

Submission ID	Name	I / We	Position of replacement tree	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
6729	Nathan Bryan	support the plan	Option A	
6727	Cheryll & David Martin	do not support the plan	Option C	<p>The concept of the plan for the crossing is a possibility BUT the placement is very WRONG. It is far too close to Fairford Street. It needs to be further north outside 56-58 Gardiners Road. As a parent whose children did attend Cotswold School I would not have wanted my children crossing so dangerously close to this corner.</p> <p>Being placed so close as shown in the plan will also make it very difficult for any traffic to turn right into Gardiners Road. Having to negotiate the crossing island while turning right would it make it possible that while watching traffic approaching from the north and the south, they might not see any children crossing from west to east across Gardiners Road, and possibly hit them. The crossings on Harewood Road are a considerable distance from the corners making them much safer to cross, and this proposed island should be much further away from any side street corners.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines that will be on Gardiners Road will also remove ALL street parking for any visitors to 49 Gardiners Road (a set of 4"over 60s" units which do not have any off street parking).</p> <p>The yellow lines on the Fairford Street side of Gardiners Road will also force the cars that would have parked outside 52 &54 Gardiners Road to possibly park further around on Fairford Street further compounding the narrowness of that street which already has too many cars parking on the street.</p> <p>The tree being removed does NOT need to be replaced especially not in position A. There was a tree near the front of that property when it was a house that caused enough problems to the drainage system. The ribbonwood trees are</p>

Submission ID	Name	I / We	Position of replacement tree	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
				<p>nothing but a PEST consistently distributing their rubbish (leaves, flowers etc) into the gutters blocking them right down to Harewood Road. The people in 53 will be happy to see it gone. Position B will also be unnecessary as there is already a tree near there, and it is only something else to cause diminished visibility on the street.</p> <p>The grass outside 49 Gardiners Road has already been dug up several times for various reasons. Recently each time the grass was rejuvenated by the residents it has been dug up again for another reason (broken pipes, drains etc) When the drains are running full they have had numerous problems with drains backing up into the units into toilets.</p> <p>They do NOT need a tree outside the property especially with the covered unit there already. A tree would only likely have more of a chance to cause further problems with the drains there.</p> <p>It would also make it harder for the residents to look after the grass with a tree there and as they are all elderly it hardly seems fair.</p> <p>And it would also make the space VERY limited for residents of the 4 units to place their rubbish bins outside the property on collection day.</p> <p>Other houses further north all have off street parking so the crossing island and yellow lines would not be such an issue for them.</p>
6715	Christine Bryan	have some concerns	Option A	<p>How disruptive to traffic is this going to be and how long will it take?</p> <p>We are missing a couple of trees from Gardiners Rd outside #63. If you're removing a tree from #53, it should be replanted at #49 not on Fairford Street</p>

Submission ID	Name	I / We	Position of replacement tree	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
6706	Glenn Oakley	have some concerns	Option C	I have concerns about the lose of on street parking in both Fairford St and Gardiners Rd . [REDACTED] [REDACTED] both sides of the rd are frequently used for parking . No. 54 Gardiners Rd also has a number of cars parked on the rd after work and thru the night etc were do these cars park now ?Another concern is the crossing being so close to the corner performing a right turn out of Fairford St will bcome difficult .
6685	Michaela Collett	support the plan	Option B	
6663	Ainslee Collins	support the plan	Option A	
6643	A & N Gillespie	support the plan	Option A	
6640	Clarence Eric Wilson	have some concerns	Option B	Option A would impede the vision for vehicles coming from the driveway of the units of 49 &51. Little thought has been considered where the crossing is being placed the main foot traffic comes from Aitree St to Harewood Road, Crofton Road via Pelorus Place and St Ives St. Foot traffic from The north end of Gardiners Road going to Cotswold school mainly go through the walk way around 78 Gardiners Road. A better place would be outside 39 Gardiners Road. In addition you are making no parking outside 4 over 60 units removing 2 parking spaces for visitors. [REDACTED] 53 Gardiners Rd [REDACTED] [REDACTED] this crossing is outside there place they should be given the oppportunity to comment.
6511	E & J Spruyt	support the plan		
6509	Antoinette Baker	support the plan	Option A	

Submission ID	Name	I / We	Position of replacement tree	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
6474	William Peirson	do not support the plan	Option C	<p>NO. I do not support this plan. With respect, it would be more sensible to duplicate the traffic lights currently at the Harewood / Northcote/ Greers Rd intersection at the Harewood/ Breens/Gardiners Rd intersection. Benefits : phasing with the G Rd/Sawyers Arms Rds signals would marshall vehicular traffic to flow as discrete quanta in G Rd in each direction and give pedestrians larger gaps in the vehicular traffic in G.Rd to let them cross safely near the Fairford St 'T' intersection, without narrowing the roadway with obstacles such as a pedestrian 'refuge' in the traffic flow along G.Rd.</p> <p>There already is a traffic light controlled intersection at the Sawyers Arms/ G.Road intersection</p> <p>Traffic lights would enhance traffic safety generally, and that of cyclists and pedestrians in particular at the Harewood/ G Rds junction, noting that Breens Intermediate and Isleworth schools are on the south side of Harewood Rd. -a four lane arterial road with vehicle speeds in excess of 60km/hr more often than not. A controlled intersection at the Harewood/Gardiners Rds intersection would generally reduce vehicle velocities here. The cost/benefit ratio of a traffic light controlled intersection at the Harewood end of Gardiners Road will far outweigh the current proposal you have asked for comments</p>
6471	R J Partridge	support the plan	Option A	I would rather have liked lights installed at Harewood, Breens-Gardiners Road intersection
6469	Christian Kerr	support the plan	Option A	
6468	Sheils Carnihan	support the plan	Option A	
6466	Catherine Coghill	support the plan		Don't mind A or B
6465	Bruce & Marie Todd	support the plan	Option A	Yes, a good proposal for the safety of pedestrians, especially for children

Submission ID	Name	I / We	Position of replacement tree	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
6411	Fennad Wortelboer	support the plan	Option C	Neither - why should we have any input into putting a tree in front of another persons house
6410	Arendje & Martin Monteba	support the plan	Option A	Very pleased with the idea of the crossing. Have been very concerned watching the school children crossing that busy road
6349	AL & DE Meikle	have some concerns	Option B	<p>Most children crossing Gardiners Road appear from Aintree St. Surely the refuge would be best sited further south opposite 44 and beside the yellow 'CBD' vent. Any children from the northern end would surely use the alleyway thru to Oldwood St.</p> <p>The resulting yellow lines in this location would not have such a devastating effect on 51 and 53. (5 residences) (4 are 60+), and visitors cannot park on a shared drive. Further south driveway is a single residence. A lot more traffic turn right from Fairford into Gardiners than any from Aintree (a Culdesac). Definitely 'NO' to option A the roosts that had to be removed for the steel "Comms" bunker were large and would not be a welcome repeat into the bunker or the drive.</p> <p>████████████████████████████████████████</p> <p>████</p>
6348	Rosemary Olsen	support the plan	Option A	
6257	Gerrit Veivema	do not support the plan		<p>Most inappropriate place for a road impediment - right adjacent to a T-intersection (uncontrolled). Please think about traffic safety whilst you're thinking of pedestrian safety. if you really need/want the P.refuge please place it well away from the intersection suggest outside Gardiner Road 56.</p> <p>Let those in the position of most effect have the say - Gardiners 1/49 & Fairford 53 ... they're the ones that have to "put up" with all the "negative" effects the tree can have. I at ██████████ already have to "put up" with the grossly inappropriate silver birch "weeds" on our St!</p>

Submission ID	Name	I / We	Position of replacement tree	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
6015	Donna McLachlan	support the plan		
5967	Bernard Klaassen	support the plan	Option B	