

12 August 2017

Freepost 2199  
Island Bay Cycleway (114)  
Wellington City Council  
P.O. Box 2199  
Wellington 6140  
theparade@wcc.govt.nz

**Re: Love the Bay - Delivering on the cycleway**

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.

We have the following comments to make regarding the proposals to remediate the Island Bay cycleway:

1. We appreciate that the political situation of the Island Bay cycleway means that money must be spent on getting a new cycleway established in Island Bay. We do however note that, prior to the building of the current cycleway:
  - (a) there was little need for hard cycleway infrastructure on this wide, low traffic volume street
  - (b) there were (and still are) much higher priorities for cycling infrastructure in the city than Island Bay
  - (c) there existed (and still exists) the parallel option of Derwent St, which has even lower traffic volumes, and is ideal for novice cyclists for much of the route
  - (d) designs need to be understood in terms of the types of contexts that they were designed for (e.g. peri-urban/urban contexts without driveways), and some contexts are better without hard infrastructure
  - (e) the real issue here is the dominance of public space used to encourage car ownership and use (e.g. driveways and car parks). The validity of compulsory on-site car parks on private property and the land useage for driveways needs challenging. We support a plan change to remove this requirement. Parking meters, or a system street car parking rental for residents, should be considered.
  
2. We also consider that cycleways beginning from the inner-city and moving out to the suburbs are more likely to:
  - (a) address tightly constrained routes,
  - (b) increase commuter cycling because of their closer proximity to the city centre as a key destination, and
  - (c) reduce cycling accidents

than spending money on suburban routes.



the architectural centre inc.  
PO Box 24178 Wellington

3. We consequently ask the Council to prioritise these, concentrating on the first bus zone of potential corridors, rather than the full length, and progressively build cycling infrastructure out from the city, rather than concentrating on isolated longer routes one at a time. This strategy could be paralleled with a PT fare structure that encouraged increased cycling. A link to a CBD congestion charging zone could also motivate mode shift from cars.
4. Regular commuter cycling constitutes higher mileage, and so greater impact on emissions reduction, than recreational cycling, and consequently commuter cycling ought to be prioritised at this stage given the immature nature of our cycling infrastructure.
5. We advocate that the Council address the most difficult parts and areas of greater need (e.g. as determined by accident rates, insufficient vehicle space etc.) over the Island Bay cycleway.
6. We do not have a problem with any reduction of car parks. The Final Design Report stated that: "There are currently 265 legal on-street car parks along The Parade. Surveys show that occupancy of those car parks typically ranges from 150-180 spaces, with a peak of 216."<sup>1</sup> This suggested prior to the implementation of the current cycleway, there was an over supply of at least 49 car parks during the highest peak. As we understand it, the current design removed 29 car parks. Experience of the current design shows that there is still a significant over supply of car parks. We believe that a further reduction of 42 car parks (with angle parking) would leave more than the typical maximum use of 180 car parks.
7. Comments on each of the options:
  - (a) Option A
    - i. this option has sufficient flexibility to enable cyclists to turn right at intersections with relative ease.
    - ii. it avoids current problems with vehicles and people blocking the cycleway (e.g. service vehicles, cars trying to see the road before leaving their driveways, passengers disembarking, families farewelling visitors).
    - iii. it is good to have a door buffer in this version of the design
    - iv. the bus bypass is a problem as it diverts cyclists onto the footpath (c.f. Brighton design). At the very least, if this option is chosen, a second cycle lane should traverse through the bus stop to indicate that this is the normal route when there is no bus parked at the stop.

---

<sup>1</sup> WCC "Island Bay Cycleway: Final Design Report" p. 8.



[Bus stop and cycle bypass, Brighton, England. Note use of kerbs to distinguish road space from pedestrian footpath, and gradual path curvature to reduce the inconvenience of horizontal deviation.]

(b) Options B, C & D

These options are substantively similar to each other with the angle parking effectively being the distinguishing factor, if all options use kerbs and level changes to distinguish modes.

- i. these options are better in relation to bus stops, and appears to adopt the Brighton model, which we endorse, where the cycleway is differentiated from the footpath and car parking by kerbs.
- ii. we appreciate that car parks have been removed to assist driver visibility, but still consider that a study is needed to ascertain the visibility needs of drivers backing out of driveways. Currently many end up sitting across the cycleway, and blocking it, in order to see cars on the road. This aspect of the design is its major disadvantage.
- iii. transverse streets should include a bike box (which is clear of the cycleway), on the raised approach to intersections, to facilitate right turning.

**8. Issues common to all proposals**

- (a) For all options we recommend a properly designed shared space (including traffic calming - we suggest to 12 km/hr) in the Island Bay village ("business zone"). The reasons for this are:
  - i. the current proposal will require cyclists to encroach on the footpath at a point where there are higher concentrations of pedestrians who will need greater footpath space.
  - ii. fast cycling will not be possible because of street furniture, verandah posts and pedestrians
  - iii. a shared space will indicate the different nature/character of the village

**9. Issues for the developed design**

In addition to the above comments regarding: a second cycle lane through bus stops (7(a)(iv)), the need for bike boxes at the raised approaches on transverse streets (7(b)(iii)), and the design of a proper shared space through Island Bay village (8(a)), the following issues will also need addressing in the further design of option/s.

- (a) what is the detail for the intersection with raised pedestrian crossings (options A & B)?

- (b) intersection design: we suggest the model of continental Europe roundabouts be used. These "are designed to be more cycle friendly. They do this by ensuring that vehicles entering the roundabout have to slow right down to speeds consistent with pedestrian and cyclist safety. They also position cyclists more in the central vision of motorists."<sup>2</sup> The Cycling Safety Panel report also notes: "There would be value in trialling European roundabout designs in New Zealand."<sup>3</sup>

## 10. Recommendation

There are strengths and weaknesses in all of the options, but we consider that all of the proposed options are improvements on the existing cycleway. Our preference is for one of options B, C, or D with a fully developed shared space in the Island Bay village.

## 11. Consultation

We note the numerous documents (17 links) related to this consultation and the short time of two weeks. This is in addition to the overlap with three other consultations which may be of relevance to groups interested in the built environment, two also being transport-related consultations. We consider that this is an insufficient period of time for a consultation, given that there is no valid reason for this consultation to be less than the usual four week period. This suggests that a decision has already been made and that the Council will not take submissions seriously. We hope that this is not the case, and that the abbreviated consultation time has not also disadvantaged other submitters.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed Island Bay cycleway options. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully



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

## References

- Cycling Safety Panel "Safer journeys for people who cycle: cycling safety panel draft report" (25 September 2014)  
<http://www.nzta.govt.nz/consultation/cycling-safety-panel/docs/cycling-safety-panel-consultation-draft-sept-2014.pdf>
- WCC "Island Bay Cycleway: Final Design Report" (August 2014)  
<http://wellington.govt.nz/~media/have-your-say/public-input/files/consultations/2014/09-cycling/design-report-august-2014.pdf>

---

<sup>2</sup> Cycling Safety Panel *Safer Journeys for People who Cycle* p. 31.

<sup>3</sup> Cycling Safety Panel *Safer Journeys for People who Cycle* p. 31.