

Proposed upgrade of Kilmore St (Colombo St to Durham St): Submissions and project team responses

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
Nicola Williams	Principal Urban Designer, Ōtākaro Limited	Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>The Ōtākaro Planning, Placemaking and Design Team generally support the plans but have some concerns. In particular, we commend CCC for the removal of the free left hand turn from Kilmore into Durham Street.</p> <p>However, we recommend the following considerations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kilmore / Durham / Victoria intersection cycleways. Please consider directional arrows for cyclists to clarify directional cycle movements (particularly to Victoria Street). i.e. straight through + left and right movements. 2. West side of Town Hall Is the service lane along the western side of the Town Hall still in use/active? If so, consider a drop kerb between the proposed trees on Kilmore Street. 3. Recommend 2 x bus stops are dedicated for public buses 24 - hous a day and that the Town Hall drop - off area accommodate evening coach drop-offs. 4. Recommend soft landscaping in the upstand kerb between The drop-off area and the cycle lane outside the Town Hall entrance. 5. Have all options been considered for a safe mid - block crossing (or geometries) of desire lines for pedestrians – especially given the adjacent activities (car parking). 	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Council traffic engineers advise that there is insufficient room for directional arrows and these do not accord with traffic rules.</p> <p>This is a service lane and drop kerbs are proposed in the plan for approval.</p> <p>Environment Canterbury recommends that the front (rather than the rear) bus space be reserved for coach parks between the hours of 6pm and 6am. This change has been adopted in the proposed plan for approval.</p> <p>No space is available in this area which will be used by passengers alighting from buses.</p> <p>A pedestrian crossing will be considered as part of Phase 2 planning for Kilmore Street.</p>
Brian Coker Wishes to be heard		Not stated	<p>I am a double amputee as a result of the 2011 earthquakes. As a result of that I have some significant mobility issues. The provision of adequate mobility parks makes a considerable difference to my quality of life.</p> <p>There does not appear to be adequate provision for mobility parks in this section of Kilmore Street where they are most needed for people accessing the Town Hall. I note that the information provided states that there will be one park on Kilmore St although it does not appear to be shown on the plan and two further parks in Colombo St. I believe that these provisions are inadequate.</p> <p>My wife and I have always been keen supporters of arts and cultural events and attended the Town Hall on a regular basis. Both the Theatre Royal and the Piano have only one disability park each on the street which is totally inadequate for the number of users of the adjoining facilities.</p> <p>I want to make sure that the same mistake is also not made with the Town Hall which is of course a much larger facility.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. A new mobility park is provided on Kilmore Street near the Town Hall entrance. Two additional mobility parks will be provided on Colombo Street immediately south of Kilmore Street.</p> <p>The drop-off area in front of the Town Hall will usually be available. If it is not, three evening P5 parking spaces have been provided for drop-offs on Kilmore Street to the east of Colombo Street.</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
Di Lucas	Peterborough Village	Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>From discussions held in Peterborough Village we support the proposal as an interim to two-laning.</p> <p>Given the block is the entrance to a major city venue we support the provisions for bus stops, drop-offs and thus no private parking in the block excepting for mobility.</p> <p>We seek a shared path of at least 5 metres width along the block, and support the added strip.</p> <p>We seek clarification re cycle parking. They should not clutter the bus stops and should be handy to Town Hall entrance.</p>	<p>General support for Phase 1 plan noted.</p> <p>The shared path will now not be provided in front of 70 Kilmore Street because of the potential conflict with pedestrians. The southern footpath is expected to be heavily used by pedestrians when events are occurring at the Town Hall. The project team accepts feedback that pedestrians – particularly those who are visually impaired or are physically disabled - would feel vulnerable if the path was also used by cyclists.</p> <p>Agree. The number of cycle stands near bus stops will be reduced to provide access to the bus stops. Additional cycle stands will be installed on Colombo St adjacent to the James Hay Theatre.</p>
Fiona Bennetts		Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>I think it is a waste of money doing a temporary upgrade now, only to change it in a few years' time, but if something has to be done now, then please refer to the below comments.</p> <p>The cycle lanes are too narrow for traffic travelling at 50 km/h - better to combine the two lanes into one wider lane on one side, with the ability to change positions at the lights to connect to either Victoria Street, Durham Street, or continue down Kilmore Street. Give cyclists a separate light to give them a head start at this intersection (Durham/Kilmore/Victoria).</p> <p>The crossing of the cycle lanes to access the loading bay and bus stops is dangerous. More needs to be done to increase the safety here, or change the location of the cycle lane to the north side of the street only</p>	<p>The current proposal has been designed to minimise rework on the street when it becomes two way. The rework will only involve road marking.</p> <p>Cycle lanes are 1.8 metres wide, the standard width, except at bus stops and loading zones when they are 1.5 metres wide.</p> <p>The cycle lanes will be painted to alert drivers of the cycle lane when accessing the bus stops and crossings.</p>
Allison Nicholas-Dunsmuir		Support the plan	<p>Thank you for including mobility parking in the text of the written materials provided for this consultation. On the concept plan itself the Mobility Parking icons are way too small to be seen.</p> <p>Please can Council consider 1) better icons and 2) make it business as usual to include Mobility Parking in the key for every plan that goes out for consultation.</p>	<p>Agree. The mobility park will be labelled in the plan for approval.</p> <p>We will endeavour to label mobility parks more clearly for future Council transport plans.</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
Amy Hartnell	Earthquake Disability Leadership Group	Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>This is the Earthquake Disability Leadership Group's (EDLG) feedback on the proposed upgrade to Kilmore St (Colombo – Durham).</p> <p>The EDLG's feedback will always advocate for the prioritisation of pedestrians and a logical, usable and safe footpath design that enables an accessible journey for the pedestrian. Pedestrians as a group, encompass a wide range of people with a diverse range of abilities. This group have a range of physical abilities, sensory abilities, intellectual abilities, plus vary in age and size. They may use a range of tools, such as a mobility scooter, wheelchair, walking frame, pushchair, balance bike, walking stick or guide dog.</p> <p>Due to the range of physical abilities from pedestrians as a group, we do not support the acquisition of a space for a shared pedestrian/cycle path. Kilmore St already boasts two cycle lanes that are planned to undergo re-marking as part of the upgrade. The proposed section of shared pathway would also detract from the road etiquette and behaviour change we are encouraging from the cycle community, by allowing them to duck off the road onto a footpath and then cut back onto the road to essentially skip the lights at a corner.</p> <p>It would be our recommendation for those cycle users who are less confident at the intersection, to install a separate cycle first green light that would ensure turning cars wait, while cyclists move first.</p> <p>Pedestrians, particularly those with visual impairments also need a logical, usable and safe footpath design that enables an accessible journey. The current footpath design seems to narrow immediately in front of the Town Hall and then flows directly into street furniture, a bus shelter and trees that are part of the proposed bus stop. It would be our recommendation that this project enlist the technical advice of the Blind Foundation to ensure that the footpath provides a clear and useable journey for all pedestrians as they navigate this block of Kilmore St.</p> <p>Our final discussion point is around the existing drop off zone for the Town Hall. Prior to the quake, the Town Hall had been known to close this drop off zone for large events to use as an area for people to congregate or as a drop off zone for VIP's only.</p> <p>Our concern is that a dedicated drop off zone for disabled people, the elderly, those arriving by Taxi or Uber will be required at all times for events at the Town Hall. Similarly, an area for waiting vehicles such as Taxi's and Uber will be required post event. The lack of any sort of stopping / loading area within this block, not just for people but also delivery vehicles is a concern.</p> <p>The Earthquake Disability Leadership Group is advocating for a rebuilt Christchurch that is a genuinely accessible and liveable place for all its citizens to participate in and belong to. It is imperative that the needs of</p>	<p>Agree that a shared cycle and pedestrian path on the southern side of Kilmore Street presents issues for pedestrians with physical disabilities. This shared path will not be provided.</p> <p>Cyclists who are less confident at the intersection will be able to dismount in the cycle lane and walk their cycles on the footpath.</p> <p>Agree. The Blind Foundation has been consulted.</p> <p>During the limited times the drop-off area in front of Town Hall is not available, passengers can be dropped off in the P5 spaces in Kilmore St, east of Colombo St.</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
			pedestrians, including disabled people, older adults, families with children, visitors and tourists, are well designed for and planned to ensure a safe and usable place is created for all.	
Carina Duke	Blind Foundation	Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>Strongly support the removal of the dedicated slip lane as this will improve safety for all pedestrians.</p> <p>I assume the area in front of number 70 is the land that is being purchased for extending the footpath width? What will the width of the path be along this section? I am concerned that a shared path has been determined as the most appropriate solution "for less confident cyclists". The Blind Foundation does not support shared paths and specifically where these are installed for cyclists to bypass a traffic light system to access an adjacent street. The "less confident cyclists" will be mixing with pedestrians and there will be several points of conflict - the main being at the intersection with Durham Street North where they will return to the roadway. This will require manoeuvring around pedestrians and the cyclists to give way. If the property at 70 is built on in the future there will be little warning of pedestrians and cyclists approaching the corner which will add to the safety issues. If a cyclist has arrived at this intersection they have been through several intersections where confidence was required. Is the plan to have the whole street footpaths to be shared when the next sections are completed? This will result in some vulnerable pedestrians also avoiding this street.</p> <p>Great to see the directional tgsi added to keep pedestrians who are blind or have low vision on the accessible route but the installation on Durham Street North needs to be closer to the kerb (see attachment). Other installations require minor adjustments (shown on attachment).</p> <p>What directional information will there be available for pedestrians travelling west on the South side of Kilmore to veer out with the change in footpath alignment? (Comment provided on attachment.)</p> <p>A seat added to the build out west of the bus stops will prevent pedestrians approaching the cycle on ramp by accident and improve amenities for pedestrians.</p> <p>Are the two bus stops dedicated services or a multi stop? Recommend dedicated as the footpath is narrowed by furniture and trees to travelling efficiently between the two.</p> <p>Trees - will these be at a height that the branches will be above head height from planting? If not could be a hazard to pedestrians and bus travellers.</p> <p>Does the drop off section in front of the Town Hall have a full height or detectable height kerb?</p>	<p>Support for removal of slip lane noted.</p> <p>Project team will consider treatment at the edge of the drop-off lane to provide some sensory cue for the visually impaired.</p> <p>The footpath in front of 70 Kilmore Street will be 5m wide. This will no longer be a shared path because of the conflict with pedestrians and cyclists on a section of footpath that is expected to be heavily used.</p> <p>Change to plan, but maintaining compliance with road and traffic standards. We will contact you to discuss tactiles prior to installation.</p> <p>Concern noted. Will look to provide some form of tactile guidance as part of detailed design.</p> <p>As discussed previously, this is a driveway to the town hall and seating cannot be provided in this area.</p> <p>These are multi-stops to facilitate turnover of buses.</p> <p>Having tree branches that are above head height is the objective for mature trees. When the trees are smaller they may need to limbed</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
			<p>Are the orange highlighted items cycle racks? If yes these need to have tactile and visual elements to prevent them being tripping hazards. Or moved to a different location.</p>	<p>The project team will consider treatment at the edge of the drop-off lane to provide some sensory cue for the visually impaired.</p> <p>Yes, the orange highlighted items are cycle racks. Those that have prompted your concern will be situated between trees so the risk of them being tripping hazards is minimised.</p>
Margaret Forward		Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>I wish to comment on the creation of landscaped areas and the planting of trees at the entrance to Durham St to indicate the start of the 30 km zone. Alerting motorists to the start of the 30 km zone is vital but this could be done with street markings instead e.g. white cross markings right across Durham St and an encircled 30 in each lane.</p> <p>Creating more planted areas and four trees is unnecessary as Durham St already has enough of planted areas between Kilmore and Armagh Streets. This would be a cost saving in terms of plants and long term maintenance. (Many of the newly planted areas in the city are not maintained requiring weeding at the very least. Gardens maintenance resources already appear stretched as existing street landscaping areas are neglected as well).</p> <p>The orange and white area across Durham St is unknown (not in key) but if this is a pedestrian crossing it may be better placed in the middle of the green zones so as to be some metres further from the intersection and thus safer.</p> <p>Are six trees in a stretch of about 60 m in the bus stop/coach stop area really required? Same for the three trees within 35 m opposite the Town Hall near the Colombo St intersection. Seems to be overkill and being planted for immediate effect rather than considering the long term (it seems Tilia Platyphyllos grows to some height and width).</p>	<p>Trees are included to provide a visual gateway to the 30 km/h zone.</p> <p>Planting is included to create a more attractive setting for one of the city's landmarks and enhance key travel routes.</p> <p>The coloured surfacing on the road is to mark the change from 50 km/h to 30 km/h. It is not a pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>Trees – The inclusion of 4 trees immediately in front of the Town Hall will reinstate the trees that were lost during restoration. Originally there were 3 trees in this location and the overbridge. Four trees are proposed and align with the architectural features of the Town Hall.</p> <p>Where possible trees are included to assist in increasing the amenity of the city. Greening the city was a strong theme that emerged in the 'have your say' engagement immediately after the earthquake. There is often significant infrastructure (pipes and cables) and vehicle crossings within the road and footpath limiting the location of trees.</p>
Bronwyn Larsen	Canterbury District Health Board	Generally support the plan but have	<p>Details of submitter</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB). 2. The Ministry of Health requires the submitter to reduce potential health risks by such means as submissions to ensure the public health significance 	

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
		some concerns	<p>of potential adverse effects are adequately considered during policy development.</p> <p>Details of submission</p> <p>3. We welcome the opportunity to comment on the proposed upgrade of Kilmore Street (Colombo St to Durham St).</p> <p>4. Health and wellbeing is influenced by a wide range of factors beyond the health sector. These influences can be described as the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age, and are impacted by environmental, social and behavioural factors. They are often referred to as the social determinants of health. The most effective way to maximise people's wellbeing is to take these factors into account as early as possible during decision making and strategy development.</p> <p>Kilmore St / Durham St North / Victoria St intersection</p> <p>6. The CDHB recommends that measures are taken to simplify pedestrian crossing at this complex intersection, including consistently placed and well-marked kerb drops (with visual and tactile markers) to support those with vision and mobility impairment.</p> <p>Access to Town Hall site</p> <p>7. The CDHB supports the inclusion of a disability carpark near the entrance to the Town Hall on Kilmore St, along with the two additional disability carparks located on Colombo St.</p> <p>8. Effective circulation through the Town Hall drop-off bay is necessary to prevent queuing vehicles from backing up in traffic lanes and over the cycleway. The CDHB recommends that clear signage is installed to prevent congestion caused by vehicles parking or pedestrians standing in the drop-off bay.</p> <p>9. The CDHB encourages installation of low-profile separators between the road and cycleway (like in Quay Street, Auckland) over the access way to the drop-off bay in front of the Town Hall entrance to improve safety for all users by providing cues for drivers and elicit caution when vehicles are crossing a cycle way.</p> <p>10. The CDHB supports the inclusion of designated bus stop bays and shelter outside the Town Hall, and that the shelter is set back in line with proposed trees to allow effective circulation along the footpath.</p> <p>11. The CDHB recommends that a mid-block pedestrian crossing is considered in Phase 2 of the road corridor upgrade to facilitate safe crossing once the Town Hall is reopened and east bound bus stops are</p>	<p>These elements are included in the plan for approval and are objectives of this project.</p> <p>Support for mobility car parking spaces noted.</p> <p>Agree that effective circulation is required. This will be managed by Vbase, operator of the Town Hall when it reopens.</p> <p>There is insufficient space to install low profile separators which could be trip hazards for pedestrians in this location.</p> <p>Support for bus infrastructure noted.</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
			<p>added.</p> <p>Conclusion 12. The CDHB does not wish to be heard in support of this feedback. 13. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed upgrade of Kilmore Street (Colombo St to Durham St).</p>	<p>Whether a pedestrian crossing should be included will be considered as part of the Phase 2 plan for Kilmore Street.</p>
Adele Geradts		Support the plan	<p>I think the drop off bay at the front of the town hall is very important and it should be large enough to accommodate at least 4 cars at one time. If we expect the venue to be well used we should provide the infrastructure that supports a busy location.</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>The drop-off bay has been reinstated with some minor design changes.</p>
Dirk De Lu Wishes to be heard	Spokes Canterbury	Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>The Accessible City plan does a very poor job of providing safe cycling infrastructure for commuter cyclists. Kilmore Street should do the best job possible to make up for this. Please amend this plan.</p> <p>The shared path at 5m width is appreciated. The cycle lanes at 1.8m width are inadequate, especially as they shrink to 1.4m at loading zones and 1.3m at bus stops. Taking at least 0.2m from the shared path provides commuter cyclists with the room to pass safely and goes a bit too future proof this cycle route. If the desired outcome of more people cycling is achieved many interested but concerned cyclists will graduate to commuters and they will need the room. Alternatively some people will zoom along on the shared path placing people at risk. Council can plan for this and needs to do so. The cheapest and easiest approach is to provide adequate infrastructure from the outset.</p> <p>The 1.4m width at loading zones is likely to result in disruption and injury. Loading operations often have vehicles intruding into the cycle lane along with people moving goods also intruding. From the illustration it appears that the only loading zone is in front of the Town Hall near Colombo and intrudes into the shared path. Pedestrians, cyclists on the shared path and on the road are all placed at risk. This really is not good enough.</p> <p>Two options to improve usability and safety and obvious. 1. Remove the loading zone and use the drive in front of the Town Hall as the loading zone. Council may wish to limit the hours of use. 2. Shift the shared path a bit south into what appears to be open space in front of the Town Hall. This can allow retention of the paths width and provide safer cycling.</p>	<p>The plans for consultation and approval provide on-street cycle lanes on both sides of Kilmore Street. Care has been taken to balance the needs of all users.</p> <p>The shared path will now not be provided in front of 70 Kilmore Street because of the potential conflict with pedestrians. The southern footpath is expected to be heavily used by pedestrians when events are occurring at the Town Hall. The project team accepts feedback that pedestrians – particularly those who are visually impaired or are physically disabled - would feel vulnerable if the path was also used by cyclists.</p> <p>In the plan for approval, the Phase 1 cycle lanes are 1.8 metres wide, the standard width. Cycle lanes at bus stops are narrower (1.5 metres) in order to accommodate the width of buses. As buses have no doorways exiting into the cycle lane a safer environment exists than that provided against car parking spaces. Cycle lanes at loading zones are also 1.5 metres wide.</p> <p>The space near Colombo Street is a mobility park, not a loading zone.</p> <p>In the plan for approval, three loading bays will be installed in Phase 1. Two will be converted to bus stops in Phase 2.</p> <p>The space in front of the Town Hall will be paved, while the plans have legal boundary separating the road reserve from the Town Hall land. In reality there will be no difference and the whole space will appear as a consistent space.</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
John Burt	Body Corporate 164 - 168 Kilmore Street (for the 11 apartment residents, 164 - 168 Kilmore Street)	Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>The plan looks good, thank you.</p> <p>On a related matter, we were concerned that 6 car parks were removed with no consultation for bike lanes outside 164 - 168 Kilmore Street in 2015. Looking ahead, we'd like assurance this won't happen when Kilmore Street is reconfigured between Madras and Manchester.</p> <p>There was no consultation when this occurred and with hindsight and a lot of lobbying from the residents and Cancer Society, traffic engineer Stephen Hughes amended the markings to regain some of the lost parks. This compromise appears to have no effect on the sight lines or bike lanes.</p> <p>Although we have lost fewer parks with this intervention, we do have parking problems with the reduced number. As the bike lanes were positioned to allow for two way, we think it would be reasonable for the CCC to ensure that there is no further parking reduction.</p> <p>Pre earthquake there was establishment of a line of trees in the footpath along this section of Kilmore Street. With the exception of the one directly outside 166 Kilmore street (which died and hasn't been replaced) they are well established and add positively to the streetscape.</p> <p>The footpath is quite wide and we would be happy for the CCC to re-establish the missing tree in the same place. This would improve the visual amenity and keep beautification away from intruding on parking.</p>	<p>General support noted.</p> <p>Parking between Madras and Manchester Streets is outside the scope of this project.</p> <p>Parking and landscaping issues will be considered during the development of plans for the remainder of Kilmore Street and Salisbury Street.</p>
William Trenrove	Trenrove Architects	Do not support the plan	<p>My concern over this plan is the reduction of lane widths and the removal of uncontrolled left turn to Durham Street.</p> <p>The narrow widths as demonstrated in Durham street and St Asaph make negotiation of Trucks trailers emergency vehicles very difficult. There is no space for confident cyclists or E bike riders. Traveling at just under 30kph it is unsafe to expect this growing number of commuters to use shared path cycle ways for less confident cyclist and pedestrians.</p> <p>The simple cost free solution of providing a centre line and no cycle lane markings is continually overlooked by the planners. The cycle lanes as shown on the plan do not allow cyclist to pass each other safely and the car drivers are not accepting or cycles in the car lanes.</p> <p>A huge amount of on street car parking has been removed from Colombo street Oxford and Cambridge Terrace. A casual visit by car to the town hall or victoria square has been made unnecessarily difficult. If you visit the city with a camper van or trailer you are unable to access parking buildings and the on street parking worked well.</p> <p>I live and work in the central city and am a keen cyclist. However the</p>	<p>Lane widths of 3.25 metres are adequate for vehicle traffic in Kilmore Street and Durham Street.</p> <p>The removal of the uncontrolled left turn to Durham Street is needed to reduce the complexity of the intersection when Kilmore Street changes from one-way to two-way.</p> <p>Cycle lanes are required for safety reasons on roads that have high traffic flow. Cyclists wishing to pass other cyclists need to do this when there is clear space in the adjacent traffic lane to do so.</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
			<p>central city road design to date has made cycling significantly more dangerous so I use a car more often. I have provided my staff with an office cycleit is very seldom used. If we did not have ACC I expect the CCC would be facing legal challenges on the deficient design and the accidents that have occurred.</p> <p>The wide one way streets were the easiest and safest way to access the city good to cycle and park on and greatly reduced dangerous right hand turns....we have seen huge unnecessary expenditure to the detriment of a working city. Unfortunately I am out of Christchurch Wednesday 11th April however I am very keen to discuss this plan in more detail.</p>	
Leila Torrington	Environment Canterbury	Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback for the proposed upgrade of Kilmore St (Colombo St to Durham St). This is a staff submission from the Public Transport team at Environment Canterbury. We appreciate the hard work that the City Council has undertaken to plan a safe passageway in the Kilmore St area for all traffic modes.</p> <p>We fully support the removal of the left-turning slip lane to improve space for pedestrians.</p> <p>We fully support planning for new landscaping and the addition of mobility parks for appropriate users.</p> <p>We fully support the new double-length bus stops, bays and double-length shelter outside the Town Hall which will service the following routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Blue Line (including express trips) -29 -95 <p>These bus services run a maximum 12 trips an hour in peak times, so it is vitally important the buses can quickly and easily pull in and out of stops.</p> <p>So that these buses can easily use this stop, we strongly recommend that the coach stop is located at the front position. If the stop is in use by a Metro bus, the coach pulls in behind it, waits until it moves away, then the coach moves to the front of the stop before opening its doors to let its passengers alight. This allows for another arriving urban bus to pull in behind, unload/load and get away quickly and keep the network running efficiently. While the coach stop is designated 6pm-6am only our experience has shown us the coaches can stop at other times of the day and take a considerable amount of time to load & unload so the stop at the front allows the coach to stop for the time needed and Metro buses to pull in behind.</p>	<p>General support noted.</p> <p>We appreciate the need to facilitate the turnover of buses at stops. The plan has been amended to locate the coach stop at the front of the bus stop.</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
Shueh Lim		Support the plan		Support noted.
Ryan Coey		Generally support the plan but have some concerns	I am curious as to why there needs to be cycle lane on both sides of the road considering the road is one way- are the cycle lanes for cyclists going in the same direction?	A cycle lane is needed on the north side of this Kilmore Street block so cyclists can turn into Victoria Street. This is consistent with existing cycle lanes on Kilmore Street.
Martin Brown		Support the plan	Two way traffic (Salisbury St & Kilmore Street)	Support noted.
Trish & Glenn Perkins		Support the plan		Support noted.
Zdenko Zec		Support the plan		Support noted.
Greg Vodok		Support the plan	<p>1. There should be extra signage notifying drivers of a cycle lane on their right - no motorists will be used to that.</p> <p>2. The cycleways should be protected / separated from traffic, as per the CCC cycleway design guidelines (at a minimum, there should be a painted separation).</p>	The cycle lane on the north side of the Kilmore Street block will have standard green surfacing. It will be clearly defined and visible to motorists and pedestrians.
Anna Poole		Support the plan		Support noted.
Richard Houghton		Support the plan		Support noted.
Tom Rose		Support the plan		Support noted.
julie bruggers		do not support the plan	We have lived in Chester Street West (Cranmer Square) for 18 months now and feel that any more disruption to Kilmore Street for the sake of 2 bus stops is somewhat futile. We pass many of the buses coming down Kilmore Street and are dismayed to see how empty they are - to put other drivers and pedestrians and cyclists under yet more inconvenience down the particular street seems totally unfair. Especially with the disruption already caused in the past year with new builds and the ongoing town hall repairs.	Due to the extensive works associated with the Town Hall restoration, there is a need to replace kerbs and pavement. To reduce overall disruption and save costs the whole block will be done at the same time and be future proofed for the change in traffic from one-way to two-way.
dave king		Support the plan		Support noted.
Andrew Hamilton	Corcovado	Generally support the plan but have some concerns	We have expressed the same concerns as with the Victoria St upgrade around execution. If this is done at the same time as works down Victoria St, we will see a sharp downturn in visitors. Examples have been recent Durham and Montreal works which saw a 50% reduction in visitor numbers over the weekends these were performed. Customers mentioned repeatedly that these works prevented wayfinding to our business. We have seen 3 important businesses leave the area due to the anticipation of ongoing works on Victoria/Salisbury/Durham inhibiting wayfinding. Given the experience of Manchester St and the businesses that went under there, this is understandable.	If this project is approved and construction will take place ahead of work in Victoria Street. We appreciate your concerns about disruption and Council contractors will work closely with businesses to minimise disruption.
Ruth Gardner		Support the plan	Strongly support the provision of shared path for less confident cyclists, and hope this can be extended.	Support noted.

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
Ernest Duval	Fino Hotel	Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>I received the CCC flyer advising of the proposed changes to Kilmore st . and whilst I think some of the changes are needed, I have some doubts over the merits of other aspects.</p> <p>1.If you are not aware we own and operate the hotel at 87 Kilmore st (in fact developed it 25 years ago)so require 24/7 access to and from the site virtually across the entire street frontage. This is because there is a drive in /off the street used by cars, delivery vans , service vehicles, guests vehicles , buses and other passenger vehicles at all times of the day and night and every day. There is also a two way ingress/egress for guests to the two levels of car parking we have on site. The plan you have provided has insufficient detail around our site to show the impact of the foot path, cycle way and roadway on this and our site.</p> <p>2.From the plan it seems to indicate a widening of the foot path in front of the hotel to the point it will contact the cycle way. From a logistics perspective this is likely to pose a number of problems for deliveries and elevate the potential hazard to cyclists, pedestrians and motorists because a number of delivery vehicles must temporarily park on the street to effect their daily deliveries. These include large trucks delivering linen supplies, gas bottles, Bidvest food deliveries, shuttle buses etc. This design will force them to park either on the street (obstructing the cycle way and northern most west bound lane, or they will be forced to straddle the very wide foot path and obstruct pedestrians. The plan seems exhibits insufficient understanding of the operations of this hotel and how we can safely operate when its been implemented.</p> <p>3.The plan shows the proposed location of a 'Tilia Platyphyllos' tree somewhere in front of the hotel but not specifically . As previously mentioned we have several entry and exit points which cannot be obstructed so it will be important to accurately identify the tree location in conjunction with the hotel manager. Moreover the species you have selected for this location may not suit. Whilst it is a very attractive tree also known as the "large leaf lime" it grows to up to 30m, nearly 100ft or the height of a 10 story building with a spread of 20m. It is deciduous so sheds its leaves every year and we have a flat open roof restaurant very close to the tree. From the plan provided this tree would eventually grow over our property. We also have all our essential underground services in this location and these trees have a significant root structure. See images below (attached)</p> <p>4.The widened foot path could be an issue for us so may I suggest we have a discussion around that with the hotel manager and a more detailed plan for the area in front of the hotel? Maybe a loading zone to accommodate vehicles and a more suitable tree?</p> <p>5.The left turn from Kilmore st into Durham st north does not seem very driver friendly.It will require a hard 90 degree left turn when logic would</p>	<p>After an on-site meeting with the hotel owner and manager the Council's project team agreed to make provision for large vehicles servicing the hotel, and remove a tree in the plan for approval.</p> <p>In the plan for approval, three loading bays will be installed on the north side of Kilmore Street in Phase 1. Two will be converted to bus stops in Phase 2.</p> <p>The proposed lime tree in front of the hotel has been removed from the plan for approval.</p> <p>See response to No. 2.</p> <p>The removal of the uncontrolled left turn to Durham Street is needed to reduce the complexity of the</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
			<p>suggest that given the amount of land you have on that corner that a easier left turn for west bound Kilmore traffic would be more workable and prevent cars backing up. There is enough land on the corner to impliment some generous landscaping , a pleasant pedestrian staging point and a left turn for cars that keeps traffic moving. Take a look at an example of the corner protrusion at the intersection of Madras and Lichfield st where the kerb has been broken up by cars having to execute an difficult RH turn off the one way system. What the council needs to understand is that poor design costs the ratepayers money in repairs.</p> <p>6.The 30 kph restriction on Durham st. I think this is a failure and has been proved so on Montreal st. I drive down Montreal st most days and witness the frustration in motorists having the crawl along the street. The concept is self defeating because the traffic lights need to remain green longer for the slower speed so motorists know this and drive up to 50k to connect with them. The speed restriction abruptly finishes in latimer square where traffic returns to normal? If the point is to slow traffic down to make for a better environment for pedestrians then it is misdirected because there are so few pedestrian walking along that section. It wastes time, fratrates motorists, acts as a disincentive for motorists to enter the city and sets a speed limit t equivalent to driving through road works or a traffic accident scene, is that we are saying a 30kph zone is?. Even the police have stated that enforcement of this is a 'low priority' in other words imposing an arbitrary 30kph limit over a few blocks within the inner city on a one way street is pointless. It doesn't make Christchurch an accessible city and simply adds to the disincentive for motorists to enter the city.</p> <p>To do the same on Durham st will simply create the same outcomes.</p> <p>7.Narrowing of the entry to Durham st. I think this reflects poor planning and fails to understand the traffic dynamics of the area . The entry point to Durham st is restricted to two lanes yet it is meant to receive traffic across the intersection from three one way lanes where most of that traffic intends to travel through the city on the same road system yet has to squeeze into two lanes before running the gauntlet through a narrow two lane carriage way with potential obstruction from cars attempting to reverse park into street side parks where they must stop oncoming traffic to be able to park. The plan shows the footpath widening on both side in order to restrict the carriageway. This will become a bottle neck and does not need to be so because you have the space on both sides to make a safer entry to the system. One only needs to view st Asaph st to see the problems this approach has created and one can see from the tyre markings on the new kerbs the difficulty motorists are having accessing carparks. If one drives through st Asaph and a vehicle in front wants to park then that vehicle holds all traffic behind it up including into the intersection.</p> <p>8.Delaying the two waying of Kilmore st. I don't think delaying is a good</p>	<p>intersection when Kilmore Street changes from one-way to two-way.</p> <p>Outside the scope of this project.</p> <p>The plan narrows the road on the approach to the 30 km/h restricted speed zone. The wider paths are provided to improve facilities for pedestrians.</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
			<p>idea. The fact council has identified this street as needing to revert to two lanes as it was many years ago, is an acceptance that its not working as a one way system. The primary problem is that anyone attempting to access properties between Columbo st and Durham on Kilmore have to circumnavigte around the block in order to enter that section of Kilmore st from Colombo st. Proposed hospitality and other developments planned for the sites at 71, 95 and 119 will have the same challenge as well as restricting access to the town hall to the south side of the street. Given the town hall, hotels and hospitality activities are very people focused having a one way traffic system dissecting those activities is out of sync with creating a more people orientated environment. One way streets are designed to move vloumes of traffic from one part of the city to another and hence why the traffic light systems are synchronised. Traffic moves faster on a one way system and is not concerned about business, just moving through. A two way system slows traffic down and is more beneficial for the businesses on both sides of the street and creates more flexible access points as well as a more people focused street scape which is I think what you are trying to achieve in Kilmore st?</p> <p>9.Has the council considered putting in some kerb side electric charging points in this area and what is the plan for that? It will be the future of cars and every block should have a couple of parks reserved for charging?</p> <p>Finally, I think we have to accept for better or for worse, that Christchurch is a city of cars.It is a radial city where people live far from the city centre with ever expanding suburbs. We do not have a viable public transport system and people use their cars as a practical means of getting around. Mother with kids, doing the shopping, travelling in bad weather,the easterly cold wind, people with houses in the suburbs , families,the elderly, going into to town at night, safety etc are reasons why we all prefer to use cars. The city planners need to accept this because if its not the cars we drive today it will be autonomous electric cars, but they are still cars. If we build to a plan that that doesn't work we will need to spend more ratepayer money to fix and we can all see that is going to happen in parts of our city so lets try to avoid it here.</p>	<p>The draft 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan, which delays the construction of the remainder of Kilmore Street and Salisbury Street until 2021/22, is out for consultation until 13 April 2018. Submissions can be made at www.ccc.govt.nz/ltp</p> <p>The Council has a current policy of providing electric charging in parking buildings within the central city area.</p> <p>The current central city transport plans aim to improve travel for all types of users and enhance streetscapes within the inner city. The needs of motorists are carefully considered during new transport projects.</p>
David Robinson		Do not Support the plan	<p>The proposed design should not go ahead. The cycle lanes must be off road or on-road and completely physically separated from traffic.</p> <p>The ongoing high fatality rates for cyclists clearly indicates that on-road facilities are not safe.</p> <p>The Council has a moral if not legal responsibility to provide safe transport infrastructure.</p> <p>On-road cycle lanes are not consistent with a vision zero approach.</p>	<p>There is insufficient road space on Kilmore Street to provide separated cycle lanes. The proposed cycle lanes are 1.8 metres wide except at bus stops and loading zones where they are 1.5 metres wide.</p>
Richard Hack		Support the plan		<p>Support noted.</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
James Clark		Generally support the plan but have some concerns	The upgrades proposed are very necessary, especially in light of the Town Hall restoration, however the whole of Kilmore St should be made two way at the same time. A significant amount of high density residential development has occurred in Kilmore St between Fitzgerald Ave and Manchester St, and having a two way street right the way through to Park Terrace would make access to / from this area much more efficient. Please find the funding to make this happen sooner, rather than having roadworks twice and prolonged transport inefficiency.	<p>The plan is for one way traffic at this time. It will become two way at a later date.</p> <p>The draft 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan, which delays the construction of the remainder of Kilmore Street and Salisbury Street until 2021/22, is out for consultation until 13 April 2018. Submissions can be made at www.ccc.govt.nz/ltp</p> <p>This section of Kilmore Street has been designed so that no major construction work will be required when the road becomes two-way in the future.</p>
Mark Heseltine		Generally support the plan but have some concerns	How about finishing some of the other roadworks in the CBD before starting more. As I cross the CBD each day to get to work it is a bloody nightmare most days. Get Durham St finished. It has gone on long enough	Your comments about roadworks are noted. The Council understands that Ōtākaro Limited plans to finish the Durham Street works in Durham Street in April 2018.
Reuben Cresswell		Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>There is NO need for cycle lanes on both sides of a one way street in Kilmore Street.</p> <p>There is an obsession within this current city council for cycle lanes and enough is enough.</p> <p>Not everyone is willing or even able to cycle and cycle lanes on both sides of a one way street is simply excessive.</p> <p>Car lanes should be kept at the original width to cope with traffic especially during busy times and functions at the Town Hall.</p> <p>Narrowing the car lanes too much will cause danger and restrict flow e.g. St Asaph Street</p>	A cycle lane is needed on the north side of this Kilmore Street block so cyclists can turn into Victoria Street. This is consistent with existing cycle lanes on Kilmore Street.
Marjorie Manthei	Victoria Neighbourhood Association (a sub-group re street upgrades)	Support the plan	<p>The Victoria Neighbourhood Association set up a sub-group of 5 members to consider and respond to plans regarding the upgrading of streets in our area. This is the first response from that group. We agree that the proposed plan for the upgrading of the Kilmore Street section from Colombo to Durham St is sound. We particularly support doing away with the dedicated left-turn slip lane. Residents have seen (and experienced) several problems with the current configuration, especially with cyclists caught in the middle.</p> <p>Re the proposed timeframe: Agree that the roadworks should be done to coincide with completion of the Town Hall. Our only concern with dividing the Kilmore St project is that multiple closures of the same road does cause ongoing problems for residents and businesses. We experienced this when Montreal and Victoria Streets were closed (or seriously compromised) several times each. It was also suggested that the Colombo St work</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>This section of Kilmore Street has been designed so that no major construction work will be required when the road becomes two-way in the future. Current Ōtākaro works on Colombo Street are not expected to cause any significant problems for Kilmore Street traffic.</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
			<p>currently underway be completely finished before work on Kilmore St starts.</p> <p>The fuller VNA membership has discussed the 30 km/hr speed limit several times, with general agreement. Narrowing the road and providing other visual cues through the plantings should also help remind motorists that they are entering a slower speed area.</p> <p>The VNA also has supported the cycle lane initiatives and, in some cases, the shared pedestrian-cycle approach has made sense. However, one of the sub-group members does not like cyclists and pedestrians sharing the same space, primarily because some 'speedy and soundless cyclists can come up from behind, and one false sideways step takes me into the cyclist's path without me knowing the risk is approaching'. We therefore suggest that whenever there is a shared path that they are very well marked, perhaps with reminders to cyclists to be extra careful when approaching pedestrians.</p>	<p>The shared path will now not be provided in front of 70 Kilmore Street because of the potential conflict with pedestrians. The southern footpath is expected to be heavily used by pedestrians when events are occurring at the Town Hall. The project team accepts feedback that pedestrians – particularly those who are visually impaired or are physically disabled - would feel vulnerable if the path was also used by cyclists.</p>
Arthur McGregor		Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>I generally support this proposal because the road is in very poor condition and or would be a shame for the newly re-opened Town Hall to have such a shabby road outside. It would make accessing the Town Hall unpleasant and unsafe.</p> <p>However, I have two concerns.</p> <p>Firstly, the location of the 6 new parking bays on Durham St relative to the cycle lane. I am concerned that drivers may not see oncoming cyclists and pull out in front of them. In particular the trees (part of the 30km/h gateway) seem to be a visual obstruction. In addition, drivers attempting to parallel park will prevent cyclists from getting past safely.</p> <p>Secondly, I hope this design has been constructed in such a way that it will not have to be redone when the two way conversion occurs. From what I can see it appears that may be the case, but I'm no traffic engineer! It would be a waste of money to do significant ground work twice. Although I realise some changes will be needed, hopefully it will not require rebuilding the road again - otherwise I would not support this proposal!</p>	<p>There is sufficient width to allow cyclists to pass safely. The cycle lane on Durham Street is 2.3 metres wide and there is an additional painted buffer between cycle and vehicle lanes to avoid contact with car doors.</p> <p>The current proposal has been designed to minimise rework on the street when it becomes two-way.</p>
Martin Hoffmann		Generally support the plan but have some concerns	<p>Generally the consultation plans look good and will be a great improvement to the public realm.</p> <p>Looking at the consultation plans I am a bit concerned with the potential conflict between buses and cyclists. However, this will depend on the frequency buses and coaches use the bus stops. Is there potential to put the cycleway on the footpath side of the bus stop?</p>	<p>The cycle lane width allows cyclists to safely pass stationary buses at bus stops.</p>
Peter Sillifant		Generally support the plan but have	<p>I like the way the plan looks, and I support it. My only concern is the possibility of major reworking required once the two way conversion occurs which would seem a bit of an additional burden for motorist already tired of so much roadworks. In the event that this reworking is not going to</p>	<p>The current proposal has been designed to minimise rework on the street when it becomes two-way.</p>

Name	Name of organisation (if applicable)	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Team responses
		some concerns	be too significant (which I suspect is the case), then I don't have any concerns. Thank you very much for allowing me to comment! :)	
Stuart Winter	Laneway Espresso (Petition 43 signatures)	do not support the plan	On first look at the proposed plan, it appears that there will be some extra carparks installed on the East side of the street opposite Laneway Espresso - excellent. The proposed loss of carparks on the West side of the street will however have a huge impact on the local businesses on the West side of the street. Durham St is very busy, people avoid crossing it and certainly wont do so, risking their lives for a flat white. When trees were planted, removing carparks we were reassured that there would be no impact to businesses. Sure, the trees look nice, but they have caused nothing but issues with traffic flow and access to the remaining carparks. These issues have resulted in lost revenue. In such a tough market, this could be the final straw for local operators. The narrowing of the street at the Kilmore/Durham intersection and the addition of landscaping and street trees is supposed to act as a gateway to the 30km/h zone. Is this really necessary? Why don't we all work together to come up with something that instead of being detrimental to local businesses, actually contributes to their success AND creating a form of gateway or similar to the city.	In the consultation plan six parking spaces were added on the east side of Durham Street, and five were removed to make way for the gateway to the 30 km/h zone. Following a review of parking spaces in this section of Durham Street, no further spaces can be added on the western side. The threshold north of Laneway Espresso is needed to signal entry to the 30 km/h zone and Spark also has a consent to install a cellphone tower in this location.
Robin Meier	NA	Support the plan	We are concerned that Parking in Phase 2 may be compromised / reduced at the Park Terrace end of Kilmore st	The concept design for that section of Kilmore Street is still being developed
peter russell	Abbott Insurance Brokers Ltd	Generally support the plan but have some concerns	The 2 waying of Kilmore Street I feel needs to be prioritised with some urgency	The draft 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan, which delays the construction of the remainder of Kilmore Street and Salisbury Street until 2021/22, is out for consultation until 13 April 2018. Submissions can be made at www.ccc.govt.nz/ltp
Jonathan Ludgater	Ludgater Holdings Ltd	Generally support the plan but have some concerns	I would like the dedicated turning lane to remain in place	It is not possible to retain the dedicated turning lane as a 30 km/h threshold is required on Durham Street and the intersection has been designed to for the two-way traffic change in the future.
Jackie Thompson		Support the plan	I agree to the new ideas, it makes perfect sense.	Support noted.
Philip Richards		Support the plan	I am delighted to see the Lime Tree plantings. These always looked so good against the Town Hall, and reinstate the historical connection of the site to the Limes Hospital,	Support noted, along with acknowledgement of the link between the lime trees and the former Limes Hospital on the Town Hall site.
Angela Webster		Support the plan		Support noted.