



the architectural centre inc.
PO Box 24178 Wellington

13 April 2016

Hutt Road Cycle Path Consultation (KCIF02)
Freepost
Wellington City Council
P.O. Box 2199
Wellington 6140
huttroad.submission@wcc.govt.nz

Re: WCC Hutt Road Cycle path

This submission is from the Architectural Centre, an incorporated society dating from 1946, which represents both professionals and non-professionals interested in the promotion of good design.

The Architectural Centre supports the WCC's proposal for the Hutt Rd cycle path. We consider this route as having unfilled potential as a key cycling commuter route, as well as supporting the Te Aranui o Pōneke/Great Harbour Way route, and reducing cycling accidents which currently occur on this road.

We have the following comments to make:

Hutt Road cycleway

1. While we support the introduction of T2 transit lanes for peak travelling times, we consider that it would be better to formalise **a peak bus lane**, and encourage the council to prioritise public transport over cars.
2. We encourage the WCC to **remove all car parking from arterial roads**.
3. We support having a sufficiently (and consistently) wide **cycling and walking path**. The Island Bay cycleway has inconsistent widths for both pedestrians and cyclists, and cyclists are constantly diverted from a direct path (around bus shelters, car parks, pedestrian crossings etc.). Commuter cyclists prefer a direct path, rather than having to be directed around other transport modes. We note that the proposal here is an improvement on the Island Bay design. We also encourage different surface treatment to distinguish pedestrian and cyclist paths tactilely. A smooth surface will be appreciated by cyclists.
4. Regarding the proposal for the T2 transit lane, this is a smart way to rethink issues of transport capacity relative to time, in the way that a two-way cycleway will likely achieve in practice. The Architectural Centre considers that **smarter thinking about space and time** has the potential to radically increase the potential use of transport resources. We wonder whether the current 4-lanes are under-utilised and request that the council do design work for a system that would enable 3-lanes in the peak direction (i.e. bus lane + T2 transit lane + others). Smart thinking regarding road markings could deliver better transport outcomes.

5. The proposal refers to a **new pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities** and a reconfigured bus stop at the Ngauranga Gorge intersection. More detail is needed regarding this. The design, and any signal timing, needs to be intelligent. There are many instances around town where the cycling crossing signal, for example, does not appear to provide any mode specific benefit (e.g. to reflect greater travel speed of bikes) and if not well thought through there may be a significant proportion of cyclists and pedestrians who will cross regardless of signalling.

6. Speed humps at business entrances may be a good idea, but the detail of speed humps at business entrances is needed in order to properly assess this. The location and design of speed humps can sometimes introduce impediments or inconvenience to cycling, without increasing the necessary increased visibility due to slower speed.

7. Use of strategically placed dropped kerbs can increase flexibility for cyclists and we encourage consideration of these in the development of the design.

8. We note that bikes on the Petone to Ngauranga cycleway are especially prone to punctures due to the cyclepath surface and tendency for “tyre-unfriendly” objects to lie here. This may be an issue for this area too, any designwork to prevent the punctures due to glass, small metal objects etc. would be beneficial.

Post Island Bay

As the first public consultation regarding cycling since the Island Bay cycleway construction, we consider that this is an important opportunity to provide some feedback to the council.

9. It is good to see that the WCC has largely avoided many of the errors of the Island Bay cycleway in the Hutt Rd proposal. These errors are numerous and include:

- (a) investing in low priority areas (i.e. regarding opportunity for improving cycling safety and cycling uptake)
- (b) implementing hard infrastructure in places where this is not the most appropriate mechanism for increasing cycling
- (c) implementing a design meant for urban and peri-urban contexts (i.e. with few or no driveways) into a suburban context
- (d) failing to ensure visibility between cyclists (including children) and cars is maintained and not blocked (e.g. by parked cars)
- (e) causing cars to block the cycleway in order to see road traffic before entering the car carriageway
- (f) providing insufficient infrastructure (e.g. kerbs) to assist drivers to park cars in allocated places (i.e. to prevent cars parking partly on cycleways)
- (g) inconsistent and narrow cycleway widths
- (h) insufficient room for cyclists to overtake other cyclists (i.e. lack of consideration of the different speeds different cyclists travel, including e-cyclists)
- (i) removing median strips which provide safety for cyclists and pedestrians crossing the road
- (j) removing flexibility for right-turning cyclists
- (k) requiring cyclists to be diverted around the paths of all other transport users (i.e. cars, buses and pedestrians) visibly identifying cyclists at the bottom of the transport hierarchy.
- (l) placing the cycleway where broken glass and service grates are located
- (m) reducing footpath widths in some places

10. Experience from Island Bay demonstrates that generally NZ drivers do not excel in parking, and need guidance. Traditionally the kerb has been the mechanism to prevent cars from driving onto the footpath. The Island Bay cycleway has

demonstrated that lack of a physical barrier between the designated area for car parking and the car door allowance (CDA) zone has rendered the CDA zone largely useless, because many cars are not confined to the parking space. This suggests that another mechanism is needed, such as the CDA being provided at the shared footpath/cycleway level.

11. The Island Bay experience has also shown the importance of the passenger door side of the car footpath as a key social space for farewelling family and friends using cars in a neighbourhood context. This has meant that intuitively some residents find themselves unconsciously occupying the cyclepath as they farewell people. This may not be such an issue in urban and peri-urban (e.g. industrial) areas of the city, and so perhaps less important along the Hutt Road, but is an issue that is important in existing suburban and residential neighbourhood contexts.

Finally, while we support the Hutt Road cycle path initiative, we do urge the WCC to address cycling needs in and across the CBD, which are a major impediment to greater commuter cycling. Cycling through the CBD is inconvenient, and at times dangerous, and appears to have been sidelined, as if Karo Drive and the waterfront provide sufficient cycling infrastructure, which is not the case.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the WCC Hutt Road cycle path consultation. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully



Christine McCarthy
President, Architectural Centre
arch@architecture.org.nz