

## 7. WALTHAM ROAD/WILSONS ROAD: BROUGHAM STREET TO ST MARTINS ROAD

<b>Officer responsible</b> City Streets Manager	<b>Author</b> Michael Thomson, Pedestrian Advocate
Corporate Plan Output: Capital Works Programme Pedestrian and Cycle Safety Initiatives	

The purpose of this report is to inform the Board of feedback received from the public consultation phase of the project to improve cycle and pedestrian facilities on Waltham Road and Wilson's Road between Brougham Street and St. Martins Road (see attached plans).

The standard City Streets consultation leaflet was distributed to residential and commercial properties in August 2000. In addition, 1300 leaflets were distributed to five local schools seeking children's views on this project and approximately 250 were returned. Those residents whose property would be directly affected by the proposed parking restrictions were contacted personally to ensure they understood the plan and that their views were recorded.

A summary of responses to the leaflet is as follows:

1. Concern about speed of traffic and does not think this plan is very practical.
2. Would like deep dish kerb and channel replaced in Waltham Road.
3. Good plan, but please do the work when the pool is closed.
4. Concern about access to Austin Street.
5. Concern about left turning traffic from Waltham Road into Fifield Terrace.
6. Two questions asked: Are the powerlines to be undergrounded, and will any property frontages be taken?
7. A wonderful plan, cycleways will be appreciated.
8. Very good plan but would like children warning signs. Would also like wider footpaths.
9. Believes that Waltham Road is too narrow for parking, cycle and traffic lanes, as well as the median. Suggests angle parking in the garden area.
10. Please mark turning lane for traffic turning into Hastings Street east.
11. Cannot see the plan working. Will make the road too narrow. Remove parking opposite the pool.
12. Great idea, but cars park too close to driveways.
13. Concerned about the effect of city-bound vehicles losing control when exiting the St Martins/Wilsons Road roundabout.
14. Concerns about exiting Fifield Terrace and existing visibility.

15. Concerns about whether there is enough room for cyclists and traffic.
16. Would like road marking to identify driveways.
17. Great idea would like road marking to identify driveways.
18. A resident of Waltham Road has no objection to broken yellow lines outside their property.
19. The resident of a corner property has no objection to broken yellow lines outside their property.
20. Two residents of Wilsons Road have no objection to broken yellow lines outside their property.
21. One property owner in Waltham Road objects to loss of parking outside his properties.
22. No objection from the local school.
23. Suggestion to install more pedestrian islands.
24. Feedback on the children's survey.

The following comments are in response to the above:

1. The introduction of marked sidelines, cycle lanes and flush median will channel traffic with the effect of calming traffic speeds.
2. Kerb and channel is renewed on a priority list. The 130 metres (approximately) of kerb and dish channel opposite the park is in good condition and is not likely to be renewed within ten years.
3. The physical construction is minimal and can be programmed for a time outside of pool operating hours.
4. Access to Austin Street will be improved, particularly for large vehicles. The painted median will accommodate right turning vehicles into Austin Street from Waltham Road.
5. The island proposed to be located 20 metres north west of Fifield Terrace will not affect left tuning traffic.
6. Waltham Road by the park is not programmed to be undergrounded. No property frontages are required for this proposal.
7. Children warning signs incorporate part of this proposal.

8. The road has adequate width to accommodate the proposed features. Refer to Ferry Road, which has had similar traffic management for some time. Angle parking is not appropriate on a busy arterial road.
9. At this location, there is a solid median cycle lane and two south-bound traffic lanes. There is no room at this location to add another traffic (turning) lane.
10. Parking removal has been minimised.
11. Driveway delineation with “parking ticks” can be installed.
12. This work will not affect the driving environment at this location.
13. Visibility for vehicles exiting Fifield Terrace is not affected by this proposal, however, visibility can be improved by trimming of foliage on reserve land.
14. The road has adequate width to accommodate the proposed features. Refer to Ferry Road, which has had similar traffic management for some time. Angle parking is not appropriate on a busy arterial road.
15. Driveway delineation with “parking ticks” can be installed.
16. Driveway delineation with “parking ticks” can be installed.
17. The owner of two properties objects to a parking restriction outside his properties. The need for this restriction is due to vehicle tracking when negotiating the left hand bend, travelling out of town. If parking occurs at this location there would be a very abrupt alignment change for both cyclists and vehicles, placing the cyclists at increased risk. Removal of the flush median would remove the opportunity for future islands (if deemed necessary) and remove the right turning facility for trucks into Austin Street. It has been requested that the vehicle lanes be moved to the outside of the bend to facilitate parking. Both removal of the flush median or a lateral relocation of the lanes will be a disadvantage in maintaining the appropriate curve alignment for vehicles negotiating this bend.
18. More islands will require the removal of substantial parking adjacent to, and opposite the park.
19. Children’s survey. At the time of writing this report, not all survey forms returned have been analysed. However, twenty returns have been checked, providing the following results (refer attached survey form).

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Question 1	15	2
Question 2	14	3
Question 3	8	9
Question 4	16	1
Question 5	16	1
Question 6	15	2
Question 7	3	13
Question 8	15	2
Question 9	11	4
Question 10	0	14

While a significant amount of work is required to further analyse the responses, the initial indication is that children do not have an objection to the proposal.

If significant concern from children arises following full analysis of the survey, the project details will be reviewed and reported back to the Board.

In conclusion, the only negative, unresolvable response is from the one owner of two adjoining properties. The cycle planner advises that in excess of 100 cyclists use this section of Waltham Road. While the concerns of the one property owner are acknowledged, City Streets Unit staff are of the opinion that the benefits in terms of road safety for the vulnerable road users (cyclists and pedestrians) outweigh the property owner's concerns.

- Recommendation:**
1. That the Board supports the project as proposed to the community.
  2. That the City Services Committee be informed of the Boards support for the project.