Option 1	Option 2	Comments
	Yes	
		We hereby decline both options and ask you to find another path for the cycle route. Thank you.
	Yes	I am disappointed that there were not more options to choose from. Yes it is great to keep the trees but I am still going to be living on a street where two cars can't safely pass each other as the road will be too narrow once the cycleway is put in.
		The road itself is in poor condition as are parts of the footpath. At my end of the street <b>sector</b> there is a flood everytime it rains as the drainage is all out of whack. Are these issues also going to be dealt with?
		Please fix the road, footpaths and drainage <u>before</u> you add a cycleway. Put lights in the park to make it safe for pedestrians and the cyclers as there are none which is not great if you are that concerned about cyclists on the road light the park.
		As a home owner along Lochee Rd I have major concerns about the alternative option mailed out. The time frame given to us to respond back is fairly quick and is concerning to me about the whole consultation process. I wonder what alternatives to Lochee Rd have been considered. There is bare land on Wharenui Rd that runs through to Middleton Park and could connect thru to Suva St. Initially my concerns where about removal of trees and how narrow the street will become for two cars and cycles. In reading the alternate plan I have major concerns over the removal of carparking and the impact that will have both on residents and on future house values. As a regular walker on Lochee Rd I am aware of the number of cars that park currently on one side of the street and with the proposed 21 parking spots removed this will be completely unacceptable to those who live within the street. Visiting friends and family may need to park a considerable distance away. Currently weekends are busy in the street with either sport in Middleton Park or church attendance at Every Nation both contributing to huge on street parking challenges without the removal of 21 parking spots. Has the council done an ongoing analysis of how the street is used? Are you aware of how many cars are parked at different times and days currently. The alternative diagram mailed out has a cross section that says not to scale, this gives a very false impression of the space. Pedestrians on both sides, trees on both sides, a cycleway and two cars passing one another in a 5.5metre gap. This is space for two cars to pass one another is very slim and will therefore cause another whole concern about driver safety. Will this mean in future that our speed limit will be lowered? In providing feedback about the initial proposal I feel very unheard as this alternative is saying that trees can be
	Option 1	Yes

Name	Option 1	Option 2	Comments
			removed or carparking removed, in actual fact as a resident I don't want a cycle lane in our street. Is consultation actual consultation or is it merely a way for you to tell us what you are intending on doing anyway. Hardly a democratic process. I look forward to hearing how this will be resolved.
Tony McPheat			I am against the recent suggestions to reduce even further the number of car parks in Lochee Road. Part of this is due to the number of cars that use all the current parking available during the early or later evenings on any given day. This will cause visitors and/or residents on Lochee Road significant frustration if they are required to park some distance away from houses they are visiting or returning to. This may be as far away as the current Middleton road car park located some 170 metres from our property.
			There would be merit in the council better exploring other alternatives i.e. planning the cycle way to run entirely through Middleton park from wharenui road (by the NZ Sports Institute) to Middleton road near Suva street. This protects Lochee Roads parking which is already limited to one side of the street, it protects the trees some residents value, and protects the current width of Locheee road that is already narrow.
			By more fully using Middleton Park for the cycle way, costs to the council would be substantially reduced in creating the cycle way. It would also seem to align with the sports institute ethos by accommodating the recreational sport of cycling, walking and running beside it's premises.
			Has the council even discussed with the NZ Sports Institute any arrangements it could agree in this regard? I suspect you could have happier residents, happier cyclists, and with a CCC arrangement, a happy NZ Sports Institute as well.
			I look forward to your reply to my submission on the above.
Ron Greaves			I DO NOT accept either OPTION 1 OR Option 2.
			Some points I would like to make.
			1. Many residents down the road have not received this alternative proposal. This is very concerning if you are trying to genuinely hear from all the residents who will be impacted by this change to their environment.

2. I made a large submission with many suggestions. I would like to have a response to the questions I
asked. Especially around impaired access to our properties, dealing with rubbish collections, and physical
lack of land to build the proposed roadway width of 5.5m.
3. You have told me that you have 600 approximately responses that you are working through and that a
summary of the findings of the survey to the residents is not completed. You have told me that this summary
will be available to the residents concerned soon. I look forward to having this.
4. You have told me that Vicki Buck the Councillor for Riccarton Ward is aware of the concerns and as you
suggested, I will pass my returns on to her so that she is fully informed of all our feelings.
Thank you Ann for your time and honesty in speaking to me on the phone on Thursday and I hope that an
outcome acceptable to the residents who will be impacted the most will be arrived at because as a rate payer I
want our rates used on projects that will benefit all residents and have all residents support to avoid the project
becoming an ongoing source of anger, accidental deaths, destruction of our environment and major disruption to
Middleton park users, Church goers and users of all forms of locomotion along our road.
Second submission
Option 3: Neighbourhood greenway (low speed shared street)
If you do not take the street opinion with you the whole plan will FAIL and be a major disaster for the Council and
residents. Please adopt <u>Option 3.</u>
Firstly this is insulting to receive this form only <u>5 days</u> before your close date of Monday 3 June.
You have had <u>many</u> weeks to look at our submission but you only give us 1 week to respond. This is not
acceptable. Many residents have not received this alternative option. WHY?
You have not answered our questions/addressed our concerns. You have not addressed a major flaw in the plan
that the roadway will <u>not</u> fit in all the features. Eg 2 way cycle lane, berm and roadway of <u>5.5m</u> this just does not "fit".

Name	Option 1	Option 2	Comments
			You have not addressed safety concerns to UallU users of the road if option 1 or 2 goes ahead.
			The only solution is for there to be a <u>Neighbourhood Greenway established.</u>
			We are aware tht our street traffic usage allows for this. So why not do this option. THIS IS WHAT OUR STREET RESIDENTS WILL "LIVE WITH".
			Nothing else is acceptable (refer above)
Sophie van Hamelsveld			Neither option satisfies the needs of road users and residents and both are a safety risk.
Hamelsveld			Option 1 does no satisfy the needs and wellbeing requirements of Lochee Road residents and it also devalues and decreases the aesthetic appeal of the road. Tree-lined streets are a hallmark of Christchurch city, so removing even one of the Lochee Road oaks goes against the ethos of the city. In fact, a 2015 study by Kardan et. Al. published in Nature Scientific Reports found that Toronto residents living near relatively higher concentrations of trees had lower rates of cardiometabolic conditions (eg. insulin resistance) than those who lived near comparatively fewer trees. Trees in residential areas also aid in air pollution removal and the shade that they provide can reduce energy use (Nowak, Crane and Stevens, 2006). Improved mental and physical health, air quality and reduced energy use are all in line with the Christchurch City Councils stated goals for Christchurch city. Thus, option 1 for the proposed Lochee Road cycleway massively fails to uphold the values and goals of the CCC, and I, a Lochee Road resident reject it.
			Option 2 has been provided to the residents of Lochee Road as an alternative design; however, this design also fails to meet the needs and safety requirements of Lochee Road residents and road users. The Option 2 design proposes to remove a significant amount of parking from Lochee Road. This is problematic for two reasons. Firstly Lochee Road has a significant number of flats and conjoined units. This means that there is a high concentration of people living on Lochee Road. Many of the residents are unrelated and in flatting situations so are likely to own private vehicles. This increases the need for on-street parking as most homes will have insufficient off-street parking to meet residents needs. Secondly, Lochee road services and park and a busy church (Every Nation Church). On Sundays, all available on-street parking is taken by church-goers. If parks are removed, church-goers will be forced to park on the busier Wharenui Road, a dangerous situation for the many

Name	Option 1	Option 2	Comments
			families that attend church with small children. Families needing parking for sports games in Middleton Park will
			also struggle to find safe parking spots if the Option 2 design goes ahead.
			My next concern is the safety worries raised by myself and other residents during the initial consultation are not resolved by either Option 1 or Option 2. These concerns, such as the danger of the two-way cycleway and the risk posed by drivers reversing out of their driveways across the cycleway have not been addressed. These safety shortcomings were detailed in my initial submission (Ref no. 22476)*. I frequently either bike or walk from my flat on Lochee Road to the University of Canterbury and have noticed that the two-way cycleway on Clyde Road between the Clyde Road pedestrian crossing and University Drive frequently creates confusion between cyclists and pedestrians. I do not want this outside my home and form my commute to University. Hinau Street is an example of a cycleway to maximise safety while retaining trees and greenspace as well as on-street parking. Hinau Street has a 30km/h speed limit, a design feature that I think could be implemented on Lochee Road. The reduced speed limit discourages drivers from using Hinau Street as a short cut to Riccarton Road, something that drivers are currently using Lochee Road for. Decreasing the speed limit on Lochee Road to be incorporated into the South Express Major Cycle Route. A design and speed limit to Hinau Street would satisfy safety requirements whilst retaining existing parking spaces and trees/green space.
			Lastly I would like to voice my upset over the way the CCC and Project Manager Brendan Bisley have acted towards Lochee Road residents during this design and consultation process. Effectively, residents of Lochee Road have been given one week to respond to the alternative and original proposals for the cycleway. For busy parents and elderly lacking internet access or a means to visit a post office, the time frame for submitting feedback is totally insufficient. I believe this has been done deliberately to silence residents and take away our voices. This is tantamount to bullying by the CCC and Cycle Route team. Our initial concerns (eg. safety, loss of parking, loss of historic trees) have not been fully addressed by either Option one or two. Myself and the other residents of Lochee Road have not had our opinions and concerns properly understood by the CCC and Cycle Route team, leaving us with feelings of deep dissatisfaction and devaluement. I hope the CCC and Cycle Route team can come back with a third option that fully delivers on the Lochee Road residents' needs.

Name	Option 1	Option 2	Comments
			References:
			Kardan, et. al. (2015). Neighbourhood Greenspace and Health in a Large Urban Centre. Scientific Reports. 5:11610
			Nowak, Crane and Stevens (2006). Air pollution removed by urban trees and shrubs in the United States. Urban Forestry and Urban Greening. 4:115-123
			* At the time of writing my first submission I was not a Lochee Road resident. I have since moved into the address 37B Lochee Road as of 14 April 2019.
Kurt Hewson			Option 3: Take the residents feedback seriously and produce a good design.
			I have multiple comments.
			I am disappointed at how the consultation stage has been handled (this is the same for the rest of the Lochee Road residents). Our concerns regarding the initial proposal have gone 'unheard' according to the latest response.
			I have spoken with the residents of Lochee Road and we all have very similar concerns (which were well addressed in our original Consultation Letters). One of these common concerns being parking; as I stated in my Consultation Letter (attached) Lochee Road services the residents (most homes being Units, therefore high density of people living on a small street), the Every Nation Church; which fills the street with cars every Sunday, and Middleton Park which has weekend sports (and sports training during the week). Lochee Road already has limited parking due to the North side being yellow lines the length of the street.
			We rejected the first design for this reason, so to present it to us again; as an Option is rude. We believe this is the Councils way of bullying us into selecting a design, when we do not like either.
			We also had concerns regarding road width, the proposed designs mean narrow street, virtually making the street unusable (the Typical Cross Sections are still not drawn to scale, I would hate to believe this has been done to foul residents). This issue has not been addressed in Option 2.
			Option 2 retains all the trees, which is good. As these trees are what gives Lochee Road good amenity; they make it a pleasure to live, walk, bike and drive down Lochee Road. They are old, beautiful oak trees; hence why the community and residents were absolutely disgusted when the initial proposed stated removing five down Lochee

Name	Option 1	Option 2	Comments
			Road. To propose this was foul, and against the Council District Plan. Removing trees should never have been an option. So to respond to the residents with Option 2 (being the only option) is rude, as tree removal should never of been proposed in the first place.
			We also had concerns regarding cycle safety. I am a cyclist myself (I strongly believe I ride my bike more than the person reading this letter), I commute from Lochee Road to Hagley Park everyday (rain or shine). I stated the major safety concerns regarding a two-directional separated lane down a quiet street. The major risk of being struck by a vehicle reversing out of a driveway, the risk of a vehicle turning into or out of a side road striking a cyclist coming up behind them in their blind spot etc. I can relate to these as I have nearly been hit three times when I use to commute down Grove Road.
			I am glad to see the shared footpath has been removed, and the crossing point moved to where the existing drop kerb is. Yet once again a shared footpath should never have been proposed in the first place. As the risk of a blind, elderly, disabled, or child being struck and injured in very high.
			I called Brendan Bisley to ask why our other points have not been addressed; and that it was upsetting and rude to only send us Option 2 (Option 1 being the initial design we rejected). I asked why the residents have not been presented with more options; options that take our initial comments into account. Only to be told 'it's hard', 'Lochee Road is a tricky one' which to me means the project manager does not care, he is not open to exploring new options and ideas with the community/ residents.
			I asked why have we not been presented with 'neighbourhood greenway'? As from my discussions with the residents they would be happy with this solution. He goes on to tell my traffic volumes must be below 2500 vehicles per day, and that unfortunately Lochee Road is above that, which was a lie. I proceeded to investigate the traffic count (as I am a resident I know the traffic volume would be well below this figure) and found on the CCC traffic count data website the Average Daily Traffic to be 1576 vehicles (attached). So, this begs me to ask, why have we not seen this as an option.
			Giving us two options was rude. I believe the residents are being bullied into choosing between two options, that are both rubbish. The project team and Council are refusing to take our comments seriously. Our comments have not been reflected in the two options. You have now lost the Lochee Road residents trust.

Name	Option 1	Option 2	Comments
			It has taken the project team/ Council 2 months to respond to our initial comments, so to expect us to respond
			within effectively 1 week is unacceptable, and most likely in breach of the consultation process. This is not
			acceptable.
			ATTACHMENTS ALSO WITH THIS SUBMISSION
			Additional email:
			Please see attached alternative solution.
			This was produced from conversations with the residents after the 'Lochee Road, alternative option for feedback' letter was received.
			The concerns we have with both options presented being;
			Parking
			<ul> <li>Road width</li> <li>Trees</li> </ul>
			Cycle safety
			Drainage
			Amenity
			Accessibility
			These above points have been discussed further in the residents submissions.
Nico & Lvana Haima van der Wal	Yes		We are the owners of Lochee Road and the tree in front is ripping up the footpath and keeps blocking our (the roots) sewage and stormwater systems. We are in favour of the extra parking spaces, the park has plenty of trees. So we would prefer option 1.
			The footpath outside our property was raised high because of the trees roots, a piece has been cut out but has never been replaced so is a tripping hazard for the elderly, blind and children. The trees are never kept up tidily and as there is more and more foot traffic and car traffic and more people moving into houses, ie being rented out, more parking is required, also with the church behind our property more parking is required.

Name	Option 1	Option 2	Comments
			So Option 1 please.
			Many thanks and have a good day.
Jason Graham			These are not acceptable alternatives:
			<ol> <li>The road width is no better</li> <li>The parking is not better</li> <li>You haven't really listened to first response and thought this through</li> <li>Access to my driveway is hard enough already during peak times</li> </ol>
Paulette Greaves			Option 3: Neighbourhood greenway
			If you do not address the issues we have raised to the satisfaction of the residents this whole project <u>WILL FAIL</u> . People will be injured, quality of life for residents will be impacted negatively.
			<ul> <li>This is very inconsiderate to only give respondents less than a week to respond. 3 June is a holiday also!</li> <li>You have had many weeks to look at our submissions but you only give us less than 5 working day to respond to a major change to our living environment.</li> </ul>
			• In speaking to neighbours many have not received this alternative response. Why? What are you going to do about this?
			<ul> <li>You have not answered our questions, nor proposed an alternative which would address our concerns.</li> <li>A major flaw which been identified is that there is simply not enough width of land available to incorporate all features eg, double cycleway, berm, road and footpaths and carparking.</li> </ul>
			• You have ignored major safety concerns for all users and also access to our properties for our vehicles.
			The only solution is for there to be a <u>neighbourhood greenway established.</u> We <u>know</u> that our street meets the requirements of such a plan. So please DO THIS OPTION if you have to go ahead with this plan.
Mark Greaves			Option 3: Greenway belt
			I strongly oppose both options 1 & 2. The only sensible logical cycle route option is a greenway belt.

Name	Option 1	Option 2	Comments
			I drive in and out of Lochee Road weekly as my parents look after my young children. I am very concerned about the visibility and safety entering and exiting and the disruption to parking proposed in both options you are proposing.
			I don't understand why you have not even put a greenway belt as an option, very disappointed! Why would you waste our taxpayers money when there is much more inexpensive options and safer than what you are proposing.
			A greenway belt would work for everyone and is the safest option for everyone.
			Kind regards
Jason Greaves			Option 3: Greenway belt
			I strongly oppose both options 1 & 2. We support a greenway belt, as an alternative.
			My parents at Lochee Road take care of our 3 little children on a weekly basis, so the disruption of parking visibility and safety is a major concern to us.
			We have a large people moving van and if we have to pull into their driveway we need to reverse out across the cycleway and try to manoeuvre between the cycleway separator and narrow gap to the tree.
			The road is very quiet with low volume traffic, I don't understand why the major works and expense needs to be done when a simple greenway belt would work just as well but make the street still useable for everyone.
			Kind regards
Leah Greaves			Option 3: Neighbourhood greenway
			Option 1 and Option 2 are <u>not</u> acceptable. I park my car on Lochee Road and already it is congested for parking. Where am I going to park? I don't have off-street parking available.
			The neighbourhood greenway is the best and only proposal. It <u>keeps</u> the trees and <u>keeps</u> the parking.

Name	Option 1	Option 2	Comments
			I <u>do not support</u> removing any trees from the road. They are a feature of the road and an asset to the <u>garden</u> city. They cannot be replaced and they are helping to remove tonnes of CO2 from the environment. How dare you think cutting these down when we are all trying to <u>care for the environment</u> we are living in.
Sarah Greaves			Option 3: Create a neighbourhood greenway leaving the road/footpaths/trees unchanged.
			I frequently visit Lochee Road to visit friends and parents. Removal of parking is not acceptable as the road is already congested for parking particularly when the church is running on Sundays and in the winter months when the Middleton Park is in full use for sports.
			Removal of any trees would be unacceptable as the trees are beautiful in all the seasons and they are part of what makes the street beautiful. Also with the Council declaration of an emergency in climate change how can anybody cut down trees which are soaking up tonnes of carbon to protect our environment. This option too is <u>out of the question</u> .
			I am an early childhood teacher, I know what dangers road movement are to children and their parents. A cycleway which has cyclists moving <u>both</u> ways and road traffic also a real danger to children using the footpaths and Middleton Park when moving to/from transport options/park activities.
			Option 3 is the only sensible plan that I could support but I have real doubt about if using this street is sensible at all because of all the conflicting uses that go on here, eg use of Middleton Park, use of church, nature of residents many having to leave vehicles on the street overnight.