



Response to Parnell Cycleway and Residential Parking Zone

INTRODUCTION

The Parnell Business Association are supportive of cycleways when they add value, enhance amenity and do not materially detract from local business's ability to operate or restrict patrons that support those businesses in the process.

We acknowledge that cycleways are a valuable tool for giving Aucklanders a greater range of transport options and should be considered together with enhancing Public Transport.

On behalf of the Parnell business community we are opposed to the current cycleway proposal for the following reasons:-

- The dramatic loss of PARKING and subsequent impact this will have on affected parties, including Whitecliffe College and the Callaghan Innovation Centre, Rose Park Hotel and the Rose Gardens, Gladstone Road neighbourhood shops including Rosies Café, Parnell District School, Quality Hotel, the Holy Trinity Cathedral and businesses around the intersection of Parnell Road and upper St Stephens Avenue.
- The PROCESS has been typified by lack of proper consultation with Parnell Inc (the Parnell Business Association/PBA), Parnell Community Committee (PCC), and limited interaction with the WLB (Waitematā Local Board). We feel it has been characterised by misleading information, and what could be interpreted as a disingenuous consultation practice, which seems to have a predetermined outcome, no matter what the feedback is from stakeholders.
- Key PRINCIPLES have been ignored, such as:
 - The design doesn't address increased safety risks.
 - The design misses the opportunity to address loss of community and to improve amenity.
 - The premature introduction of part of the Parking Management Plan, before it has been fully consulted.
 - Striking the right balance of resources for all road users.
- Substantial negative FEEDBACK has been received from both the business and local community



We are supportive in principle of the Residential Parking Zone, but only as part of the overall Parking Management Plan, pending revisions and detail of recommendations on Gladstone Road and upper St Stephens Avenue as well as other details requested for the entire precinct.

We particularly support investment in cycle routes that are alongside rail or motorway corridors, through parks or reserves and not on major arterial roads. To this end we would have preferred that the funding had been channelled into the Greenways Route demarcated adjacent to the Parnell Station.

PARKING

We are opposed to the dramatic loss of parking along the currently proposed route. Gladstone Road/St Stephens Avenue corridor has approximately 268 parking places, from which the current proposal plans to remove 95 (37%).

This seems completely contrary to the documentation that “AT will keep as much on-street parking as possible, but in some locations may need to reallocate space to make streets safer. Any removal of parking spaces will depend on the road space available and the type of improvements being provided. On-street parking in shopping centres is of particular importance to businesses, and AT will focus on solutions that retain parking and enhance the streetscape in these areas”.

The AECOM report correctly states that “*Feedback from the business associations, Parnell Inc and Parnell Community Committee, during the CMP process included the support for cyclists to use St Stephens Ave / Gladstone Road rather than Parnell Road. In addition, the associations wish to discourage commuter parking in the area*”. We did however state very clearly in our response to the Parnell, Newmarket, Remuera cycle improvements consultation in which feedback closed in June 2016, that “*While the route via St Stephens Ave/Gladstone Road is the preferred option, this in no way, from our point of view, endorses the removal of parking to put in cycle lanes. Any loss of parking along this route would have an adverse impact on several parties and would be resisted.*”

Affected parties who would feel a negative impact from the loss of parking include:-

- **Whitecliffe College and the Callaghan Innovation Centre.** In addition to the all day commuter parking, much of the parking is occupied by students at Whitecliffe College as well as the Callaghan Innovation Centre. Many of the 350+ students carry lots of art materials and equipment and for many of the students, they have no other way of getting to the college.



“This is an extraordinary move towards a society where only the rich can afford what is in many cases a necessity - the ability to get to work in a reasonable time and the ability to transport equipment and tools to and from work. 2) Public transport is not an option for many (2k walk from bus stop to home for me. I often work till very late at night and need to transport tools and equipment”.

“There is no reasonable alternative transportation to this part of Parnell. The proposed train station is over a km away and the buses are often full and offer poor links to southbound commuters once in Newmarket. There is very limited off-street parking in terms of car parking areas, so would threaten the feasibility of some businesses as employees are unable to park”.

- **Quality Hotel, Rose Park Hotel and Rose Gardens**

“It will have a negative effect on our Hotel and Conference Business, especially Conferences held here for local business. As we are owned by a Charitable Trust, revenues earned are donated back into community organisations”.

“Because there will be inadequate parking spaces for people visiting the Rose Gardens”.

- **The Gladstone shops** who rely on the constant churn the current angle parking provides, in addition to overflow parking up and down Gladstone Road, as well as in the side streets.

The offering of the Gladstone neighbourhood shops has significantly increased in the past 3 years with the addition of high quality tenants such as Rosies Café, Blush etc, all of whom have required access to parking facilities for short and medium term patrons. The suggestion that the creation of 3 marked car parks in Avon Street, will compensate for the loss of some of the angle parks outside the shops, is not realistic as this will be severely compounded with the loss of car parks in the adjacent blocks either side, PLUS the residential parking zone.



"This is terrible. Many older Parnell residents drive to the local shops. Parking is difficult there at the best of times. 2 parallel parks is grossly inadequate".

"Gladstone Rd shops and adjoining businesses are important elements of Parnell resident lives and adequate car parking is essential to retain the current workability".

"Businesses are going to have to move as people will grow unwilling to add another 30min onto their Auckland transport route. Small business' such as cafes etc. will eventually close as there won't be anyone to cater to - and just watch the few cyclists go by".

"It is dreadful and devastating for those essential businesses and for local Parnell residents like myself".

"The detrimental effect on he businesses and the people they serve is so obvious it hardly warrants a comment".

"No its an idea for get fit or just for fun people not real retail business people working around the clock to make their business in Parnell work..it denigrates Parnell. Do you think the businesses here are just a game insulting!!!"

"This is going to affect both business and residents really badly, and not only along Gladstone Rd, it is going to affect businesses in greater Parnell area. This includes congested transportation, not going to cafes and shops because of the problems with parking. Overall Parnell will be in decline if this is implemented".

"Will not get used enough and wastes carpark spaces. AT should be building carparks to compensate".

"Vehicle users asked to sacrifice too much for a minority".

"Parking sucks in Parnell that's why there are so many empty shops".

- **Parnell District School**

The Parnell District School is very dependent on parking at drop off and collection times. They have indicated that they are in support of a cycle lane, but



the effect of losing about 50% of their carparks will have an impact on how the school interacts with the parents – many of whom are very community minded and pop in for a chat with teachers when collecting or dropping off children.

“During peak hours both roads are very busy especially when Parnell School starts and finishes. I see many other dedicated cycle lanes around the city with hardly any cyclists most of the time”.

“This will affect business on Gladstone Ave and make collecting children from school a nightmare”.

- **Holy Trinity Cathedral and businesses in Parnell Road, adjacent to the intersection, including Parnell City Lodge.**

While the cathedral supports cycling initiatives, they feel that vehicular access to and parking for significant events is important and while they have some car parking, overflow parking in the surrounding streets is a necessity.

“Typically it is not practical to arrive at a school prize-giving, concert, wedding or funeral by bicycle”.

PROCESS

The process has been typified by leading questions, misleading information, and what could be interpreted as a disingenuous consultation practice, which seems to have a predetermined outcome, no matter what the feedback is from stakeholders.

1. Pre the following processes the **Gladstone Shops** (via landowner Chris Hardley and PCC), vigorously defended the loss of angle parking outside the shops as proposed by AT. This was supported by over 1,200 signatures from the community, as well as an expert traffic assessment.

2. Oct-Nov 2015. Gladstone Road Cycleway as part of the Newmarket to Strand initiative

- The PBA and PCC were initially approached by Auckland Transport in Oct 2015 with a plan outlining issues and constraints along this route to which we responded highlighting that any reduction in parking would have an adverse



effect on several parties (see appendix 1). This is the last time anyone from Auckland Transport met with us personally on the proposed cycleway on this route.

3. May- June 2016. Parnell, Newmarket, Remuera cycle improvements consultation in which feedback closed in June 2016

- Brochures were mailed to residential properties, directed at asking cyclists (a minority of the community), asking where they would like to cycle. Business was not asked to consult. This does not represent consultation with a cross-section of the community, in particular ‘affected stakeholders’.
The Waitematā Local Board, PBA, PCC, NBA were only informed of this consultation a few days prior to distribution – there was no early warnings nor individual engagement (see appendix 2,3,).
- The Parnell Businesses Association, Parnell Community Committee, Newmarket Business Association and the Waitematā Local Board (amongst others) all questioned as to why Auckland Transport had elected to give the public a blank canvas on which to document their desired routes and not outline specific routes and in particular why the Greenways Route had not been documented as an option (see appendix 4,5)
- Feedback noted in the *‘Public Feedback and Decisions Report, Inner East Suburbs Cycle Improvements, Parnell, Grafton, Newmarket, Remuera, Meadowbank and Ōrākei’* is fragmented, disparate and indicative of the open-ended consultation process. It documents 994 feedback submissions from a very wide area of consultation, encompassing 2,298 route suggestions, grouped together to 324 different routes they would like included in the cycling network. Submitters also specified 3,171 issues and concerns that put them off cycling in the area, relating to 1,904 different locations. This is mirrored by the *‘Issues and Concerns Feedback Spreadsheet’*, which itemises a plethora of locations, concerns and issues and has little information on Gladstone Road and St Stephens Avenue. In our view this does not represent a mandate to proceed.
- Yet the conclusion in the report states the following:- *“By 2018, new cycleways will be constructed on Tamaki Drive between Quay Street and Ngapipi Road, and from the intersection of Tamaki Drive/the Strand to Parnell Road via Gladstone Road. Further to the east, the final section of the Glen Innes to Tamaki Drive cycleway will also be open by 2018”*.
- This feedback was sent to us on the 29th November/1 Dec, on the same day we were notified by AT that The Parnell Cycleway and Residential Parking Zone was opening for public feedback (see appendix 6,7)



4. Nov-Dec 2016. The Parnell Cycleway and (part of a) Residential Parking Zone

- As noted above we were notified, not consulted, just days before the material went out. Neither ourselves, PCC or the WLB had the opportunity to contribute to the material nor did we have time to assess the feedback from the previous effort.
- We view the request to submit by the 23rd December, when you know this is a very busy time of the year, as deliberate and unhelpful.
- The PBA has been an important component of on-going discussions regarding the Parking Management Study in Parnell. We engaged our members and solicited over 150 responses to your survey. On 23 November PBA and PCC were presented the results and recommendations as hard copies/drafts. We are in support of most of the recommendations, but requested confirmation of some details as well as soft copies, but have been told the team are only able to revert in January. The study included more than 1 residential zone, so we question why the cycleway consultation has been combined with just a portion of the Parking Management Study?
- The positioning that *'Auckland Transport is proposing changes to Parnell to create cycling connections and to improve parking availability for residents' and businesses'* within the context of two totally different initiatives is muddying the waters and in our view designed to achieve specific outcomes.
- The documentation in the leaflet is misleading in that it represents no loss of parking in the block between Avon and Stanwell Street and unless you are an internet savvy consumer who takes the trouble to download the 'Detailed Consultation Plans', you would not be aware of your proposed amendments.
- The online and brochure questions are leading and biased e.g. *"What do you like about the proposed design?"* and make no acknowledgement of a potential opposing view.

PRINCIPLES

We object to the current proposal based on the following principles:-

Increased Safety Risks

AT documentation refers to 'A safe, separated cycling connection between Parnell Road and Tamaki Drive'. However we feel there are serious safety issues with intersections on and leading into Gladstone Road which have not been adequately addressed as part of the design solution.



“Cycleways on both sides of a main central city feeder route that has 3 dangerous intersections and 13 side roads is both dangerous unnecessary for the following reasons”.

- The Strand/Gladstone intersection is currently difficult and unsafe for motorists, cars and cyclists. It has a history of crashes as noted in the AECOM report. The reference in the Detailed Consultation Plans for this project to ‘future signalised intersection by NZTA’ is totally unsatisfactory. The treatment of this intersection is absolutely key to the links between Quay Street and Parnell for all users, so the detail, timing and funding status should be part of this proposal.
- St Stephens/Brighton Road- the cycleway across St Stephens Avenue is perilous at this intersection and this location also has a history of crashes.

“It’s nuts, it’s going to make Brighton Rd 100 x worse. I’ve been first on the scene of a truck collecting a cyclist there, and have seen 100 near misses. I can’t see how it will be safer for anyone!”

- The traffic islands at the intersection of Gladstone/St Stephens are difficult to negotiate and the crossing of children to and from the school will be made worse with this proposal, creating an increased number of frustrated parents who cannot find parking for collection and drop offs.
- The concept of buses and cars pulling in and out in front of a cycle lane is not considered desirable. When a cyclist is in a shared and busy street, they know they have to stay aware of other vehicles, but in a separated lane the inference is they can relax more – but this is not the case.

Lack of Amenity

The current design contributes nothing to enhance a sense of place nor increased visual amenities or aesthetics to this heritage precinct.

- AT documentation promises ‘New landscaping and improved visual appearance of public spaces, including shopping centres’. It also notes ‘*The project will provide a high quality, safe and attractive cycle route, suitable for riders of*



varying abilities and confidence levels’. We do not concur that the current design meets these criteria.

- The AECOM report states that *‘The section of Gladstone Road between St Stephens Avenue and Canterbury Place is the only part of the corridor that still has overhead power lines. There may be the opportunity for cost savings, and improved urban design outcomes, if the undergrounding of power lines occurs during the construction of cycle facilities’*. This recommendation however was not carried into your proposal? We concur with this statement and believe this **MUST** be done as part of the project and a solution needs to be sought with Vector before proceeding further. The current power poles situated on wide pavements impede opportunities for a reduced footpath or other design opportunities.

“PCC seeks the above matters be reviewed and considered, together with effective community collaboration to come up with a bespoke solution for Gladstone Road rather than the application of a green paint and white marked segregated system which will destroy the character and enjoyment of Gladstone Road.”

“The last thing we want in Parnell is the visual nightmare of Carlton Gore Road.”

“Get rid of the lampposts and make the pavement a shared space”.

Loss of Community

Part of the appeal of Auckland is a city surrounded by small villages. Separated cycleways, similar to those of Carlton Gore Road and the current proposal, remove the destination value of shopping and town precincts to create ugly thoroughfares that will eventually be abandoned by business and active community interests.

- We concur with the Parnell community response that the current design proposal ignores the role of Gladstone Road in providing a gateway to Parnell, the Rose Gardens, Judges Bay and route to the Cathedral from the waterfront, and fails to consider the role of the Gladstone community shops as an important hub for the community- where parking is important and will destroy character amenity and lifestyle in a heritage suburb.



“We will all have our views on cycleways but in my opinion they are generally to be encouraged. However, I think this proposal if implemented in its current form will have a major negative impact on our community interaction at the Gladstone Rd shops. These shops provide both local residents and those passing through with a short stop, local convenience shopping opportunity and at the same time the chance to bump into and chat in person with locals and friends. It’s a vital part of our locality and any transport proposal must be designed to enhance communities, not dislocate them.”

Limited Network Possibility

The Inner East Suburbs Cycle Improvement map, which was part of the Parnell Newmarket Remuera proposed cycle network, shows the section up Gladstone and St Stephens Avenue as funded, but the balance unfunded. Given that there would be significant challenges along Broadway, it seems futile to spend significant sums on a section of an overall network that ends abruptly until further funding can be sourced. The Gladstone St Stephens component should be presented within the context of an holistic plan, from Remuera to The Strand so the implications of the full route can be assessed. Anything less than this is premature thinking.

Incomplete representation of the Parking Management Plan

A full Parking Management Survey has been completed by Auckland Transport and is in draft presentation format. It includes both business and residential zones. In general we are in support of this initiative in order to reduce commuter parking in the area and have requested copies of the finer details.

To present only 1 residential zone as part of this process is misleading.

The Parking Management Plan needs to be consulted upon as one comprehensive entity and implemented before any format of cycling lanes are confirmed.

Parnell is very short of parking in general with very limited private parking opportunities. Gladstone Road and St Stephens Avenue are full of ‘all day’ parking places. However, at this stage we are unable to discern how many of these are occupied by staff of Parnell businesses and how many are ‘hide-and-ride’ commuters on their way to the city.



Even though we generally support the initiative, it is going to present some challenges to businesses with inadequate staff parking, and it would be far wiser to let this settle and be able to assess the outcomes (both positive and negative) before causing significant pain to a local business community.

Lack of balance for all road users

We do not believe this proposal will achieve an outcome that balances the needs of all road users. There is no balance if the vast majority of other road users are disenfranchised for a small minority of cyclists and while cycling is a growing mode of transport, even doubling the usage in in the next few years does not justify dislocating an entire business community in the process.

The Parnell community includes walkers, cyclists, commuters, pedestrians and vehicle drivers of all ages. The entire community comprises not only the residential component, but over 1,000 businesses and more than 7,000 staff who work in the area. It also includes schools and tertiary education facilities.

Cycling is recognised by the community as an important transport mode to encourage, but we also need to assess what type of cyclists are likely to use this route.

The AECOM report notes that it is unlikely to include school cyclists and may be biased to a particular demographic (e.g. recreational / more confident users). This is consistent with our feedback and several comments from cyclists who completed our survey.

“Why take away the parking spots of working individuals to allow for more room so the 12 6am morning cyclists can use a bike lane 3 times a week”.

“1)As a cyclist who regularly uses Gladstone Rd, it has no serious pinch points and is not overly congested. 2) On the down hill side, the design with bikes on the wrong side of the parked cars, is very dangerous for serious cyclists who like to travel at speeds approaching those of cars and for people on foot. 3) This cycleway appears to be a case of misguided social agenda which will have an inverse effect to that desired”.

“NO, I am a cyclist and I can tell you that 100% of cyclist will use the road on the downhill ride and not a cycle lane so it is a waste of time”.



“The Parnell cyclists are predominantly mid-life crisis Tour de France fantasists who come down Gladstone Road in high speed groups and will not be using the cycle lanes”.

FEEDBACK

The local community has actively engaged on this proposal.

In addition to the feedback AT must have received on its site, over 120 people attended a public meeting held by the Parnell Community Committee, over 800 people signed a petition not to remove the angle parking at the Gladstone Shops and over 120 people completed the Parnell Business Association survey.

In our survey we asked the following questions:

1. Do you support the proposed cycleway on either side of Gladstone Road and upper St Stephens Avenue? 64% said NO, 4% said not sure and 32% said YES*.
 - a. Out of those that said YES, only 5 people indicated they represented a business in Parnell, and none of those that said YES indicated they represented an ‘affected party.’
 - b. Out of all those that said NO, almost 50% were unaware that AT intended removing the angle parking outside the Gladstone Shops, and only 1 person was unsure of the effect this may have (everyone else said it would have a dramatic impact/loss of business).
 - c. Over half that said NO to question 1, suggested alternative options.

Our survey, together with letters received from local businesses, plus feedback from the local community, overwhelmingly indicate the lack of buy in from key stakeholders and the need to STOP, REVIEW and RECONSIDER.

“It is poorly designed and not suitable for the types of cyclists who use the street; plus the design doesn't 'fit' with the local amenity values. The concrete buffers are unsafe and also bad design - need a concept a concept that also includes undergrounding of power poles (to create more space for a properly designed modern cycleway)”.

“Poor design and will be less user friendly for cyclists - especially commuters heading south who travel at 35kph (with traffic)”.



“Cycle lane on the uphill side by removing power polls and using part of the foot path to create the cycle lane”.

“Needs to be coordinated with removal of power poles, re-aligning footpaths - i.e. a proper integrated solution between CCOs; otherwise the road should be basically left as is (which would be least cost and therefore should please Mayor) as currently cyclists travel in a safe way”.

“Reduce the width of the foothpaths to accommodate the cycleway. Make the design exemplar not "rough and ready". Link it to Tamaki Dr so there is no danger spot on the Strand”.

* Percentages taken from amount of surveys collated by 20 Dec and excludes additional extras and written responses. All responses have been provided to AT.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we are asking AT to please STOP, REVIEW and RECONSIDER and REDESIGN. The project is premature and should be delayed for the following reasons.

- The comprehensive Parking Management Plan should undergo due consultation, be implemented and allowed to settle before cycleways are even considered. While this could pose significant challenges for certain businesses which have inadequate staff parking, the possible positive spin offs from reducing commuter

parking could assist AT cycleway objectives. The AECOM report states - *The introduction of a residential parking zone would mitigate these impacts and allow for the restriction of parking on Gladstone Road, creating additional space for potential cycle facilities. In addition, restricted parking implemented in advance of this project should open up parking availability near the Gladstone Road shops. Why was this recommendation not heeded?*

- The undergrounding of power lines is essential to not only improving the current visual amenity, but also opening opportunities for a re-design that will more fully support AT cycling objectives while not having such a detrimental effect on this corridor. Examples could include reducing the footpath and having cycle lanes on one side only. Vector need to participate in this process before huge sums are invested on a cycleway.



- The current proposal has very little buy in from the local businesses and the residential community who are requesting a REDESIGN that incorporates effective community collaboration.
- The redesign needs to be presented as part of a holistic network that is funded and not a series of green stripes that ends abruptly, hanging in limbo at a busy intersection.
- Parnell is anxious to see additional funding to enhance the Parnell Station and the pedestrian access to and from Parnell Road. To date, we are not aware that any funds from AT have been allocated for this purpose, which does not correspond with AT objectives to enhance PT options.

“Focus on completing the Remuera to City cycleway along the railway - this will significantly increase bicycle usage. The Gladstone Rd cycleway will add significantly to the already dangerous (from a cyclists perspective) antagonism between cars and cyclists with out any benefit to cyclists”.

“I can see both points of view but the council needs to be realistic about putting in carparking towers for better space utilisation and at a reasonable cost then people have more options where to park - currently the parking situation is narrow and shortsighted in Auckland and Parnell generally. (e.g put a train station in and no ability to park and ride really - very few or no carparks etc)”.

“It could jeopardise small businesses in the area whose employees rely on convenient commuter parking. The public transport links are poor in the eastern side of Parnell compared to the CBD and inconsistent with stated timetables. I tried using the bus from Royal Oak, however in particular the pm commute resulted in long waits for often full buses in both Parnell and Newmarket, so would add 30-50m plus to a 30m journey. Extremely disappointing that the suggested direct route linking the south to Onehunga/Newmarket/Parnell/CBD was not implemented this year. Consultation was only based on an either/or option with existing access through Khyber Pass rather than it being proposed as an additional route anticipating increased demand”.



Lastly we are asking AT to rethink balancing the needs of all road users as well as the businesses and patrons of those businesses who contribute to a heritage suburb right on the fringe of the CBD.

“Future application of taxpayer money will have to have much more robust cost benefit analysis than Parnell residents and business owners have been offered in Auckland Transport’s so-called consultation material. Any future Government will have to carefully consider the generally positive publicity associated with promoting active transport alongside the acute problems created for local residents.”

David Seymour, cyclist

Cheryl Adamson

General Manager

Parnell Incorporated (Parnell Business Association)

Cheryl@parnell.net.nz

09 379 0606

Please note: Quotations in bold surrounding border have all been extracted from comments made in our survey, all of which have been included as separate submissions.

Appendices

1. Parnell letter cycleways, Nov 2015
2. Email from Danielle Van Saambeek, tell us how we can get you cycling, May 19th
3. Email from Pippa Coom, May 30th, 2016
4. NBA cycling submission, June 2016
5. Parnell, Newmarket, Remuera cycleway submission, June 2016
6. Email from Danielle van Sambeek – InnerEast Suburbs Cycle Improvements, Nov 29
7. Email from Aaron Hutchings, Nov 29