



Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency
Attention Transport Policy Team
The Majestic Centre, Level 7, 100 Willis Street,
Wellington Central, Wellington 6011
Reshaping.streets@nzta.govt.nz

RESHAPING STREETS REGULATORY CHANGES

The proposed street changes, Reshaping Streets and accompanying legislation is anti-business.

There are several positive aspects to the overall proposal including community streets. But the intention to disregard business is very evident. In discussing School Streets, it is described as in partnership with the school and RCA, Community Streets calls for proportionate and adequate consultation with local residents as well as assuring access for important vehicle movements, but there is no mention of any engagement with business whatsoever with regard to Pilots and Modal Filters.

The Rule (Land Transport Rule: Street Layouts 2022, Section 2)

While we note that the Shaping Streets Proposal focusses on Pilots, the accompanying Street Layouts Rule, already gives carte blanche to RCA's upfront, and there are no questions in the survey regarding this?

- The Road Controlling Authority (RCA such as Auckland Transport) may change the use of roadways without any consultation, and there is no mention of the impact on adjacent business. A road controlling authority (RCA) may take any of the following actions in relation to a roadway that it controls:- prohibit or restrict the use of motor vehicles, or one or more classes of motor vehicle on the roadway, install or remove car parks and install or remove modal filters.
- The definition of purpose for which they are doing this is so wide that there will always be an opportunity to substantiate any of the following:- improve access and mobility of pedestrians or cyclists, improve operation of public transport, support environmental sustainability and support the wellbeing of communities.
- The only obligation of an RCA is to notify (no timing given) to the public and to any emergency services that, in the opinion of the road controlling authority, may be affected.

Pilots and modal filters under this proposal are anti business

While as a business association we are, without doubt, in support of tactical urbanism and streetscape pilots as a way of testing and refining a concept prior to final installation, but we believe that certain aspects of the current Reshaping Streets proposal, together with the proposed change in law, are anti-business.

- The Road Controlling Authority (RCA such as Auckland Transport) may install street layout changes as a pilot, with two weeks notification, and use the pilot as an opportunity for feedback, again with no mention of the impact on business.
- The RCA can install, change or remove any part of the road for the purpose of a bus lane, cycle lane, installing or removing modal filters, curb cut-outs, plants, trees, or street

furniture, installing or removing car parks, prohibiting or restricting the use of motor vehicles, setting a new speed limit.

- The definition of purpose for which they are doing this is so wide that there will always be an opportunity to substantiate any of the following:- improve access and mobility of pedestrians or cyclists, improve operation of public transport, support environmental sustainability and support the wellbeing of communities.
- The only obligation on the RCA prior to the installation of a pilot is to advise the public and 'specified organisations' (by their definition such as emergency services and utility operators), in any way that 'it' considers appropriate but no later than two weeks before the pilot is installed. There is no provision for notification of local business, nor business associations if not considered 'appropriate' by the RCA.
Two weeks is hopelessly inadequate for business to prepare. We strongly feel that the proposal needs to provide requirements for consultation and longer notice periods where business would be impacted - two weeks is nowhere near enough time for a business to reconsider their stock and staffing before a major upheaval outside their door.
But by the same token, the installation of a parklet affecting just a few parties could be a shorter timeframe.
- A pilot may remain in place for up to 2 years, by which time it could look a real mess, and there is no way for a business to plan around this.
- There are no requirements as to the 'aesthetic' of these pilots. They could legitimately be hit sticks, cones, concrete blocks or planters, which could degrade over time, look unsightly and further damage the image of an area.

Pilots as consultation, permanent or not?

- There is no requirement for the RCA to state the intention of the pilot to be permanent or not, prior to it commencing. This begs the question: is this just a foil for RCAs to put their plans in place without consultation? I think many of us would agree that it would be unlikely to go to the trouble of installing a pilot on a major corridor if there was no intention to carry it through. There is far too much time and cost involved.
- There is no provision, prior to the pilot, to conduct any trade/customer spend surveys or benchmarking in the case where the pilot may be part of a business district or Town Centre. The RCA obligations are to monitor the operation of the pilot and give the public a reasonable opportunity for the public to provide feedback on the pilot. There should be a requirement to benchmark trade /vacancies/foot traffic before a pilot commences.
- In considering the decision whether or not the pilot should be permanent, the requirement to provide information on the pilot is inconsistent. If the RCA decides not to make the change permanent it needs to restore the street to its previous layout and make publicly available a summary of any information or data collected on the operation, a summary of the feedback received and the reasons why it was not going to be made permanent. However should the RCA decide to make the pilot permanent they are only required to consider any information or data collected while monitoring the operation of the pilot and consider any public feedback received and promptly notify the public. But they are not required to carry out any other consultation or make the information publicly available.
- All pilot initiatives should be required to be publicly notified with clear purpose, objective, requirements as to how the pilot will be assessed and measured, identify who has requested the pilot and the length of pilot advised. The public notification period should be on a scale for 5 levels of differing time frames to allow for preliminary community engagement and consultation. As an example, a pop up parklet or street market may fall into Level 1, 2 months consultation period, while a new cycle way may fall into Level 5, 4-6 month consultation period and far more intensive business/community reach.
- What is defined as the 'public' needs to include all affected stakeholders.

Auckland Transport

Many of our own experiences with Auckland Transport over the years have been less than positive, resulting in stand-offs and run-ins. And we are not alone here as the CCO review revealed. So, the thought of giving them carte blanche to install temporary traffic restrictions without consultation, is spine-chilling.

We have often struggled to get Auckland Transport to even consider the local business association as a key stakeholder, ahead of implementing projects under the current framework. So, the fact that they would unilaterally be able to decide what is appropriate is more than concerning.

The current legislation does not clarify if the RCA needs to consult with the Local Board or the Council, as in Auckland, where the entities are separate, or if they have autonomous authority.

We have lobbied long and hard to be considered early in the conversation, not at the end of the process, and in so doing be available to assist with communication to our local business community, but the response from Auckland Transport is hit and miss. Sometimes we are informed, and sometimes not.

A few years ago, Auckland Transport closed one lane of Parnell Road for three weeks over the Easter and Anzac holidays. From their point of view it was a quiet time for traffic, (which was correct), plus we had requested the safety improvement project. But they had not considered a local business that had stocked up on Easter eggs months before in preparation for their most lucrative time of year, nor the hospitality businesses who had taken on extra staff for the holidays..

The impact on town centres

The proposal does not take into account the myriad of different types of roads in our urban areas, and the potential impact on town centres. Parnell is as different to Newmarket as we are to the CBD. We don't have a one size fits all approach, despite being linked by the same corridor.

Parnell's demographic is older, we have no multi-story public parking facilities in the middle of the town centre, and the retail is destination driven. Losing parking or adding a bus or cycle lane in Parnell Rd would not be vaguely similar to losing it on Broadway in Newmarket.

Put yourself in the shoes of a retailer who had signed a three to five-year lease. Would it not be preferable to honestly engage on their future and give them an exit opportunity?

At the heart of it, we need to ask how important our local democratic voice is to us and whether the aspirations of local community ought to matter. Currently, government objectives appear to override the desire to preserve our town centres and villages and the government should be honest about that, if that is their intention. .

We believe the way forward is to get people involved in the conversation and supportive of a new way of thinking about our streets and public places. The arrogance of over authoritative entities such as Auckland Transport, is already divisive and this legislation will create more division.

Please see answers to specific questions in the survey on the following pages.

Cheryl Adamson
General Manager
Parnell Business Association
cheryl@parnell.net.nz

PROPOSAL 1: A new approach for piloting street changes

What we propose

To support RCAs to pilot street changes, we propose to introduce clear powers and requirements for RCAs to pilot street changes as a way to consult with their communities. These powers would be established in a new Street Layouts rule.

Pilots would enable RCAs to test street changes that could be made permanent in the future. They could be used to monitor the impacts of changes for meeting a particular objective (eg to improve safety for pedestrians), and to receive community feedback on these street changes.

This approach would differ from traditional types of consultation where people are expected to look at written plans and respond to them. Instead, people in the community would be able to experience the proposed street changes for themselves and tell their local authority about their experiences and views.

Pilots could include street changes like:

- extending or widening footpaths and shared paths
- new bus lanes, cycle lanes, or cycle paths
- removing or reconfiguring on-street car parks
- traffic calming devices like speed bumps
- creating shared zones (areas where people driving motor vehicles need to give way to pedestrians)
- installing modal filters.

We propose introducing the following powers and requirements for pilots:

- A pilot could be installed for up to two years. An RCA would be able to stop and remove the pilot early if it is not meeting the needs of their community.
- RCAs would not need to consult before installing a pilot, as the pilot is meant to be used as a method for consultation. However, an RCA could engage with people in their community before installing a pilot if they want to. For example, an RCA could collaborate with a community group to ensure street changes improve accessibility. Waka Kotahi will provide guidance to RCAs on engaging effectively with communities on pilots.
- An RCA would need to notify the public and emergency services of a pilot at least two weeks before installing it. Notification requirements would include details on where the pilot will be located, what will be installed, any restrictions for road users, the pilot's duration, how to provide feedback, and when feedback is needed.
- During the pilot, an RCA would need to give the public a reasonable opportunity to provide feedback. The RCA would also need to monitor the impacts of the pilot.
- Based on feedback and monitoring, an RCA could decide to modify the pilot. This could include removing parts of the pilot or changing physical features.
- Before the end of a pilot, an RCA would need to decide whether to make any or all of the piloted changes permanent. This decision would need to be informed by public feedback and monitoring done during the pilot.
- If an RCA decides to make the street changes permanent before the pilot ends, these changes could remain in place. Otherwise, the piloted changes would need to be removed.

It is important to note that all the requirements outlined above would be minimum requirements. This means that an RCA could do additional consultation before and after the pilot is installed, and/or give more advance notice of a pilot, if the RCA decides to do so.

We propose amending current provisions in the LGA1974 to support pilots

By creating a new rule for RCAs to pilot street changes, RCAs would no longer be required to use the LGA1974 to install pilots.

However, there could still be some legal ambiguity with schedule 10, section 11(b) of the LGA1974, given that many RCAs currently use this provision to install pilots.

To resolve this ambiguity, we propose making changes to this clause in the LGA1974 so that is very clear that RCAs should not look to this provision when making these types of street changes. We are interested in your views on what this change should look like.

We propose to enable RCAs to lower the speed limit to support a pilot

Some RCAs may wish to lower the speed limit on a street to encourage people to travel at lower speeds in areas where a pilot is installed.

To support this, we propose to allow RCAs to lower the speed limit as part of a pilot, in areas with a posted speed limit of 60km/h or less. In these situations, RCAs would need to install a sign with the pilot speed limit on it. A supplementary sign would not be required.

To change the speed limit, RCAs would need to follow the rules and requirements for installing pilots, as outlined above. For example, they would need to notify the public and emergency services about the proposed change, collect data and feedback on the piloted speed limit, and decide at the end of the pilot whether to keep it or remove it.

RCAs would not be required to consult before installing the piloted speed limit, as the pilot is meant to be used as a method for consultation.

RCAs would not be able to pilot speed limits on their own. The piloted speed limit would need to support other features of a pilot.

We also propose to update rules related to TCD trials to support RCAs that want to trial TCDs as part of their pilot

RCAs can currently trial potential TCDs (eg signs, road markings, and traffic signals), but the notification process to install these is outdated. For example, RCAs must notify people by advertising the change in at least two newspapers.

We propose to update these requirements so that RCAs can choose a reasonable way to notify the public about the trial.

QUESTIONS

1. Do you support providing RCAs with new powers and requirements to install pilots, and set requirements for how to install them? Why/why not?

Agree

Strongly agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

I don't know

Neutral

Why/ why not?

- We do not agree that new powers should be given to RCA's to install pilots without consultation.

While as a business association we are, without doubt, in support of tactical urbanism and streetscape pilots as a way of testing and refining a concept prior to final installation, we believe that certain aspects of the current Reshaping Streets proposal, together with the proposed change in law, are anti-business.

Any pilot initiative should be required to be publicly notified with clear purpose, objective, requirements as to how the pilot will be assessed and measured, identify who has requested the pilot and the length of pilot advised. The public notification period should be on a scale for 5 differing levels of time frames to allow for preliminary community engagement and consultation. As an example a pop up parklet or street market may fall into Level 1- 2 months consultation period, while a new cycle way may fall into Level 5- 4-6 month consultation period and much more intensive business/community reach.

The consultation with the community should be public – and the definition of ‘public’ should include any appropriate stakeholders and affected parties, including business and key organisations such as business associations and residents associations where pertinent.

- Re the requirement for minimum of two weeks period. We note this is may be intended to set a minimum requirement which would support the smallest of projects, but have little faith that this would not be abused.

We note this is unlikely to be adequate notice in a number of situations and requirements need to be specified for longer notice periods based on the level of impact that the changes could bring to the surrounding community in order for them to prepare in advance. Businesses order stock months in advance, and two weeks is nowhere near enough time for them prepare for a loss in sales and make plans accordingly. It is barely enough time to change staffing requirements.

- We note under 4.1 (5) there is no reference to *improving operations for freight or deliveries*. This is a vital function for most businesses.
- We understand and support more flexibility for temporary installations such as parklets, but those too would need to be discussed with adjacent and affected businesses.

2. Do you support pilots being used as a way to publicly consult with communities? Why/why not?

Agree

Strongly agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

I don't know

Neutral

Why/ why not?

We support the opportunity to consult with communities by using pilots, in order to refine an intended project that has been previously consulted upon –

- We do not support pilots being installed without consultation.
- We do not support pilots being installed to experiment with the livelihood of business people.
- pilots should be installed as a precursor to intended permanent projects that have previously been consulted upon.
- We do understand that the experience of a pilot can contribute different feedback to evaluating concepts off plans.

We note the inconsistency in the release of feedback when changes are/are not going to be made permanent and this needs to be consistent and released to the public and affected communities – business or otherwise.

As is currently stands in the Street Layouts Rule, in considering the decision whether or not the pilot should be permanent, the requirement to provide information on the pilot is inconsistent. According to the proposed rule – if the RCA decides NOT to make the change permanent it needs to restore the street to its previous layout and make publicly available a summary of any information or data collected on the operation, a summary of the feedback received and the reasons why it was not going to be made permanent. However should the RCA decide TO make the pilot permanent they are only required to consider any information or data collected while monitoring the operation of the pilot and consider any public feedback received and promptly notify the public. But they are **not** required to carry out any other consultation or make the information publicly available.

3. We propose that pilots could be installed for up to 2 years. Do you think this time is:

suitable?

too long?

too short?

If you answered too long or too short, what would be a good time period?

Why too long?

As we have seen from several instances all over our city, you can severely damage trade within a few weeks. We have seen this with cycleway projects. In a year you can completely annihilate a town centre and destroy the businesses within it.

Businesses sign leases for several years – they have a right to know what is planned for outside their doorway.

The impermanent nature of pilots and the materials used could typically degrade quite quickly. The time used for a pilot should be as limited as possible, unless seasonal changes would contribute different perspectives – e.g. a street that experiences lots of seasonal change with holiday makers.

Quality feedback from the community would wane quite quickly, so the pilot should be as limited as possible to avoid community disengagement.

Note this question is targeted at RCAs:

4. We have not specified how RCAs should make the decision to install a pilot, or to decide whether to make the piloted changes permanent. If you are providing feedback from an RCA, we are keen to hear your views on this approach. Do you foresee any difficulties with making these decisions?

N/A

Note this question is targeted at RCAs:

5. Does your RCA close roads to traffic for 'experimental diversions' for any purposes other than piloting street changes?

Yes

No

I don't know

If yes, what else do you use this provision for?

N/A

6. Do you support RCAs being able to lower the speed limit on a road to support the installation of a pilot?

Agree

Strongly agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

I don't know

Neutral

Why/ why not?

I would expect the speed may need to be lowered for safety reasons. But if the pilot is testing how the road should operate under changed circumstances, then these changes need to be as realistic as possible throughout the pilot.

7. Do you support RCAs being able to trial new signs, road markings or signals as part of a pilot?

Agree

Strongly agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

I don't know

Neutral

Why/ why not?

Makes sense to do so.

PROPOSAL 2: Filtering and restricting traffic

What we propose

We propose to make changes to our rules so that RCAs can install or remove modal filters on their streets. This will enable RCAs to limit through-movement of vehicles and filter traffic. RCAs would be able to use any physical object as a modal filter, provided it is safe. Under these proposed changes, RCAs could still lay out modal filters in a way that enables people and deliveries to access places they need to get to (including via alternative routes). Waka Kotahi will provide guidance to RCAs on how to filter or restrict traffic in a way that appropriately maintains access.

Modal filters would only be able to be installed by RCAs if they meet one of the following purposes:

- to improve the access and mobility of pedestrians, people using mobility devices, cyclists, and people using other devices (e.g, scooters and skateboards)
- to improve public transport operations
- to protect and promote public health and safety
- to support environmental sustainability, including reducing carbon dioxide emissions
- to create public places that promote the well-being of communities.

We also propose making changes to the LGA1974 to support these changes, by removing the condition in current legislation that road facilities cannot (in the opinion of the council) “unduly impede vehicular traffic entering or using the road.” This will ensure RCAs have a strong legal foundation to filter traffic.

We also propose to empower RCAs to restrict the use of motor vehicles and install or remove traffic control devices

We want to make the process for local authorities to make street changes clear and efficient, and this includes changes that require TCDs. We propose to empower RCAs, through the Street Layouts rule, to:

- prohibit or restrict the use of motor vehicles, or one or more classes of motor vehicle, on the roadway
- install or remove traffic control devices to instruct road users of a prohibition or restriction
- install or remove traffic calming devices
- install or remove modal filters.

A prohibition or restriction of motor vehicles could apply at all times, at specified times, or during specified conditions.

These restrictions would need to meet any of the purposes outlined above for installing modal filters (ie related to access, public transport, health, safety, environmental sustainability, and community wellbeing).

RCAs could use the proposed Street Layouts rule when deciding to install TCDs, including traffic calming devices, if they choose to do so. This would allow the installation of TCDs (like signs) to ensure that street changes are enforceable.

We also propose to make it explicit in this rule that RCAs may install or remove on-street car parks to change street layouts. This would not limit the abilities of RCAs to install TCDs or make other changes to the roadway using other legislation.

We also propose to empower RCAs to restrict the use of motor vehicles and install or remove traffic control devices

We want to make the process for local authorities to make street changes clear and efficient, and this includes changes that require TCDs. We propose to empower RCAs, through the Street Layouts rule, to:

- prohibit or restrict the use of motor vehicles, or one or more classes of motor vehicle, on the roadway
- install or remove traffic control devices to instruct road users of a prohibition or restriction
- install or remove traffic calming devices
- install or remove modal filters.

A prohibition or restriction of motor vehicles could apply at all times, at specified times, or during specified conditions.

These restrictions would need to meet any of the purposes outlined above for installing modal filters (ie related to access, public transport, health, safety, environmental sustainability, and community wellbeing).

RCAs could use the proposed Street Layouts rule when deciding to install TCDs, including traffic calming devices, if they choose to do so. This would allow the installation of TCDs (like signs) to ensure that street changes are enforceable.

We also propose to make it explicit in this rule that RCAs may install or remove on-street car parks to change street layouts. This would not limit the abilities of RCAs to install TCDs or make other changes to the roadway using other legislation.

QUESTIONS

8. *Do you support RCAs having clear powers to install objects as modal filters?*

- Agree*
- Strongly agree*
- Disagree*
- Strongly disagree*
- I don't know*
- Neutral*

Why/ why not?

We do not support the Street Layouts Rule offering RCAs power without consultation. We do not support RCA's having the power to install modal filters of any nature without consultation, including.

- prohibiting or restricting the use of motor vehicles, or one or more classes of motor vehicle, on the roadway
- removal of parking

The definition of considerations/purposes for the installation of a modal filter are so wide that anyone could justify any purpose under these criteria.

- We note there is no mention of the consideration of freight/deliveries.
- We note there is no mention of business.

9. We are also interested in your views on whether we should make any changes to our rules related to regulatory filters. Should we investigate creating signs and markings to create pedestrian and cyclist only zones on sections of the roadway?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

10. Do you support the removal of “unduly impede vehicular traffic entering or using the road” from the Local Government Act 1974?

- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know
- Neutral

Why/ why not?

This removes all obligations from the RCA and they can justify anything they like.

11. Do you support RCAs having clear powers to restrict or prohibit traffic for the specified purposes?

- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know
- Neutral

Why/ why not

- The specified purposes are so wide, they could justify just about any crazy idea.
- We do not support the Street Layout Rule with no consultation.
- There is no consideration for the rights of business.

Note – this question is primarily targeted at RCAs

12. Is it useful RCAs to have an explicit power to install TCDs in the new rule?

- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know
- Neutral

Why/ why not

N/A

PROPOSAL 3: School Streets

What we propose

We propose to allow RCAs to create School Streets in their local areas, in partnership with local schools. Powers to create School Streets would be established through the proposed Street Layouts Rule.

The new rule would define a School Street as an area of roadway that restricts motor traffic outside or nearby a school during student drop off or pick up times.

School Streets would be treated as a traffic restriction. Vehicle access to the street could be blocked during the restriction, while children walk, cycle, or ride a device on the street to school. Anyone who needs to access a property on the street could still drive through the restricted area, provided they give way to children and travel at walking speed. A school street may also be installed as part of a pilot.

School Streets could be held during student drop-off and pick-up times on every school day, or only apply on certain days at certain times (eg pick-up times on Fridays). Outside of these times, the street would be open to all road users.

We also propose to introduce new signs and features to support School Streets and ensure people follow the restrictions. These would be like signs used in the United Kingdom and Canada, which outline the times when vehicle access is restricted. RCAs would be required to install signs under the proposed changes, but any other features would be optional, depending on the school environment.

If an RCA decides to install a School Street, the RCA would be required to notify emergency services and anyone who may be affected by the proposed changes.

QUESTIONS

13. Do you support RCAs and schools working together to provide more spaces for children to walk, cycle or ride a device to school by restricting access on some streets during pick up and drop off times?

- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know
- Neutral

Why/ why not?

- RCAs and schools should work together.
- Incentives for children to safely walk, cycle or take public transport to school should be encouraged as parents dropping off children contributes to congestion.

14. If there is anything that you think RCAs and/or schools need to consider when designing or installing School Streets?

Businesses in close proximity

PROPOSAL 4: Community Streets

What we propose

To support residents and RCAs to create Community Streets, we propose to introduce rules for how Community Streets can be created and used. These changes would align with [Play Streets guidelines](#) created by Waka Kotahi. This guidance outlines best practice advice about how RCAs can design their own processes to support the creation of Community Streets in a way that balances safety risks and the needs of their community, rather than requiring the use of formal traffic management plans.

The proposed changes are intended to introduce principles-based rules that RCAs must consider before approving a Community Street, while still giving them the freedom to design their own Community Streets processes based on guidance.

Under the proposed changes, anyone would be able to apply to their RCA to hold a Community Street in their local area. They could apply for any number of events over a 12-month period. If their application is approved and they want to continue holding Community Streets at the end of the 12-month period, they would need to apply to the RCA to get approval for another 12 months.

An RCA would have the option to approve or deny any application to hold a Community Street.

If an RCA decides to approve a Community Street, it must be satisfied that:

- the Community Street will be safe for people using it, during the period the Community Street is held
- pedestrians and people using mobility devices will be able to access properties on the Community Street
- conversations or consultation with residents who live on the Community Street (and other affected streets) has been carried out
- there is a plan for how motor vehicles will be guided through the Community Street if any vehicle needs to access a property located on the Community Street.

RCAs would also need to consider:

- the ability for motor vehicles to safely take alternative routes
- whether the Community Street is located on a major freight bus or emergency vehicle route
- any guidance that Waka Kotahi has released about holding Community Streets and/or Play Streets.

When approving a Community Street, RCAs would be able to set conditions that Community Street organisers would need to follow. Before setting conditions, the RCA would need to assess the overall risk of the Community Street by considering:

- how many people are expected to attend the Community Street
- how many roads/streets will be impacted
- the type of road the Community Street will be located on, and what type of roads connect with it
- how many vehicles use the street
- the speed limit on the street
- the day and time that the Community Street will be held
- how long the Community Street will last for.

Proposed requirements

We propose to include the following requirements for setting up a Community Street:

- If an RCA approves a Community Street, a person (who could be a resident) would need to be designated as the “organiser” of the Community Street. The organiser would be the point of contact for the RCA and would be responsible for notifying other residents about the Community Street. RCAs would be responsible for notifying emergency services about the Community Street.
- When a Community Street is held, it would be treated as a traffic restriction. This means the street is blocked off to general traffic, but anyone can drive through to access a property located on the Community Street (e.g. people who live on the street). No one would be allowed to drive faster than walking speed when doing this.
- People walking, using a mobility device, cycling, or riding a device (like a skateboard or e-scooter) would be able to travel through the Community Street at any time.

QUESTIONS

15. Do you support residents being able to create Community Streets with approval and support from RCAs?

- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know
- Neutral

Why/ why not?

Yes, this flexibility for communities would be good and the guidelines are adequate. It is concerning that you think these guidelines should be observed for residents, but do not apply the same rules regarding businesses and pilots.

16. Do you think the proposed requirements for Community Streets are:

- satisfactory
- too prescriptive
- not prescriptive enough

17. Is there anything else that you think RCAs need to consider before approving a Community Street? Is there anything else that should be included in guidance?

No

PROPOSAL 5: Closing roads for other functions and events

What we propose

We propose to allow RCAs to close roads for reoccurring events, by removing the 31-day limit per year for road closures in the LGA1974.

To make legislation more accessible, we propose to bring together powers and requirements to close roads for events in one piece of legislation. During this process, we will update notification requirements. RCAs would have more flexibility to decide how to notify the public, rather than being required to notify the public via a local newspaper. We propose to set a minimum two-week notification requirement for events. RCAs could provide more advance notice if they choose to do so.

We could remove the requirement for promoters or organisers of events to have insurance cover for any damage associated with the event. Local authorities could still set insurance requirements if they choose to do so.

QUESTIONS

18. *What is your view on limiting how often a road can be closed for regular events?*

- There should be a limit, like the current limit*
- The limit should be increased to enable closures once per week*
- There should not be a specific limit?*

19. *Do you support the proposal to put all road closure powers for events in one piece of legislation?*

- Agree*
- Strongly agree*
- Disagree*
- Strongly disagree*
- I don't know*
- Neutral*

Why/ why not?

The current legislation is prohibitive and clunky. The current limit for road closures is arbitrary and does not reflect the opportunity for appropriate regular use – such as markets.

20. *Do you support the proposal to update notification requirements for events, so that RCAs can notify the public in any way that they consider appropriate at least two weeks before an event?*

- Agree*
- Strongly agree*
- Disagree*
- Strongly disagree*
- I don't know*
- Neutral*

Why/ why not?

The current requirement for newspaper notification is outdated and ineffective, but the wording 'that RCAs can notify the public in any way that they consider appropriate', is too loose and needs to reflect the needs of the various affected stakeholders as well as other community bodies.

The reduction down to "up to two weeks" should also support more spontaneous events – but note the importance for RCAs to require adequate notice which may be longer than two weeks for more significant events (both in terms of duration and scale) to ensure the impacted community (business or residential) can respond and plan accordingly.

21. *The 1965 Regulations require an RCA to be satisfied that the promoter of an event has adequate insurance to cover any damages from the event. Should these insurance requirements be kept if powers and requirements for events are shifted to the Street Layouts rule?*

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

PROPOSAL 6: Pedestrian Malls

What we propose

We propose to remove the requirement for local authorities to use the special consultative procedure when establishing pedestrian malls. Instead, they must apply the consultation principles in the LGA2002.

We also propose to Remove the ability for people to appeal to the Environment Court when a pedestrian mall is being created. People would be able to challenge the installation of a pedestrian mall through judicial review.

Finally, we propose to shift legislative provisions for pedestrian malls to the proposed Street Layouts rule.

QUESTIONS

22. *Do you support the proposals to make the consultation requirements and appeals process for creating pedestrian malls consistent with other types of street changes?*

- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know
- Neutral

Why/ why not?

- We do not support the proposed Streets Layout Rule with no consultation and therefore do not support the installation of pedestrian malls without prior consultation with all affected stakeholders
- We support the use of the LGA 2002

23. Do you support the proposal to shift the powers and requirements for establishing and managing pedestrian malls to the new rule?

- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know
- Neutral

Why/ why not?

We don't agree with the new rule

PROPOSAL 7: Transport shelters

What we propose

We propose to remove special notification requirements for creating transport shelters. Instead, RCAs would be able to publicly consult on transport shelters in the same way they do for other features, like bus stops.

QUESTIONS

24. Do you support the proposal to remove the prescriptive consultation requirements for installing transport shelters?

- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know
- Neutral