area and that AT and others involved in the project are working with local communities and businesses to identify their needs. If, as suggested, the Parnell cycleway is part of a network, presumably cyclists from other areas will also use this cycleway and therefore it seems logical that consultation should extend beyond Parnell alone.

(b) CTA understands that the proposal in its current form is opposed by the Parnell community.

(c) Although we support a comprehensive network of cycling routes across Auckland, we would prefer the initial focus to be on improving safety, not necessarily in the inner city. As Tamaki Drive and Quay Street already provide a safe, continuous cycle route along the waterfront into the city centre, this area should not be a priority (some of the rationale for the Parnell route being its connection to the waterfront).

(d) We see Broadway as more of a priority than St Stephens Ave and Gladstone Rd as regards safety, as well as many other parts of the city where people currently have fewer transport options.

(e) We suggest that this cycleway project is deferred in favour of prioritising areas where safety for cyclists is actually an issue, such as dangerous intersections where there is no space provided for cyclists. Where money is being allocated for cycling infrastructure, it should address safety issues first. We note that the city centre tends to get more money spent on it than suburbs further out.

(f) We know that Parnell locals have been consulted and we urge that their views are given priority. The local knowledge and expertise of both residents and those who work/visit/recreate in the area should be fully taken into account and used to inform the proposal.

(g) We note that this proposal appears not to have grown out of any local demand or particular safety concerns.

(h) We presume that some cyclists have been consulted and suggest that a cross-section of cyclists' views should be canvassed, not just one body of cyclists. As noted in 2(b), there are many different types of cyclists, and different groups have different points of view. The views of cyclists who live in the area and who use the route regularly should have more weight than those of cyclists who do not.

(i) The amenities in this particular neighbourhood, and who uses them and how these people access them need to be considered in the design of the cycleway. The rose gardens and the cathedral, for example, will attract many elderly people, for example. It is important, therefore, that in the zeal to provide cycleways, a reasonable provision of car parking continues.

(j) Proper community involvement should appropriately consult with local planners and designers. The Parnell Community Committee can provide details of such groups/individuals.

(k) CTA is opposed to the removal of any trees for the purpose of the cycleway. Despite initial claims that tree removal of the six pohutukawa opposite MOTAT was necessary, their ultimate retention by AT is clear evidence that trees can be retained and that doing so is the wish of the public.

(l) We request that AT, the NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Council take time to absorb the feedback that has been received during the short consultation period, take time to consult further, and, in consultation with local experts, provide more options. Providing only one option for the proposed cycleway is not acceptable.

(m) CTA suggests that the current proposal be put on hold and that alternatives are sought, in consultation with the residents and other users of these routes, with reference to good examples from overseas.

4. What do you like about the proposed residential parking zone?

(a) CTA appreciates that local parking needs have been considered and that commuter parking is being discouraged.

5. What would you change about the proposed residential parking zone?

(a) We are concerned that residents' and amenity/services parking needs be addressed. We understand that the Gladstone community shops are an important hub for the area and that parking is important in this location, not only for the businesses but for the residents. These shops, Parnell School, and the important tourist attractions of the rose gardens and the cathedral all need reasonable levels of parking provision.

(b) We suggest that trialling some alternative parking provisions would be helpful, to see how well they operate.

6. Do you have any other comments?

(a) We emphasize our view that local people need to be fully consulted, and to have sufficient time for this, as the best people to comment on what is needed in an area are the people who live there and who use the amenities of the area.

(b) We recognise that there are a large number of rental properties in Parnell and therefore a residential parking permit scheme where application can be made only once a year does not seem workable, and that the ability to apply for a parking permit should of course be available at any time, to cater for a change in tenant.