AGENDA
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Heather Shotter
Chief Executive, Palmerston North City Council
PLANNING AND STRATEGY COMMITTEE MEETING

2 September 2019

ORDER OF BUSINESS

NOTE: The Planning and Strategy Committee meeting coincides with the ordinary meeting of the Community Development Committee. The Committees will conduct business in the following order:

- Planning and Strategy Committee
- Community Development Committee

1. Apologies

2. Notification of Additional Items

Pursuant to Sections 46A(7) and 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, to receive the Chairperson’s explanation that specified item(s), which do not appear on the Agenda of this meeting and/or the meeting to be held with the public excluded, will be discussed.

Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7) must be approved by resolution with an explanation as to why they cannot be delayed until a future meeting.

Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7A) may be received or referred to a subsequent meeting for further discussion. No resolution, decision or recommendation can be made in respect of a minor item.

3. Declarations of Interest (if any)

Members are reminded of their duty to give a general notice of any interest of items to be considered on this agenda and the need to declare these interests.
4. **Public Comment**
   To receive comments from members of the public on matters specified on this Agenda or, if time permits, on other Committee matters.

   (NOTE: If the Committee wishes to consider or discuss any issue raised that is not specified on the Agenda, other than to receive the comment made or refer it to the Chief Executive, then a resolution will need to be made in accordance with clause 2 above.)

5. **Draft Use Of Public Spaces Policy 2019 Submissions**  Page 7

6. **Confirmation of Minutes**
   “That the minutes of the Planning and Strategy Committee meeting of 5 August 2019 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record.”  Page 35

7. **Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space 2019 - Summary of Submissions**  Page 41
   Memorandum, presented by Julie Macdonald, Strategy & Policy Manager.

8. **Amendment to Dog Control Policy 2018 - Deliberations and Adoption**  Page 59
   Memorandum, presented by Julie Macdonald, Strategy & Policy Manager.

9. **Annual Section 10A Dog Control Act 1996 Report to Secretary of Local Government**  Page 103
   Memorandum, presented by Aaron Thornton, Acting Senior Animal Control Officer and Chris Dyhrberg, Chief Customer and Operating Officer.

10. **Urban Cycle Network Masterplan 2019**  Page 119
    Report, presented by David Muphy, City Planning Manager.

11. **Report on Solutions to Issues Raised in Dogwood Way Petition**  Page 273
    Memorandum, presented by Kathy Dever-Tod, Parks & Reserves Manager.

Memorandum, presented by Kathy Dever-Tod, Parks & Reserves Manager.

13. Committee Work Schedule

14. Exclusion of Public

To be moved:

“That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting listed in the table below.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for passing this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as stated in the above table.

Also that the persons listed below be permitted to remain after the public has been excluded for the reasons stated.

Chief Executive (Heather Shotter), Chief Financial Officer (Grant Elliott), Chief Infrastructure Officer (Tom Williams), General Manager – Strategy and Planning (Sheryl Bryant), General Manager – Community (Debbie Duncan), Chief Customer and Operating Officer (Chris Dyhrberg), General Manager - Marketing and Communications (Sacha Haskell), Sandra King (Executive Officer) because of their knowledge and ability to provide the meeting with advice on matters both from an organisation-wide context (being members of the Council’s Executive Leadership Team) and also from their specific role within the Council.

Legal Counsel (John Annabell), because of his knowledge and ability to provide the meeting with legal and procedural advice.
Democracy Administrators (Carly Chang, Courtney Kibby, Natalya Kushnirenko and Penny Odell), because of their knowledge and ability to provide the meeting with procedural advice and record the proceedings of the meeting.

[Add Council Officers], because of their knowledge and ability to assist the meeting in speaking to their report and answering questions, noting that such officer will be present at the meeting only for the item that relate to their respective report.

[Add Third Parties], because of their knowledge and ability to assist the meeting in speaking to their report/s [or other matters as specified] and answering questions, noting that such person/s will be present at the meeting only for the items that relate to their respective report/s [or matters as specified].
SUBMISSION FROM CONSULTATION

TO: Planning and Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 2 September 2019

TITLE: Draft Use Of Public Spaces Policy 2019 Submissions

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO PLANNING AND STRATEGY COMMITTEE

1. That the Planning and Strategy Committee hear submissions from presenters who indicated their wish to be heard in support of their submission.

2. That the Committee note the Procedure for Hearing of Submissions, as described in the procedure sheet.

SUBMITTERS WISHING TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF THEIR SUBMISSION

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Marilyn Bulloch on behalf of Railway Land Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Major M A Pettersen on behalf of Linton Military Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Kerry Hocquard on behalf of Cancer Society of New Zealand, Manawatu Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENTS

1. Submissions 1
2. Procedure for hearing of submissions 2
From: Submission
Subject: FW: Use of public spaces policy submission

Your contact details

Name
Florence Malama

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?

Withhold my contact details
True

Your feedback

Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
Yes

Why?
It's fair, although I do think you should move iwi consideration and cultural diversity criteria as a main consideration of the criteria.

Is there anything else you'd like to add?
Merle Lavin

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Use of public spaces policy submission

Your contact details
Name
Carl Massarotto

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?
No

Withhold my contact details
False

Your feedback
Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
No

Why?
The criteria that have been listed are suitable but I would suggest adding one around cost:benefit assessment, or cost savings to users

Is there anything else you’d like to add?
From: Submission
Subject: FW: Use of public spaces policy submission

**Your contact details**

Name
Anna Casaje

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?
No

Withhold my contact details
True

**Your feedback**

Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
Yes

Why?
If its for the betterment of the community then carry on

Is there anything else you’d like to add?
No
Your contact details

Name
Joy Dick

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?
No

Withhold my contact details
True

Your feedback

Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
Yes

Why?
As written, the criteria are straightforward, somewhat specific as well as being flexible - that is, the interests of the public are kept in mind, commercial transactions are of lesser importance, provision of experience for the public is paramount, but an element of discretion is still retained by the Council by including the point of the event should support the Council's goals. Also, casual use is not included in these guidelines, which is sensible.

Is there anything else you'd like to add?
Your contact details

Name
Harry Lilley (Manager) Creative Sounds Society Inc.

Address
84 Lombard Street

Phone
06390120

Email
admin@creativesounds.org.nz

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?
No

Withhold my contact details
True

Your feedback

Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
Yes

Why?
In principle we agree with the proposed assessment criteria. These higher level criteria provide broad coverage to consider aspects of proposed activities. It would be good to see some guidelines for both events/activity applicants and council officers to refer to. This would assist applicants by providing clearer expectations about what might be considered, the relevant policy that these criteria are referring too, and any other things that might not be evident from such a high level perspective.

Is there anything else you’d like to add?
Creative Sounds Society supports the use of public spaces for accessible arts (especially music) and cultural activities. We hope that PNCC will continue to support and encourage local communities to access public spaces for events/activities and will
provide appropriate information and support to communities that wish to use public space for events/activities. Creative Sounds Society would like to see a more detailed plan from the PNCC about the future of public concerts in Palmerston North. The scale and frequency of these have changed over the past decade and we think it is time that this was addressed. We would like to see the return (and continuation) of publicly accessible (free) concerts featuring original NZ music in appropriate public spaces with quality content and production.
From: Submission
Subject: FW: Use of public spaces policy submission

Your contact details

Name
James Victor Banks

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?
No

Withhold my contact details
True

Your feedback

Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
No

Why?
Because the council need to keep control of it with the firm hand otherwise you will have all sorts of trading on council land which will be unlicensed operators and all the flyby nighters.

Is there anything else you’d like to add?
That’s all thanks
From: Submission  
Subject: FW: Use of public spaces policy submission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your contact details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes P M Erkens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?  
Yes

Withhold my contact details  
True

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?  
The policy should include a clause that any commercial activity which is on a regular/semi permanent or permanent basis should not be allowed in recreational or reserve area's. A reserve/park should be respected to be quiet, a play area for the young and a relaxing place for everyone to enjoy. The Council seems to consider allowing a commercial activity to start up in the Ashhurst Domain. This activity is a for wedding celebration, bar, semi permanent canopy to be erected, carparks for 80-100cars to be established etc. Toilet block to be extended and whatever more is involved. Not to say the rubbish which will be created. The policy on Freedom campers to be limited and to include a clause that all recreational area's and reserve's should not to be used for Freedom camping. Freedom campers should be directed to the camping grounds for overnight stay.

Is there anything else you'd like to add?  
That the use of car radio/stereo, portable radio/stereo equipment to be limited and not to disturb the other recreational users of the area. That people remove all rubbish, bottle's, empty cans etc. to disposed off at their own place of living.
Merle Lavin

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Use of public spaces policy submission

Your contact details

Name
Sue Pugmire

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?
Withhold my contact details
True

Your feedback

Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
Yes

Why?
But- There is no mention of ‘ethical’ activities in there. Eg Ethical use of these spaces in terms of pollution, waste, climate change emissions, sustainability, peace, etc. -I don’t think our public spaces should be used to promote war or weapons in any way -We should avoid unnecessary burning of fossil fuels, and encourage environmental sustainability & renewal -Public events should be zero waste.. ie no polystyrene or plastics, balloons, straws etc -Local businesses, services & suppliers should be used in preference to chains, national, or global ones, where possible

Is there anything else you’d like to add?
•climate change (CO2 emissions etc) •environmental sustainability (& renewal) •clean air, clean water, clean land •zero waste •equality •peace Should inform all council decisions Thank you
Draft Policy for the Use Public Space 2019
Palmerston North City Council
Palmerston North

Railway land Action Group Inc,
c/o Mrs Marilyn Bulloch

Submission - Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space, June 2019

Preliminary Comment

This Draft Policy is based on the assumption that Public Space is available for use. An observation is that Public Spaces are gradually diminishing, especially in the older area of Palmerston North. Parks and Reserves are constantly being under threat of being sold off or developed, and therefore no longer available for public use. Also, this loss of public space leads to increasing pressure on the use of the remaining land or space.

The publicity photo on the front of the consultation document shows what is normally the driveway to the back of the All Saints Church being used for an event. To the right in the photo is the Council owned Square Edge building and to the left All Saints Church which is a known earthquake hazard.

Public land is also under increasing demand to be leased out for long term commercial activity which may preclude it’s use by the general public. The Reserves Act 1977 addresses this matter, but the Act may be over-ridden with councils having delegated powers which enables them to over-ride the Act.

1. **Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?**

We support most of the assessment criteria with some exceptions and additions.

We would take issue with one of the criteria which states: *Provides an experience rather than a simple commercial exchange*. Providing an experience is an extremely subjective matter. For example, would a Gypsy Fair on the Railway Land provide more than of an experience than a Motor-Home show? In making an assessment of whether an event should be allowed on a public space providing “an experience” should be removed as a criterion. *Therefore, remove this criterion.*

**Add a further criterion** which asks: Does the use of the particular public space conform to the District Plan, the Reserves Act 1977 and any Management Plans for the land, and any other legislation?

**Add a further criterion** which asks: Are all health and safety requirements being assessed and met? For example, bouncy castles are very popular. Has it been adequately secured? Could it come loose?

2. **Is there anything else you would like to add?**

We have a concern over the permanent commercialisation of public space by way of granting leases for private commercial benefit. Some of these activities could be located on private land if the business so chose. Parks should be seen as areas of tranquillity, not areas of commercialisation.

PNCC-Submission-Use of Public Space -22-07-19
Administration of the Use of Public Space Policy

Questions that need to be asked.

Administration Policy Manual or Appendix

Is there a need to support this policy with some kind of administration manual or appendix?

Administration of Policy

How would this policy be administered within Council itself? Who, within Council, would take responsibility for the administration of the Policy?

Time Restraints on applications

Would there be any time restraints on applications for larger events requiring Council permission?

Right of Appeal

Would there be any right of appeal and to whom if the request for the activity is rejected?

Alterations to landscape

What alterations to the landscape would be required in order for the activity to proceed? For example, would trees or other vegetation need to be pruned or cut down?

Compliance

Who, within Council, would take responsibility for compliance once an activity is underway?

Responsibility for repair of damage to site

Repair of damage to council land from the activity needs to be addressed. This has been a problem in the past. For example, two past events on the Railway Land led to damage. This included a failure to restore the turf to a satisfactory standard after the 2009 Young Farmers contest held in July 2009. As part of the activities the soil was dug up. The restoration job left the turf looking more like a farm paddock. It took at least a year for the grass to recover to its former state.

A second lot of major damage occurred in October 2017 when a period of wet weather saw the Webb Bros circus leave the Railway Land in a very muddy mess following their departure from the City. Council staff member, John Brenkley, was quoted as saying that the $800 bond would not cover the repair damage to the land. (See Manawatu Standard article by Janine Rankin dated 18/10/2017). Again, the land took some time to recover. We also later noticed an infestation of prickly problematic Onehunga Weed which we reported to Council.

We wish to speak to our submission.

PNCC-Submission-Use of Public Space -22-07-19
From:        Submission
         FW: Use of public spaces policy submission

Your contact details

Name
Stewart Harrex

Your feedback

Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
Yes

Why?
They seem reasonable as long as the value of the space is assessed primarily as a space that is available to the public as a whole and not just to the interests of a few

Is there anything else you’d like to add?
I am most concerned about open green spaces, that they have an intrinsic value for their very openness. They give peace and breathing space to a city and enable us to see vistas such as the hills.
ITEM 5 - ATTACHMENT 1

Merle Lavin

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Use of public spaces policy submission

Your contact details

Name
James Imlach (on behalf of the New Zealand Motor Caravan Association Inc.)

Your feedback

Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
Yes

Why?
The criteria is sufficiently broad enough to enable the approval of a broad range of activities that would be of benefit to the local community, businesses and visitors to Palmerston North, e.g. overnight parking sites and short-term events that cater for motorhomers travelling in certified self-contained vehicles.

Is there anything else you'd like to add?
Palmerston North is an accredited Motorhome Friendly Town. Therefore, it is important any new policies do not inadvertently restrict the ability for Council to continue to support activities that align with the purpose of this accreditation.
Your contact details

Name
Kenneth Bidlake

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?
No

Withhold my contact details
False

Your feedback

Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
Yes

Why?
Seems fair. It may not be easy to consult others regarding substantial use of an area but advanced signage would allow alternative plans to be made.

Is there anything else you’d like to add?
I am involved in the Manawatu Mountain Bike Club run rider development sessions which are typically from 5 pm to 7 pm on Thursdays in the 4th school term at Paneiri Park and its surrounding tracks. This usually takes 8 weeks and can be followed up with an externally run course in the 1st school term on 1 Saturday. I am not clear if exclusive use is possible or needed at these times but we can have 180 students on the evenings which fills the space quite well making use of the cricket wickets more difficult? Also I am not sure if these sessions are events or a sporting activity? The club may be interested in running summer series races at the same venue but some members of the public have hindered this in the past by interfering with course marking. A race would take place in a summer evening or 2 for 2 hours (the venue is varied week to week over 2 months). A race would require exclusive use of certain trails but overall the space could be shared. 50 to 100 typically participate.
1. Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
   Yes
   - Two points to consider:
     - The Policy Implementation Program
     - The Placemaking Program
   - Here policies are about public spaces and consider community feedback
   - Is Council Way and Corporal Space under public spaces?

2. Is there anything else you'd like to add?
   - Keep the practice short and simple.
   - Allow for flexibility. Community often work on spontaneously.
   - At times the public will see factors as tightly done, where Council policy will stipulate otherwise.
   - Community-led planned events often use public spaces, roadways, streets and corpora - urban spaces.
   - I would like to work more on this with you, Rebecca. This could be awesome and I love the policy public space.

   Kind regards,

   [Signature]

Please send in your feedback by 4pm on Monday 29 July 2019:

Visit our website:
Visit our website and fill out the online submission form at pncc.govt.nz/get-involved/have-your-say

Email your comments:
Email your submission to submission@pncc.govt.nz
(Write Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space in the subject)

You can post your comments to:
Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space 2019
Palmerston North City Council
Private Bag 11034
Palmerston North 4442

Deliver it to:
Palmerston North City Council Customer Service Centre
32 The Square
Palmerston North
Your contact details

Name
Annette Nixon

Your feedback

Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
Yes

Why?
Generally agree the assessment criteria provides useful way to accommodate short term events and commercial use of public space. BUT No mention of longer term passive use of public space? Quiet parks and gardens, seating rather than activity, meditation walks and spirals, not used for events of any type but provided for and valued for their aesthetic qualities, natural environments, vista inspired locations, the cool situations they provide and the biodiversity benefits they sponsor. Please do not allow events in all our reserves and public areas. Please encourage the placement of seats and gathering areas for informal use in public space. What about encouragement to use space for community gardens, orchards and small fruits cultivation, flower plots and tree planting? Increasingly the loss of backyards push people to enjoy participation and just looking at such projects along with habitat restoration and plant a tree projects. Fees for use of short term events in public space - Not for profit organisations use space free of charge? Who needs to book space (without a fee) and who doesn’t? What action happens when a short term event becomes long term? What happens when a large group takes over a park for a BBQ, sports or family celebration? Are there any limits on numbers or costs when an organised or group's activities and events take place regularly in the public space rather than a hall where a fee would apply? Does group size and type of activity eg use of a sound system require any limits or controls?

Is there anything else you’d like to add?
I would like to see some areas and public events designated to be free of dogs on both a permanent basis and on an event related basis. Is it possible to have some parks as dog free areas, monitored and promoted as such? Not everyone likes animals and others are allergic to dogs with medical and psychological consequences. People with mobility difficulty can lose confidence in the presence of dogs. Already I hear stories of people not using the new walking bridge because some dogs are not on a leash, or a person is trying to control more than one dog, unsuccessfully. In the same way people who bring multiple dogs into The Square should not be doing so. I would prefer The Square to one totally dog free public space and for dogs to be banned around food places. Litter removal, appreciation of and pride in public spaces - can this awareness and action be built into policy development? It needs to be celebrated when it happens.
Merle Lavin

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Use of public spaces policy submission

Your contact details

Name
Major M.A. (Mike) PETTERSEN, Linton Camp Commandant

Address
Linton Regional Support Centre, LINTON CAMP 4820

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?
Yes

Withhold my contact details
False

Your feedback

Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?
Yes

Why?
Agree, with a Caveat. 1. Linton Camp borders onto the Manawatu and Kahuterawa Rivers. Part of the southern end of the Kahuterawa River is bordered by the He Ara Kotahi Cycle Way. No issue here. 2. The north area of the Kahuterawa River and the Manawatu river borders are extensively used for military training. Minor Demolitions, Rifle Range, Light Armoured Vehicle (LAV) training, Driver training, Engineer Plant training, i.e. Dozer, Loader, Excavator, Tractor, Digger training, and Patrol and Search, Rescue training and Urban Security training. 3. The draft policy definition of Public Space, Quote; "Any outdoor area that is open to or used by the public and that is under control of the Palmerston North City Council, and including The Square, Railway land, Reserves, Parks, Riverbanks, and Verges." could be perceived that "Riverbanks" includes the Linton Camp area of concern above. 4. It is suggested that the word "Riverbanks" be deleted from the definition of Public Space. 5. This wouldn't change the operation of the policy, as "Reserves" are still included (Council controlled land along the riverbanks is reserve land) but it makes it clear that not all riverbanks are controlled by the PNCC. 6. I am happy to produce a Power Point presentation to provide more detail to the submission.

Is there anything else you'd like to add?
Cancer Society Manawatu Submission to Palmerston North City Council Draft Policy for the use of Public Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation: Cancer Society of New Zealand Manawatu Centre Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative Name: Mrs Kerry Hocquard, Community Health Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address: Addis House, PO Box 5170, Palmerston North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: (mobile) 027 3378166 (hm) (wk) 06 356 5355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 06 356 7804 Email: <a href="mailto:Kerry.hocquard@cancercd.org.nz">Kerry.hocquard@cancercd.org.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you want to speak to the Council in support of your submission: YES

ABOUT THOSE MAKING THIS SUBMISSION:

Cancer Society Manawatu is a non-profit organisation which is committed to reducing the incidence and impact of cancer in the Midcentral District Health Board region of Manawatu, Horowhenua, Tararua and Palmerston North.

We work with our communities to reduce the incidence and impact of cancer through prevention, raising awareness of the need for early detection and providing support. One of the aims of Cancer Society of New Zealand Manawatu Centre (CSNZ Manawatu) is to reduce the rate of cancers in the Manawatu region caused by harmful exposure to ultra-violet radiation (UVR) and harmful exposure to smoking, both active and second-hand exposure.
Cancer Society Manawatu Submission to Palmerston North City Council Draft Policy for the use of Public Space

Executive Summary

Palmerston North City Council plays an essential role in the health and wellbeing of our community.

If we are to strengthen our position as a healthy city, a Smokefree city, a SunSmart community, the associated health-related policies need to be part of the promotion to residents and visitors through existing Council plans and included in the proposed Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space.

The Cancer Society of New Zealand is working hard to raise awareness about the ongoing harms caused by smoking and over-exposure to ultraviolet radiation (UVR). We are aware that we are only one organisation in a complex environment where we need the support of Council, organisations in our city, and the community, to achieve our goal of improved health and wellbeing of New Zealanders. It is only by working together, using a health impact lens on our decision-making, that we can hope to make a real difference to the burden caused by smoking and over-exposure to UVR in our community and our country.

Recommendations

For the health and wellbeing of our community and visitors to our region, I ask that:

- Palmerston North is promoted, as a healthy smokefree and sunsmart city, particularly to those expressing interest in hiring Council spaces

- Related policies, that need to be observed, are listed in the Use of Public Space Policy:
  - The Smokefree Outdoor Areas Policy (1)
  - Signs and Use of Public Places Bylaw (provisions relating to the table and chairs permit) (2)
  - Sugar Sweetened Beverages Policy (3)
  - The Sun Protection Policy (4)

Rationale

Cancer is a leading cause of illness, disability and death in New Zealand. The number of new cases of cancer diagnosed nationally each year is expected to rise to around 50,000 by 2040—an increase of nearly 50% from 2018. (5).

The most common types of newly diagnosed cancers for the MidCentral population are: prostate cancer (14.9% of MidCentral cancers registered), breast cancer (12.7% of MidCentral cancers registered), skin melanoma (10.6% of MidCentral cancers)
Cancer Society Manawatu Submission to Palmerston North City Council Draft
Policy for the use of Public Space

lung cancer (10.2% of MidCentral cancers), and colon and rectum (together 13.6% of
MidCentral cancers). (6)

Cancer deaths caused 28.8% of deaths. Most common cancers causing death were: lung
cancer (around 20%), colorectal cancer (around 13%), prostate cancer (around 6%), breast
cancer (around 6%), pancreas (around 6%), skin melanoma (around 4%). (6)

Tobacco use, the leading cause of preventable death, results in approximately 5,000
unnecessary deaths per year and thousands of New Zealanders who live with a disease or
disability caused by smoking (4) Second-hand smoke exposure continues to be a significant
public health concern and a substantial threat to the future of the children, our next
generation. (7-8)

The role of Palmerston North City Council

Palmerston North City Council plays an essential role in the health and wellbeing of our
community.

Nationally, our Council is seen as a leader in the commitment to the goal of Smokefree
2025. The Council aspires to being a role model in healthy lifestyle choices. The progress
we are making in reducing the incidence and impact of cancer, through Smokefree and
SunSmart policies, outdoor environments and outdoor dining, has put our region on the
map for a healthy future.

In the PNCC Healthy Community Plan 2018-2021, Council recognised that it has an
important role in building healthy communities, creating the conditions for people to
make healthy choices and working with partners to promote health and well-being. (9)

The PNCC Sun Protection Policy (2010) contributes to minimising the adverse effects of
overexposure to ultraviolet radiation by providing SunSmart Event Planning guidelines for
event organisers and functions.

The Sun Protection Policy recommendations include:

During the high ultraviolet radiation season, the City Council will encourage the scheduling
of outdoor community events, parades and festivals (such as the Christmas Parade) to occur
outside the hours of 11am-4pm in order to avoid the times of greatest harmful ultraviolet
exposure.

Events either hosted or held at City council owned facilities during the high ultraviolet
radiation season will promote the SunSmart message.

Information, appropriate personal sun protection such as sunscreen and temporary shade
should also be provided.

A SunSmart plan shall be a fundamental part of event planning.
Cancer Society Manawatu Submission to Palmerston North City Council Draft Policy for the use of Public Space

Where City Council facilities and events are hired or contracted out, the contractor will ensure that they align with this policy and work in conjunction with the Cancer Society, and this expectation will be documented in the relevant contracts with the City Council (4)

In 2017, Council adopted a Sugar Sweetened Beverages policy that promotes healthy drink choices on Council premises, events and functions. (3)

In the PNCC Healthy Community Plan 2018-2021, Council identified goals of:

• Palmerston North being known as a Smokefree city, with businesses working in partnership with Council to promote Smokefree Outdoor Dining.

• Palmerston North having outdoor spaces that provide for protection from the sun. (9)

Presently however, there is no mention made of the Council Smokefree, SunSmart and Healthy Beverages Policies on the City Council Conference and Functions website, or in the proposed draft policy for the use of public space.

If we are to strengthen our position as a healthy city, a Smokefree city, a SunSmart community, these policies need to be included in the promotion to residents and visitors through existing Council plans and the proposed Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space.
Recommendations

For the health and wellbeing of our community and visitors to our region, I ask that:

- Palmerston North is promoted, as a healthy smokefree and sunsmart city, particularly to those expressing interest in hiring Council spaces

- Related policies that need to be observed are listed in the Use of Public Space Policy:
  - The Smokefree Outdoor Areas Policy (1)
  - Signs and Use of Public Places Bylaw (provisions relating to the table and chairs permit) (2)
  - Healthy Beverage Policy (3)
  - The Sun Protection Policy (4)

- Potential hirers as part of the public space agreement, commit to the Smokefree and Sun Protection Policies, with the following recommendations:
  - No smoking or vaping, to be explicitly stated in the council’s terms and conditions for hiring a public space under Council jurisdiction
  - Ensure that smokefree signage is in all areas identified as Council facilities, venues and events
  - Events either hosted or held at City council owned facilities during the high ultraviolet radiation season to promote the SunSmart message.
  - Information & appropriate sun protection such as sunscreen and temporary shade be provided.
  - A SunSmart plan be a fundamental part of event planning for the high UVR months.
Cancer Society Manawatu Submission to Palmerston North City Council Draft
Policy for the use of Public Space
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Feedback on Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space
Palmerston North City Council

To: Palmerston North City Council
Address: Private 11034
         Palmerston North 4442
Email: submission@pncc.govt.nz

Feedback by: New Zealand Defence Force
Contact Person: Rebecca Davies, Senior Environmental Officer
Address for Service: New Zealand Defence Force
                    C/- Tonkin + Taylor
                    PO Box 2083
                    Wellington 6140
                    Attention: Sarah Bevin
Phone: +64 21 445 482
Email: rebecca.davies@nzdf.mil.nz / slevin@tonkinTaylor.co.nz

1. Introduction
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space.

2. Background
NZDF operates the Linton Military Camp on the outskirts of Palmerston North. From time-to-
time NZDF may need to undertake temporary training activities, termed temporary military
training activities (TMTA), outside of the Camp. TMTA can include a range of activities, from
office or classroom based activities to field based exercises. These activities provide
personnel training in search and rescue, infrastructure support (deployment of water
purification units and supply facilities), civil defence response training, dental and medical
training, and training for flood response. On occasion these activities are undertaken in
public spaces, such as parks and reserves. Being able to stage training activities in varied
locations is essential, as NZDF personnel may be deployed to a wide range of locations
around New Zealand and the world. Maintaining capability is also a requirement under the
Defence Act 1990.

3. Feedback
NZDF requests that these activities are broadly provided for by the Policy, recognising that
TMTA are also subject to the rules in the District Plan.

As noted above, TMTA include a wide variety of activities, and to provide the personnel with
an authentic training experience many of these activities are required to be undertaken
across different locations within a district and across the country. It is important that the Policy on the Use of Public Space provides for the breadth of activities that may be undertaken in public spaces.

3.1 Assessment of Applications

Activities for defence purposes should be specifically provided for in Council's Assessment of Applications criteria. NZDF requests the following additional bullet points:

- Supports the achievement of community health, safety and wellbeing
- Provides for training activities associated with emergency and disaster response, or which contribute to national security.

NZDF requests that the following bullet point is added to the matters that 'Council may also consider':

- The contribution of the proposed event or activity to community health, safety and wellbeing.

4. Closing

NZDF would welcome the opportunity to discuss this feedback with you, as part of further development of the Policy.

__________________________
Person authorised to sign
on behalf of New Zealand Defence Force

Date 29 July 2019
PROCEDURE SHEET
HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

Presenting your submission
You have indicated a wish to present your submission in person before a committee of Councillors. You may speak to your submission yourself or, if you wish, arrange for some other person or persons to speak on your behalf.

We recommend that you speak to the main points of your submission and then answer any questions. It is not necessary to read your submission as Committee members have a copy and will have already read it.

Questions are for clarifying matters raised in submissions. Questions may only be asked by Committee members, unless the Chairperson gives permission.

Time Allocation
10 minutes (including question time) will be allocated for the hearing of each submission. If more than one person speaks to a submission, the time that is allocated to that submission will be shared between the speakers.

Who will be there?
The Planning and Strategy Committee will hear the submissions. The Committee comprises of elected members as identified on the frontispiece of the Agenda.

There will also be other people there who are presenting their submission. The Hearing is open to the media and the public.

Agenda
An Agenda for the meeting at which you will be speaking will be forwarded to you once printed. The Agenda lists the submissions in the order they will be considered by the Committee, although there may be some variation to this.

Venue
The meeting will be held in the Council Chamber, First Floor, Civic Administration Building, The Square, Palmerston North.

The Council Chamber will be set out with tables arranged appropriately. You will be invited to sit at the table with the Councillors when called.

Tikanga Maori
You may speak to your submission in Maori if you wish. If you intend to do so, please contact us no later than four days before the date of the meeting (refer to the “Further Information” section below). This is to enable arrangements to be made for a certified interpreter to attend the meeting. You may bring your own interpreter if you wish.
Visual Aids
A whiteboard, and computer with PowerPoint will be available for your use.

Final Consideration of Submissions
Final consideration of submissions will be at the ordinary meeting of Council on Monday 23 September 2019. The media and public can attend these meetings, but it will not be possible for you to speak further to your submission, or participate in the Committee or Council deliberations.

Changes to this Procedure
The Committee may, in its sole discretion, vary the procedure set out above if circumstances indicate that some other procedure would be more appropriate.

Further Information
If you have any questions about the procedure outlined above please contact Natalya Kushnirenko, Committee Administrator, phone 06 356-8199 or email natalya.kushnirenko@pncc.govt.nz.

* * * * *
PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning and Strategy Committee Meeting Part I Public, held in the Council Chamber, First Floor, Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square, Palmerston North on 05 August 2019, commencing at 9.01am

Members Present: Councillor Duncan McCann (in the Chair), The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

Non Members: Councillors Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Lew Findlay QSM and Leonie Hapeta.

Apologies: The Mayor (Grant Smith) (early departure on Council business).

Councillor Vaughan Dennison entered the meeting at 9.04am during consideration of clause 53. He was not present for clause 52.

Councillor Aleisha Rutherford left the meeting at 9.10am during consideration of clause 54. She entered the meeting again at 9.24am during consideration of clause 56. She was not present for clauses 54 to 55 inclusive.

The Mayor (Grant Smith) left the meeting at 11.57am during consideration of clause 61. He was not present for clauses 61 to 63 inclusive.

49-19 Apologies

Moved Duncan McCann, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the Committee receive the apologies.

Clause 49-19 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

50-19 Public Comment

Public comment was received from Mr Chris Teo-Sherrell regarding parking near the College Street and Pitama Road intersection.

Councillor Vaughan Dennison entered the meeting at 9.04am

Moved Duncan McCann, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED
1. That the public comment be received for information.

Clause 50-19 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

51-19 Summary of Submissions - Proposed amendment to the Dog Control Policy 2018

Memorandum, dated 21 June 2019 presented by the Strategy & Policy Manager, Julie Macdonald.

Councillor Aleisha Rutherford left the meeting at 9.10am

Moved Duncan McCann, seconded Leonie Hapeta.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the summary of submissions on the proposed amendment to the Dog Control Policy 2018 be received.

Clause 51-19 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Tangi Utikere.

52-19 Confirmation of Minutes

Moved Rachel Bowen, seconded Tangi Utikere.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the minutes of the Planning and Strategy Committee meeting of 5 June 2019 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Clause 52-19 above was carried 13 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions, the voting being as follows:

For:

Abstained:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillor Leonie Hapeta.
Status of Master Plans in each Triennium
Memorandum, dated 16 July 2019 presented by the City Planning Manager, David Murphy.

Councillor Aleisha Rutherford entered the meeting at 9.24am

Moved Duncan McCann, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the information contained within the report titled “Status of Master Plans in each Triennium” be received.

Clause 53-19 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

Palmerston North Wastewater Bylaw 2019 - deliberations on submissions
Memorandum, dated 24 June 2019 presented by the Strategy & Policy Manager, Julie Macdonald.

Moved Duncan McCann, seconded Lorna Johnson.

The COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. That the Council confirms that the Palmerston North Wastewater Bylaw 2019 is the most appropriate form of bylaw and does not give rise to any implications under the NZ Bill of Rights Act 1990.

2. That the Council adopts the Palmerston North Wastewater Bylaw 2019 and Palmerston North Wastewater Bylaw 2019 Administration Manual, as shown in attachments 1 and 2.

3. That the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Planning and Strategy Committee be given delegated authority to approve minor amendments to the Palmerston North Wastewater Bylaw 2019 and Palmerston North Wastewater Bylaw 2019 Administration Manual prior to publication.

Clause 54-19 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.
55-19  Palmerston North City District Plan: Proposed Plan Change D - Pressure Sewer Systems
Memorandum, dated 8 July 2019 presented by the City Planning Manager, David Murphy.

Moved Duncan McCann, seconded Lorna Johnson.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED


2. That the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Planning and Strategy Committee be authorised to make minor amendments to Palmerston North City District Plan: Proposed Plan Change D – Pressure Sewer Systems prior to public notification under clause 5, schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Clause 55-19 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

The meeting adjourned at 10.20am
The meeting resumed at 11.03am

56-19  Organisational Approach to Environmental Sustainability
Memorandum, dated 6 July 2019 presented by the City Planning Manager, David Murphy.

Moved Leonie Hapeta, seconded Susan Baty.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the Memorandum dated 6 July 2019 and titled “Organisational Approach to Environmental Sustainability” be received.

Clause 56-19 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.
**57-19**  
**Draft Venues Policy for consultation**  
Memorandum, dated 11 July 2019 presented by the Strategy & Policy Manager, Julie Macdonald.

During discussion it was noted that there were a number of queries in relation to the Draft Venues Policy and resolved that the Policy be considered at a later date.

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Leonie Hapeta.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Draft Venues Policy to be discussed be adjourned until the February 2020 meeting of the appropriate Committee.

Clause 57-19 above was carried 12 votes to 4, the voting being as follows:

- **For:**
  - The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Susan Baty, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Duncan McCann, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

- **Against:**
  - Councillors Brent Barrett, Rachel Bowen, Lorna Johnson and Karen Naylor.

The Mayor (Grant Smith) left the meeting at 11.57am

**58-19**  
**Palmerston North City District Plan: Proposed Plan Change B - Napier Road Residential Area Extension**  
Memorandum, dated 16 July 2019 presented by the City Planning Manager, David Murphy.

Moved Duncan McCann, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**


2. That the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Planning and Strategy Committee be authorised to make minor amendments to Palmerston North City District Plan: Proposed Plan Change B – Napier Road Residential Area Extension prior to public notification under clause 5, schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Clause 58-19 above was carried 14 votes to 1, the voting being as follows:

- **For:**

- **Against:**
  - Councillor Leonie Hapeta.
Priority Intersection and Safety Treatments Across City

Report, dated 19 July 2019 presented by the Transport and Infrastructure Manager, Robert van Bentum.

Moved Duncan McCann, seconded Karen Naylor.

The COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. That Council receive the report outlining the current approach and options for maintaining, enhancing or reducing investment in intersection safety improvements.

2. That Council endorse the Officer recommendation to adopt Option 1 being the maintenance of the current level of investment safety improvements for the 2018-2021 three year NZTA funding cycle.

Clause 59-19 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Committee Work Schedule

Moved Duncan McCann, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the Planning and Strategy Committee receive its Work Schedule dated August 2019.

Clause 60-19 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

The meeting finished at 12.35pm

Confirmed 2 September 2019

Chairperson
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning and Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 2 September 2019

TITLE: Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space 2019 - Summary of Submissions

PRESENTED BY: Julie Macdonald, Strategy & Policy Manager

APPROVED BY: Sheryl Bryant, General Manager - Strategy & Planning

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO PLANNING AND STRATEGY COMMITTEE

1. That Attachment 2 of the memorandum dated 2 August 2019 and titled “Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space 2019 - Summary of Submissions” be received.

1. ISSUE

The Council is consulting on the Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space 2019. Seventeen written submissions were received, and four submitters have indicated that they wish to speak to Council about their submissions.

This memorandum provides a summary of the public feedback received on the draft policy. The written submissions are attached in full to the Committee Order Paper.

2. BACKGROUND

The Council approved the draft policy for public consultation in December 2018. The draft policy addresses the desire for a consistent policy position guiding Council’s decision-making in response to requests for public space use.

Consultation started on 28 June 2019 and closed at 4pm on 29 July 2019. The full consultation document is provided as Attachment 1 of this memorandum.

Feedback was encouraged in the following ways:

• A dedicated consultation page on Council’s website with an online submission form.

• The consultation document was available in the Customer Service Centre and all city libraries.
• Public notices were placed in the Manawatū Standard and The Guardian newspapers.
• An article about the draft policy appeared on Stuff.co.nz.
• Facebook posts advising the opening of the submission period were made on Council’s page, Placemaking Palmerston North, and Palmerston North - City of Cultures.
• Emails were sent to organisations that have booked public space in the past 18 months.
• Emails were sent to stakeholders and Council’s strategic partners.
• A presentation was made to the Rangitāne Bimonthly meeting.
• Officers attended Saturday morning Parkrun, Global Festival 2019, and the Highbury Flea Market to raise awareness of the consultation.

3. SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

Attachment 2 presents a summary of both the written submissions received and conversations with members of the public about the draft policy.

Of the written submissions, six supported the policy and assessment criteria as drafted. Ten submissions suggested changes to draft policy. One submission opposed the draft policy.

4. NEXT STEPS

Officers will prepare a report with recommendations in response to the issues raised by the public, including any changes recommended to the draft policy. That report is expected to be presented to the 23 September 2019 Council meeting to provide the opportunity for the policy to be adopted before the 2019 Local Body Elections.

5. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes quote relevant clause(s) from Delegations Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the decisions significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council’s policies or plans?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommendations contribute to Goal 2: A Creative and Exciting City

The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the Creative and Liveable Strategy

The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in the City Centre Plan
The action is: to develop guidelines regarding the use of public space by commercial activities.

**Contribution to strategic direction**

- Provide a consistent and transparent approach to assist staff considering all applications for the use of public space.
- Facilitate community access to information about Council decision-making.
- Ensure the process for approving public space use contributes to meeting Council’s vision and goals to encourage greater and more diverse use of public space.
- Enable the Council to respond quickly to new ideas and be flexible in its response to applications.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Consultation Document - Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space
2. Summary Of Submissions - Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space
CONSULTATION DOCUMENT
DRAFT POLICY FOR THE USE OF
PUBLIC SPACE

JUNE 2019
CONSULTATION DOCUMENT
DRAFT POLICY FOR THE USE OF
PUBLIC SPACE

JUNE 2019
Introduction

We want our public space to play host to unique activities, increasing opportunities for social interaction and economic growth. We want our city to have great places and plenty to do.

We also want to ensure our public spaces are equally accessible for everyone in our community. We have a responsibility to care for and protect public assets, including the built and natural environment.

We must balance these responsibilities whenever someone applies to use public space. To make sure our decision-making is consistent and transparent, we are proposing a Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space.

What activities fall under the policy?

Public space is any outdoor area under Council control, including The Square, Railway Land, reserves, parks, riverbanks, and verges. Under the draft policy an application to Council is required for any use of public space, except casual and informal use (like a picnic in the park).

The policy is intended to apply to the full spectrum of public space use. It covers both long and short-term use of public space, from a permanent licensed cafe to a short wedding ceremony. It would apply to commercial activities, like food trucks, permanent shop kiosks and outdoor bootcamps; and community activities, like neighbourhood events, public art and community gardens.

We are also developing a Draft Venues Policy. We will consult on that at a later date.
How would applications be assessed?

We are proposing high-level assessment criteria that would apply to all applications for the use of public space. We want to know if you agree with the proposed assessment criteria.

**Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space**

"2. Assessment of Applications
In considering an application to use public space, and particularly where there are competing applications for the use of public space or high demand for a public space, the Council will consider whether the event or activity:
- Supports the achievement of the Council's goals
- Is accessible to the wider community
- Adds to the variety of events or activities available in Palmerston North
- Enhances any precinct identities (e.g. Broadway as a hospitality precinct)
- Provides an experience (rather than a simple commercial exchange)
- Do not significantly limit the availability of space for general community use

The purpose of these criteria is to inform Council decision-making, rather than to provide an exhaustive list of necessary criteria."

"Depending on the nature, duration, and type of activity or event, Council may also consider:
- Initial feedback on the proposed event or activity
- The opportunity to enhance or celebrate the heritage values of the public space
- The opportunity to enhance or celebrate the natural environment of the public space
- Potential impact on existing city businesses."

The objective of the draft policy is to encourage and enable a diverse range of activities and events to occur in public spaces. We want to increase visible public life, and diverse activities and events will help this happen.

However, public space also belongs to all people of Palmerston North, and we propose that activities should not significantly disrupt wider public access.

Rangitane o Manawatū has mana whenua status for Palmerston North, and we will use land in a way that respects its significance to Rangitane. In addition, use of public space should not unnecessarily compromise our heritage, our environment, or our local businesses.

Would the public have a say on applications?

Applications may be subject to public consultation where we think the application is likely to be controversial, or may not be consistent with the intent of the policy.

What happens next?

The full policy is included at the end of this document. We want to hear what you think about it. Your feedback will be presented to Councillors to help them decide what the final policy should say.

Have your say

There are lots of ways you can have your say on the Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space. You can fill out an online submission form or write your comments in the spaces provided in this document. See the next page for details.

The consultation is open for feedback until 4pm on Monday 29 July 2019.
If you have any questions, please contact Julie Macdonald (julie.macdonald@pncc.govt.nz) or Rebecca Hofmann (rebecca.hofmann@pncc.govt.nz).
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1. Do you agree with the proposed assessment criteria?  
   Yes  
   No

2. Is there anything else you’d like to add?

Please send in your feedback by 4pm on Monday 29 July 2019:

Visit our website:
Visit our website and fill out the online submission form at pncc.govt.nz/get-involved/have-your-say

Email your comments:
Email your submission to submission@pncc.govt.nz (write Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space in the subject)

You can post your comments to:
Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space 2019
Palmerston North City Council
Private Bag 11034
Palmerston North 4442

Deliver it to:
Palmerston North City Council Customer Service Centre
32 The Square
Palmerston North
Appendix: Draft Policy for the Use of Public Space

Introduction

There are many public spaces in Palmerston North providing opportunities for community and commercial organisations to hold events and celebrations, to campaign and raise awareness, and to provide services and recreational opportunities for the community. This policy provides guidance for Council decision-making on applications for the use of these public spaces.

Strategic context

The Council’s vision for Palmerston North is small city benefits, big city ambition. Council’s goals are for:

- An innovative and growing city
- A creative and exciting city
- A connected and safe city
- An eco city
- A driven and enabling Council

This policy contributes to Palmerston North becoming a city that is an exciting place to live, work and study, with great places for people and lots to do. Decisions about the use of public space will be made in the context of the wider Council goals.

Policy objectives and goals

The purpose of this policy is to encourage and enable a diverse range of activities and events to occur in public spaces. This policy guides the Council’s response to applications for the use of public space to achieve the following objectives:

- Encouragement and facilitation of a variety of uses for public space;
- Clear and accessible application and booking processes;
- Transparent decision-making in policy implementation;
- Appropriate level of control over activities to ensure potential negative effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated;
- Sufficient public access to open space, the Manawatū River, and other water bodies, to enable community recreation and enjoyment;
- Appropriate use and protection of places, buildings, and objects with significance to iwi;
- Commercial users of council land are not unfairly advantaged over established city businesses;
- Protection of urban amenity, heritage, and the natural environment.
Activities & events not covered by the Policy

- Use of Council owned and controlled buildings
e.g. community centre booking, commercial building leases

- Casual and informal use of public space
e.g. school picnic in the park, chalk art

Definitions

The following definitions apply for the purposes of this policy:

**Public space:** Any outdoor area that is open to or used by the public and that is under the control of the Palmerston North City Council, and including The Square, Railway Land, reserves, parks, riverbanks, and verges.

**Commercial activity:** Activity undertaken for profit and/or the benefit to the individual(s) or business(es) carrying on a trade, operation, occupation, or activity.

**Community activity:** Activity for not-for-profit and/or benefit to the Council, community, community group, sport or recreation group, or charity using the space.

**Exclusive use:** Where the space is used exclusively by the event or activity.

**Event:** An organised temporary activity with set start and end times and dates, which is set-up in a public space.

**Short-term:** A one-off event or activity of up to three days in duration.

**Long-term:** Duration of any event or activity beyond one day.
**Guidelines**

Implementation of this policy will follow these guidelines to achieve the goal of enabling and encouraging a diverse range of events and activities in public spaces.

1. **General**
   
   Individuals and organisations wanting to use public space for an event or activity requiring shared or exclusive use of all, or part, of a public space must make an application to the Council.

2. **Assessment of applications**
   
   In considering an application to use public space, and particularly where there are competing applications for the use of public space or high demand for a public space, the Council will consider whether the event or activity:
   - Supports the achievement of the Council's goals
   - Is accessible to the wider community
   - Adds to the variety of events or activities available in Palmerston North
   - Enhances any precinct identities (e.g. Broadway as a hospitality precinct)
   - Provides an experience (rather than a simple commercial exchange)
   - Do not significantly limit the availability of space for general community use

   The purpose of these criteria is to inform Council decision-making, rather than to provide an exhaustive list of necessary criteria.

   Depending on the nature, duration, and type of activity or event, Council may also consider:
   - Iwi feedback on the proposed event or activity
   - The opportunity to enhance or celebrate the heritage values of the public space
   - The opportunity to enhance or celebrate the natural environment of the public space
   - Potential impact on existing city businesses

   Council may require applications to be subject to public consultation where an application is likely to be controversial, or where it is unclear if the proposal is consistent with the overall intent of the policy. Note that none of the criteria or considerations provided for in this policy outweigh the freedoms guaranteed under the Bill of Rights Act 1990.

3. **Compliance**

   Activities in public spaces must be managed in accordance with the Council's bylaws and policies, and with other governing legislation (including traffic legislation, Resource Management Act 1991, and the Reserves Act 1977). Any compliance matters are outside the scope of this policy, and applications are subject to this policy in the first instance.

4. **Fees and charges, and administration**

   Applicants should apply at least seven working days prior to a short-term or one-off event or activity, and 40 working days prior to proposed long-term or repeated use, to allow for the necessary consultation or other processes.

   Payment of a booking fee, bond, or rent may be required, depending on the nature of the event or activity, and on whether any permit, licence, or lease contract is required.

   Fees and charges are subject to the annual review of fees and charges.

   Information about the implementation of this policy will be available on the Council’s website.

**Monitoring**

The implementation of this policy will be monitored and reported to Council by June 2020.
ATTACHMENT 2 – SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK
DRAFT POLICY FOR THE USE OF PUBLIC SPACE 2019

This summary covers both the written submissions received and conversations with members of the public about the draft policy. Comments are followed by either a submission number or the letters ‘OF’ (for ‘other feedback’) in the point was raised in conversation.

As shown in the Attachment 1, submitters were asked whether they agreed with the proposed assessment criteria and whether they had any other feedback on the draft policy.

1. Opposed

One submitter opposed the assessment criteria because “the council need to keep control of it with the firm hand otherwise you will have all sorts of trading on council land which will be unlicensed operators and all the flyby nighters” (6).

2. Supported

Six submitters supported the policy and assessment criteria as drafted. The reasons cited are:

- If it’s for the betterment of the community then carry on (3).
- As written, the criteria are straight forward, somewhat specific as well as being flexible (4).
- These higher-level criteria provide broad coverage to consider aspects of proposed activities (5).
- They seem reasonable as long as the value of the space is assessed primarily as a space that is available to the public as a whole and not just to the interests of a few (10).
- The criteria are sufficiently broad enough to enable the approval of a broad range of activities that would be of benefit to the local community, businesses and visitors to Palmerston North (11).
- Seems fair (13).

3. Supported with changes

Definition of “public space”

- Clarify if roadways and carparks are included as public space (13).
- The definition of “public space” should be altered to remove “riverbanks” to make it clear that not all riverbanks are controlled by Council (15).

Moving/rewording assessment criteria

- Move “Iwi feedback on the proposed event or activity” to the main set of criteria (1).
- A member of the public suggested rewording the criterion “Adds to the variety of events or activities available in Palmerston North” to “Adds to the already existing variety of events or activities available in Palmerston North, or creates new events or activities”. They felt that the original criterion could inadvertently restrict existing activities and events that are a fundamental part of our culture, such as Saturday morning rugby (OF).
- A Disability Reference Group member suggested rewording the criterion “Is accessible to the wider community” to “Is inclusive of and accessible to the wider community.”
They suggested that being accessible and being inclusive were not the same thing, and inclusivity should underpin all Council decisions (OF).

Adding assessment criteria

- Add a further criterion on cultural diversity (1).
  - On follow-up, the submitter said the Council should consider whether the event or activity is inclusive and promotes connection with, and interest in, other cultures (OF).
- Add a criterion around cost/benefit assessment, or cost savings to users (2).
  - On follow-up, the submitter said some events and activities would be too expensive to hold without using public space. They thought this should be considered in assessing applications (OF).
- There is no mention of ‘ethical’ activities in there (8).
- Add a further criterion which asks: Does the use of the particular public space conform to the District Plan, the Reserves Act 1977 and any Management Plans for the land, and any other legislation? (9)
- Add a further criterion which asks: Are all health and safety requirements being assessed and met? (9)
- Add a further criterion: “Supports the achievement of community health, safety and wellbeing” (17).
- Add a further criterion: “Provides for training activities associated with emergency and disaster response, or which contribute to national security” (17).

Removing assessment criteria

- Remove the criterion “Provides an experience rather than a simple commercial exchange” (9).

Other suggested changes

- Include a clause stating that any commercial activity which is on a semi-permanent or permanent basis should not be allowed in recreational or reserve areas (7).
- Include a clause that all recreational areas and reserves should not to be used for freedom camping (7).
- Clarification needed about the position regarding longer-term passive use of public space (14).
- The Policy should reference other Council policies and bylaws that must be observed (specifically the Smokefree Outdoor Areas Policy; Signs and Use of Public Places Bylaw; Healthy Beverage Policy; and the Sun Protection Policy) (16).
- A member of the public asked for clarity about whether religious activities can be held in public space (OF).

4. Other feedback

Four submitters expressed a desire to leave public space as open and tranquil, and to avoid commercialisation (see submissions 7, 9, 10, 14).
Five submitters sought more detailed operational guidelines in response to a broad range of identified issues (see submissions 5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16).
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning and Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 2 September 2019

TITLE: Amendment to Dog Control Policy 2018 - Deliberations and Adoption

PRESENTED BY: Julie Macdonald - Strategy & Policy Manager

APPROVED BY: Sheryl Bryant, General Manager - Strategy & Planning

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That the Council adopts the amended Palmerston North Dog Control Policy 2018 provided in Attachment 1.

1. ISSUE

1.1 Council adopted the Dog Control Policy in June 2018. The Policy included provision for a 12-month trial allowing dogs on-leash in public places in the Central Business District (CBD) or the City Centre. The trial commenced on 23 August 2018 following the adoption of the Dog Control Bylaw 2018 that gave effect to the adopted policy.

1.2 The trial has been monitored and has been deemed a success when measured against performance measures set by staff (see section 2.2). As a result, in May/June the Council consulted on an amendment to the policy that removed references to the trial and added the CBD to the list of public places allowing dogs to be under on-leash control.

1.3 Sixty-five submissions were received with the majority of (80%) submitters supporting the policy amendment. In addition, other feedback from the community on the issue has been analysed through an on-line form on Council’s website (generating 114 responses) on the trial, comments on Council’s Facebook page (over 100 comments) and through an analysis of calls to Council.

1.4 On balance, it is considered that the trial has demonstrated that allowing dogs into the CBD on-leash been successful and as a result, the Council should proceed to amend the Dog Control Policy 2018 to allow dogs on-leash in public places within the CBD. Attachment 1 presents the amended Dog Control Policy 2018 for adoption.
2. **BACKGROUND**

Timeline of events:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 June 2017</td>
<td>Approval to review the Dog Control Policy 2011</td>
<td>At this stage of the process, general comments were made about reviewing areas in which dogs are currently prohibited, on-leash and off-leash and the ability to be flexible and responsive around the use of current prohibited areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2017</td>
<td>Approval for consultation on Statement of Proposal – draft Dog Control Policy</td>
<td>Feedback was sought on whether Council should consider dogs on-leash in existing prohibited areas including the CBD with around half of feedback indicating an appetite for change. There was a mix of negative and positive comments in relation to the CBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Committee resolved that the Statement of Proposal would include the option of a 12-month trial allowing ‘on leash’ dog access to the CBD (replacing the proposal to allow dogs at events in prohibited public places).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April 2018</td>
<td>Summary of consultation feedback on the draft Palmerston North Dog Control Policy</td>
<td>Formal feedback on the proposal to allow dogs on-leash in the CBD for a 12-month trial period was evenly divided, with many submitter s having very strong views. Many of the people who supported the trial proposal also raised concerns, particularly about the need for more enforcement and clean-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other feedback was presented including the results of a Facebook poll, a CBD survey (February) and ‘Let’s Talk’ sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 June 2018</td>
<td>Deliberation on submissions and adoption of policy</td>
<td>Feedback opportunities showed around two thirds of the people who engaged through the submission process allowing dogs in the CBD on-leash were positive about that proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The trial was made subject to a set of conditions with a formal review agreed at 6-month mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June 2018</td>
<td>Dog Control Policy 2018 adopted by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 August 2018</td>
<td>Adoption of Dog Control Bylaw 2018 (including the trial)</td>
<td>Extraordinary Council meeting resolved that the bylaw, that gives effect to the adopted policy, come into effect on 23 August 2018. The CBD dogs on-leash trial started and dog poo bag dispensers and signs were also installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2019</td>
<td>Report on six-month review of CBD dogs on-leash trial</td>
<td>Several feedback mechanisms were used to gather feedback on the trial, including encouraging feedback through Council’s website and Facebook page, the review of dog-related complaints and calls received, regular staff meetings, and staff observations. Overall, the trial was considered to be going well when evaluated against set measures of success criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May 2019</td>
<td>Report to Planning and Strategy Committee seeking approval to consult on amendments to policy (as a result of trial)</td>
<td>Further analysis of the trial concluded that it has been a success and as a result, the Council should proceed to amend the Dog Control Policy 2018 to allow dogs on-leash in the CBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 May - 10 June 2019</td>
<td>Formal consultation period on amendment to policy</td>
<td>Sixty-five submissions were received with the majority of submitters supporting the policy amendment. In addition, other feedback from the community on the issue has been collected through the online form on the trial accessed on Council’s website and through posts on Council’s Facebook page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June 2019</td>
<td>Submissions and summary of submissions reported to Planning and Strategy Committee</td>
<td>Twenty percent of submissions opposed the proposed policy amendments. Key reasons cited for opposition are safety concerns, the availability of other public places to walk dogs, concern about dog poo not being disposed of, and, that until Council’s general approach to dog control improves, problem dog behaviour will negatively impact on everyone. Eighty percent of submissions support the proposed policy amendments. Main reasons cited for supporting the amendment are related to enhanced social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Final Review of Trial Allowing Dogs on-Leash in the CBD

#### 3.1 Starting on 23 August 2018, the purposes of the 12-month trial were:

- To contribute to City Centre vibrancy and socialisation benefits by allowing people and their companion dogs to enjoy public places.
- To allow Council time to consider options for the future in terms of a permanent dog control status for the CBD/City Centre.

#### 3.2 Measures of success were developed by staff to evaluate the success of the trial. These measures are:

- Fewer than 25 complaints received through the Council’s Contact Centre from CBD businesses and the general public about dog waste, off-leash dogs, unattended dogs, dog attacks (dog/dog; dog/person), long leads (causing tripping etc) and dogs at events.
- General adherence to the bylaw during the trial period.
- Dogs are being brought into the CBD/The Square and owners/dogs are demonstrating responsible behaviour.
- General positive feedback received about the trial.

#### 3.3 Feedback on the trial has been through Council’s website, reviewing dog-related complaints and calls received, regular staff meetings, and staff observations. Reports on the trial were received at the March and May 2019 meetings of the Planning and Strategy Committee.

#### 3.3.1 Council Website Feedback Form

An online form has been accessible to members of the public for the duration of the trial. As reported in May 2019 (eight months into the trial), the majority of responses at that stage received through an online form on Council’s website were favourable (69%), with the remainder expressing negative or neutral feedback on the trial.
At the end of the trial period, a total of 114 comments have been made on the online form. Figure 1 shows the final breakdown of positive (63%), negative (34%), and neutral (3%) responses.

![Figure 1: Council Website Form on CBD Trial - Categorisation of Feedback from 23 August 2018 to 14 August 2019](image)

Comments received through the online form are in Attachment 2.

3.3.2 **Contact centre calls and complaints** - There were 35 calls through the Contact Centre over the duration of the trial that have been categorised into types of issues as shown in Figure 2 (with previous years shown for comparison). For 2018/19 most calls (74%) related to roaming dogs in the CBD, or roaming dogs that have been secured within the CBD, with relatively few concerns raised about other dog control issues coming through the Contact Centre.

In addition to these calls, three dog faeces complaints were made requiring Council action. There has also been one email received in relation to the type of dog leash over the last twelve months.
3.3.3 **Observations** - Staff have observed low uptake of dog poo bags and little dog waste needing to be attended to by CBD-based operational staff. Vandalism and misuse of the dog poo bags has occurred but has not caused any significant issues.

Animal control officers also carried out patrols within the CBD and often reported no dogs present, with some dogs observed to be off-leash.

3.3.4 **CBD survey** - A face-to-face survey with over 100 participants working in or visiting the CBD was carried out in December 2018. From this survey 51% of respondents considered the trial is going ‘good’; 24% of respondents either weren’t aware of the trial or didn’t know, or care about it. Ninety four percent of respondents said that they had not seen any concerning dog, or dog owner, behaviour in the CBD in the last three months (August - November 2018). Twenty seven percent of respondents said that they have seen positive interactions between dogs and people in the last three months.

3.3.5 **PNCC Facebook Poll** – A Facebook poll in November 2018 attracted over 400 responses, with 77% of respondents saying they felt the trial was ‘going great’, and 23% indicating they were not happy with it.
3.4 This table records an overall assessment of feedback against the success measures set by staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fewer than 25 complaints received through the Contact Centre from CBD businesses and the general public about dog waste, off-leash dogs, unattended dogs, dog attacks (dog/dog; dog/person), long leads (causing tripping etc) and dogs at events. | While there have been 35 phone calls over the last year through the Contact Centre, these relate to a broader range of issues identified in the measure described. Most calls can be attributed to roaming dogs or roaming dogs that have been secured by the person finding them. An analysis of all complaints coming into Council (excluding any comments made through the opportunities described above such as formal submissions, the online form collecting trial feedback and Facebook comments) shows the following complaints:  
  - Dog waste – 3  
  - Off-leash dogs – 3  
  - Unattended dogs – 1  
  - Dog attacks – 0  
  - Long leads – 1  
  - Dogs at events – 0 |
| General adherence to the bylaw during the trial period | No bylaw infringements or fines have been issued over this time period. |
| Dogs are being brought into the CBD/The Square and owners/dogs are demonstrating responsible behaviour. | Observations and feedback collected through various methods show that most dogs and their owners are visiting the CBD responsibly. |
| General positive feedback received about the trial. | Most comments received through the various communication channels over the last twelve months have been positive about the trial. It is also noted that the matter of dogs in the CBD has been raised with Rangitāne o Manawatū representatives at bimonthly meetings. While there has been some level of discomfort expressed about dogs in Te Marae o Hine, there has also been an |
3.5 There is some evidence of community concern about dogs in the CBD both reflected in comments received and in the measure of fewer than 25 complaints being exceeded. Overall, however, it is considered that the trial, when assessed against the success measure, has demonstrated that allowing dogs into the CBD on-leash been a successful initiative.

4. ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE POLICY

4.1 Submissions (made through the formal LGA process) on the proposed amendment were considered at the June 2019 meeting of the Planning and Strategy Committee.

Twenty percent of submissions opposed the proposed policy amendments. Key reasons cited for opposition to allowing on-leash dogs in the CBD permanently, are:

- safety concerns,
- the availability of other public places to walk dogs,
- concern about dog poo not being disposed of, and,
- that until Council’s general approach to dog control improves, problem dog behaviour will negatively impact on everyone including allowing dogs in the CBD.

These types of concerns have been commonly expressed throughout the dog control policy review process (that started in June 2017) when the issue of a less restrictive environment for the control of dogs in the CBD was first introduced.

4.2 Eighty percent of submissions support the proposed policy amendments. Main reasons cited for supporting the proposed amendment are:

- enhanced social opportunities (for dogs, their owners and others interacting with the dog/dog owner)
- increased CBD vibrancy,
- enabling more dog walking opportunities,
- a more permissive approach that is becoming more common in other places,
- success of the trial in terms of few issues or complaints, and that it
- benefits people visiting the City.

These are similar themes that have emerged throughout the policy review process that started in June 2017.
4.3 In addition, feedback on the recent proposed amendment was generated through Council’s Facebook page. The first related post on 10 May generated 28 comments. Over 80 comments were received on a 26 July 2019 post signifying the trial period ending and alerting people of the up-coming decision-making process on the dog control area status for the CBD.

Facebook comments generally reflected the themes collected through the submission process, as described above. An analysis of the 10 May comments showed more favourable responses with two-thirds supporting a permanent change (with some suggesting support only if certain conditions were met such as dogs being on leash and dog owners removing waste) with the remaining third not supportive. The 26 July comments were more negative in nature (with about 53% oppositional) with less positive responses (about 38% supportive) and a further 8% expressing a neutral stance on the issue.

4.3.1 Additional concerns to those raised in formal (LGA) submissions via social media channels are:

- people’s (particularly children’s) safety for those afraid of, or uncomfortable around, or intimidated, by dogs
- dogs can attack and inflict wounds and scars
- inappropriate to have dogs at family focussed events at events in The Square
- the only dogs that should be allowed are guide/support dogs
- seen as unnecessary to take dogs into town (does not benefit the dog); CBD is a people-only place
- lack of control or responsibility from dog owners
- urine marks on walls, seats etc.
- sensible to place restrictions on not having dogs in the CBD
- we don’t need to follow what other places do (in terms of more permissive approach to dogs in the CBD)
- lack of monitoring by Council
- dogs seen unleashed
- do not need to add to other concerns occurring in The Square
- The trial should have included the need to muzzle dogs (in addition to them being on leash)

Positive comments:

- Enjoyment in able to have companion animals in the CBD
- Happy to pick up dog poo left by others
- Provides a safe walking opportunity that is well-lit at night
- Lack of dog poo evidenced
- Chance for local businesses (e.g. cafes) to benefit from dogs and their owners
- Support but need for strict enforcement and related infrastructure (waste bins)
5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Deciding on whether to amend the Dog Control Policy 2018 requires careful consideration and balancing of the wide range of views expressed over the course of the policy review period and the targeted consultation over the trial period.

5.2 An analysis of all the feedback received from the community shows a shift over time to more support for a policy change allowing access of dogs into the CBD under on-leash control. This change could be attributed to the trial occurring without major incident, and low levels of complaints, and is reflected in the content of the feedback received. In noting this, however, the serious nature of maintaining public safety through the Council’s responsibilities under the Dog Control Act 1996, and Council’s own policy, should not be discounted.

5.3 The objectives of the Policy are guided by Section 10 of the Dog Control Act and seek to:

(a) Minimise danger, distress and nuisance dogs may cause to the community generally;
(b) Avoid the inherent danger in allowing dogs to have uncontrolled access to public places that are frequented by children or other vulnerable members of the community, whether or not children might be accompanied by adults;
(c) Enable, as far as practicable, the public (including families) to use streets and public amenities without fear of attack or intimidation by dogs;
(d) Provide for the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners.
(e) Ensure dogs within the city boundary are registered and microchipped.
(f) Encourage responsible dog ownership so that owners take all reasonable steps to ensure that their dogs do not cause a nuisance to other people or other animals.

5.4 Through the consultation opportunities many people have expressed real concern about their fear for themselves and their families around dogs and how this impacts on their enjoyment and use of public places. The decision to change the level of access to the CBD should, therefore, not be taken lightly.

5.5 Should the policy be amended Council’s approach to ongoing monitoring of dogs in the CBD needs to continue to ensure that the policy objectives are met and the likelihood of any incidents is reduced.

5.6 On balance, it is considered that the trial has demonstrated that allowing dogs into the CBD on-leash been successful and as a result, the Council should proceed to amend the Dog Control Policy 2018 to allow dogs on-leash in public places within the CBD.
6. **NEXT STEPS**

6.1 If adopted, the amended Dog Control Policy needs to be given effect by an amended Dog Control Bylaw. This needs to be done within 60 days of the Policy being adopted. The subsequent bylaw would be drafted for adoption by the Council on 23 September 2019 with no further consultation required.

6.2 A communications plan reinforcing expected behaviour for dog owners wanting to access public places in the CBD will be prepared and delivered.

7. **COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION**

| Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide? | No |
| Are the decisions significant? | No |
| If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water? | No |
| Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan? | No |
| Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure? | No |
| Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions? | Yes |
| Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council’s policies or plans? | No |

The recommendations contribute to Goal 3: A Connected and Safe Community

The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the Connected Community Strategy

The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in the Safe Community Plan

The action is: Achieve compliance with relevant legislation, bylaws, and policies through provision of information, education and enforcement (animal control, building compliance, bylaws, health compliance, liquor licensing, noise control, planning compliance).

| Contribution to strategic direction | The trial allowed Council time to consider future options for the permanent dog control status for the CBD/City Centre. The trial has been considered a success when evaluated against specified measures and no significant health and safety issues have been experienced over the last year. Allowing dogs on-leash into the CBD contributes to Council’s strategic direction to be a safe and connected community as well as contributing to aspirations to be a more liveable City. |

Nil
ATTACHMENTS

1. Amended Palmerston North Dog Control Policy 2018
2. CBD Trial - feedback received through online form on Council's website
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OVERVIEW

The overall purpose of dog control is to maintain and improve public safety. The Council recognises that most dog owners in the City are responsible and that most interaction between dogs and the community is positive. This policy aims to balance dog control and public safety while recognising the health, well-being, and wider community benefits of dog ownership.

This Policy is a requirement of the Dog Control Act 1996 (the Act) that requires some mandatory content. The Policy should be read alongside the Palmerston North Dog Control Bylaw that gives effect to and provides the legal instrument to implement the Policy. This Policy applies to all of Palmerston North City.

A key aim of the Policy is to explain Council’s approach to dog control to the community as well as providing a basis for internal operational policy and practice. It also indicates how Council will exercise its discretionary functions under the Act.

Every year the Council is required to report to the Department of Internal Affairs under Section 10A of the Act on the administration of its dog control policy and dog control practices as well as a variety of dog control related statistics. The 2016/17 report showed that:

- There are an increasing number of registered dogs (over 8,000 in 2016/17).
- There are a high number of complaints about roaming/uncontrolled dogs and barking dogs.
- While trends over the last six years show that there is a decreasing number of complaints about aggressive and rushing dogs, and dog attacks, there is still a need to minimise attacks and instances of intimidation.

Animal control activities are almost fully funded from registration fees and impoundment fees and charges. The Council’s animal control service is prioritised based on risk. Reports of dog attacks, and aggressive dogs receive an immediate response and are considered ‘priority one’ activities. Roaming dogs, barking dogs, preferred owner checks and unregistered dog checks are planned and carried out around the priority one activities.

An out of hours service for priority one activities is undertaken by a contractor on behalf of the Council. The Council also operates an animal pound within the City.

Council provides education through its Animal Control Team and through the provision of information on its website.
Summary of Legal Requirements for Dog Control

Dog Control Act 1996 - dog control is regulated by this Act that focuses on managing risk and enabling the Council to take action to mitigate unreasonable risk. The regime created by the Act is based on dog owners being responsible for the control of their dogs and complying with the Act. The Council’s role is to administer, implement and enforce the Act.

Dog Control Policy - explains Council’s approach to dog control to the community and provides the basis for internal operational policy and practices. The Policy indicates how Council exercises discretion under the Act (e.g. for neutering menacing dogs, determination of probationary owners) and covers mandatory requirements set out in Section 10 of the Act.

Dog Control Bylaw – gives effect to the Policy by specifying the legal requirements for the keeping of dogs in Palmerston North. The requirements are necessary to ensure compliance with the Dog Control Act 1996 and the Palmerston North Dog Control Policy 2011, and to give effect to the objectives of that Act and that Policy.
PART 1 INTRODUCTION

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Policy is to express how Palmerston North City Council will fulfil its responsibilities under the Dog Control Act 1996.

The Policy identifies areas where dogs are prohibited, where dogs must be controlled on a leash, areas where dogs can be exercised without being controlled on a leash, and where dogs are not prohibited or required to be controlled on a leash.

The Policy also outlines the obligations and responsibilities of dog owners.

2. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Policy are guided by Section 10 of the Dog Control Act and seek to:

(a) Minimise danger, distress and nuisance dogs may cause to the community generally;

(b) Avoid the inherent danger in allowing dogs to have uncontrolled access to public places that are frequented by children or other vulnerable members of the community, whether or not children might be accompanied by adults;

(c) Enable, as far as practicable, the public (including families) to use streets and public amenities without fear of attack or intimidation by dogs;

(d) Provide for the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners;

(e) Ensure dogs within the city boundary are registered and micro-chipped;

(f) Encourage responsible dog ownership so that owners take all reasonable steps to ensure that their dogs do not cause a nuisance to other people or other animals.

3. REVIEW

This Policy will be reviewed by 2023.

4. DEFINITIONS

All definitions used in this Policy are in Appendix One.
PART 2 ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

5. EFFECT OF POLICY

The Policy is given effect and implemented through the Palmerston North Dog Control Bylaw 2018.

6. NATURE AND APPLICATION OF DOG CONTROL BYLAW

Section 20 of the Act lists the matters for which bylaws may be made. The Council’s Dog Control Bylaw covers the following matters:

General control of dogs in public places including:
• exempting certain types of dogs (working and disability assist dogs) from control areas
• prohibiting dogs from specified public places
• requiring dogs to be on a leash in specified public places
• designating specified areas as dog exercise areas/off-leash areas

Keeping of dogs including:
• placing limitations on the number of dogs that may be kept on properties
• requirements for dogs to be kept a minimum distance from a boundary
• requirements to provide exercise, standards for the accommodation of dogs, confinement of bitches in season, responsibility to remove faeces, diseased dogs and dogs becoming a nuisance or injurious to health
• dogs not kept under proper control
• dogs classified as menacing must be neutered
• dog and owner education

Enforcement approach including:
• seizure of dogs in public places that are in contravention of the bylaw
• offences and penalties.

7. ENFORCEMENT TOOLS

There are a range of enforcement tools available to the Council including:
• Seizure of dog/s
• Issue of infringement notices and fines
• Prosecution with fines being possible
• Declaring a dog as menacing or dangerous
• Prohibiting people from owning dogs (disqualification)

Non-regulatory methods, such as education and a registration fee schedule that recognises responsible dog ownership, are also covered in this Policy.

8. SEIZURE OF DOGS

An Animal Control Officer or a Dog Ranger may seize and impound any dog at large in a public place in contravention of this Policy and in accordance with the powers contained in the Act.

9. INFRINGEMENT NOTICES

Infringement offences, with associated fines, are set by the Dog Control Act 1996. Council has no discretion to alter these fees.

Where, in the opinion of an Animal Control Officer, the keeping of dogs on a premises is, or is likely to become, a nuisance or injurious or hazardous to health, property or safety, the owner may be served with an infringement notice to:

(a) reduce the number of dogs on the premises,
(b) alter, reconstruct or improve the accommodation for dogs,
(c) require the dogs to be tied up or confined,
(d) take such other precautions as may be considered necessary.

10. DOGS CLASSIFIED AS MENACING MUST BE NEUTERED

Dogs classified by Palmerston North City Council as menacing under sections 33A or 33C of the Dog Control Act 1996, or any dog classified as menacing which is transferring to Palmerston North City Council, is required to be neutered.

11. DOG ATTACKS AND DANGEROUS DOGS

Dog attacks and dangerous dogs are responded to as an immediate priority. Animal Control Officers will conduct an investigation using best practice guidance.

12. BARKING DOGS

Council’s process for dealing with barking complaints is to determine if it is loud and persistent and is causing a nuisance. It will then take the appropriate action under the provisions of the Act.
13. **ROAMING DOGS**

Upon notification of a roaming or stray dog the Council will respond as soon as practical to locate the dog. If the dog is caught the Animal Control team will endeavour to reunit the dog with its owner. If this is unsuccessful the dog will be impounded. Frequent roaming will result in impoundment and further enforcement action.

14. **DOGS NOT KEPT UNDER PROPER CONTROL**

Dogs not kept under proper control may be required by the Council to be neutered or for owners to complete a dog obedience course approved by the Council. Notice that a dog is required to be neutered or complete an obedience course will be served on the owner.
PART 3 AREAS OF DOG CONTROL

15. CONTROL OF DOGS IN PUBLIC PLACES

Three categories of control areas in the City are identified:

(a) Prohibited Public Places
(b) Dog On Leash Areas
(c) Dog Exercise Areas

Dog owners must carry a leash at all times in all of the control areas as required by the Act. Dog owners must also carry a dog waste bag at all times in any of the control areas to collect and properly dispose of dog faeces in Council provided rubbish bins or at the owner’s premises.

In all public places where dogs are not prohibited or required to be on a leash, dogs must be under the control of their owners at all times. This means when referring to a dog, either controlled on a leash, or controlled by voice command where the dog obeys the commands of its controller without hesitation.

Control areas will be publicised through appropriate signage.

These control areas are shown on maps available on Council’s website: https://www.pncc.govt.nz/local-regulations-and-licences/dogs-and-other-animals/dogs/exercising-your-dog/.

16. PROHIBITED PUBLIC PLACES

16.1 Prohibited public places are locations in the City where dogs are not allowed at any time for a number of reasons, including in areas where:

(a) There is high density of pedestrian traffic where dogs may compromise the health, safety and comfort of people;
(b) Children or other vulnerable people gather or play, and the presence of dogs may pose a risk to their health and safety;
(c) It is a sensitive natural environment;
(d) The nature of the public place or facility makes it inappropriate to have dogs present.
16.2 Subject to clauses 16.3 and 16.4 and with the exception of working dogs, all dogs are prohibited from the following places:

(a) Any swimming pool or aquatic facility owned or controlled by the Council, including all areas within the fenced boundary of the swimming pool;

(b) Within 30 metres of any child’s play equipment or play area or paddling pool in any park or reserve, or of any aviary in any park or reserve;

(c) Palmerston North Holiday Park (the camping grounds);

(d) Any marked grass playing surfaces or artificial sports surfaces of sportsgrounds or sportsfields owned or controlled by the Council;

(e) *(deleted by amendment 23 September 2019)*

(f) The Council Crematorium and all Council Cemetery grounds;

(g) Memorial Park;

(h) The Ashhurst Domain Playground and adjacent picnic area;

(i) The Ashhurst Domain Wetlands Conservation Area;

(j) The central Victoria Esplanade area (which includes the children’s playground and paddling pool, the scenic railway station; Peter Black Conservatory, Central Energy Trust Wildbase Recovery Centre, aviary and the cafe, also known as Victoria House);

(k) The Junior Road Safety Park in the Victoria Esplanade;

(l) The walkway around the Awapuni racecourse between 5am and 10am daily;

(m) Turitea Controlled Water Catchment Area, subject to clause 16.5;

(n) Central Energy Trust Arena Manawatū.
16.3 Where the only pedestrian access to either the owner’s residence, or a veterinary surgery, is through a prohibited public place the owner may lead the dog through the prohibited public place provided that:

(a) the owner and dog take the most direct route across the prohibited public place, and
(b) the dog is controlled on a leash.

16.4 Where a dog is being exercised in a dog exercise area (as specified in clause 20) that borders a prohibited public place, the owner may lead the dog through the prohibited public place provided that:

(a) there is no reasonable alternative access, and
(b) the owner and dog take the most direct route across the prohibited public place, and
(c) the dog is controlled on a leash.

16.5 A dog may only be allowed within the Turitea Controlled Water Catchment Area if it is registered and under the control of a person holding a valid Hunting Permit issued by the Council for the Turitea Water Catchment Reserve, and subject to conditions the Council may apply to that Hunting Permit.

17. TEMPORARY PROHIBITED PUBLIC PLACES

Notwithstanding any provisions allowing for dog on leash areas or dog exercise areas, the Council may from time to time by resolution declare any public place that is not already a prohibited public place to be a prohibited public place for a specified time.

The Council will give public notice of its intention to declare any area to be a temporary prohibited public place specifying a reason. Appropriate signs shall be posted in the area and prior notice shall be published in a newspaper circulating in the District and on Council’s website.

18. TRIAL OF CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT AREA TO DOG ON LEASH CONTROL AREA (deleted by amendment 23 September 2019)

19. DOG ON LEASH AREAS

Dog on leash areas are locations where dogs are permitted on a leash in public places.
The owner of a dog (other than working dogs) shall not allow the dog on any public place (not being a prohibited public place or a dog exercise area) unless the dog is kept under control on a leash.

The following are public places in which dogs are to be kept under control on a leash:

(a) All streets, roads and footpaths within the District except those within prohibited areas or dog exercise areas;

(b) All parks, reserves and walkways within the District except those within prohibited areas or dog exercise areas;

(c) All public places within the Central Business District;¹

(d) The walkway around the Awapuni Racecourse except for the prohibited time between 5am and 10am daily;

(e) Ashhurst Domain Camping Grounds;

(f) Manawatū Riverside Walkway and Bridle Track between the Fitzherbert Bridge and the Palmerston North Holiday Park;

20. **DOG EXERCISE AREAS**

Dog Exercise areas are locations where dogs can be run at large, that is, off the leash but under the control of their owners at all times.

The ability to exercise dogs without a leash does not absolve owners from their obligations under the Act, to ensure their dog is kept under control, and to carry a leash at all times with the dog in a public place. Keeping a dog under control includes the obligation to ensure that the dog does not stray onto private property.

Dog Exercise Areas are generally recreational areas, such as parks, reserves and walkways, where people can expect to encounter dogs being exercised under proper control.

Council will review the need for specified dog exercise areas, including the provision of Dog Parks, and suitable locations, as necessary.

The following areas are dog exercise areas:

(a) Drainage Reserve area off Rugby Street;

¹ Inserted by amendment 23 September 2019.
(b) Ashhurst Terrace Walkway;
(c) Frederick Krull Reserve and Walkway;
(d) Schnell Wetland Walkway;
(e) Manawatū Riverside Walkway and Bridle Track excluding the section between the Fitzherbert Bridge and the Palmerston North Holiday Park;
(f) Mangaone Stream Walkway (except where it passes around the Awapuni Racecourse);
(g) Upper Celaeno Park (between Frederick Krull Reserve and Shakespeare Way);
(h) The Ruamahanga Wilderness area;
(i) Edwards Pit Park;
(j) Ahimate Reserve (previously Waitoetoe Park);
(k) Durham Street Park;
(l) Linklater Reserve (only the part open to the public);
(m) Awatea Terrace Reserve;
(n) "Railway" land, bounded by Pitt Street, Church Street, Pioneer Highway, and Cook Street (excluding the Skate Park that is defined as a play area under clause 16.2(a));
(o) Turitea Stream Esplanade Reserves (Green Corridors);
(p) The Upper Circuit of the Ashhurst Domain, except for those parts of the walkway which pass through Prohibited Public Places or Dog on Leash areas as designated in clauses 16 and 19 of this Policy.
(q) Summerhill Reserve
(r) Poutoa Walkway;
(s) Titoki Walkway;
(t) Pari Reserve and Walkway (previously known as Mangaotane);
21. CLASSIFICATION OF AREAS UNDER OTHER LEGISLATION

Access for dogs may be controlled by other legislation, for example the Conservation Act 1987 can declare any part or parts of land managed and administered by the Department of Conservation as “controlled dog areas” and “open dog areas”.

Dogs are not allowed in the Manawatū Gorge Scenic Reserve.
PART 4 DOG OWNERSHIP

22. RESPONSIBLE DOG OWNERSHIP

Dog owners have the following responsibilities:
- registering dog(s) and informing Council of any changes of address;
- keeping dog(s) under control at all times;
- ensuring dog(s) get care and attention, and has enough food, water, shelter and exercise;
- ensuring dog(s) do not disturb people with repeated barking or howling;
- ensuring dog(s) do not hurt, endanger or distress people, animals or protected wildlife;
- ensuring dog(s) do not damage or endanger property belonging to someone else;
- complying with the requirements of the Dog Control Act and all regulations and bylaws made under the Act;
- providing the Palmerston North City Council with details of dog(s) microchipping and neutering.

Dog owners should familiarise themselves with the Animal Welfare (Dogs) Code of Welfare 2010. The purpose of this code is to encourage all those responsible for dogs to adopt the highest standards of husbandry, care and handling.

23. PREFERRED OWNER SCHEME

To reward responsible dog ownership a dog owner may apply to the Council to be a preferred owner. Preferred owner status must be renewed each year and will qualify owners for a reduced dog registration fee.

Application to retain preferred owner status will be made using the registration fee demand. The application will be approved at the discretion of an Animal Control Officer, taking into account the following criteria:

(a) the previous ownership history of the applicant including registration compliance;

(b) an interview or completion of a self-administered test based on information contained in the Dog Owner’s Handbook (or both, at the discretion of the Animal Control Officer);
(c) the premises, inspected from time to time, where the dog is kept including approval of fencing, sleeping quarters and exercise space;

(d) There is access to a door on the property without your dog(s) being able to approach people when they enter.

Preferred owner status may be lost where any of the criteria is no longer met such as failing to register on time, repeated offences for roaming, and moving to a property without adequate fencing.

For more information refer to: https://www.pncc.govt.nz/local-regulations-and-licences/dogs-and-other-animals/dogs/preferred-owner-scheme/

24. REGISTRATION FEES

Dog registration fees are set annually by Council resolution. A schedule of fees for Dog Registration is available from the Customer Service Centre of the Council and is available on Council’s website.

Registration fees are issued before the end of each registration year (30 June) and shall take into account:

(a) the classification of the dog;

(b) number of dogs owned (see clause 26);

If the registration demand is unpaid by 1 August of any year 50% of the registration demand will be added to the fee;

If a preferred owner fails to pay the registration demand by 1 August of any year the registration fee will revert to the standard fee for the classification of the dog together with an additional 50% of the standard registration fee, and the owner will lose preferred owner status for that year.

The Council reserves the right to invoice a dog owner for the cost of registering any dog which is not validly registered by 1 August each year. Unpaid invoices may be subject to debt collection.

25. OTHER FEES

These fees are also set by Council resolution and include, but are not limited to:

(a) Impounding fees (set down under the Impounding Act 1955);
(b) Sustenance and board during period of impounding (set down under the Impounding Act 1955);

(c) Micro-chipping (set down under the Dog Control Act 1996).


26. CARE AND MANAGEMENT OF DOGS

26.1 Number

No more than two dogs may be kept on premises of less than 2000m², provided that not more than one unspayed bitch may be kept on the property. The number of dogs on a property does not include dogs under the age of three months.

26.2 Housing

Dogs shall not be housed, confined or restrained within 1.8 metres of a boundary fence.

Dogs must be provided with adequate accommodation, for example a kennel on a hard surface or access to the interior of a building with adequate sleeping area at night.

26.3 Exercise

Owners must provide their dogs with adequate exercise. An in-season bitch must be confined but adequately exercised.

26.4 Removal of faeces

Owners must remove their dog’s faeces from public land or premises other than that occupied by the owner.

Dogs suffering from an infectious disease must not be taken into any public place or allowed to wander free.

27. EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

All owners are expected to plan and prepare for the care and welfare of their dog(s) in anticipation of an emergency. While a state of emergency is in place dog owners must:
(a) Keep their dogs under effective control at all times;
(b) Ensure their dog does not injure, endanger or cause distress to any person.
28. **EXEMPTIONS**

An owner may apply to the Council for an exemption from the requirements of clauses 26.1 (multiple dog permit) and 26.2 (housing permit).

The Council may grant an exemption for a specified duration under clause 26 provided that -

(a) there is insufficient space on the property to house, confine or restrain the dog in accordance with clause 26.2, and

(b) the neighbour whose boundary adjoins the proposed area for housing, restraining or confining the dog does not object on reasonable grounds to the granting of an exemption, and

(c) the Council may impose such conditions as may be necessary to ensure compliance with this Policy, the Dog Control Act and for the avoidance of nuisance.

29. **DOG AND OWNER EDUCATION**

The Council encourages dog owners to attend dog obedience courses, particularly puppy training classes, to assist in the training and socialisation of dogs.

The Council may from time to time, by resolution, approve education programmes for dogs and their owners.

30. **PROBATIONARY OWNER’S EDUCATION**

Where a person is convicted of any offence (not being an infringement offence) under the Act or any offence under the Animal Welfare Act 1999, Conservation Act 1987 or National Parks Act 1980 the Council may classify that person as a probationary owner.

If a person is classified as a probationary owner under the Act the Council will require the person to undertake a dog owner education programme or dog obedience course approved by the Council. The probationary owner will be notified in writing of the obligation to attend the programme or course.

The probationary owner will undertake the programme or course at his or her own expense.

The Council shall be furnished with satisfactory evidence of completion of the programme or course. The probationary owner may apply for termination of classification as a probationary owner six months after completion of the programme or course provided that the applicant has
not committed any further offences or infringements to which section 21 of the Act applies.

The Council shall consider the application for removal of classification as probationary owner in accordance with this Policy, including all the relevant circumstances of the applicant as a dog owner and may, at its discretion terminate the classification.
APPENDIX ONE

DEFINITIONS

Except as described below all definitions used in the Policy are the same as those contained in the Dog Control Act 1996 and amendments.

**Act** means the Dog Control Act 1996.

**Bylaw** means the Palmerston North Dog Control Bylaw 2018.

**Central Business District** means from the mid-line of the road reserve for the roads that form the Inner Ring Road, namely the area bounded by and including from the intersection of Grey and Princess St along Princess Street, to the intersection with Ferguson Street, along Ferguson Street to the intersection with Pitt Street, along Pitt Street and Bourke Street to the intersection of Bourke and Walding Streets, along Walding Street and Grey Street to the intersection with Grey and Princess Streets.

**Council** means the Palmerston North City Council.

**Disability assist dog** means a dog defined as a disability assist dog under the Dog Control Act 1996 and specifically includes a dog certified by one of the following organizations as being a dog trained to assist (or as being a dog in training to assist) a person with a disability:

(a) Hearing Dogs for Deaf People New Zealand

(b) Mobility Assistance Dogs Trust

(c) New Zealand Epilepsy Assist Dogs Trust

(d) Royal New Zealand Foundation of the Blind

(e) An organisation specified in an Order in Council made under section 76D of the Dog Control Act 1996.

**District** means the area within the territorial boundary of the Palmerston North City Council.

**Dog Exercise Area** means a public place identified in this Policy as an area where dogs may be exercised at large without being controlled on a leash. Dogs must still be under control within Dog Exercise Areas.

**Dog on Leash Area** means the areas identified in this Policy where dogs must be controlled on a leash.

**Leash** means a lead which is capable of restraining the dog.
Nuisance means anything which interferes with or threatens the health or enjoyment of people, and in this context may involve things such as barking, causing distress via intimidating behaviour (such as aggressive barking or rushing), or attacking people, wildlife or other animals.

Policy means the Dog Control Policy.

Premises includes any recreation ground, yard, building or enclosed space whether separately occupied or not and whether public or private.

Prohibited Public Place means a public place identified in this Policy as a place where dogs are prohibited, except as provided for in this Policy or the Act.

Public Place has the same meaning as in section 2 of the Dog Control Act 1996, and generally means a place that is open to the public whether or not it is private property.

Under control means, when referring to a dog, either controlled on a leash, or controlled by voice command where the dog obeys the commands of its controller without hesitation. Keeping a dog under control includes the obligation to ensure that the dog does not stray onto private property.

Working Dog means a dog defined as a working dog under the Dog Control Act 1996, and specifically includes:

(a) any disability assist dog;

(b) Any dog –

i. Kept by the Police or any constable, the Customs department, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Fisheries or the Ministry of Defence, or any officer or employee of any such Department of State solely or principally for the purposes of carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Police or the Department of State or that constable, officer, or employee; or

ii. Kept solely or principally for the purposes of herding or driving stock; or

iii. Kept by the Department of Conservation or any officer or employee of that Department solely or principally for the purposes of carrying out the functions, duties, and powers of that Department; or

iv. Kept solely or principally for the purposes of destroying pests or pest agents under any pest management strategy under the Biosecurity Act 1993; or

v. Kept by the Department of Corrections or any officer or employee of that Department solely or principally for the purposes of carrying out the functions, duties, and powers of that Department; or

vi. Kept by the Aviation Security Service established under section 72B(2)(ca) of the Civil Aviation Act 1990, or any officer or employee of
that Service solely or principally for the purposes of carrying out the functions, duties, and powers of that Service; or
vii. Certified for use by the Direction of Civil Defence Emergency Management for the purposes of carrying out the functions, duties, and powers conferred by the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002; or
viii. Owned by a security guard as defined in section 4 of the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act 1974 and kept solely or principally for the purposes of carrying on the business of a security guard; or
ix. Declared by a resolution of the territorial authority to be a working dog for the purposes of this Act, or any dog of a class so declared by the authority, being a dog owned by any class of persons specified in the resolution and kept solely or principally for the purposes specified in the resolution.
**COMMENTS RECEIVED THROUGH COUNCIL’S WEBSITE – ON-LINE FORM ON TRIAL**

**Positive/supportive comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM 8 - ATTACHMENT 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|Living closer to the CBD I love walking my furbaby at night-time as my work hours prevent me from doing it in daylight. So with the square so bright and glorious it is quite safe and olie dog just loves the sights n smells and its not so noisy and busy for him.

My only concern was getting verbally abused by the street/homeless peeps telling me off for having my dog in town...also is there designated poop bag dispensers anywhere in town...like along the river walk...I do have some but it would be handy if we have an extra accident.

I love seeing dogs in the CBD. All the dogs I have seen have been sensible and well controlled. Seeing dogs out and adds joys to my shopping/lunch/errand running activities! I hope it continues past the trial phase! Also if Bunnings can be pet friendly I think the CBD can be pet friendly!

Allowing dogs in the CBD is amazing! I’ve walked my dog there heaps and have had lots of people stop for pats. I love being able to walk him there

I am not a dog owner, but I think it is a good idea to have dogs on leashes in the city. Gives me a chance to pat one! Another suggestion is to have a permanent dog park/fenced off area on the railway land. Like the dog parks they have in New York City. Where dogs and owners can play and socialise. A great idea and lots of fun.

Love it so far! All the dogs and owners seem very well behaved.

Seems ok

I am thrilled with this initiative. I have not seen or experienced any problems with dogs in the CBD & I thoroughly support the idea of making this a permanent thing - I have occasionally taken my son’s dog with me into town to enjoy sitting outside for a café lunch and met with nothing but positive comments and smiles. Since I can already take her with me to Terrace End for the same purpose it is lovely to also be able to do it in the central part of town. Well trained dogs on a leash are an asset to the cityscape, friendly animals enhance our sense of wellbeing and seeing dogs being well cared for and enjoyed is good role modelling for children to see.

Awesome move and I see no issue. Council just has to manage those negative residents who will complain just because they can.

Can’t say I’ve noticed any difference. I have always taken my dog for evening walks on a leash into the CBD. I always pick up any mishaps. Haven’t noticed any increase in “unattended” dog shit in the CBD. My dog is always on a leash - I don’t think it’s appropriate for dogs to be off leash there. On leash is fine.

I say it is Great and about time that this was available. Visitors and locals will use the coffee shops and other areas etc, more so if their dogs are accepted also. It gives a friendlier feel to the city. Companion dogs are important to lonely people and this opens up their life for people who live alone. They are able to go for coffee alone and still feel comfortable. They have company which connects with other people. They make friends. I come from Howick [Auckland] and it is great to see the interaction of dogs with children & adults. Coffee shops give biscuits and have water for the dogs. Helps the business. Dogs can travel on buses also re: driver’s ok. When we travel through the country a few towns have the old rule “No Dogs” and I can understand that they don’t want working dogs in town but the companion dogs are like family members and are different. My friends don’t hang around these towns for long. The area in the Esplanade, Coffee shop also needs to be looked at, as customers are not able to take their dogs there, but outside the fence, dogs are ok. Strange rule. [council land] Needs looking at. This does hurt the business.

It’s so lovely to see dogs around the CBD! I hope it becomes permanent :)
Absolutely amazing idea! Our dog is like another member of our family, and we love to take her everywhere! And she loves to be with people, so I don’t see why well trained, obedient dogs shouldn’t be allowed in the CBD. Hope this trial continues on to be permanent.

Yes I love it. I was so happy to find out taking my pup into the square to watch the music few months back was great. He was leashes and everyone got to say hello because he’s so cute. It was good to see other dogs and their owners being responsible! Please keep it I think it’s a great idea !!

I think that this would be a marvellous idea to better Palmerston North, but I know that there would be people who would object to this, I understand that dogs are really messy, and the owners would have to pick up their dogs poop, which some people (unfortunately) don’t. So I think that this trial would be a good idea, to see how the people of Palmerston North would respect this bit of freedom to bring their dogs to the square.

"It's been absolutely fantastic dogs have been allowed back into the CBD. I have spoken to a few dog owners around the city in passing, they are really excited that this change has allowed them to visit more in the city. One owner even said that he hasn't walked the inner streets for years because he wasn't allowed to with his dog in tow!

if people are allowed, why not dogs. it is about respect for animals

I took my two small dogs to the square for a play while I had family staying. I found it to be a great experience. I loved that doggy doodoo bags were available for free, I needed one in the end and I could dispose of it too. I noticed other dogs visiting too and we stopped to talk to the other dogs and their owners...such a doggy social thing to do. The shade of the trees was lovely too, we humans and pooches both had shade. From Marion Lulu and Charlie

if people are allowed, why not dogs. it is about respect for animals. why not have stickers in shop windows showing pet friendly shops to save the dog and the owner the indignity of being evicted. veterinarians should not be permitted to take part in any discussion because it is obviously vested interest, just like microchipping and de-sexing of cats. cats have rights too - despite efforts to microchip - are cats allowed on a leash. liberate the library and council building - lead by example.

As a newcomer to Palmerston North, I was delighted to find that I could bring my dog with me to the CBD.

As my constant companion, it's wonderful to be able to bring him with me especially to the square and not have to leave him at home all the time.

To be able to sit at a cafe and have him with me is something that is so common overseas and yet in NZ most CBDs still don't allow this. So well done PNCC for this initiative,

The health (and social) benefits have been widely publicised and I hope that this practice continues beyond the trial.

I do not own a dog yet, but I think being allowed to bring your dogs into the CBD is a welcome approach to making our CBD more inclusive. However, we want our dog owners to be responsible - ie making sure their canines are well-behaved, esp towards other dogs, children and traffic. And pick up their dog’s poop as well! Please! Bad enough on the burbs outside my house - big poop, little poop. Yuck! I am not willing to step outside barefoot on grass anymore.

Likewise, I think a lot of our locals should be educated re the common etiquette with animals - do not assume that it is OK to pet someone's dog unless permission is sought (and given). Do not assume that it is ok to let your dog 'roam' and that your dog is always 'well-behaved' when you are not looking.

I also think it is NOT ok for dogs to be allowed into food areas (e.g. inside a restaurant) but outside seating should be ok unless it is a service dog.

I think if both sides - dog owners and those who have little or not experience (including those who do not like dogs) - are willing to be tolerant and educated, it should work

Very good initiative to reward responsible owners and their dogs. I enjoy seeing people out walking their dogs!

I think this is a great initiative. it should be coupled with initiatives from local vets on the importance of microchipping, desexing and vaccinating as well as local dog training groups. Good ownership.
promotion should be central to this initiative. It is important to change the stereotypes that are ingrained into palmy. Bad owners not bad dogs.

Seems to be going really well. Nice to see a move towards the more dog friendly laws of European countries.

Great idea for the dogs and the owners, if the owner is responsible for the dog then why not have your dogs enjoy the CBD.

It is great to finally be able to walk through the CBD with a dog.

This seems to be working fine. The sceptics are not knee-deep in dog poo as they thought they would be! Let’s make it permanent

love this initiative. Dogs are part of the family and should be viewed as such. As long as people clean up after their dogs there is absolutely no issue.

Yes! Leashed dogs should be allowed everywhere!

Very positive -- It gives people an extra reason to be in the Square, leading to an increase in vibrancy and activity, and I expect better business for nearby shop owners. I walk through the Square regularly and have never seen dog droppings left.

I think it’s a wonderful idea

Love it. The way a society treats its pets is a good measure of that society. I’d like to see dogs more accepted everywhere.

I think it’s a fantastic idea and that it should continue.

It’s been amazing for my family and dog to be able to go to the CBD. It has helped him become calmer around “exciting”, busier places and helped us tremendously. He has been 100% fine and simply walks with us without bothering anyone. He just wants to sniff the stinky nooks and crannies of the street and he’s happy!

Love it the fact dogs are allowed in the CBD. As long as the dogs are well behaved its a great place for training.

Love it! Dogs should be allowed anywhere public

It’s been so great being able to bring my dog into town! The Square is such a gorgeous space and being able to bring my best lil bud there is awesome.

Awesome. Keep it going. Our dogs should be allowed everywhere!!

We love being able to bring our little boy into town with us, it’s great! With the new dog park, Palmy is such a dog friendly city which suits us really well.

This is a great initiative. It has encouraged my family to visit the square and George st a lot more often and we enjoy sitting outside the local cafes with our morning coffee after a walk with out dog.

We love that we can walk into town and have breakfast with our dog with us. Been great being able to sit in the square with my dog while partner just gets a few things.

Its going great thanks, being able to take the my dog to places with crowds of people like the square and Broadway is great for her training. Teaching her to pay attention to me, and not others etc.

Even just being able to take her when we go to drop my partner off at the intercity bus stop, is really nice. Hope it becomes permanent, Thanks

This is excellent and should be permanently implemented!

I’ve taken my two dogs into the square once...i had my family on holiday here so it really was a pleasant whanau experience. We sat under the trees and chilled on the bean bags and spoke with other dog owners. It was nice to be able to bring the dogs with us.

Really enjoyed walking my dog around the square. Think it’s a great idea 😊

It’s great, safe, friendly and social to let dogs in the centre city! Let’s keep it up and make it permanent

I find this trail to be of great benefit for both dog and owners alike. Dogs get to socialise more with other dogs and owners get to chat to like minded people in a beautiful setting. I have made more like
minded friends thanks to this trial. Thank you very much PNCC, this is such a very good initiative Do hope this trial becomes permanent.

Please keep dogs being allowed in the CBD, permanently. It’s a great concept and we love it.

I think it’s amazing to be able to take my small dog with me. Being from rural Woodville when we head to Palmerston it usually a day trip and if I couldn’t have my Chihuahua with Marci wouldn’t be shopping in the CBD as not willing to leave her in the car. Thanks

I think this has been great! I try to take my dog everywhere, it’s good for him and it seems to uplift people when they see him. I agree that people are shifting towards more dog friendly areas. I work in the vet industry and it’s something I constantly hear about from clients. This is a good change.

Really love seeing people with their dogs in the city. Hope we can encourage more. I’ve seen over and over the dog’s bringing people together. They become a connection point, a conversation starter. It’s just lovely to see. The other day I saw a young Man stopping his walk to allow an older woman to introduce her nervous but curious grandchild to his dog. He actually doubled back and crouched down and waited patiently for the child to approach and stroke the dog carefully. How wonderful for young Man, older woman, child and dog alike.

Dogs on leads, and with owners picking up - no problem at all.

This has been one of the most positive initiatives the council have done in a very long time. Allowing our dogs to be with us has benefited us as dog owners, plus the general public who get to see or interact with us and our dogs when out walking. I have truly loved seeing Balanced K9 (Sam and Rachel) bringing their large packs thru the city. They get a lot of attention but give back so much to those of us who stop to chat or just watch them in action. To be honest, there is noting more pleasurable than sitting having a cuppa on a sunny day in the CBD with our dogs.

Great the council is trialling dogs in CBD up to owners to make it work by following the rules.

I have enjoyed walking my dog in town a few times. One sunny morning we had an iced coffee and cake outside the French bakery and shared the space with an early morning cycling group all my age and retired. Both puppies could be socialised too at different times. I’d like the trial to be made permanent please.

Love that the dogs are allowed in the CBD. We have only taken ours once but it was quite lovely. As long as the dogs are on a lead then that is no issue

Love having dogs in the CBD area and cafes have been welcoming - only comment is that several owners do NOT heed the "short leash" rule and this should be enforced with a fine. I would recommend that signs be placed that extendable leashes are not allowed, because this is most definitely happening!

100% for it! This is good. Not everyone has friends, sometimes their pet is their best friend. Being able to chill in town and enjoy pooches comfort helps those who aren’t that extroverted and social. May even provide health benefits for those people. No issues, however there should be penalties for those owners who are irresponsible and don’t keep their poosches under control.

We love it! Pippy is doing here CGC training and it is great. Always on lead and never approaches people….but we love people coming to say hi and make friends.

With nicer weather on the way….after a walk around the square …we can relax and have a pappuccino before heading off to Animates to shop.

(Yes, pappuccino is a real thing 😊)

Really hope you let this continue….we are no where as annoying as street kids n drunks on Fri/Sat night…. I know as I did volunteer work for years with them.

This has been a great idea. As a resident I believe it should be allowed to bring your dog within this area as long as it is leashed and under control. The areas to walk your dogs are becoming less and less. Thanks for all the work you guys and girls do!

I think it’s great being able to take our dog in the square. We play Pokemon and it’s nice to be able to gather in the square with others and have our dog with us. Please let us keep this in the future
I really love being able to walk my dogs in town. Great move :)
Hopefully the trial gets to become a permanent thing.

The trial has been a great opportunity for us to give our dog extra mental stimulation, and to extend our walking opportunities. I’ve experienced no issues with poor, antisocial dogs or bad behaviour from humans and dogs alike. I’d love for this to be made a permanent privilege for dog owners to take their friends out and about!

I think it’s great to have dogs in CBD. Gives a more community feel.

Love being able to bring my dog with me coming into town. All dogs I’ve seen in the CBD have been well behaved. Great initiative. Long may it continue.

It has been great with being able to take my dog into the city centre, around the shops and green space has been able to encourage going into the city centre more as it is easier with being able to take my dog out for a small walk in the square. Also seeing others being able to bring their dogs out.

This trial has been amazing! It is so nice to have responsible dog owners no longer be punished by irresponsible ones and can finally include their dog on-leash in the CBD. It is so nice to see dogs at The Square, and have never seen dog poop left anywhere. I go to more events in The Square because I can bring my dog now, and always getting a child or adult ask me if they can pat my friendly dog is very nice. Please make this trial a permanent bylaw!

It’s great to be able to walk completely round the city with my dog and have the freedom to take into the CBD, it would help to have a few dispensers of Dog bags so that I don’t have to carry my own as you never know how many you may go through on a walk.

I think this has been great! I try to take my dog everywhere, it’s good for him and it seems to uplift people when they see him. I agree that people are shifting towards more dog friendly areas. I work in the vet industry and it’s something I constantly hear about from clients. This is a good change.

Really love seeing people with their dogs in the city. Hope we can encourage more. I’ve seen over and over the dog’s bringing people together. They become a connection point, a conversation starter. It’s just lovely to see. The other day I saw a young Man stopping his walk to allow an older woman to introduce her nervous but curious grandchild to his dog. He actually doubled back and crouched down and waited patiently for the child to approach and stroke the dog carefully. How wonderful for young man, older woman, child and dog alike.

Please keep dogs being allowed in the CBD, permanently. It’s a great concept and we love it.

I think it’s amazing to be able to take my small dog with me. Being from rural Woodville when we head to Palmerston its usually a day trip and if I couldn’t have my Chihuahua with Marcì wouldn’t be shopping in the cbd as not willing to leave her in the car. Thanks.
Opposing comments

The CBD should be kept free from dogs. My reason is this. People come into the Square to meet up with friends or meet up with people for lunch or just socialising. We want to be able to sit down on the grass or under the tree without having to sit on dog urine or watch dogs doing a number 2 on the grass, and some of the owners are careless and won't pick up after their dogs. We want to enjoy sitting outside a café without having dog hair flying around and landing on our food or dealing with smelly dogs. I am just saying I think the CBD should just be kept dog free, because the council has offered other areas for dogs to go and play. I have dogs, but I don't think the CBD is an area to be bringing them.

My issue is with pet dogs are often untrained in basic commands. Sit stay and down. Get nippy around wheelchairs [especially dogs who chase push bikes and cars] Had that happen with being in the street in wheelchair. Hazards if on street café tables. Who's picking up the poos, or enforcing those who don't. Leaving it for people to stand/wheel through it Where as working dogs are generally under control at all times. I personally have had dogs and grown up with working dogs [sheep dogs guide dogs and assistant dogs]

I do not think dogs in the CBD is a good idea. I am quite frightened of dogs and was walking back from lunch along George street and there was a dog not on a leash walking (admittedly he was next to his owner) but it still frightened me.

This does put me off going into town at lunch time and I worry that the boutique style shops on George street will suffer.

Also there is an impact on those allergic to dogs and small children.

Caller does not think there should be dogs in the square as their doggy do does not get picked up.

"My son (3.5) was barked and lunged at by a dog. It wasn't in an aggressive way, more a playful way which is why I didn't report it to animal control but my son is young and it scared him silly. He now no longer wants to go into the square and if we do we will flat out refuse to walk and I have to carry him right through.

Dogs don't need to go everywhere and some places should remain a safe space for our young people. People have shown time and time again that there are terribly irresponsible owners around and now they are allowed in the cbd. I realize not all owners are irresponsible and it's likely a small percentage, however this trial has opened up the way for those irresponsible ones to enter the cbd now. This trial is the worst thing to have happen to the cbd and"

No dogs at all please

Dogs should not be allowed in the CBD under any circumstances. Some people do not like to be approached by dogs. It is not right that a minority of people who are dog owners should be allowed to undertake an activity that has negative effects on other people.

I love dogs but I'm not keen on dogs in the city centre. You're taking away car parks so it is crazy enough with foot traffic during events or busy holidays. The last thing we need is to dodge dogs too.

I am a dog owner and I don't think the CBD is a place for dogs even if they are on a lead. I walk my dogs regularly and I see all too often dog poo on the pavements or grass verges. While most dog owners are responsible there are still many who are not. It's lovely to have a place to walk around that isn't littered with dog poo.

"Please, no dogs. They foul the streets, regardless of being on leads or not and unfortunately many owners are not responsible.

Also, with motorised scooters, kids on scooters, tricycles and everything else on the footpaths, dogs are just one more hazard too many."

"NO why on a beautiful sunny day, when I sit down on the grass in the square would I want to sit on a dogs urine patch or remnants of dog shit smeared in the grass when it's been attempted to be picked up. My young children also don't like dogs so why should they be scared that dogs could run at them to sniff or lick them as their owner walks by."
I think it’s a very idea that you allow dogs in the square. We live dogs and have a couple but honestly we have a daughter that is absolutely terrified of dogs she has come along way but that is her fear so I used to enjoy taking her to the square now she fears it. I think there is plenty of parks and places to go too but allowing them in the square isn’t great

I can’t take my kids into this public space with animals large enough to bite them

No to dogs in the CBD. Plenty of other places for dogs to go. Which Councillor gets sacked first when some out of control pitbull bites a kids cheek off?

I have just seen this for the 1st time I am against this, like someone has already stated there is enough places for owners to walk their dogs, one of my children is absolutely scared of dogs big and small she is already restricted at parks because of dogs everywhere and now this just limits her even more from going out, and I understand there will be rules set in place but a lot of places we have been to where no dogs allowed or dogs on leashes are not followed and whose there at those times? No one! and by then my child is upset and everyone has to leave and this has happened More than once

I will not be bringing my kids into the city centre often if dogs will be allowed across the square etc. I am fearful of dogs having had numerous experiences with them which have left me scared. I also do not wish to have my kids walking through town with all the possible outcomes - no dog or child is ever trustworthy.

I think there is so many issues in Palmerston North that resources can go to. The council have already have spent money on a park for dogs why do they need the CBD. I would make an exception for disability dogs. To me it looks like the council is catering for a very small minority in Palmerston North. It would be better if they spent time and resources on human social issue e.g. poverty. Also, there are people with a fear of dogs. Are they consulted?

Far too many dogs are not on leash and the mess isn’t being cleaned up by some owners

I don’t see the point of dogs in town, how does it benefit the dog? Next thing they will be allowed in the Plaza, shops and cafes. Not all owners will pick up their poo, how disgusting that will be in the square and on the street. And what if a dog attacks someone! It’s bad enough people take dogs to markets (again what’s the point). And how is it going to be policed? I really can’t imagine council staff actively monitoring the rules are being adhered to.

I feel there are plenty of recreational areas around town So there is not a great need to allow dogs within the CBD unless they are required for mobility. The mobility restriction also comes with a higher training requirement for the animals. In most other cases people can be really emotionally attached but not that stringent on the training aspect. So those dogs that haven’t had a certain level of training still instinctively approach people who actually might not like dogs. I myself come from a farming family and like dogs for work and outside recreation but I wouldn’t take them to the square where there are public events, food outlets and unrestrained open spaces that can be highly populated because it’s so easy to offend someone these days.

I don’t think it’s necessary to have dogs in the square. Next thing they will be allowed in cafes and restaurants. It’s bad enough seeing dog poo on our lovely new bridge and walkways we don’t need to see it in the square as well.

Dogs not needed in the CBD. We do not need dog poo on the foot paths or dog leads wrapped around our ankles. Owners do not clean up dog urine from the post and walking areas. Many small children are threatened by the presence of a dog. People should not have to weave their way around a dog tied to a cafe chair to gain entry to the cafe. The city has many places for dogs and dog exercise. Dogs are lovely animals but they are not needed in the CBD.

My vote is for no dogs in the square.

The square is now littered with dog poo. Its disgusting. Makes me not want to go to the square anymore. You obviously don’t have small children who are petrified of dogs. Put yourself in their shoes.
Dogs should not be allowed in the square. This is the one safe place that is green and open in the CBD that my children who are semi afraid of dogs can go without worry. The amount of piss stains and dog poo that I have seen over the past two months does not make me want to sit down anywhere! This would limit my attending public events too. Leave the square for humans.

I am scared of dogs and hate the thought of being in the square and finding any kind of dog there - in Europe they are all tiny, harmless, well behaved dogs... not the mongrel gang fighting dogs we have here. I think it's super unnecessary - there are SO many places you can take your dog in Palmy and it's not like they can go in shops so I really really fail to see why this is remotely necessary. Why allow this for a few people who want to do it when most don't? Even many dog owners don't think this is necessary! Please listen to the majority here!!

Keep the dogs out of the square!! I see poo often in the square not to mention the PEE MARKS!! All over walls seats etc. I have two large breed dogs and I'm not for it.. The amount of owners who can barely control their dogs ON a leash is ridiculous. Thanks

I don't like this idea. I walk through the Square every day and notice Dog pooh and let's be honest here, there are plenty of dog parks around why can't we just leave the CBD alone, especially the Square. Come to Christmas in the Square and New years Eve the ground will be covered in dog pooh. Can you please just leave the CBD alone.

No I don't think so not in the square I'm a dog lover and have two dogs but I think there is enough parks and places to walk with dogs I also think dogs shouldn't be allowed in Bunnings/Mitre 10 etc some kids are afraid. There is a lot of family things in the square and I just think dogs shouldn't be allowed here

Please do not let this become permanent. I have a horrific fear of dogs and the CBD used to be one of the few places in the city where I can feel free from fear. During the trial I have been highly anxious. Please, I beg you, please reconsider. I can't go to parks. I can't walk around my neighbourhood. Yet I used to be able to go to town. There are plenty of places people can take their dogs.

I fail to see why there needs to be dogs in the CBD. People cannot take there dogs in the shops or into work so there is no need to have them in the CBD. People do take their children to the shops though and it is one more risk to watch out for young children while trying to navigate young children round people and cars you now need to keep them away from dogs often at eye level with the child. As all by laws there will be people that push the boundaries, the result of these boundaries being pushed will be dogs off leash (I am walker and a rarely see any one obeying the dogs on leash signs ) dog faeces will be left there is no maybe about that, once again my children will take second place to the rights of dogs to be in the square.

Julie Davis

I may be a lone voice in the wind, but I would like for the prohibition on dogs to return at the conclusion of the trial. I admit to being averse to dogs, and it feels that there are few places to go that are dog-free. Especially when there are numerous dog owners who ignore or are uninformed about either the prohibited areas, or the leash rules. I avoid places like the Sledge Track because, despite signs, people let their dogs off the leash. The Gorge walk is better, at least the people who miss the no dogs signs seem to keep their dogs leashed. It was mentioned that other towns allow dogs in the centre, but it was a positive point of difference that Palmerston North's CBD was dog free. I live near the central city, and work in the CBD, walking to work each day. My quality of life has diminished because of the presence of dogs in areas that used to be dog-free, but also because of numbers of dog owners who have their dogs in the CBD on those long, unwinding leashes, or not on leashes at all. Dog owners seem very passionate about how wonderful their pets are, but I feel uncomfortable around them. Having dogs sniffing me, leaping at me, charging at me barking, is not pleasant. As I said, I realise that my submission may well be in the minority, but there are already so many places for dog owners to let their pets out, it would be great if the central city returned to the peace and calm of being dog free.

Thank you
I do not like dogs at cafes and I don’t particularly like dogs in the city centre. I am a dog lover but believe there is a place for dogs and that’s not the city centre. I have seen dogs walking through town when it is busy with their tails between their legs and believe nervous dogs are capable of doing things they wouldn’t normally do. I’d hate to see an incident where a member of the public, especially a child, is hurt.

While in the square I saw a guy with a Pitbull or Pitbull Cross. He had the dog on a lead, then unleashed it & let it run. It ran towards the bus stop where people & children were, scaring a few people.

I don’t see the point of dogs in town, how does it benefit the dog? Next thing they will be allowed in the Plaza, shops and cafes. Not all owners will pick up their poo, how disgusting that will be in the square and on the street. And what if a dog attacks someone? It’s bad enough people take dogs to markets (again what’s the point). And how is it going to be policed? I really can’t imagine council staff actively monitoring the rules are being adhered to.

Far too many dogs are not on leash and the mess isn’t being cleaned up by some owners.

### Neutral/other comments

I am neither here nor there on the status of the trial, I however think that canines have free reign over most of the city so I don’t see the need for them to be in the square. I have also not seen a great amount of dogs to warrant continuing the dogs in the square. I do appreciate dogs and I do love being able to pet safe ones in the square.

Not enough photos of Freddie in the promo material = -100% engagement rate.

Vet observation here - A good number of people do not realise their dogs are not allowed on extendable leashes in the CBD area and do not understand the meaning of a short leash. Should dogs be permanently allowed in the CBD, I do suggest that if PNCC do put signs up that say or depict “leashed area only - 1.2m leash” or similar (perhaps you can use the dog leash signs that you already have a long the Bridle Track but put 1.2m along the length of the leash in the picture). Thanks for taking the time to run the trial.

Consistently find doggie do when out walking along Te Awe Awe, Pahiatua, The Lagoon, Ihaka, Albert streets.

I walk from Pascal Street to the Square on a regularly and the area of the CBD is fine but in the last week in Pascal Street and Cuba Street there seems to be more dog poo on the footpaths, irresponsible owners not cleaning up after their dogs. Unfortunately I never see the owners so cannot provide any more details about the dogs or owners.

I am neither here nor there on the status of the trial, I however think that canines have free reign over most of the city so I don’t see the need for them to be in the square. I have also not seen a great amount of dogs to warrant continuing the dogs in the square. I do appreciate dogs and I do love being able to pet safe ones in the square.
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RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL


1. ISSUE

The Dog Control Act 1996 ("the Act") requires Council’s to produce an annual report on the administration of its dog control policy and practices. This is the Palmerston North City Council report for the 2018/19 year.

2. BACKGROUND

The Act requires the following information to be provided:

(a) the number of registered dogs in the territorial authority district;

(b) the number of probationary owners and disqualified owners in the territorial authority district;

(c) the number of dogs in the territorial authority district classified as dangerous;

(d) the number of dogs in the territorial authority district classified as menacing;

(e) the number of infringement notices issued by the territorial authority;
(f) the number of dog related complaints received by the territorial authority in the previous year and the nature of those complaints; and,

(g) the number of prosecutions taken by the territorial authority under this Act.

Attached is the report on Council’s administration of its Dog Control Policy and practices for 2018/19.

The number of complaints or investigations continued to trend down. The number of reported dog attacks decreased by 23% from last year and is 14% below the five-year average. A third of the attacks were on people, 38% on other dogs and 29% on other animals. The most significant source of complaint was in relation to roaming or uncontrolled dogs (45%) followed by barking dogs (20%). The number of barking dog complaints received by Council decreased by 36% from the previous year to continue the downward trend.

During the year the following service improvements were made:

- The Senior Animal Control Officer position was reviewed and changed to Team Leader Animal Management and Education to reflect the increased focus on compliance and education.
- A Kennel Manager was employed and commenced on 29 April 2019. This has enabled improved assessment of the health and wellbeing of dogs and the development of individual food plans based on size and condition. All dogs are now provided with adequate daily exercise. Scales were procured to enable dogs to be weighed to assess and monitor their condition on entry and whilst in the Pound.
- Improvements at the Pound have been made to ventilation, heating, bedding, access to exercise, drainage, cleaning and hygiene, storage of chemicals and bird-proofing. Remodelling has been carried out to create three pens for extra large dogs. Security cameras providing coverage of all internal areas and the Pound surrounds have been installed.
- Neighbourhood surveys have been introduced to assist resolving barking dog complaints. There are often difficulties obtaining evidence of loud and persistent barking. Obtaining information from a neighbourhood provides a more complete picture of each situation to better inform compliance action.

It is particularly pleasing to note that customer satisfaction with the animal control service increased for very satisfied from 64% to 80% and decreased for very dissatisfied from 6% to less than 2%.

3. **NEXT STEPS**

This report, if received, must be placed on the Council’s website and publicly notified.
4. **COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes quote relevant clause(s) from Delegations Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the decisions significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council’s policies or plans?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommendations contribute to Goal 3: A Connected and Safe Community

The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the Connected Community Strategy

The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in

The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in the Safe Community Plan

The action is:
- Achieve compliance with relevant legislation, bylaws, and policies through provision of information, education and enforcement (animal control, building compliance, bylaws, health compliance, liquor licensing, noise control, planning compliance).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution to strategic direction</th>
<th>The Council must make the report publicly available and give public notice of the report.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ATTACHMENTS**

Palmerston North City Council

This report has been prepared to satisfy the requirements of Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996 (‘the Act’). The report covers the 2018/19 financial year.

Policy on Dogs

Following the adoption of the Dog Control Policy in June 2018, Council adopted the associated bylaw on 23 August 2018. A 12-month trial allowing dogs on-leash in the CBD also commenced on this date. Council monitored the trial, providing a six-month update to Council in March 2019. As it was progressing well, Council decided to amend the policy and seek further input from the community on the dog control status for the CBD. Consultation was carried out between 10 May to 10 June 2019 and resulted in 65 submissions. The bylaw will be amended in the 2019/20 year.

Several issues have arisen, or remain unresolved, since the Dog Control Policy and associated bylaw were adopted last year:

- How the policy reflects the Council’s discretionary functions under the Dog Control Act 1996. As identified through a recent internal audit of animal control fees and charges. A summary of these audit findings was presented to the Audit and Risk Committee in May 2019.
- The possibility of relaxing the Policy/Bylaw to allow controlled dog access for special events and occasions in prohibited public places, such as sports fields and aquatic centres.
- The general provision in the policy relating to dogs being prohibited from within 30 metres of play equipment and play areas. User conflicts between children’s play and dog exercise activities at the Linklater Reserve were raised at the policy deliberations stage and need further investigation. Council is also preparing a ‘Play Policy’ and this issue will be discussed with the community as part of this process.

Due to the nature of these issues and given that the formal policy review process was carried out recently, an earlier than planned review of the policy is recommended. It’s recommended that this take place in two years’ time, rather than the scheduled review in 2023. This will allow the issues outlined above, along with any emergent matters, to be fully researched and analysed.

Accommodation

The Animal Control Office is in Palmerston North City’s Central Administration Building situated on The Square in central Palmerston North. The Council Pound is located at Totara Road, Palmerston North, at the back of the racecourse adjacent to the waste water treatment plant. This facility has kennelling for 36 dogs and six puppies, with an administration area and exercise yard.

Improvements at the Pound have been made to:

- ventilation;
- heating;
- bedding;
- access to exercise;
- drainage;
- cleaning and hygiene;
- storage of chemicals; and
- bird-proofing.

Remodelling has been carried out to create three pens for extra-large dogs. Security cameras providing coverage of all internal areas and the Pound surrounds have also been installed.

Personnel

The Animal Control team is based within the Customer Unit and reports to the Head of Environmental Protection Services. The team comprises one Team Leader/Senior Animal Control Officer, three Animal Control Officers and a Kennel Manager. The most recent Senior Animal Control Officer resigned in March 2019. The position has been reviewed and changed to Team Leader Animal Management and Education to reflect the increased focus on education.
Hours of Operation
Officers work on a roster system which provides for an Officer to be on duty from 7am to 6pm on week days. After hours animal control services for dog attacks, secured dogs, aggressive dogs and roaming dogs are provided by a contractor.

The Pound is open to the public between 8.30 and 9.30am and 2.00 and 4.30pm Monday to Friday. The emergency release of animals outside of these hours is available, but subject to an additional fee.

Dog Registration
In 2018/19, 8,449 dogs were registered to 6,829 owners. This is an increase of 2.2% from the previous year.

Fees
The Palmerston North City Council has fee categories for general registration, approved preferred owners, rural non-working and rural working dogs. As well as discounted fees in all categories except rural working dogs for de-sexed dogs. Disability assist, and special working dogs have no fees.

Fees and charges under the Dog Control Act 1996 are reviewed annually and were increased by 5.2% from 1 July 2019. This increase was driven by the increased cost to comply with the Code of Welfare: Temporary Housing of Companion Animals, that took effect on 1 October 2018.

Dog registration fees, fines and impound fees contributed 92% of the cost of animal control in Palmerston North City in 2018/19.

Preferred Owners
There is a financial benefit, with reduced fees, by being classified as a “preferred owner” (PO). A preferred owner (PO) must:
- have had the dog registered for the last 12 months;
- provide a satisfactory secure environment in respect to fencing, sleeping quarters and exercise space;
- demonstrate an understanding of basic dog welfare and owners’ obligations;
- not have had more than one dog impounded or found roaming in the last 12 months;
- not have had more than one substantiated complaint about the dog or dogs in the last 12 months;
- have paid dog registration fees on time; and,
- provide access to a door on the property without the dog(s) being able to approach people when they enter.

In general, preferred owner status remains in place if the owner pays the registration on time, is at the same address and there are no material changes to the property.

In 2018/19 there were 3,094 preferred dog owners, an increase of 1.7% from the previous year.

De-sexing Programme
Palmerston North City Council received funding from Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) of $9,230 in 2016/17 to de-sex 42 dogs classified as menacing at the Massey University Veterinary Teaching Hospital. Twenty-nine dogs were de-sexed in 2016/17, 15 in 2017/18 and the funding was completely expended de-sexing a further seven dogs in 2018/19. This bought the number of dogs de-sexed by the programme to 51.

Complaints
A total of 3,536 complaints or investigations were conducted during the year, which continued the downward trend. The number of reported dog attacks decreased by 23% from last year and is 14% below the five-year average. The most significant source of complaint was in relation to roaming or uncontrolled dogs (45%) followed by barking dogs (20%). The number of barking dog complaints received by Council decreased by 36% from the previous year to continue the downward trend.
Impounded dogs

In 2018/19, 500 dogs were impounded. Of these 362 (72.4%) were collected by their owner, 76 (15.2%) were euthanized and 51 (10.2%) were rehomed, sold to a new owner or transferred to the SPCA. The remaining 2.2% were dogs that were awaiting an outcome (10), or illegally removed from the Pound (1).

Dog attacks

There were 84 reported dog attacks during the year, 28 were attacks on a person. Of these attacks 22 assessed as minor, five moderate and one serious. There were 32 attacks on other dogs, with 20 assessed minor, 11 moderate and one serious. There were an additional 24 attacks on other animals, with 11 assessed minor and 13 moderate.

Infringements

Council continued its focus to ensure that all known dogs were registered. Infringements were issued to multiple offenders and in some cases, dogs were impounded. In 2018/19, 105 infringements notices were issued for unregistered dogs, failing to have a dog under control or confined, or dogs not microchipped. Of the infringements issued 26 (25%) were waived or cancelled for compliance or due to extenuating circumstances.

Menacing dog classification appeals

During the year, two objections to classification of dogs under section 33A were heard by the Council’s Hearing Committee. In both cases the Committee upheld the classification.

Prosecutions

One prosecution was heard during the year for failing to comply with a Dangerous Classification, resulting in a dog attack on a person. The defendant pleaded guilty to three charges and was convicted and discharged. The Court ordered the destruction of the dog and reparation of $200 to the victim.
**Dog Parks**

The Ahimate fenced dog agility park was officially opened in February 2019. The park came about as a direct result of community members making submissions to the city's annual plan, asking for a fenced-in area for dogs.

The 3,000 square metre park, within Ahimate Reserve in Awapuni, contains six pieces of dog agility equipment. As well as water drinking areas, wash stations and dog poop bags all on site.

A fenced area is provided for small dogs, or dogs who aren’t well-behaved when off leash.

During the year, Linklater Reserve added eight pieces of dog agility equipment. Plus, another 7.5 ha of dog off-leash walking with an additional 1 km of walking paths.

**Customer Satisfaction**

For the 2018/19-year, overall customer satisfaction from 156 respondents with the Animal Control service was:

- 80.00% very satisfied (up from 63.95%),
- 10.77% somewhat satisfied (down from 15.02%),
- 4.62% neither satisfied or dissatisfied (down from 10.30%),
- 3.08% somewhat dissatisfied (down from 4.29%), and
- 1.54% very dissatisfied (down from 6.44%).

This shows that satisfaction with the service improved and dissatisfaction decreased.

The key areas of dissatisfaction continued to relate to responsiveness to complaints, lack of feedback and the resolution of barking dog complaints. Neighbourhood surveys have been introduced to assist resolving barking dog complaints. There are often difficulties obtaining evidence of loud and persistent barking. Obtaining information from a neighbourhood provides a more complete picture of each situation to better inform compliance action.

**Improvement Opportunities**

A Kennel Manager was employed and commenced on 29 April 2019. This has enabled improved assessment of the health and wellbeing of dogs. Including the development of individual food plans based on the dog’s size and condition. All dogs are now provided with adequate daily exercise. Scales were procured to enable dogs to be weighed to assess and monitor their condition on entry and whilst in the Pound.

Animal Control Officers attended the Christmas Parade, Esplanade Day and Dog Day Out and provided education sessions to Plunket Nurses and the Linton Community.

**2019/20 Programme**

The focus for 2019/20 will be:

- Designing a Pound facility compliant with the Code of Welfare: Temporary Housing of Companion Animals. This is to provide provision for the quarantine and isolation of dogs.
- Reviewing the charging structure for animal control fees. This is to ensure the most appropriate balance for costs is achieved between registered dog owners and non-compliant dog owners.
- Developing and delivering animal control education to create improved dog ownership and behaviour and improve public understanding of how to behave around dogs.
Summary
The reporting requirements of the Dog Control Act 1996 for the period 2018/19 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Registered Dogs</td>
<td>8,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Disqualified Owners</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Probationary Owners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dogs classified as dangerous under Sect 31 of the Act</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dogs classified as menacing under Sect 33A of the Act</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dogs classified as menacing under Sect 33C of the Act</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dog related complaints (See Appendix 1 for details)</td>
<td>3536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Prosecutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Infringements</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attached as Appendix 1 are details of dangerous and menacing dogs.

Attached in Appendix 2 is a comparative summary of Dog Control Statistics for the period 2014/15 to 2018/19. This contains the information above with the addition of a breakdown of types of complaints processed by staff.

Graeme Gillespie
HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION SERVICES
Appendix 1: Dangerous and Menacing Dog Details

Dog Control Act 1996 S 31 – Dangerous Dogs

Section 31 requires the territorial authority to classify a dog as a dangerous dog if:

- the owner of the dog has been convicted of an offence in relation to dog attack;
- the territorial authority has reasonable grounds to believe that the dog constitutes a threat to the safety of any person, stock, poultry, domestic animal, or protected wildlife; or,
- the dog owner admits in writing that the dog constitutes a threat to the safety of any person, stock, poultry, domestic animal, or protected wildlife.

Dogs within the jurisdiction of Council that were classified as dangerous under S 31 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Malamute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberian Husky</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retriever Labrador</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Shepherd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Pit Bull Terrier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dog Control Act 1996 S 33A – Menacing Dogs

Section 33A menacing dogs are dogs that have not been classified as a dangerous dog but the territorial authority considers may pose a threat to any person, stock, poultry, domestic animal, or protected wildlife because of any observed or reported behaviour of the dog or any characteristics typically associated with the dog’s breed or type.

Dogs within the jurisdiction of Council that were classified as menacing under S 33A were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Koolie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldog</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldog, American</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogo Argentino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Pointer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyhound</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 9 - ATTACHMENT 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastiff, Bull</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastiff, Neapolitan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retriever, Labrador</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodesian Ridgeback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rottweiler</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shar Pei</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd, German</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberian Husky</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrier, American Pit Bull</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrier, American Staffordshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrier, Bull</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrier, Fox (Smooth)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrier, Staffordshire Bull</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: American Pit Bull Terriers and Dogo Argentinos are by default classified as menacing under section 33c (Breed) of the Dog Control Act but as the behaviour of some individual dogs was of concern then the classification for menacing was changed to Section 33A (behaviour). This was to ensure that all officers were aware that the dog(s) in question had temperament problems.*

**Dog Control Act 1996 S 33C – Menacing Dogs**

Under section 33CA the territorial authority must classify as menacing any dog that the territorial authority has reasonable grounds to believe belongs wholly or predominantly to 1 or more of the following breeds or types:

- Brazilian Fila
- Dogo Argentino
- Japanese Tosa
- Perro de Presa Canario
- American Pit Bull Terrier

**Dogs within the jurisdiction of Council that were classified as menacing under S33C, were as follows:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dogo Argentino</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrier, American Pit Bull</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 2: Dog Control Statistics 2014/2015 to 2018/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of Dogs Issued with a Registration Tag (Registered Dogs)</td>
<td>7982</td>
<td>8091</td>
<td>8130</td>
<td>8271</td>
<td>8738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of Disqualified Owners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of Probationary Owners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of Dogs classified as dangerous under S31 of the Act</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Number of Dogs classified as menacing under S33A of the Act (Behaviour)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Number of Dogs classified as menacing under S33C of the Act (Breed)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Number of Dog Complaints or investigations initiated by public or ACO, (Refer to below for details)</td>
<td>4289</td>
<td>4208</td>
<td>4257</td>
<td>3859</td>
<td>3536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Aggressive/Rushing Dogs</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>Dog Attacks</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>Barking Dogs</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d</td>
<td>Roaming Dogs</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e</td>
<td>Lost Dogs</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f</td>
<td>Property Checks</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g</td>
<td>Other Dog Related Incidents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h</td>
<td>Identified/Reported Unregistered dogs</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Number of Prosecutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Number of Infringements</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

1. The total number of complaints or investigations continues to trend down due to reductions in rushing/aggressive dogs, dog attacks, and barking dogs.
2. Roaming dogs’ notifications increased slightly over the previous year but was lower than the five year average.
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TO: Planning and Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 2 September 2019

TITLE: Urban Cycle Network Masterplan 2019

PRESENTED BY: David Murphy, City Planning Manager  Strategy & Planning

APPROVED BY: Sheryl Bryant, General Manager - Strategy & Planning

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO PLANNING AND STRATEGY COMMITTEE

1. That the Urban Cycle Network Masterplan 2019 is endorsed to inform future Council decision making, in particular the preparation of Asset Management Plans and Long Term Plans.

2. That it be noted that future decision making processes, including Long Term Plans, will enable further public consultation and direct engagement with affected stakeholders on the implementation of the Urban Cycle Network Masterplan 2019.

3. That the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Planning and Strategy Committee be authorised to make minor amendments to the Urban Cycle Network Masterplan 2019.

1. ISSUE

The Draft Urban Cycle Network Masterplan was approved for consultation at the Planning and Strategy Committee meeting on the 6 May 2019.

Following a two month consultation period and analysis of submissions, an updated Masterplan is being presented for endorsement. A copy of the final Urban Cycle Network Masterplan 2019 is included as Attachment A.

2. BACKGROUND

On 28 May 2018, as part of its deliberations on the 10 Year Plan, Council resolved that:

- That the Chief Executive be directed to develop an Urban Cycle Network Development masterplan (resolution 3.18).

Subsequently, on 6 May 2019 the Planning and Strategy Committee resolved that:
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- That the Draft Urban Cycleways Masterplan be approved for consultation.
- That the chairperson of the Planning and Strategy Committee and the Deputy Mayor be authorised to make minor amendments to the Draft Urban Cycleways Masterplan.

3. CONSULTATION

A number of direct engagement meetings took place in relation to the Masterplan and related work, including:

- 24 November 2017: Active and Public Transport Forum (public invited) to review draft maps and solicit input on opportunities and issues.
- 11, 12 December 2018: Business case and Masterplan development workshop 1 and 2.
- 17 January 2019: Business case and Masterplan development workshop 3.
- 14 March 2019: Briefing with the People on Bikes Forum.
- 15 March 2019: Workshop with councillors.
- May-July 2019: Public consultation period
- 13 August 2019: Revised Masterplan briefing with the People on Bikes Forum.

The consultation ran for an initial period of one month, from 13 May till 6 June 2019. This period was extended by a further month, to ensure local community groups and stakeholders had additional time to submit on the Masterplan. The extended submission period closed on 5 July 2019.

156 submissions were received. The submissions have been analysed and informed the amendments made to the Masterplan. Submissions were received from individuals, community groups and a number of key stakeholders, including:

- NZ Transport Agency.
- The NZ Police.
- Midcentral Health.
- Sport Manawatu.
- Massey University
- Community cycling advocate groups e.g. People on Bikes Forum.

Submissions were generally supportive of the overarching vision, implementation plan and phasing plan. A common theme in submissions was support for Council proactively planning
for alternative modes of transport in the face of climate change. Another reoccurring theme was the importance for Council to focus on separated/buffered cycle lanes, rather than painted cycle lanes.

A summary of submissions, including a response to common issues raised in multiple submissions (Part 1), and Council officer responses with recommended amendments (Part 2) is included as Attachment B.

In the submission form, participants were also given three yes / no questions asking if they agreed with:

- The proposed vision.
- The proposed network.
- The proposed phasing plan.

A fourth question was asked whether to focus investment on:

- Better or more cycleways.

The bar graphs below (Figure 1 and 2) represents the results from the questions and demonstrates that submitter agreement is high in relation to the overall vision but decreases in terms of the proposed network and phasing. Submitters also favoured better cycleways over more cycleways.
The Masterplan was featured in four Facebook posts during the consultation period on the PNCC Facebook page, which has 14,621 followers. The popularity of the posts was as follows:

- First post (asking if people agree with the cycleways vision) – seen by 30,692 individuals and had a total of 2582 likes/comments/shares
- Second post (asking for an opinion on the prioritised streets) – seen by 6906 individuals and had a total of 1776 likes/comments/shares
- Third post (asking what would encourage people to cycle more) – seen by 8028 individuals and had a total of 1484 likes/comments/shares.
- Fourth post (asking how we can make it easier for people to cycle in our city) – seen by 6577 individuals and had 1089 likes/comments/shares.

The Social Media Report is included as Attachment C.

4. **AMENDMENTS TO THE MASTERPLAN**

While a number of minor amendments have been made to the Masterplan, key amendments include the following new sections:

- Summary – setting out the main strategies and challenges to be met.
- Public input – how the public was involved in the development of the Masterplan.
• Strategic alignment – new references to align+ with Council’s Eco-City Strategy.

• Intersections – why cycle lanes in roundabouts are only possible in limited cases and means of providing for people on bikes at traffic signals.

• Central city – expanding on previous content, particularly for access across the ring road and cycling within the city centre.

Other significant changes include:

• The NZ Transport Agency’s Transportation Enhanced Funding Assistance Rate (TEFAR, referenced on page 11 of the draft Masterplan) is no longer available. In addition, previous funds for College Street from programme 279 – minor works, are now proposed to be allocated to the James Line barrier arms project ($480,000). Therefore, staff are now proposing to use part of the Masterplan capital budget to complete College Street.

• The Masterplan has been amended to ensure it is a strategic document rather than a detailed implementation plan. Section 5 of the Draft Masterplan included a phasing plan for allocation of the $2.9M in LTP Programme 1559 over the 19/20 and 20/21 years. To provide Council with flexibility in how funding is allocated, including further investigation and programming through the business case process, the phasing plan table has been replaced with a priority list for the top 25 ranked corridors.

5. NEXT STEPS

• Publish the Masterplan and implement initial priorities (section 9 of the Masterplan)

• Use the Masterplan to inform future decision making, in particular the preparation of Asset Management Plans and Long Term Plans.

6. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes quote relevant clause(s) from Delegations Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the decisions significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council’s policies or plans? **No**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The recommendations contribute to Goal 2: A Creative and Exciting City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the Creative and Liveable Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in the Active and Public Transport Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The actions are: Smart city practices, Sustainable Practices, and Strategic Partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution to strategic direction</th>
<th>The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in the Active and Public Transport Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The actions are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and implement pedestrian and cycle focused improvement to intersections and road crossings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a pack of programmes to complete the Primary On-road Cycling and Shared Pathway Network, including higher cycle lane visibility, improved paint quality, and rearranged parking and kerb line layouts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upgrade, on a prioritised bases, cycle route interconnections and intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop and implement a programme to promote the city’s walkways, cycling programmes, and activities aimed at generating a behaviour change for a mode shift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop (a pedestrian) and cyclist amenity plan and implement projects identified in this plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Attachment A - Urban Cycle Network Masterplan
2. Attachment B - Summary of Submissions UCNMP
3. Attachment C - Social Media Report UCNMP
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Summary

Our society is facing huge challenges: an unacceptable level of deaths and serious injuries on our streets, increasing obesity and the threat of climate change. Many people are struggling to afford the basic necessities of life while spending a large part of their income on automobile transport.

Safe cycleways are part of the answer. They help kids develop independence in how they get to school and around their neighbourhoods. Cycling is a great way to be fit, healthy and active. Every person on a bike is one less car in the queue or jockeying for a car parking space. Cycleways are not just for people biking – they provide space for other wheeled modes such as mobility scooters and electric scooters where footpaths are not the best place to ride. Crossings designed for cycleways often improve crossing opportunities for pedestrians. Trips made by bike also save fuel – keeping more money in your pocket and the local economy.

This Masterplan envisions an Urban Cycle Network investment resulting in an environment and culture change that enables people in Palmerston North to choose cycling more often.

Council plans to:
- reduce traffic speeds around our schools and shops
- expand the network of cycle lanes, including some physically separated cycleways
- support school and workplace travel planning; education about sharing roads and paths courteously; events like street festivals, recreational tours and competitions.

For some streets, we will start with painted cycle lanes and upgrade to separated cycleways in coordination with the street maintenance programme.
There will be four main challenges:

1. Funding is limited. Council has allocated $2.9M to jump-start the network improvements signalled in this Masterplan, but leveraging central government funding is never guaranteed and maintaining ongoing funding will require a long term commitment.

2. At intersections, many of our existing cycle lanes drop out in favour of multiple lanes for cars. Our residents say this isn’t good enough to encourage them onto their bikes. We may need to widen the street, reduce traffic lane widths, and/or combine left and through movements to fix this.

3. On some otherwise quiet residential streets, speeding endangers people and pets, disrupts sleep, and discourages walking and cycling. Streetscape features such as landscaping help reduce traffic speeds and improve amenity with a minimal impact on parking. We may also need to restrict motor vehicle turns and/or install mid-block traffic signals where these routes intersect with busy roads.

4. Main thoroughfares are primarily for the safe movement of people and goods whether walking, cycling or driving. Council’s responsibility is to balance these different uses of the street. A big issue that affects most users is on-street parking. On some streets with commercial shopping centres, we will need to retain as many car parks as possible by removing berms, narrowing flush painted medians, or completely redesigning the street as a slow speed shared space. On other streets with sufficient off-street parking, such approaches are not cost-effective. Each street will be different – there is no single solution.

Addressing these challenges may increase project costs and/or motorist travel time. The combination of safety, health, and environmental benefits will nearly always outweigh the costs by a large margin.

These are not just technical problems to be quantified by economists and solved by engineers. We need to work with affected communities to demonstrate why change is needed and to explore alternatives that meet our shared liveability, accessibility, and safety objectives.

It is clear that our streets and the behaviour of people using them can be improved. This Masterplan is only one part of the solution. We will leverage our stunning He Ara Kotahi pathway with the completion of pathways to Ashhurst, Feilding and the coast. Success will also depend on the implementation of other strategies and policies governing parking, traffic speeds, multi-modal street design, our regional freight network, land use, and the design of our central city.

Let’s have the most active community in New Zealand!
1 Introduction

What is this plan and why have one?

Safe cycleways have many benefits. They help kids develop independence in how they get to school and around their neighbourhoods. Cycleways provide more travel choices for all of us. Cycling is also a great way to be fit, healthy and active.

They are not just for people biking – they provide space for other wheeled modes such as mobility scooters and electric scooters where footpaths are not the best place to ride. Crossings designed for cycleways often improve crossing opportunities for pedestrians. Trips made by bike also save fuel – keeping more money in the local economy and giving better environmental outcomes.

This Masterplan builds on previous work

Over the years, public surveys and Annual Plan submissions have revealed that the lack of safe cycleways and the behaviour of some motorists. The 2007 Manawatū Active Transport Strategy informed the development of today’s primary on-road cycling and shared path network. The Urban Design Strategy 2010 sought to ‘increase numbers of people who ride bicycles’ as a measure of success. The Cycling Investigation Working Party published a Cycle Action Plan in 2015 with actions intended to help deliver on that vision, many of which have been completed or carried forward in this Plan. The purpose of the Active and Public Transport Plan is to have a safe, efficient, and effective active and public transport system. The Roading and Parking Asset Management Plan aims to reduce injuries and deaths by improving the quality and condition of the cycling network, including at intersections.

Public input to this Masterplan

Council began the process of urban cycle network planning in mid-2017. Public and key stakeholder engagement has included:

- November 2017 Active and Public Transport Forum (public invited) to review draft maps and obtain input on opportunities and issues
- December-January 2018: business case and Masterplan development workshops
- March 2019: briefing with the People on Bikes Forum and workshop with councillors
- 13 May–5 July 2019: public consultation of the draft Masterplan
- August 2019: People on Bikes Forum briefing on revised Masterplan

Submissions were received from individuals, community groups and key stakeholders such as the NZ Transport Agency, NZ Police, MidCentral Health, Sport Manawatū, and Massey University. A common theme in the submissions was the need for more transport choices in the face of climate change and rising obesity. There were many comments about the need to balance community needs for parking with safety of people on bikes; a strong preference for separated cycleways and dedicated traffic signal phases for people on bikes wherever possible; and many requests for more detail on accessing the central city by bike.

PRIORITY 5 of the Council’s Creative and Liveable Strategy is TO HAVE THE MOST ACTIVE COMMUNITY IN NEW ZEALAND
Vision

The **Urban Cycle Network** **INVESTMENT** results in an **ENVIRONMENT** and **CULTURE** change that enables more people in Palmerston North to **CHOOSE** cycling more often.

This Masterplan aims to create a safe, convenient, and comfortable cycle network and transport system in the Palmerston North main urban area, for people of all ages and abilities. This includes people who already cycle and those who are currently less confident about doing so (section 2).

Various ways to provide for cycling are illustrated in section 3. Substantial work has already been included in the 10-Year Plan 2018-28 (section 4):

- The **investment** includes a multi-million dollar funding boost in years 2 and 3 of the 10-Year Plan (section 4) and a proposed ongoing investment for future years.
- The **environment** change includes cycleways (section 4) and cycle parking (section 6) coupled with supporting speed management, parking management, and land use planning (section 7).
- The **culture** change will be delivered through a comprehensive education, encouragement and enforcement campaign aimed at school children and the wider community (section 7). It will also happen with improved infrastructure that prioritises safety for people walking and cycling.
- **Choice** is about providing multiple transport options for people to suit their particular trip needs. It is also about providing access for people who cannot or do not wish to drive and do not have public transport options. People choosing to cycle is a key outcome to be monitored (section 8).

The actions described throughout this Masterplan are summarised in section 9.
**Strategic alignment**

The purpose of this Urban Cycle Network Masterplan is to envision how to provide for people to cycle in Palmerston North over the long term, and to inform investment in facilities and supporting activities over years two and three of the 10-Year Plan.

Increasing the number of people cycling in the city has been a Council priority for over 15 years. This aligns with the latest Government Policy Statement (GPS) on Land Transport (Figure 1), which prioritises safety and more transport choices by signalling investment in cycleways, speed management, and promotional activities.²

The 10-Year Plan states the Council’s vision for Palmerston North is “small city benefits, big city ambition”. To fulfill this vision the Council has adopted five goals, each with an associated high-level strategy. While this Plan contributes to a varying degree to four of these strategic goals (Figure 3), it is most closely aligned with the Creative and Liveable Strategy (Goal 2). The Council works towards this goal through the Active and Public Transport Plan 2018 – of which this Plan is an action.

Council’s Eco City Strategy⁴ envisions a 25 per cent reduction in total greenhouse gas emissions. More cycling will help reduce the 42 per cent of emissions that are attributed to transport in the city. Wide shared paths and cycleways are also ideal places to ride electric bikes and low-speed vehicles – technologies that have the potential to redefine how we move around and help combat climate change. E-scooters are a major change in New Zealand cities, and have a similar safety profile to that of kick scooters and bicycles. Self-balancing electric scooters are ideal for elderly people with mobility impairments and can travel faster than standard mobility scooters. Central government is planning a law change to clarify rules around low-power/low-speed vehicles in 2019/20.

---

2. The GPS on Land Transport is the latest Government Policy Statement on Land Transport, which provides a framework for decision-making on land transport matters.

4. The Eco City Strategy is the Council’s strategy for promoting sustainable and environmentally responsible growth and development in Palmerston North.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10-YEAR PLAN GOALS</th>
<th>CYCLING NETWORK RELEVANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An innovative and growing city</td>
<td>A cycling network helps the city attract and retain people who prefer more transport choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A creative and exciting city</td>
<td>The most vibrant cities around the world often have strong cycling cultures. Less individual and public spending on vehicle travel means we can spend more on education, the arts, and multi-modal ‘complete streets’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A connected and safe community</td>
<td>Investing in cycleways fills gaps in the existing cycle network and improves the safety of people who cycle. Compared to driving, cycling offers more opportunities for people to connect with one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An eco city</td>
<td>Cycleways support zero-carbon transport and provide a way for people to engage with their environment. They reduce the need to dedicate land for motor-vehicle-oriented infrastructure, including parking, as the population grows. Less single-occupant driving helps achieve climate change mitigated targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A driven and enabling Council</td>
<td>Through 10-Year Plan submissions and other consultations, the community has asked for better cycleways. Council will work with the community as an enabler for change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People walking and cycling spend $34 per trip and shop more often than drivers.²

15 per cent of the typical household budget is spent on transport¹ - cycling helps keep money in our pockets and available to spend locally.

---

¹ Source: Urban Transport.
² Source: National Cycling Survey.
Urban cycling today

People who cycle in Palmerston North say that the flat roads and temperate climate make it an easy choice. It’s fun, saves money, improves fitness and helps the environment. With 5.9 per cent of its workforce cycling to work, Palmerston North City is well above the national average (2.9 per cent). However, there is much room for improvement. Compared to other major urban areas, Palmerston North was number 1 up until 1996, and has fallen a place in every census since then. The upward trend in other communities like Nelson, Christchurch, and the Hawke’s Bay is likely to be associated with a strong investment in cycleways and shared paths these communities have made in recent years. The 2018 census results were not available at the time of writing.

For example, Christchurch has seen a 34 per cent increase in the number of riders in just one year since eight major cycle routes were opened, and an increase in the proportion of riders who are female from 32 to 38 per cent.

Although there are more people cycling on Palmerston North pathways, the number of people cycling on-road and cycling to school declined between 2013 and 2015, before stabilising in recent years (Figure 7).

---

**Figure 6:** Journey to work by cycle (source: Census)

**Figure 7:** Palmerston North on-road cycle counts over time. *2019 values based on Feb/Mar period only (source: Council data)
As late as the mid 1980s, scores of Palmerston North Girls’ High students rode through The Square. Today, fewer than five Girls’ High students ride to school – although cycling remains popular for Boys’ High students. Like the rest of New Zealand, cycling to school amongst all age groups has fallen precipitously in the past decades.¹

On many of our streets, people on bikes are crowded by parked cars, be it cars backing out of parks, cars parking in cycle lanes, or drivers opening their doors without looking. This environment can create discomfort and fear for people on bikes. Our streets should be designed to be forgiving of road user mistakes.

Some of our main streets, designated as part of the cycling network in previous strategies, have no cycling facilities (Botanical Road, Ferguson Street) or stop-start cycle lanes (Te Awe Awe Street, Featherston Street). Even where we have cycle lanes, they often stop before traffic lights.

Council has made good progress with off-road pathways – and the network will continue to be extended and improved.

However, primary cycling routes such as Featherston Street, Botanical Road and Te Awe Awe Street currently have cycle symbols in the same space as kerbside parking. Larger roundabouts are particularly challenging for cycling, and many traffic signals don’t have dedicated cycling lanes.

Council needs to consider how it treats and prioritises space within existing transport corridors, particularly as urban areas are intensified. From planning to design to wayfinding, Council aims to take into consideration the space and safety needs of people on bikes, scooters, and foot.
2 Who cycles?

We already have about 10 per cent of residents cycling for various reasons – they’re riding, not always comfortably, on our current network of partial cycle lanes and shared paths.

Research has shown that more space and ideally physical separation from traffic is required to attract those who are interested in riding but concerned about safety. This is illustrated in Figure 12, which is an adaptation of work by Geller, Dill and McNeil. This Masterplan aims to get more people from the largest (green) segment on their bikes.

Figure 12 also categorises the types of people who ride by skill level and what conditions they prefer. All rider types and skill levels are likely to be comfortable riding on quiet (low traffic volume and speed) streets.

These types and levels are not rigid – for example, some people with beginner level skills will ride on busy streets (or illegally on the footpath) if they must use that street to get to their destination.

Likewise, strong riders with advanced skills may use protected cycleways, although they may find slower riders impeding their progress and be unwilling to use such facilities if there is a loss of priority over turning traffic.

Figure 12: Typology of the public in terms of cycling (source: adaptation of Geller, Dill and McNeil)
Those who are already riding (Figure 13) are role models, and the planned investment aims to make their journeys better.

**WORK COMMUTES**

**GRAHAM**  
Bus driver  
Rides to depot via Highbury Avenue, Botanical Road, and Tremaine Avenue.

**EVERYDAY TRIPS**

**JOE**  
Contractor  
Bikes to daycare and then to job site.

**SCHOOL TRIPS**

**ELSE**  
School student  
Rides Fitzherbert Avenue every day to Palmerston North Intermediate Normal School.

**RECREATION, FITNESS**

**RAEWYN**  
Online learning specialist  
In her spare time, Raewyn coordinates the iBike4kids and women’s skills programme; helps people get confident and out biking.

*Exercise at work is very slim so I bike to work to keep trim. As I drive my bus I pass cyclists without a fuss.*

While some people will drive to the trail, many recreational riders will use streets to connect to trails or rural training routes. Conversely, commuters will use off-road sealed and shared paths as part of their route to various destinations. Therefore, as many routes as possible need to cater for as broad a range of users as possible.

The Creative and Liveable Strategy says the “transport system needs to cater for the lowest level of mobility and physical capability”. As will be discussed in the next section, how the system caters for various users depends on the transport and land use context.
3 How to provide for cycling

Overview

The Council’s Street Design Manual 2013\(^{18}\) provides a design vision for Palmerston North by setting out how we want our streets to look for different land uses (residential streets, industrial areas, neighbourhood centres) and transport needs (freight priority corridors, local access, etc).

The Council is also working on a framework to better plan, design and manage our street space to balance everyone’s differing needs. On identified streets where all road users need to share limited space, measures can be taken to reduce safety risks through separation, parking removal, or reduction of speeds to make it more comfortable and enjoyable for people travelling by bike.

The NZ Transport Agency Cycling Network Guidance (CNG, Figure 14) will be used to assess what level of provision and design is most suitable for each route. This is the key reference for all New Zealand councils aiming to improve conditions for cycling.\(^{19}\)

This Masterplan aims to complement the continued expansion of the shared path network with enhanced on-street cycleways on busier streets, and ‘family-friendly’ neighbourhood greenway routes comprised of quiet local streets and accessways between them. Ways to provide for cycling in the urban area are illustrated in Figure 15.

There are other facility types such as wide shoulders (e.g. Napier Road), hard surfacing of shared paths along rivers (much of the Manawatu River Path), or unsealed trails (Mangao Stream Path). These are not illustrated because the focus of this Masterplan is on urban cycleways and a few remaining missing parks and reserves path links that connect them.

Figure 14: The online Cycling Network Guidance (CNG)
### Along streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost or quality</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Long Beach, California: Green shared kerb lane on 4-lane streets" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Broadway Avenue: Traffic calming, sharrows (1) on two-lane streets" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Campbell Street: Traffic calming and sharrows (1)" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="College Street (east of Victoria Avenue): Sharrows (1)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Fitzherbert Avenue: Wide lane, all intersections included" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Rangitikei Street: Narrow lane and/or lacking intersection facilities" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Cook Street: Dual buffers, green (latter not shown)" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Church Street: Single buffer; close to parking" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Antigua Street, Christchurch Kerb separators, cycle signals" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Napier Road: Paint and flexi-posts" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Pioneer Highway Path: Sealed path" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Te Mata Road: Gravel path; riders tend to stay on road" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood greenway (quiet streets)</th>
<th>Cycle lanes</th>
<th>Buffered cycle lanes</th>
<th>Separated cycleways</th>
<th>Shared paths – along roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Neighbourhood greenway (quiet streets)" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Cycle lanes" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Buffered cycle lanes" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Separated cycleways" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Shared paths – along roads" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increasing separation from motor vehicles**

**Figure 15: Types of provision for cycling along urban streets**

[1] Sharrows are road markings indicating where people can ride in lanes where it is too narrow for a motor vehicle and a bicycle to comfortably travel side by side. The markings are there to remind drivers they should expect to see people on bikes riding further out in the traffic lane.
At intersections

**ROUNDBOOUTS**
Roundabouts can be difficult for people on bikes, especially when there is a lot of traffic. In most cases, continuing a cycle lane up to and through a roundabout places riders out of the motorist’s field of view and increases collision risks. Council will continue to upgrade older roundabouts with new designs that reduce motorist speed. This will make our roundabouts safer for everyone, including people on bikes.

![Image of roundabout with cyclists](Image)

**TRAFFIC SIGNALS**
Palmerston North has 36 traffic light-controlled intersections.

![Image of traffic signals](Image)

At many of these, the existing cycle lanes drop out in favour of multiple lanes for cars (see figure 10, p. 6). Our residents say this isn’t good enough to encourage them onto their bikes - the cycleway needs to be continuous up to the intersection.

“...we cannot continue to define cycle lanes as a painted white line that disappears when it gets too hard, or place unrealistic expectations on our most vulnerable road users as they try to co-exist with two-tonne vehicles travelling at unsurvivable speeds on a complex urban network.”

NZ Government 2019, Draft road safety strategy, p. 35(1)

![Image of cycle lane continuing all the way up to the advanced stop boxes](Image)

Every signalised intersection is different, and the technical complexity is high. Council will need to consider a variety of options including widening, space reallocation, time reallocation, and innovative phasing options (or a combination of these). With each proposal, modelling should be undertaken to assess the impact on other road users and ensure that Council maintains the support of the community and avoids unintended consequences.

Existing council budgets provide $41,000 per year for separate phases for cyclists. This is sufficient for minor phasing and hardware changes for one movement at one intersection per year and cannot fund substantial changes. Further implementation is to be funded through the cycling network budget and/or general safety budgets.
POTENTIAL TREATMENTS AT SIGNALS

We may need to widen the street, reduce traffic lane widths, and/or combine left and through movements to fix this. Assuming that a cycle facility is provided all the way up to the traffic signal, there are several ways to help people on bikes navigate through the intersection:

Right turning riders are either directed to a hook turn box (1) to make the turn in two sequential phases or governed by directional cycle signals. A 2019 trial in Auckland and Christchurch is proving successful and this treatment is likely to be added to the Traffic Control Devices (TCD) Manual.

A national trial is planned in 2019/20 to test flashing yellow arrows for filter turns (2) by drivers across a separated cycleway. This could support the implementation of separated cycleways at more intersections and improve the safety and level of service for all types of riders.

A right turn phase such as at Ruahine/Featherston is feasible because there is a left turn slip lane and there is (some) room for right turning riders to queue out of the way of straight through riders. This treatment may be considered at other intersections but does not represent the best possible outcome everywhere. In some cases, a hook turn requires less time to navigate.

Figure 19: Directional cycle signals in Christchurch

Figure 20: Hook turn layout (Source: Cycling Network Guidance, NZ Transport Agency)

A Barnes dance enables pedestrians to cross in any direction (all cars are stopped), followed by people on bikes. A Dunedin trial (underway in 2019) may result in national approval underway. This treatment is only suitable where high numbers of people walking and cycling are expected.

Figure 21: Cycle Barnes dance enables pedestrians to go any direction first, then people on bikes

(1) Hook turns enable riders to turn right without having to merge with cars and can reduce rider waiting time compared to a dedicated cycle signal. This video explains more: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PK59BuF1U
(2) Filter turning means that motorists turning left can proceed between gaps in the flow of people walking and cycling straight across an intersection, provided that they give way. This way, cyclists could be given more time to travel straight.
4 Where: the cycle network

Projects in development prior to this plan

Palmerston North has a growing network of off-road pathways, including the new He Ara Kotahi pathway linking the city, Massey University and Linton. Rural paths to link to the coast; Bunnythorpe/Feilding, Ashhurst, and Woodville are being planned under separate projects and are not the focus of this city Masterplan.

Work is also planned for Broadway Avenue, which is intended to be a multi-modal safety and streetscape upgrade to improve integration. This project, including the cycle lanes associated with the proposal, are separate from this Masterplan.

With the off-road path network well advanced, this Masterplan aims to:

- widen and connect cycle lanes on higher traffic routes
- build out a ‘neighbourhood greenway’ network comprised of quieter local streets and pathway connections through reserves, with clear wayfinding and easier crossings of major roads.

Council has substantial investigation work underway for cycleways on many corridors including, but not limited to, the Eastern Link (Railway Road to Riverside Drive), Summerhill Drive, Maxwells Line, College Street, Botanical Road and Featherston Street. As part of the Food HQ development, there is a plan to redevelop Tennent Drive as a lower speed urban street and help create a ‘super campus’.

Both the Roading and Parking Asset Management Plan and the 10-Year Plan identify existing planned cycleway or shared path projects. All these projects are illustrated on the next page.

Figure 22: Several corridors are already in various stages of investigation
Urban cycle network opportunities

The development of this Masterplan has included a gap analysis, high level project investigation, and prioritisation of potential cycling facilities. A range of potential projects for the main urban area of Palmerston North have been identified and are shown in an online map (https://arcg.is/infOup).

While this Plan informs the urban area network development and identifies supporting programmes, it is a static document. The online map is linked to Council’s databases and therefore will remain current. For context, the online map also includes the rural path links to other towns.

Click here for interactive map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separated cycleway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffered cycle lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard cycle lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood greenway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low speed commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIM way upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signals upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cycling in the central city

Many people are accustomed to the view through their car windscreen being motor dominated, and cannot picture themselves riding into the city. The ring road (comprised of Princess, Ferguson, Pitt, Bourke, Walding and Grey streets) has been developed as a motor vehicle priority route with cycling facilities limited to wider kerbside lanes and advanced stop boxes at traffic signals. The ring road helps to divert cars around the central city, but it is also hard for people on foot and bike to cross.

An annual weekday morning (7–9 am) count of people on bikes riding into or through the central city shows nearly 500 cycle movements past the 17 count stations. Women comprise only 13 per cent of the riders observed, whereas the figure for Christchurch is 38 per cent. Women tend to be more risk averse than men and international experience shows that they are unlikely to cycle if they consider streets are unsafe.13

Getting to the central city on a bike will be improved by:

- developing a network of neighbourhood greenways on quiet streets and better cycleways on busy streets connecting to the ring road
- upgrading key ring road intersections (refer to section 3 of this Masterplan and the interactive online map for more information).

Within the central city recent connections like Cuba Street and ongoing central city street upgrades provide for people to ride in shared traffic lanes or along a wide shared path, whichever is more suitable to their needs and comfort level. Additional work is envisioned to make cycling in the city easier:

- The City Centre Framework14 envisions a lower-speed environment of 30 km/h or less for all streets and laneways, with less through (cars not stopping) traffic. This would enable people on bikes to share the traffic lane more comfortably (Figure 39, p.28) or cross into The Square itself (Figure 23).
- Kerb ramps, traffic signal phasing, and minor path improvements that improve accessibility for people on bikes travelling north/south through the Square.
- A southbound cycle lane on Rangitoke Street so that people on bikes can have queueing space to access The Square.
- Kerb ramps and cycle bypass of the Church Street/Square roundabout for westbound riders.

Figure 23: Riding through The Square will be made easier with new kerb ramps and traffic signal phases for walking and cycling.
Vision for cycling facilities in and around the city

Annual weekday morning peak (7-9am) central city count of people on bikes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 2019</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Network implementation

Including the current projects, thirty-six corridors have been evaluated. To build all of them would cost about $30M and will take time and funding. Under capital programme 1559 ('Urban Cycling Network'), Council has allocated $2.9M for implementation in years two and three of the current 10-Year Plan (2018–2028), meaning fiscal years 19/20 and 20/21. The timing and scale of investment may be adjusted depending on the outcome of a separate business case and National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) funding opportunities.

This Masterplan sets a direction for future investment. The investment comes from two main streams.

Capital borrowing: Councils borrow money to build physical infrastructure (such as libraries, roads, and cycleways) which will benefit future generations. But, because it wouldn’t be fair for the current generation to pay all the costs for infrastructure that will outlast it, repaying the debt is spread into the future.

Operational budgets: Education and encouragement activities (see section 7) are services that are going to be delivered now, and Council can’t borrow money to pay for them. This money comes from what’s called an operational budget, and it’s taken from your rates. (1)

Figure 25 shows how we plan to allocate future capital and operational budgets:

- About 10 per cent should go to supporting measures (described in section 7). So for every $900 invested in physical infrastructure, $100 should also be spent on education and encouragement initiatives.
- About 60 per cent should go to low-cost paint buffered cycle lanes with flexible safe-hit posts and/or temporary treatments (e.g. planter-box separators).
- About 30 per cent should go to separated cycleways, whether through the active transport programme alone, or to support funding for full streetscape upgrades.

This enables the roll out of a connected network of cycleways faster, with conversion to permanent facilities over time.

(1) Note that the NZ Transport Agency may part-fund operational expenditure under the road safety and demand management activity class or (if delivered as part of an infrastructure project) under the walking and cycling improvements activity class.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Featherston Street</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Concept design</td>
<td>Buffered cycle lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Albert Street</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Cycle lane options to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>College Street</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Detail design</td>
<td>Complete work in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cook Street</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Intersection safety upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Park Road West</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Cycle lane upgrade, Onley Park path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Main Street West</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Concept design</td>
<td>Separated cycleway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Waldegrave (or Campbell) Street</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Neighbourhood greenway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cuba Street</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Pending Arena Masterplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Milson Line</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Buffered cycle lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maxwells Line</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Concept design</td>
<td>Cycle lane or separated cycleway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Te Awe Awe Street</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Highbury Avenue</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cycle lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Botanical Road (South)</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Concept design</td>
<td>Cycle lane (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tremaine Avenue</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cycle lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ferguson Street</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cycle lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rangitikei Street</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Widen cycle lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Botanical Road (North)</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Concept design</td>
<td>Separated cycleway (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ihaka Street</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cycle lane or traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ruahine Street (Middle)</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Separated cycleway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ruahine Street (South)</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cycle lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Eastern Link (Roberts Line, McLeavy Drive)</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Buffered cycle lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Vogel Street (South)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cycle lane or traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Victoria Avenue</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Intersection upgrades, parallel parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Main Street East</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Concept design</td>
<td>Separated cycleway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Vogel Street (North)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cycle lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors included in the prioritisation method

**Feasibility**
- Business and resident parking impacts can be mitigated
- Network operations (traffic signals, maintenance) can be mitigated
- Ease of constructability (right of way, road profile)
- Consultation requirements

**Cost**
- Rough order capital cost is lower

**Asset management**
- Higher priority if cycleway can be part funded through planned road surface, kerb and channel or sub-surface pipe renewals

**Safety**
- Reported crashes involving people on bikes
- Heavier traffic routes

**Demand**
- Number of residents served
- Number of age 10+ school students served

**Connectivity**
- Leverages previous investments in cycling network and/or connects to key activity centres / central city

**Equity**
- Areas of high need as defined by the NZ social deprivation index

**Modal conflict**
- Routes that are not freight or motor vehicle priority routes (unless there is more than enough width)
Botanical Road is an important corridor for cycling, but it is also a designated freight route and has a constrained width. Improvements for walking and cycling along the full length will be developed alongside a wider review of multi-modal transport needs and work being undertaken by West End School that may result in changes for student pick up and drop off. The image here is an artist’s impression only; further design and consultation is required to confirm feasibility.
6 Supporting infrastructure

**Cycle parking:** People who cycle need a safe and secure place to park at home and at their destination. Council policy as set out in the District Plan is “to encourage the development of safe and accessible pedestrian paths and cycleways, as well as convenient and accessible cycle parking, to support the opportunity for people to use active and non-vehicular modes of transport throughout the City.” In addition to long stay cycle parking for staff and short stay parking for visitors, the plan requires the provision of showers and lockers for any new or changed activity where there are 11 or more staff.

Private businesses can follow design guidance available on the Bikes Welcome website and the Cycling Network Guidance (CN) website. Publicly accessible cycle parking is available city wide. Council has funded some stands on private property where there have been requests for parking; given the recent revision of District Plan rules such costs will now be borne by property owners and developers.

Council has provided 449 publicly accessible cycle stands. Council’s current budget for cycle stand replacements is $11,000 per annum. New stands are funded from the bus stop and cycle stand budget of $41,000 per annum. A map of current council-provided cycle stands is provided in an interactive online map: [https://arcgis.io/fiOui](https://arcgis.io/fiOui)

**Bike fix-it stations** provide tools, a repair stand, and pump for public use. One has been installed at the Junior Road Safety Park on Fitzherbert Avenue. More are planned in key locations including outside the i-Site.

**Wayfinding signage** has been installed parallel to College Street and on a number of pathways. The CN now has a national standard for wayfinding signs on all types of cycleways, including on-street cycleways. A network plan for wayfinding is planned, taking into account key destinations. Wayfinding signage will be included in all major cycle route project development.

**Behavioural message markings on pathways:** New markings have been added to the Manawatu River Path encouraging people to move off the path when stopped, control their dogs, warn pedestrians when overtaking, and keep left. These markings will be maintained regularly.
7 Supporting programmes

This section describes non-infrastructure actions Council and partners will take (and where resources are available) to help achieve the Plan vision. Capital budgets (for infrastructure) and operational budgets (for things like school travel plans) are funded in different ways. Only activities that are directly related to an infrastructure project can typically be included in capital budgets. In the next Annual Plan cycle, Council will consider whether more operational funding is needed; this will likely depend on the level of NZ Transport Agency funding that is approved under the non-infrastructure work category. The business case for urban cycleways will include a proposal for an operational budget that is about 10 percent of the total capital budget.

Delivery partners

Together with key partners (Figure 30), Palmerston North City Council provides local infrastructure and sets city speed limits. Funding for infrastructure is often a mix of local rates and assistance from the National Land Transport Fund, administered by the NZ Transport Agency and coordinated by Horizons Regional Council.

Advocates are represented through the Council-convened People on Bikes Forum, established to get user perspectives and community involvement in the development of the network.

Council supports cycling programmes through its contract with Sport Manawatu and through grant funding for the Bikes in Schools programme (including bike tracks). Various community groups also help deliver on the Plan objectives: the Manawatu Mountain Bike Club which holds weekly skills training for kids and adults, and The Greasy Chain Charitable Trust organises mass participation events, competitions, and promotes cycling generally.

Massey University and other educational institutions can support Bicycle User Groups (BUGs). In doing so they help staff and students who cycle benefit from enhanced end-of-trip facilities and encouragement programmes. Massey’s Sustainable Transport Working Group is currently developing a 5-year Sustainable Transport Plan 2020–2024 covering all aspects of transport related to the University’s activities on all its campuses. In particular, this will include the preparation of a cycling plan for the Manawatu campus.
Marketing and communications plan

**Messaging content.** Communicating the benefits of cycling is required to encourage a habit change. This includes addressing common public misconceptions and driver behaviours towards people on bikes (and vice versa). A marketing and communications plan will be developed to support the urban cycling network investment.

Information for drivers about sharing the road with people on bikes is available online and can be promoted through council communications.(1)

![Benefits of investing in cycling in New Zealand communities](image)

**Website and advertising.** The communications plan will consider means to educate residents on the meaning of cycle facilities such as hook turn boxes and sharrow markings as well as how to safely navigate roundabouts. Messaging is also needed to address motorist perceptions about people who bike. The communications plan will consider the most effective use of the Council website, social media, mailings, and billboards to get the messages out.

![Billboard aimed at improving motorist behaviour](image)

---


---

**Engagement at the project level.** A separate ‘complete streets engagement guideline’ has been developed to improve project delivery from initial discussions with residents and road users through to community events such as grand openings. This has been informed by NZ Transport Agency collated best practices from other cycleway projects in New Zealand. Council will continue to engage with the People on Bikes Forum to obtain user input on project plans.

![Engagement is key to the project delivery](image)

---

**The International Cycling Union (UCI)’s Bike City Label** recognises leading cities and regions around the world that not only host major cycling events but also demonstrate outstanding commitment to Cycling for All. With continued success of the annual UCI approved Gravel and Tar race from Feilding to Palmerston North and implementation of this Masterplan, we may be the first New Zealand city to achieve this recognition.
Cycling skills training and Bikes in Schools

**Bike Ready** cycle skills education is already being delivered in some schools but we plan to target additional skills training at the schools that will directly benefit from the initial urban cycleways investment. The education also aims to address parental concerns about the safety of cycling, as parents make the decision about how their children travel to school.

**Bikes in Schools** (BIS) is a package of bikes, helmets, and one or more riding tracks implemented within a school that enables all students to gain confidence and skills in a safe environment. Six schools are now participating, and more are expected to join.

The **official code for cyclists** is a valuable resource for anyone wanting to know more about the rules of the road and how to stay safe.

**Figure 34:** Bike Ready cycle skills instruction in Palmerston North

**Figure 35:** The award-winning and popular Junior Road Safety Park

**Figure 36:** Bikes in Schools Terrace End

**Figure 37:** Code for cyclists
TRAVEL PLANS WORK

To support active travel, Councils across NZ are running various education and encouragement campaigns. For example, at the first 15 New Plymouth lets go schools, 300 kids started walking, another 300 started biking, and 600 parents started school run carpools.\(^{11}\)\(^{12}\) Christchurch also have council staff dedicated to helping people try active ways to travel.

In Christchurch, council staff have provided workplace travel planning services for many central city employers, returning to rebuild many central city employers, returning to rebuild 31 per cent. This has included one-on-one advice, maps, information, and ongoing support, and it is working. Among targeted employees, car use decreased 12 per cent, bus use increased 10 per cent, walking, cycling, and carpooling increased 5 per cent, increased 6 per cent, walking, cycling, and carpooling increased 2 per cent.\(^{13}\)

BENEFITS

Walking, scooting, skating, cycling to school starts a habit that can last a lifetime. The benefits are clear:

- Helps children who are active before school are more ready to learn, as shown by improved test scores.\(^{14}\)
- Congestion is reduced near the school.
- Active travel is social and fun for children and their parents.
- Self-directed travel is proven to enhance child development. They acquire road safety skills and confidence.
- Saves money – not having to drive some or all of the time.
- Builds community, (the school’s neighbours aren’t keen on all the traffic either).
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School and workplace travel plans

Travel plans help to support physical changes around school and workplace campuses, with education and encouragement activities. We have piloted travel plans at Cluettea, Roslyn and Ronneys schools, and we aim to strengthen these in the 2020 financial year, before a further city-wide roll out in 2021. The budget in Council’s 10 Year Plan currently has $21,000 per annum to resource this further expansion being considered dependent on Government funding assistance levels and prioritisation.
ITEM 10 - ATTACHMENT 1
Supporting plans and policies

In addition to requirements for cycle parking, the District Plan guides land use planning outcomes and therefore how feasible it is for people to choose cycling. Planning applications come before the city transportation engineer for a multi-modal safety check.

The Speed Limits Bylaw is periodically reviewed and offers an opportunity to potentially lower urban speeds, benefiting people on bikes. Last updated in 2013, the next review can take advantage of the updated Setting of Speed Limits Rule 2017 and the new NZ Transport Agency MegaMaps tool, designed to help assess whether current speed limits are safe and appropriate.

Speed management using traffic calming measures in local streets is a key feature of this Cycle Network Plan and would benefit from an update of the Local Area Traffic Management Policy 2003.

Developments also have to comply with the Engineering Standards for Subdivisions 2016. These standards ensure that new roads are fit for purpose including for people on bikes. The standards are regularly reviewed to keep up with the evolution in best practice.

The Proposed Parking Management Plan 2016-2018 notes that cycle lanes and parking on both sides requires ideally 13.6m of carriageway (or more). The plan states: “Few streets are 13.6m wide however if parking were removed from one side of the road a carriageway width of 11.3m to 11.6m could allow for traffic and cycle lanes in both directions. This has been done on College Street (Botanical Road – Fitzherbert Avenue) and could be achieved on other roads such as Botanical Road, Vogel Street and Te Awe Awe Street.”

The Parking Management Plan 2016-2018 covers a time period that has elapsed. A new city-wide parking strategy and policy would be useful to help inform future reallocation of street space for multi-modal projects.
## 8 Measuring progress

Several targets will be established once baseline data has been obtained. Progress reports will be issued annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Benefit/objective</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Most recent value</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car oriented land use and transport planning</td>
<td>Improved access by cycling</td>
<td>Length of NZ Transport Agency CNG standard cycleway/greenway (1, 3)</td>
<td>70 km</td>
<td>75 km by 2021 100 km by 2023 120 km by 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qty. cycle wayfinding signs (2)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture is to drive</td>
<td>People have (and use) more transport choices</td>
<td>Cycling to school (as proportion of all modes)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate infrastructure</td>
<td>Social connections (outside our cars)</td>
<td>Access to Bikes in Schools</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-street counts (2)</td>
<td>941 across 9 sites</td>
<td>10 per cent increase p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journey to work cycle mode share from the Census (1, 3)</td>
<td>5.9 per cent (2013)</td>
<td>TBD after 2018 data released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic skills, confidence, and/or fitness is lacking</td>
<td>Fewer people being killed and injured</td>
<td>Rate of cyclist serious/fatal casualties (1, 4)</td>
<td>0.53 / 100K pop (2009-2014)</td>
<td>Decreasing trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bike Ready skills participation</td>
<td>340 - Grade 1, 1010 - Grade 2 (2017/18)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People have better health</td>
<td>Residents cycling participation (3, 4)</td>
<td>13 per cent (2017)</td>
<td>15 per cent (2020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Creative and Liveable Strategy measure (may be a refinement or subset of)
(2) Active and Public Transport Plan measure (may be a refinement or subset of)
(3) Active Community Plan measure (may be a refinement or subset of)
(4) Long term measure that will be affected by many things – not just the urban cycle network investment. Typically measured every 3 to 5 years.

---
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9 Summary of actions

All projects are subject to funding availability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan section / category</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 &amp; 5. Engineering</td>
<td>Implement priority projects</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>19/20 - 20/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove or reconfigure vehicle barriers to Manawatu River Path that limit cycle access</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>20/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue working with contractors to keep cycle lanes clear of traffic management signs</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review road and path sweeping maintenance contracts; Tie proactive maintenance of underpass to storm events</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supporting infrastructure</td>
<td>Develop and implement a cycling wayfinding plan</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle stands new and upgrade</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Engagement</td>
<td>Continue People on Bikes Forum meetings</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>At least quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use the Complete Streets Engagement Guideline to involve community</td>
<td>All Council units</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Education</td>
<td>Bike Ready cycling skills training</td>
<td>Sport Manawatu</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident education including the meaning of sharrows, hook turn boxes, and safe use of roundabouts</td>
<td>Infrastructure/Comms</td>
<td>Every October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional driver education using the Road Code information about sharing the road with cyclists – advocate to Horizons, freight companies, and taxi operators</td>
<td>Strategy and Planning</td>
<td>19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Encouragement</td>
<td>Address perceptions of people who cycle and benefits of cycling</td>
<td>Infrastructure/Comms</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free lights on daylight savings time change</td>
<td>Infrastructure/Police</td>
<td>Every March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School and workplace travel plans</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bikes in Schools</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike with Us (Green Prescription)</td>
<td>Sport Manawatu</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council to participate in, and promote the annual Aotearoa Cycle Challenge</td>
<td>All Council units</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply for the International Cycling Union Bike City Label</td>
<td>Strategy and Planning</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluation</td>
<td>Conduct mode share survey in a sample of classrooms</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct annual manual counts including apparent age range and gender</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Every March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collate mode share, count, and other relevant data from national, regional and local surveys. Analyse data and publish an annual report card</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Every April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 References

Summary: achieving the vision of the Masterplan and operationalising it

The divergence of submitter views on the types of cycleways (paint only or physically separated) and parking impacts reiterates the need for the revised Masterplan to emphasise necessary trade-offs and to introduce the Ministry of Transport’s concept of “transport mode neutrality”. Accordingly, a new section has been added that clearly states how the Masterplan vision can only be fully realised if there is a reallocation of space resulting in some decreases in level of service for motorists at intersections and reduced (but not eliminated) parking.

Physically separated cycleways, cycleways to the left of parking

Twenty-five submissions expressly sought more or only physically separated cycleways (14, 18, 36, 39, 44, 46, 54, 55, 68, 69, 71, 87, 98, 100, 102, 105, 106, 115, 121, 122, 123, 136, 139, 147, 149, 154). One submission noted that physically separated cycleways are an impediment to faster riders.

- The NZ Transport Agency submission (no. 147) indicated that “Over time it will be great to see a greater proportion of funding spent on separated cycleways that provide a greater level of service and are more likely to attract the interested but concerned”.

- It is important to note that the lead author of this Masterplan assisted in writing the relevant sections of the NZ Transport Agency’s current guidance on planning and design for cycling and has undertaken substantial research into the target audience in New Zealand.


- It is agreed that full kerb separation is the ideal from a comfort and safety perspective and will attract more people to cycling than merely painted cycle lanes.

- Physically separated cycleways require more street width than painted cycle lanes in order to provide enough room for faster riders to overtake slower riders and result in less parking due to sight lines at driveways.

- Palmerston North is dissimilar from other NZ cities where separated cycleways are being implemented: a number of key routes have a kerb to kerb dimension that is less than 11.2m wide (Vogel Street is only 10.4m wide) and has many suburban traffic signal controlled intersections where there is not enough room to extend a separated (or any) cycle facility up to and departing from the intersection without potentially significant impacts on intersection capacity. Further investigations will be undertaken.

- Positioning cycleways to the left of parking is costly and increases sight distance requirements for motorists exiting properties, limiting the ability to provide on-street parking more than with standard painted cycle lanes. Supporting national legislation defining right of way priority for users of such cycleways has not yet been put in place. However, cycleways to the left of parking are an option in the toolbox (CNG) and will be considered in design development.

- Many submitters have seen the Guardian article titled “Painted bike lanes are a waste of money, commissioners say”, which cites a journal article by Beck et al (2019) about passing distance. The problem with evidence about safety disbenefits of painted cycle lanes is that the studies are almost always on poor quality cycle lanes without provision at intersections.

- There is contrary evidence that high quality, wide painted cycle lanes with good intersection facilities are in fact useful and a good first step. See the NZTA Cycling Network Guidance, the Victoria Transport Policy Institute, NACTO, Irish Cycle Design Manual, the Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse, etc.

- The Danish Collection of Cycle Concepts (2012) says this: “…where an entire network of cycle lanes is established in an urban area without cycle tracks the number of cyclists will increase … cyclists feel more secure and perceive the cycle lane as a genuine improvement of the service level compared to being forced to bike in mixed traffic.”

- Regardless of actual safety, a corollary of perceived safety is an increase in rider numbers, which drives the “safety in numbers” effect.

- If Council focuses solely on separated cycleways, substantial political capital may be expended to get even a few kilometres done, and much of the city will not have even minimum width painted cycleways.

- The Masterplan is signalling a more “agile”, lower cost focus for many (but not all) corridors – but when streets need a full reconstruction then all options can be cost-effectively considered – including full kerb separation.

Separate cycle phases at traffic signals

Nine submissions called for more use of cycle phases at traffic lights (37, 54, 58, 68, 69, 91, 94, 113, 121)

LTP programme 1257 provides $41,000 per year for separate phases for cyclists. This is sufficient for minor phasing and hardware changes for one movement at one intersection per year and cannot fund substantial changes. Further implementation is to be funded through Programme 1559 and/or general safety budgets.

Palmerston North has 36 traffic light-controlled intersections, many of which do not have a lead-in cycle lane – which is required for a separate cyclist phase.

- A national trial is planned to test flashing yellow arrows for filter turns by drivers across a separated cycleway. This could support the implementation of separated cycleways at more intersections and improve the safety and level of service for all types of riders (those less skilled and those more confident).

- Right turning riders are either directed to a hook turn box to make the turn in two sequential phases or governed by directional cycle aspects, which are undergoing a national trial by VicStrada in Auckland and Christchurch. The trial is proving successful and the directional aspect is likely to be added to the Traffic Control Devices (TCD) Manual in due course.

- A right turn phase such as at Ruahine/Featherston is feasible because there is a left turn slip lane and there is (some) room for right turning riders to queue out of the way of straight through riders. This treatment may be considered at other intersections but does not represent the best possible outcome everywhere. In some cases, a hook turn requires less average total time to navigate.

Every signalised intersection is different, and the technical complexity is high. Council will need to consider a variety of options including widening, space reallocation, time reallocation, and innovative phasing options (or a combination of these). With each proposal, modelling should be undertaken to assess the impact on other road users and ensure that Council maintains the support of the community as well as avoids unintended consequences (such as low compliance rates from people on bikes).

Parking

Nineteen submissions addressed the trade-off in road space allocation between parking and cycleways; nine for removal of parking (36, 39, 65, 69, 71, 93, 104, 106, 115) and ten against removal of parking (1, 9, 49, 53, 62, 73, 89, 105, 127, 131)

- For removal of parking: some submitters consider that rider safety is more important than the storage of private property on a public street; the allocation of street space should not be a political question but a technical safety one.

- Against removal of parking: some submitters consider that providing for cyclists should not come at the expense of resident and business parking and access.

- On local streets, the vast majority of parking is typically retained; only a few spaces need to be removed for traffic calming features (where warranted).
Attachment B (Part 1) Common Issues Raised in Multiple Submissions

- On collector and arterial streets identified as cycle routes, the aim is to meet national minimum standard cycle facilities for the safety of users as a higher priority than the storage of private vehicles in the public right-of-way; however, the aim will be to retain the maximum amount of parking possible while not compromising on safety.

People who cycle are spending less on driving and therefore more of their income is available to be spent on the local economy; also as noted on draft Masterplan page 4, people walking and cycling spend an average of $34 per shopping trip and shop more often than drivers https://www.ntta.govt.nz/resources/research/reports/530.

Rural path connections to Ashhurst, Bunnythorpe/Feilding


- Because Manawatū District Council postponed completion of their portion of the Palmerston North – Feilding pathway, Councillors decided to re-allocate funding towards improvements to routes in the main urban area where the higher population density will generate higher benefits per dollar invested.
- Rural routes to the coast, Feilding, Ashhurst, and Woodville are out of the scope of this Masterplan but are still being developed under separate programmes.
- Where alignment information is already known, these links have been identified in the interactive map.

Botanical Road

Seven submissions sought the prioritisation of Botanical Road (31, 58, 69, 71, 94, 102, 106).

- Botanical Road is one of the corridors that is already in development (as mentioned in section 4) and a possible concept is illustrated in a full page on page 17, as well as in the interactive online map. Discussion of Botanical Road is to be added to the phasing table as well.
- Botanical Road may rise in the priorities depending on the result of a separate multi-modal “Roads and Streets Framework”, given that it is also currently a primary freight route.
- Pinch points south of College Street and leading to Park Road / the He Ara Kotahi bridge could be addressed as a first phase; conceptual options for the area around West End School and Awatapu College here have been shown to principals of both schools and were supported – but will require parking removal from the south approach to the College Street intersection.

Central city

Twelve submissions called for cycleways and/or lower speeds in the central city (10, 26, 37, 51, 57, 91, 101, 104, 115, 134, 139, 147).

- The city centre is generally out of the scope of this Masterplan; however the associated online map indicates a number of improvements that will be communicated to the relevant city centre designers.

Central city ring road

Three submissions noted that the central city ring road is difficult to ride along and/or across (28, 113, 147).

- Much of the city centre ring road (Ferguson, Pitt, Bourke, Grey, Princess) had cycle lanes and/or space for cycling up to the early 2000’s but has been redesigned for six or more vehicle travel and parking lanes over recent years as a motor vehicle priority route. The benefit of this is that motorists can be discouraged from driving through the city centre and instead directed around it.
- For enthused and confident or higher skilled adult riders, the ring road has some cycling facilities including advanced stop boxes at some intersections and space to cycle (wide kerbside lanes).

Urban Cycling Network Masterplan

- The draft Masterplan’s interactive online map highlights further intersection improvements to help all skill levels of people on bikes cross the ring road; this will be highlighted in a new section in the final Masterplan.
- New pages have been inserted in section 4 in relation to cycling in the City Centre.

Network density

Six submissions made comment about prioritising too many parallel routes (58, 71, 94, 105, 106, 113).

- All non-motorway/expressway routes are considered cycle routes (because people who cycle live and work on them).
- Varying levels of treatment are proposed – not all routes will get the same investment or have the same level of service.
- Example: Park Road is between two high priority cycling corridors (College Street and the Manawatu River Path). But it has cycle lanes on it at present, which include some pinch points and substandard sections. Council typically does not remove cycleways (with the exception of JFK Drive) – so is planning minor changes to eliminate pinch points and upgrade intersections.

Road surface roughness

Five submissions noted that the chipseal road surface on urban streets is too rough and/or traps broken glass particles (1, 55, 60, 72, 93).

- Hot mix asphalt, chipseal grade 4/5 or slurry overlays can improve the ride quality and will be considered for major cycle routes that are upgraded, developed and maintained subsequent to the implementation of this Masterplan.

Shared path surface type

Five submissions were for or against the asphalt or concrete sealing of paths in reserves and along waterways (27, 62, 96, 102, 103).

- Two submitters (62, 105) contend that paths should remain limestone to manage cyclist speeds. However, these paths are for transportation as much as recreation.
- Sealed surfaces permit all-weather, all-year access and reduce the effort required to cycle.
- The same way that appropriate speeds are set on highways and streets, the appropriate speed for a shared path is determined by the width, alignment, and user composition. It is not Council’s role to “keep rider speeds down” but to design facilities that serve the needs of people who need or choose cycling for transport as well as all other path users.
- Separate paths are currently being installed upstream and may also be considered wherever width allows (subject to budgets).
- Three submitters (27, 96, 102) advocate for better sealed surfaces on paths. Council will consider sealing pathways were appropriate, subject to budget and prioritisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key for Part 2 Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Did not answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES Agrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO Does not agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1   | Murray Leonard-Jones | -          | -              | -              | -      | • Previously a keen cyclist, but now only tends to cycle on off road shared paths.  
  • Feels the left-hand side of the road way is very poorly maintained and there has been a significant decline in road quality.  
  • The use of chip-seal rather than hot-mix makes on road cycling much less pleasant.  
  • Doesn’t believe cycleways are always necessary, particularly on neighbourhood streets where speeds are lower.  
  • Believes on-road parking is highly valuable and should be retained where possible. | • The submitter is not alone in preferring low-stress cycling environments over cycling on-road. The Masterplan aims to improve the comfort of cycling on-road.  
  • Refer general road roughness response.  
  • The Masterplan aims for neighbourhood greenways (‘quiet street’) treatments on local streets to ensure that motor traffic speeds are compatible with sharing the lane.  
  • Refer general parking response. | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended. |
| 2   | Erin M Verneill | YES        | YES            | YES            | Better | • The safer the existing cycle ways are, the better.  
  • A wider path down (or a separate lane for cyclists) by the river would be amazing as there isn’t enough room in the path as it is. | • The Masterplan aims to widen and better connect existing cycleways.  
  • Council has installed and will maintain path user behaviour pavement markings; new paths are being installed at 3.0m or wider; opportunities to widen existing paths will be taken when pavements are scheduled for renewal; the existing separate Grade 2 mountain bike track is to be extended along the river path where feasible. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  • Section 6 - add photos of Manawatu River Path signs and markings encouraging courteous sharing of pathways. |
| 3   | Lee Odlin | YES        | YES            | YES            | Better | • Health evidence is in favour of active commuting and encouraging people out of their cars.  
  • Good start for building a city for people instead of motor vehicles.  
  • Pushing lanes up against parked cars is a fatality waiting to happen.  
  • Other road users need to be educated in their responsibilities in sharing the road. Police should be included in helping to address this issue. | • New cycleways will not be of “door zone” width; existing cycleways will be widened if they do not meet at least the NZTA minimum standard.  
  • NZ Police have been consulted; there is no national priority or budget on police education of motorists towards sharing the road. However, Council can and will promote messages about sharing the road published by the NZ Transport Agency. | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
  • Section 7 - add reference to https://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/roadcode/about-other-road-users/sharing-road-with-cyclists/  
  • Council will write to Horizons, freight companies, taxi operators and recommend that all contracted drivers are reminded of key messages in the above link. |
| 4   | Clare Crowshoaw | -          | -              | -              | More   | • More lighting would help encourage more cycling.  
  • A cycle way from the top of Summerhill to Massey down old west road would be good.  
  • Stop cars parking in cycle lanes | • Lighting recommendation noted.  
  • The NZ Transport Agency has completed a shoulder widening project on Old West Road that provides more space for cycling; Council has been advised by the Agency that no further upgrades are planned.  
  • Instances of cars parking in cycle lanes can only be enforced if wardens see the infraction; observations of regular illegal parking can be recorded and passed on to council to assess whether no-stopping lines or other measures could help address common infraction locations. | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended. |
| 5   | Astarte | -          | -              | -              | Better | • Some of the cycleways have pinch points and they are potential accident places.  
  • The paint on cycleways fades quickly.  
  • Likes that PNCC is making cycling a ‘good thing’. | • The Masterplan aims to eliminate pinch points by adhering to best practice design (NZ Transport Agency Cycling Network Guidance). | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  • Section 7 - edit as per recommended change in response to submission 3 |
|-----|---------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6   | Bruce Thomson       | YES           | YES            | YES            | More         | ● Most bus drivers in town are well educated regarding cyclists, however taxi drivers need the same education.                                                                                                       | ● Paint colour does fade quickly in the NZ environment; this is a national issue that may be resolved through ongoing product development. ● Taxi driver education recommendation is noted. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  ● Section 1 - describe the potential for e-bikes and other low-powered electric micro-mobility to improve accessibility, economic and environmental outcomes. |
| 7   | Mike Monaghan       |               |                |                |              | ● This transformation needs maximally visible, pervasive safety, and visible horde of cyclist more than it needs small areas of ultra-safe cyclists.                                                                 |                                                                                                                                               | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended.                                                                 |
| 8   | Ross Bidlake        | YES           | YES            |                | Better       | ● The fastest growing area in the city is Kelvin Grove/Whakarongo. A Safe cycle route down to the Manawatu River pathways would be amazing at linking this area to the City.                                                                 | ● The Eastern Link and associated planning study is this route and is included in the Masterplan document and associated online map.            | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended.                                                                 |
| 8   | Ross Bidlake        | YES           | YES            |                | Better       | ● We need more people to take up active transport as a key part of trying to reduce carbon emissions for the city.                                                                                                  | ● While one rural district council has taken the step of designing all footpaths as shared paths, this is not supported by best practice, by NZ Transport Agency, and would be open to legal challenge. Council has no intention of compromising pedestrian safety in this way. ● Footpaths are unsuitable for cycling faster than 10-15 km/h due to driveway conflicts with motor vehicles, and therefore would not suit people who want to ride faster to get places ● Note that a proposal to allow slow cycling by children under the age of 12 to ride on footpaths is currently being considered by the NZ Government. | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended.                                                                 |
### Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis
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|-----|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9   | Roy Le Quesne      | NO            | -              | -              |              | - The Plan is very biased in favour of the few people that bike. No consideration has been made in relation to the needs of residents who live in the affected streets.  
- Last year the residents of College Street in the area between Botanical Road and Batt Street objected to the cycle plan put before them. A public meeting was held, and a new plan was created as a compromise that included insert parking. Flyer in letterbox says no insert parking because the Council doesn’t have funds, so why 3.3 million dollars allocated to cycling?  
- The current cyclist system is fine  
- The proposed cycle plan is over kill  
- Agrees with Councillor Leonie Hapeta that this process is being rushed through. |
|     |                    |               |                |                |              | - The Masterplan is aimed at people who currently or wish to cycle, correct.  
- College Street flyer is correct that money is not available in the 18/19 financial year – the Masterplan is for the 19/20 and following years.  
- College Street (current work – not the focus of this Masterplan consultation.  
- $31M is not included in this Masterplan. Under TFAR, an amount in that region may have been possible (but local share still just $2.9M). TFAR no longer available.  
- Local surveys by Massey University (Cheyne et al 2015, 2017) and other submissions received indicate that the submitter’s view about the adequacy of the existing provisions for cycling is not shared by the majority.  
- Refer general parking response. |

#### Council officer recommended changes

- This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  - Section 4 - remove references to TFAR.

|-----|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10  | Dr Helen Smith     | YES           | YES            | YES            | More Better  | - We need to get City centres more pedestrian and cyclist friendly.  
- Making town safer would be a great step.  
- Cycling is great for public health and fossil fuels are running out.  
- Would love to be able to safely cycle from Ashurst to her work at the Palmerston North City Hospital.  
- More covered places to safely leave cycles.  
- Places to chain cycles near to shops.  
- Better and cheaper subsidised bike hire.  

**ADDITIONAL SUBMISSION**

- Wants to see physical separation from the road not just road markings.  
- We need covered areas in park cycles in town.  
- It is quite unsafe to cycle, cycleways should be put on quieter streets and places where there is no car access.  
- Link up areas such as the river, and Raukawa Road with Te Matai road. |
|     |                    |               |                |                |              | - City centre is generally out of the scope of this Masterplan; however the associated map indicates a number of improvements that will be communicated to the relevant city centre designers.  
- Refer general rural path links response.  
- Council will reference the new NZTA cycle parking technical note to improve cycling parking city-wide.  
- A cycle sharing scheme may be supported but these are typically delivered by the private market; currently the international trend has seen e-scooters largely supersede cycle share schemes, Palmerston North is slightly below the typical minimum city size for international micromobility share providers (100K population) but staff will continue to market the city as a good candidate for more transport options |

#### Council officer recommended changes

- This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
  - Section 4 - clarify geographic scope.  
  - Section 6 - reference the new NZ Transport Agency technical note on cycle parking.

|-----|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11  | Anne Midwinter     | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better       | - The sooner the better.  
- Don’t make cyclists safety dependent on car drivers being polite and respectful.  
- Sharing only works if most participants do it.  
- Cars often use the cycle path on the Te Awe Awe street side of Wallace park as a second land. Paint is no good in these types of areas.  
- Wish the phasing plan was faster, especially on Albert Street.  
- Get logging trucks off Albert Street.  
- Build covered parks at Massey. |
|     |                    |               |                |                |              | - There is a tension/contradiction between wanting better cycleways but wanting faster phasing plan.  
- Albert Street is designated as an arterial or primary collector in the NZTA One Network Road Classification and it is inconsistent with national road management practice to prohibit logging trucks or other freight traffic from such streets.  
- Albert Street is a designated over-dimension route but not a designated primary freight route; should the long-planned outer ring road be developed with an upstream |

#### Council officer recommended changes

- This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
  - Online map - added proposal for Flexposts along the Wallace Park frontage.  
  - Section 6 - added note that Council will advocate to Massey University for improved end-of-trip facilities.
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|-----|-----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 12  | Phillip Devlin  | YES           | YES            |                | Better       | - Educate drivers not to be selfish and careless.  
- Safe cycle lanes in key roads is a great way to start.  
- If more people from the inner city feel safe cycling around town, the more likely they will leave the car at home.  
- Well planned and quality cycleways are a better option.  
- Some cycleways are so dangerous that a lot of cyclists won’t use them.  
- Ashhurst Bridge cycleway is the worst as it puts cyclists out on the narrowest point of the road.  
- Ask the people who use cycleways what works and what does not.  
- Cambridge Street bridge kerb ramps are designed for less confident riders. There is no reason that faster, more confident riders should have to use the footpath. At a minimum, the signs can be removed.  
- The People on Bikes Forum composed of community members who cycle will continue to be consulted.  
- Designs will be developed by people who bike, including professional engineers and planners who live in Palmerston North with relevant expertise in cycleways. |                                                    | - Section 7 - edit as per recommended change in response to submission 3 |
| 13  | Shane Simpson   | NO            | NO             | NO             | Better       | - There are plenty of cycling opportunities in both the city and tracks down by the river.  
- Most people do not use the current tracks we have because they are too lazy to ride around.  
- There is ample room on many of these streets for people to bike along and its not a very interesting route if you are doing laps for fitness.  
- Would be good to see a cycle lane run the length of Palmerston North following the train tracks.  
- The Plan won’t achieve more people cycling.  
- Having a street sweeper keeping cycle lanes clean would be a great start.  
- A river path further south of the City would be a great idea.  
- River pathways work for many people and connect some neighbourhoods to some other key routes e.g. Fitzherbert, Tennent and Linton shared paths. However, the river paths do not connect all neighbourhoods to many other destinations; that is what the Masterplan aims for.  
- There are numerous safety, security and right-of-way (width) issues with large sections of the urban rail corridor, which is an active freight environment. Kiwirail is unlikely to approve public access, even if fenced off. Other options for east-west cycle routes on the north side of town are JFK Drive (insufficient width without removal of either all parking or a travel lane), Fairs Road (proposed route), Tremain Av (too many commercial driveways and limited width), and Featherston St (proposed route).  
- Council has a proactive and reactive street sweeping contract. However, Palmerston North has an issue with some residents throwing alcohol and energy drink bottles out of car windows (more so than many other cities in NZ); a national change in recycling / bottle deposit is a potential way to address this.  
- A river path extension south-west of the city is proposed to be phased in conjunction with residential development; as shown in the online map. |                                                    | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended. |
| 14  | Ryan Ingle      | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better       | - Need to see more people on bikes in the City.  
- It is a flat, grid layout and perfect for cyclists.  
- The roads are predominantly used for vehicles, so having fewer but better quality will work for both types of road users.  
- E Bikes are the way of the future.  
- For the purposes of travel, PNCC needs to have a focus on implementing more of them into the city.  
- Refer general separated cycleways response. |                                                    | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
- Section 1 - describe the potential for e-bikes and other low-powered electric micro mobility to improve accessibility, economic and environmental outcomes. |
|-----|----------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 15  | Brenda Moana         | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better      | • For health, environment, an increased sense of community, we need to have more people on bikes.  
  • The streets in Palmerston North link well together into a network.  
  • We need to get cyclists away from cars as much as possible.  
  • Please complete the riverside cycleway from Raukawa Road to Te Matai Road. This would be a tourist boost to the region and would help with growth of Ashburton and surrounds. | • Refer general rural path links response.  
  | | | | | | | | | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  • Section 1 and Section 4 - clarify that the “urban” area is the Palmerston North main urban area and what is in/out of scope, geographically. |
| 16  | Pablo Callejas       | YES           | YES            | NO             | Better      | • Vehicle collision risk is the main reason why him and his family do not commute by bicycle.  
  • Lack of adequate bike infrastructure in Palmerston North.  
  • Better bike access to the city’ green spaces and CBD would drastically improve day to day quality of life.  
  • Featherston Street is a priority as it is extremely dangerous and highly used. Would like to see construction sooner than 21/22.  
  • An unsafe cycleway is worse than no cycle way at all.  
  • Good idea to have awareness campaigns throughout the City educating drivers and bike sceptics. | • All supported in the Masterplan.  
  | | | | | | | | | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended. |
| 17  | Jacqueline Huaxley  | YES           | YES            | -              | More        | • It is safer for a bike to be in a cycleway than not.  
  • Is there any way to make turning across traffic easier/safer during periods of high traffic? | • Hook turns are a safer way to turn across traffic during periods of high traffic.  
  | | | | | | | | | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  • Section 3 - include description of hook turns |
| 18  | Jayden Carr          | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better      | • Cities need to encourage more forms of transport.  
  • Palmerston North is small enough that biking should be easy, healthier for you, and better for the environment.  
  • Currently cycleways are largely painted onto existing roads with little regard for safety.  
  • To encourage cyclists there needs to be more separation from the traffic flow and car parking.  
  • Provide more places to securely park bicycles around the CBD, and centres of each suburb.  
  • Good to see the Council engaging with its residents. | • Refer general separated cycleways response.  
  | | | | | | | | | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended. |
| 19  | Jocelyn Woodward-Candy | NO           | NO             | NO             | Better      | • Ashburton should be a priority, including the connection of the river path to Palmerston North. | • Refer general rural path links response.  
  | | | | | | | | | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  • Section 1 and Section 4 - clarify that the “urban” area is the Palmerston North main urban area and what is in/out of scope, geographically. |
| 20  | Vicki Gifkins        | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better      | • More off-road paths like Napier would encourage more cycling.  
  • Refer general rural path links response.  
  | | | | | | | | | This submission is accepted. Change recommended as per response to submission 19. |
| 21  | David Baire          | YES           | YES            | More           | Better      | • Anything to make the roads safer for cyclists will encourage more people to use their bikes. There are health and environmental benefits to this. | • Refer general rural path links response.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>This submission is accepted. Change recommended as per response to submission 19.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22  | Shane Betts        | YES            | YES            | -              | -      | • Would like to see longer cycle ways between suburbs (Feilding, Bunnythorpe, Ashhurst etc.).  
  • The better the quality, and the more cycle ways there are both contribute towards encouraging more people onto bikes,  
  • Secure parking spaces would encourage more cycling.  
  • Wants his route to be safer when he bikes.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | The aim of the Masterplan is to create a safe, convenient and comfortable cycle network ad transport system for people of all ages and abilities. | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended. |
| 23  | Gillian Lawn       | YES            | YES            | YES            | Better | • Great starting point  
  • The key is to make roads safer and separate the cyclists from cars as much as possible.  
  • Opening car doors is particularly dangerous.  
  • Parking in cycle lanes should be considered too.  
  • Driver education is a good way to encourage more cycling.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | All supported in the Masterplan.                                                                                                              | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended. |
| 24  | Philippa Walton    | YES            | YES            | YES            | More   | • Would love to know her son is safe biking to and from school.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | All supported in the Masterplan.                                                                                                              | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended. |
| 25  | Holly Ryan         | YES            | YES            | YES            | More   | • Would love to see more cycleways around the City, specifically Milson Line and Kelvin Grove Road.  
  • Unable to drive due to slight vision problems so more cycleways would make him feel safer and give him more freedom to get around.  
  • Having less cars on the road is great for the environment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | All supported in the Masterplan.                                                                                                              | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended. |
| 26  | Joshua Thompson    | YES            | YES            | YES            | Better | • Reduced speed limits to 30km/h within the ring road and at suburban retail centres such as Hokowhitu Village, the Terrace end section of Broadway Ave, and around Pitama Road shops.  
  • Raise speed limit on Main Street to 60km/h as it may encourage more users to use it and clear other roads for cyclists.  
  • Rangitikei Street and Fitzherbert Street could also have their speed limits raised to 60km/h but would need raised medians installed first for safety.                                                                                                                                                     | Speed limits are mentioned in the Masterplan but subject to other council transport planning processes.                                      | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended.  
  The suggestion for reduced speed limits in neighbourhood key activity centres will be passed on to relevant council officers. |
| 27  | Alyse Gardiner     | YES            | YES            | YES            | Better | • Make cycleways accessible and suitable for mobility scooter uses, including the Mangaoane Stream between Amberley Ave and Pioneer Highway.  
  • Agreed that Mangaoane Stream path sealed surface would aid in access for mobility scooter users; however this is a lower priority  
  • Refer general path surface response.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  • Section 4 - mention that urban cycleways of the shared path type are also suitable for mobility scooters especially if sealed.                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                              |
| 28  | Paul Brigham       | -              | -              | -              | Better | • Make existing cycle lanes safer.  
  • Riding clockwise around the ring road is dangerous, just as riding east along Ferguson Street through the Princess Street intersection.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | A key focus of the Masterplan corridors is improvement of existing routes.  
  • The Ring Road is not a priority of the Masterplan due to modal conflict and prior council decisions prioritising the Ring Road for motorists.                                                                                                 | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended. |
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|-----|-----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 29  | Guy Rayner      | YES           | NO             | YES            | Better       | • Finding a solution to linking Ashburton to Palmy river cycle paths up and then providing friendly access from Kelvin Grove to the river cycle way are important.  
• Would be a shame if a landowner stopped freedom of travel between Palmerston North and Woodville.  
• Looks forward to Palmerston North joining the ranks of being a cycle/ scooter friendly and seeing people out of their car and enjoying the City more. | • Refer general rural path links response.  
• Kelvin Grove to river is part of the Eastern Link project as illustrated in the online map. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
• Section 1 and Section 4 - clarify that the "urban" area is the Palmerston North main urban area and what is in/out of scope, geographically. |
| 30  | Pierre Roudier  | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better       | • Some of the existing infrastructure is really risky to use and can even make confident riders feel unsafe.  
• Could build up skills by proposing areas of recreation where users can develop their skills.  
• Need to think about infrastructure could support the rise of electric bikes.  
• A lot of the cycle way entrances to the Manawatu River are too narrow for bikes that tow child carrier style trailers. | • The city has extensive off-road and junior road safety park opportunities for building up skills.  
• Agreed regarding e-bikes (as covered by CNG) and river path accessibility. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
• Include project to address river path accessway barrier removal. |
| 31  | Campbell Ogilvie| YES           | NO             | NO             | More         | • The wording of the vision statement is clumsy and reads as an attempt to tick off too many buzz words.  
• Questions why there is no cycleway shown in the Plan on College Street and Botanical Road.  
• There should be a cycleway allowing cyclists to cross Ferguson Street from Ashley to Ada.  
• Palmerston North is compact, flat and there's no excuse for the poor numbers of cyclists.  
• Planning rules should ensure any new commercial buildings include provision of employees to cycle.  
• Extend the no all-day parking free parking zone so that people can't park on College Street and walk to work.  
• Encourage workplace travel plans.  
• Many of the current cycle lanes seem to be where they are needed. | • They aren't buzz words as much as investment objectives; the vision statement has been developed by multiple parties and is specific to this programme rather than a vision for cycling generally.  
• College Street and Botanical Road are illustrated in the online map.  
• Refer general Botanical Road response.  
• A crossing from Ashley to Ada is included in the online map.  
• Provision for cycling in new commercial buildings is included in the recent District Plan review and now operative.  
• Agreed on workplace travel plans, however council will need to provide funding for this operational expense. | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Section 4 and 5 - include and explain Botanical Road planning considerations.  
• Refer suggestion of resident parking scheme to College Street project team. |
| 32  | Daryl K Dean    | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better       | • Good start to separate bikes from vehicle traffic on our roads.  
• Would be safer for cycle lanes to be positioned between parked cars and footpaths and would also provide for multiple users such as scooters and skateboards.  
• Safety on our roads for all users should be a priority.  
• Better quality cycle ways will encourage more usage.  
• Signs, road markings, barriers and bike parking at i-site would encourage more cycling. | • Refer general separated cycleways response. | This submission is accepted. There are no changes recommended. |
| 33  | Denise MacPher son| -             | -              | -              | -            | • Would be great to see a cycleway from Palmerston North to Bunnythorpe.  
• Railway Road is really dangerous for cyclist and a cycleway would make it much safer. | • Refer general rural path links response. | This submission is noted. While out of scope of this consultation, the feedback will be referred to the appropriate Council unit. |
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| 34  | Kimiura Tamatea   | YES               | YES            | -              | NO           | • The wording of the vision statement could be more captive.  
• Fix the cycleways that really need a touch up and then move to creating new roads.  
• Education, discounts, deals and incentives would encourage more people to cycle.  
• Show the rest of the Country how to reduce our emissions and become a greener Kiwi.  
• The vision is supplemented by the Section 8 monitoring targets; however, the vision could be refined to avoid the use of "more people".  
• The phasing plan does focus on upgrading existing cycleways along with new routes.  
• Operational funding is relatively difficult to attain. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
• Section 1 - change vision words "...encourage more people..." to "...enables people..." |  
| 35  | Hester Callister  | YES               | YES            | NO             | Better       | • Would like to see an emphasis on safe cycling.  
• A network is essential as gaps cause real problems.  
• Would like to see a link to Ashhurst and perhaps even Foston in the longer term. | Refer general rural path looks response. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
• Section 3 and Section 4 - clarify that the "urban" area is the Palmerston North main urban area and what is in/out of scope, geographically. |
| 36  | Gavin Roache      | YES               | NO             | YES            | -            | • The vision statement incorporates a lot of good concepts.  
• With climate change in mind this Plan is important.  
• Palmerston North has a mild climate and a flat terrain, so there is no reason cycling can’t account for 40% of all travel, just like Copenhagen.  
• Would like to see hard measurable targets in the vision – a 300% increase from 6% to 18% commuter use is achievable over 10 years.  
• Too focused on adding infrastructure on our busiest roads.  
• Cyclists need to be separated from traffic.  
• Cycleways should be created that use quiet and low traffic routes.  
• Good to have a phasing plan, although feels it should be faster.  
• More money is the answer and could be raised by making parking in the City more expensive.  
• Discourage car use and encourage public transport.  
• Shouldn’t have to choose between better quality cycleways and more cycleways.  
• Separated cycleways will make cycling safer and encourage more users.  
• Bus routes need to be more frequent and should be free at least to cyclists.  
• Needs to be free individual lockers available for bicycles at both the Airport and the Railway Station.  
• The city needs to encourage higher densities that will make public transport, cycling and walking more viable. | Council is awaiting the 2018 census results to inform the setting of a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Timely) target around mode shift. Note many other policies at the national level (taxation and subsidies relating to motor vehicle use) and cultural issues are significant influences on mode shift.  
Regarding focus on busier roads, that is where the safety risk is. The plan also includes a "quiet street" network (purple lines on the map).  
Refer general separated cycleways response.  
Agreed that parking charges are a possible lever that may be considered in separate council strategies and policies.  
Refer general parking response.  
Council will advocate to KiwiRail and the Airport to include secure long-term cycle parking.  
One issue with higher densities is that if people continue to maintain the same number of cars per household, there will be increasing public demand for on-street car parking – counter to the goal of a multi-modal street layout.  
There is a choice required between more or better when budgets are limited. | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Include an action in section 9 - Council will advocate to KiwiRail and the Airport to include secure long-term cycle parking.  
• Include consideration of mode shift in future reviews of the PNCC parking management plan. |
| 37  | Steve Stannard    | NO                | YES            | NO             | -            | • The Plan does not consider the behaviour of motorists.  
• Presently cars are seen as superior and more important than bicycles.  
• We are one of the only cities in the world that doesn’t have a pedestrian mall  
• The engagement section does consider the behaviour of drivers; the separate business case includes this issue in the ILM (Investment Logic Map) but it was considered too detailed for inclusion in the Masterplan.  
• Featherston Street design remains in concept stage for now; as per existing RUR a through cyclist has priority at | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Miriam Sharland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Submission key points

- What would happen at every intersection along Featherston Street if there is a separated bike lane and who would give way in this regard.
- Key to getting people on bicycles is to make commuting routes safe, fast and easy.
- Cook Street and Main Street West already have off-road cycle lanes, so questions why the concept design for this is going to take another year.
- Most pressing is Featherston Street and College Street, there is no reason this cannot be dealt with first.
- A cycling strategy is not simply about building more or better cycleways, it’s about producing a synergism with other road users which include motor vehicles.
- Would like to see some leadership from Council with regard to removing cars from the centre of town.
- Some streets should be closed off to cars or made one-way.
- Drive ways but not at intersections unless separate signal phases are provided (may change this year under national Accessible Streets programme of legislation changes).
- Cook Street has a cycleway, but the roundabouts and signals are not as cycle-friendly as they could be; accordingly design time is required.
- Main Street West does not have an off-road cycleway.
- Featherston and College are already prioritised.
- A choice between spending the $2.9M on more kilometres of lower-cost (“paint and posts”) versus fewer kilometres of higher-cost kerbs is appropriate; synergism is part of the separate Roads and Streets Framework.
- Car-free streets are a broader issue beyond the scope of this cycling network masterplan; the feedback will be considered by the city centre planners.
- Summerhill Drive is mentioned in the Masterplan as a current project.
- Shared paths along roads can be more dangerous for faster riders than no cycleway at all.

### Council officer analysis / comments

- Summerhill Drive is mentioned in the Masterplan as a current project.
- Shared paths along roads can be more dangerous for faster riders than no cycleway at all.

### Council officer recommended changes

- This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.

### This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:

- Section 1 - mention of climate change and externalities of driving in the strategic alignment section.
- Section 1 - update on-road counts graph.
- Section 7 - include mention of educating parents along with Bike Ready discussion.
- Section 7 - revise text regarding Massey cycling strategy.
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| 40  | Kevin Low | YES NO Yes More |               |               |              | - Stop prioritising parking over a safe transport system.  
- A cycling strategy has been written for Massey University, but hasn’t been implemented.  
- Quite astonishing that drivers need to be reminded that cyclists are people.  
- PNCC and the community benefit hugely from the work of local cycling advocates and volunteers.  
- Need more policing of bad motorists.  
- Culture of boy racers in Palmerston North, and don’t seem to be any consequences.  
- Anything to reduce this is welcomed, such as speed cameras and speed bumps.  
- Until this issue is addressed, the majority of people won’t be safe enough to cycle or will ride illegally on the footpath.  
- Plan could do with a proofread  
- Happy with the Plan but not overly optimistic that we will see an increase in cycling as a result. | | |

- Vogel Street is highly constrained (width-wise).  
- Refer general rural path links response.  
- Cuba Street extends council’s recent investment and is required because the trees are dying, and the Arena Masterplan is underway.  
- Maxwell’s Line will become increasingly important due to western urban growth.  
- Better cycleways will not cover as much of the city as more cycleways.  
- Roundabout navigation skills are very important and part of the new Bike Ready skill training programme. Council plans to invest in sharrow markings that would be accompanied by online messaging.  
- Roundabout and dooring risk messaging could be communicated through billboards, but that part is to be confirmed subject to funding and the development / implementation of a communications plan. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |

| 41  | Grant Spiers | YES NO Yes More |               |               |              | - PNCC are targeting the wrong places and are not addressing unsafe roads that cyclists use, such as the exit to Raimahunga Street.  
- More pathways means more protection.  
- PNCC need to reduce the verge along Main Street as cyclists have to pass parked cars, forcing them into the road lanes. | | |

- The prioritisation is data driven and based on research undertaken. | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
- Section 5 - add explanation of prioritisation method |

| 42  | Brendan M Boyer | YES YES More |               |               |              | - Better quality cycleways will not exist without more cycleways, let’s get started on as many as possible.  
- Cycle events such as races would encourage more cycling. | | }

- These comments are supported by the draft Masterplan. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
- Section 6 - include UCI Bike City label and races |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Agree vision?</th>
<th>Agree network?</th>
<th>Agree phasing?</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Submission key points</th>
<th>Council officer recommended changes</th>
<th>Council officer recommended changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 43  | Jane Petch     | YES           | YES            | YES            | More   | • If more people travel by bike to school and work, there will be less congestion on our roads.  
  • Would be great if workplaces and schools manage to promote places for people to store their bikes.  
  • Thinks it’s better to have more cycleways as there are many cyclists from all areas of the City.  
  • Concerned about traffic at girls high when it’s very busy. Important to provide some incentive to the pupils to encourage walking or cycling to School.  
  • Employers could try to encourage cycling to and from work.  
  • Bus stop on Summerhill Drive by Mountain View Road is dangerous, many cyclists coming down the hill are at high speed and this is an unsafe stop. | • Managing parent driver behaviour on Fitzherbert and Park at Girls High is important but too detailed for the Masterplan.  
  • Mountain View Road bus stop is acknowledged to be difficult; at peak hours drivers already pull off the road into Mountain View Road rather than stopping on Summerhill Drive. The issue is that the topography makes any improvement very expensive to achieve and therefore a low benefit-cost ratio. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  • Include managing driver behaviour around Girls High in the implementation plan detail. |
| 44  | Rebecca        | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better | • This Plan covers some of the main roads commuters use, there are definitely more roads that need to be included into this but hopefully they will come in time.  
  • Would like to request improvement of the Tremaine Ave cycleways as a high priority.  
  • Would rather have a few very well designed safe cycleways than heaps of cycleways painted on the road that don’t offer any protection from motor vehicles.  
  • Put money into building safe cycleways and use will grow.  
  • Cycling currently is not a safe option for family but would use cycleways if they were drastically improved.  
  • Cycleways must be protected from other road users either via barriers or by separate cycle tracks off the road. | • Tremaine Avenue is a Roads and Streets Framework corridor due to multi-modal priority conflicts; it will be very difficult to fit a cycleway in this corridor due to narrow road width (approx. 11m) and numerous commercial driveways.  
  • There is already no on-street parking to reallocate to cycleways and the flush median is required to provide for turns.  
  • Refer general separated cycleways response. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 45  | Phil           | NO            | NO             | NO             |        | • Does not agree with the vision statement because no parking for residents and no parking in general.  
  • Roads are of more concern, money is better off spent elsewhere like fixing and making the roads like new.  
  • Cars are swerving around pot holes narrowly avoiding crashes | • This comment is noted, however is out of scope in terms of the purpose of the Masterplan. | This submission is noted. While out of scope of this consultation, the feedback will be referred to the appropriate Council unit. |
| 46  | Tara Jolliffe  | YES           | YES            | --             | Better | • Better quality cycleways are better, separated from traffic and parked cars that can open doors out onto cyclists.  
  • Avoids cycling on busy roads and chooses cycleways that are not near traffic. | • Refer general separated cycleways response. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 47  | Sarah Gillespie| YES           | YES            | YES            | Better | • No specific comments. | • Noted. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 48  | Tania Kopytko  | YES           | YES            | YES            | More   | • It appears to be a comprehensive networked Plan, physically and socially/educatively in do-able stages.  
  • Works well for area they live in and hopes it will encourage them to cycle further.  
  • Once it is in place let’s hope it has a major effect on drivers.  
  • When the roadworks happens please ask the road workers to put their cones and signs in sensible places that do not block the cycle lanes. | • Temporary traffic management practices are a continual issue (cones placed in the space needed to ride) and education of contractors is ongoing.  
  • Opportunities for shortcuts have been considered (refer to the accessways in on the online map).  
  • School travel plans are continuing to be rolled out with education of parents a key component; agreed that school frontages need to prioritise active mode access however | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
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| 49  | Stephen Mercer | NO             | NO             | NO             |              | • More cycleways give people more options and to choose the route they want to travel.  
  • Consider developing some cycle/walk alleyways between streets to cut across would be useful.  
  • Have and encourage many more cycle events which are fun. Fun encourages people and it can encourage confidence.  
  • Let's make Palmerston North a cycling City that is New Zealand renowned.  
  • Would like to see schools and parents discouraged from parking in a dangerous fashion outside schools to drop off and collect children.  
  • Entrances of schools need to give priority to children walking, cycling or on scooters to convey the message that children's movement is a priority.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | this is a cultural issue that may take time to address. The trial treatments for school zones in Hawke's Bay will be considered but even there the parent motorist still commandeers a lot of road space.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | This submission is noted. No changes are recommended.                                                                                                                               |
| 50  | Sue Peagram    | NO             | NO             | NO             |              | • Less people bike now than 2 years ago, and the Council will have a hidden agenda like bringing in lime scooters to clip the ticket.  
  • Doesn't agree with the proposed network because people lose their roadside parking for house and workplaces  
  • Suggests the Council revisits this proposal in 10 year if cycling changes, this is not an alternative to transport as the Council suggests.  
  • Cycling is not needed in this City at his time, rate payers money is better spent in other ways.  
  • Don't need to spend 30 million on cycle ways when the ones the Council have already done like the Esplanade and Longburn are sufficient for a family day out.  
  • Taking roadside parking out will have an effect on peoples house prices at time of sale.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.                                                                                                                          |
| 51  | Katherine Stannard | YES           | NO             | -              | More         | • More people on bikes is not only healthier and better for the environment but also makes the City a friendlier and more welcoming place.  
  • Bikes do not have to follow the same routes and cars and they do not have to go on the road, so don't understand why you want to make the main busy roads cycle routes.  
  • Surely it makes sense to reduce conflict between bikes ad cars by giving them separate routes.  
  • More cycleways are better, more visibility, more access, more cyclists.  
  • Make cycling more available in the centre of town.  
  • Get a few 'cycling champions' to make it more popular.  
  • Use imagination when designing bike routes, not roading engineers.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | • People on bikes need to access the same destinations as people in cars. That is why main routes also need provision for cycling.  
  • Having a few cycling "champions" is a great idea and will be considered in the proposed communications plan.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  • Include the idea of local cycling "champions" in the communications plan.                                                                                                           |
|-----|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 52  | Margaret Tennant | YES           | YES            | YES           | Better | - Cycling is vitally important to a healthy City.  
  - Would cycle regularly with the proposed network.  
  - As an ageing cyclist, feels increasingly on the City streets as traffic speeds and driver aggression have increased.  
  - Would like to be kept apart from vehicles as much as possible.  
  - Education of drivers would encourage more cycling, as well as more bike stands and facilities.  
  - Don't just think about straight pieces of road, feels especially vulnerable when crossing lanes or turns.  
  - Traffic lights need to be calibrated for cyclists.                                                                                                                                 | Most points supported by the Masterplan.  
  - Calibrating traffic lights for cycling is difficult because NZ has a high variance in speeds for people on bikes (at least compared to northern Europe) and therefore synchronisation is not possible. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 53  | Dr Denis Slade  | NO            | YES            | NO            | Better | - The vision appears to not cater for those people who cannot ride a bike yet will live in areas. For example, where there appears to be no provision for parking on the road in a car for help collecting groceries and visiting friends. Plan will shut down aspects of their social interaction.  
  - All ratepayers have a right to access their places of residence  
  - A vision should respect all of society  
  - The vision has a super city feel for a small urban centre.  
  - Climate change will cause colder weather, with a reduced uptake of cycle activity.  
  - The vision should include dedicated times and days for priority to different groups e.g. school children.  
  - Why this obsession with cycling, why not walking?  
  - Consult and don't assume rate payers all agree with your theoretical Plan.                                                                                                                     | The Masterplan is not about making driving impossible but about mode neutrality, a key driver of NZTA funding and the Government Policy Statement.  
  - The Masterplan does not limit access to properties.  
  - Refer general parking response.  
  - Climate change is not linked to colder weather.  
  - This Masterplan is aimed at cycling; another Masterplan is in development for walking.  
  - There is no legislated requirement that all rate payers or residents must agree on a Council plan.  
  - The Active and Public Transport Plan includes actions relating to walking and the pedestrian network.                                                                                           | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 54  | Ken Sims        | -             | -              | -             | -      | - Current proposals are heavily weighted towards servicing schools and educational services, but greater emphasis is needed to be put on feeder routes in and out of the CBD.  
  - Bicycles are incompatible with heavy traffic.  
  - Cycle lanes need to be physically separated from vehicular traffic.  
  - Walking, cycling and public transport must be given at least equal rights to the road as motorists. Would argue it should be greater.  
  - Please don't throw your hands up in defeat when roads and cycle paths encounter intersections and roundabouts.  
  - Why are we considering this issue separate to an integrated transport plan for the City? Perhaps it's because you do not have a science and sustainability officer to advise you on the obvious. | Refer general separated cycleways response.  
  - High priority routes planned under this Masterplan that serve the central city (preferred term, as opposed to the singular activity focus of "CBD") include Main Street West, Campbell/Waldegave, and intersection projects to cross the ring road (see online strategy map). Refer also to the Broadway safety upgrades project that aims to improve safety for all road users.  
  - There is an integrated multi-modal planning effort underway – the Roads and Streets Framework.  
  - Additional information to be included regarding intersections.  
  - However, when cycleways are considered in a multi-modal context there is often a loss of focus on the end-to-end needs of people making a cycle journey.  
  - This cycling network master plan will inform and in turn revisions of it will be influenced by the Roads and Streets Framework. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  - In section 3 - include mention/pictures of intersection treatments, hook turns and cycle signals. |


|-----|-----------|---------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 55  | Tim Hoekstra | -             | -              | -             | -            | • Seeing Featherston Street prioritised is a welcome.  
• Separated cycleways are frustrating as cannot overtake slow cyclists or make right hand turns.  
• Disappointed to not see Ferguson Street not included in the priority list as there are numerous issues such as poor cyclist/car separation, a very rough road surface with potholes etc.  
• A City’s cycle path network is incomplete without the ability to safely bike to the main shopping mall/supermarkets in the city, which is currently not possible.  
• Otherwise the proposals all seem sensible and thinks they will encourage cycling and keep people safe. | Refer general separated cycleways response.  
• Agreed that narrow separated cycleways are to be avoided due to the wide variance in the speed of people on bikes (compared to motorists).  
• Separated cycleways in Palmerston North will be designed to provide passing opportunities and/or widths as per the NCTA Cycling Network Guidance.  
• Ferguson Street is a difficult corridor to assess; it had a fairly high ranking based on origin/destination/population served, but the ring road part of it has been designed to prioritise motor vehicles and there are now no easy ways to return to providing more space for cycling without removing a traffic lane; this would be highly controversial and may risk the delivery of the rest of the cycle network.  
Given this gap, the remainder of the street is a lower priority as a consistent level of service cannot be achieved.  
At present it is a route for the confident and skilled rider. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 56  | Keller McManamon | YES          | YES           | YES          | Better       | • Encouraging more people to choose cycling will yield a range of beneficial outcomes.  
• The city of Palmerston North is a perfectly reasonable size to choose cycling.  
• Believes the proposed network targets some high traffic streets which, if implemented would be effective at offering safer transit routes for cyclists.  
• The order in which the roads have been prioritised is agreeable.  
• One of the main risks to the safety of cyclists is proximity to motor vehicles.  
• A good quality cycleway is one that is physically separate to foot and road traffic and has a barrier between the cycleway and the road.  
• Install bike fix it stands and pumps at certain key areas such as popular cycle routes, parks and the square.  
• Really glad to see investment in cycling infrastructure in Palmerston North. | Refer general separated cycleways response.  
• There is currently a fix it station located at the Junior Road Safety Park in the Victoria Esplanade (available for anyone to use), and one has been purchased for the i-site in the square and will be installed shortly. More such stations are planned to be installed. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
• Add photo and text regarding bike fix it stations to section 7. |
| 57  | Craig Gruber | YES          | YES           | YES          | Better       | • Speed restrictions in the City centre will encourage more cycling, as well as public awareness campaigns. | Speed management is a key theme that is referred to in the Masterplan, however it is agreed that reference to it can be strengthened. | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Page in Section 4 to be added to address Ring Road and central city, including the focus on reduced speeds |
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| 58  | Tomas Behrens  | YES           | NO             | YES           | Better      | • Thinks the investment in the urban cycle network will improve rates of cycling but doesn’t think the investment is enough given the threat of climate change.  
  • Priority roads would be: Featherston St Botanical Road Te Awe Awe St Main St West Albert St College St (Botanical to Bati) Cook St Park Rd West Waldegrave St or Campbell St Milson Line Rangiiti Avenue Fitzherbert Avenue Maxwells Line Cuba St.  
  • Roads should be prioritised if they: Have a poor safety record, especially deaths and serious injuries Have large traffic volumes Have schools on them or are major routes to schools Are important routes employment, shopping and recreation.  
  • Agrees the Plan should be phased in.  
  • Would like to see a Plan that goes further into the future, towards 2030 with plans for more cycle infrastructure.  
  • Supports the plans proposal t improve the painted lines we do have.  
  • Over the mid to long term, we need separation from traffic to encourage cycling.  
  • Bicycle phasing at traffic lights that gives priority to cyclists.  
  • Pedestrian phases could also be improved to reduce wait times.  
  • Encourage walking by improving crossings and footpaths.  
  • Work with horizons to provide a better bus service.  
  • Gist of the plan is good but doesn’t go far enough in terms of a significant investment in cycling. Need to look at successful cycling countries like the Netherlands. | • The investment is a quantum change for Palmerston North (1.5M p.a. from $140K p.a.).  
• Refer general Botanical Road response.  
• The prioritisation framework used exactly the submitters key criteria.  
• This Masterplan sets the scene; it is a start, and while the phasing plan is only five years, should it be successful, and funding is continued then it could be extended. | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Section 5 - include and explain Botanical Road planning considerations. |
| 59  | Tony Reddrop   | NO            | YES            | NO            | Better      | • While it is a good idea to provide more cycleways, it is pointless unless you seriously address the issue of car and vehicle behaviour towards cyclists.  
  • Cycles to and from work and has changed the route they use to try to use more cycle ways as the roads are too unsafe.  
  • Does not agree with the draft phasing plan as it was not made with or by cyclists.  
  • Better quality cycleways save lives.  
  • Consult people.  
  • Advertise cycling.  
**ADDITIONAL SUBMISSION**  
• Unless the Council puts serious pressure on the government to increase police in Palmerston North, the safety of cyclists will continue to be at risk, even with the proposed changes.  
• Victoria Ave needs to be added to the Plan as many cyclists use this to link up to Te Awe Awe Ave.  
• To encourage more cycling, we need better covered bike storage, education of bus and truck drivers, and unmarked police cars to patrol. | • Victoria Avenue is included in the online map.  
• Agreed that police resourcing and traffic enforcement is an issue, however this is out of scope of the Masterplan, and Councils jurisdiction. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
• The prioritisation list has been extended. |
|-----|-----------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 60  | Natalie Burr | -             | -              | -              |        | • The updated cycle paths around the city have made them feel comfortable enough to start biking to work (at Massey) during the summer. With winter and getting dark so early, doesn’t feel safe sharing the roads with cars.  
  • Idea of a shared pathway alongside the railway line connecting Railway road through to Napier Road. Would provide off-street walking and bike path that would connect the two ends of the City loop (Has provided a plan of route in submission). | • Noted.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  • Added the railway link between Tremaine & Mihiaere Dr to the interactive map – it has been investigated previously and a recent KiwiRail policy change means that this is now potentially feasible. It will be included in future updates to the network planning and prioritisation, as well as the business case. |
| 61  | Michael Town | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better | • Cycling should be a choice and should not be forced upon people.  
  • That choice will be made easier with the increased investment in safe and dedicated facilities.  
  • A key focus will be to ensure both the mid-block sections and the intersections are safe and supportive for cycling.  
  • Would like to see more raised platforms to lower vehicle speed if cycling is to be a priority.  
  • It makes sense to complete existing routes before starting on new ones.  
  • Cannot afford to build a good quality cycleway everywhere, so there is a need to prioritise certain routes.  
  • Too many cycle ways too soon may result in a lower quality, discouraging people from actually using them.  
  • Slower speeds and more cycling parking would encourage more cycling in the City. | • Noted.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 62  | Karen Adam  | NO            | YES            | NO             | Better | • Doesn’t agree with the vision statement because it doesn’t take into account other road users.  
  • The river path near Dittmer Drive should not be paved as cyclists will use it as a racetrack and scare dogs and dog users.  
  • Children of primary school age and below should be allowed to ride on the footpaths.  
  • Objects to having no parking on either side of College Street.  
  • Believes cycling shouldn’t come at the cost of other residents and their safety and wellbeing. | • Multi-modal vision statements are contained within higher-level strategies; this Masterplan is focused on urban cycling  
  • Refer general path surface response.  
  • Government is consulting on a proposal to allow children 12 and under (and their guardians) to legally ride on footpaths. At present it is illegal for anyone except for postal delivery workers to ride a bicycle on a footpath.  
  • People who ride (or wish to ride) have as much right to safe passage as any other road user; parking is not a matter of safety.  
  • Refer general parking response. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
  • Section 6 - add photos of Manawatu River Path signs and markings encouraging courteous sharing of pathways (as per response to submission 2). |
| 63  | Paul Compton | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better | • We should work on better quality cycleways, so more people can be encouraged to cycle.  
  • Council should set a good example to employers and provide changing, wet gear drying, shower and locker facilities for staff that are cycling. | • Council has indoor cycle parking, fleet bikes for staff, showers and changing facilities – so already sets a good example. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nick Watson</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>• The basement space taken up by 3 car parking spaces could fit 20 more bicycles.</td>
<td>• Cycle lanes need to be wider to provide clearance for parked car door openings and overtaking vehicles; this is a key driver of the Masterplan.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Sonya Holm</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>• The word ‘safety’ should be included somewhere in the vision statement.</td>
<td>• The word safe is used dozens of times in the draft Masterplan, but we have to be careful not to over-emphasise this because it can have the unintended consequence of portraying cycling as riskier than it really is. Reference Chong et al (2017) How dangerous is cycling in New Zealand? Journal of Transport and Health Volume 6. <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrh.2017.02.008">http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrh.2017.02.008</a></td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cycling out to Ashhurst and Fielding should be priorities.</td>
<td>• Refer general rural path links response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Our streets should be designed to be forgiving of road user mistakes, real issues that are barriers to cycling but are not being addressed in the Report.</td>
<td>• Refer general parking response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parking is an issue along many streets in Palmerston North.</td>
<td>• On page 6, the Masterplan says “Our streets should be designed to be forgiving of road user mistakes”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No amount of paint on the road will improve safety if we don’t address the issue raised in the report about parking.</td>
<td>• The range of treatments to provide for cycling is consistent with NZTA best practices outlined in the Cycling Network Guidance (CNG) – the right treatment is required for each type of road and land use – there is no one size fits all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are we adding too many variations for cycle lanes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some of the new ones aren’t clearly identifiable as cycle lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Choose one way to identify cycle lanes and stick with it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ann Rosales</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>• Anyone would want a cost-effective way of travelling from A to B without compromising safety.</td>
<td>• Noted.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The improved cycleways will open a lot of benefits for individuals who want to be active.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Better quality cycleways will always be good to have, with the top consideration being safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There’s no use of having more cycleways if these will pose safety issues to riders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community awareness of the cycleways available would be a good way to encourage more cycling, such as leaflets, online awareness, annual events etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wants to instil the value of getting into cycling and its benefits to one’s health and mental wellbeing into their children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will be a good thing to look forward to having a road safe for people who cycle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Valerie Martin</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>• Great idea to try and have more people biking.</td>
<td>• Noted. More commentary will be added to the Masterplan regarding e-scooters.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 68  | Sue Pugmore       | YES            | YES            | YES           | More  | • Needs to be consideration for e-scooters, not sure about whether they are allowed to be ridden on the footpath or road.  
• E-scooters will help our carbon footprint and the congestion on the roads.  
• Has any consideration been made for these electric modes of transport?                                                                 | • In section 1 - Include more discussion of e-scooters.                                                                 |                                                                                                               |
|     |                   |                |                |               |       | Sue notes on Facebook: “ensure bike lanes also have a good safe riding surface (not pot holes & gravel), are kept swept free of glass etc, and that parked cars and roadwork signs and barriers don’t obstruct them” (Forgot to include in my submission). |                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                               |
| 69  | Elizabeth J Clouston | YES           | YES            | NO            | Better| • We need to create a safe environment for cycling in Palmerston North.  
• Research has clearly shown that (a) more people would cycle if there was better infrastructure e.g. protected separated cycleways  
(b) if you can get women and children on bikes it means that you have a safer, healthier and more vibrant city  
(c) women are more concerned about the lack of safety around cycling.  
• It is important to provide multi modal forms of transport as people should be able to have a choice all it is important to future-proof our City with issues like climate change and an increasing ageing population.  
• Priority should be given to encourage and enable commuter cycling to and from schools and workplaces.  
• Areas cannot be in isolation as it is important to have links throughout the City.  
• Preference is that Campbell Street is completed first, so it links with the new Cuba Street development.  
• Waldegrave Street could be done as part of the upgrade of the Arena.  
• Should be looking at the option of having protected separate cycleways for high traffic areas such as Featherston, Albert and Botanical streets.                                                                 | • Agreed, these research points need to be made in section 3.  
• Form of cycleway is determined through project specific investigations. Any proposed forms of cycle infrastructure in this Masterplan are indicative only.  
• Refer general separated cycleways response.  
• Refer general cycle signals response.  
• Refer general Botanical Road response.  
• Refer general parking response.                                                                 | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Add research references regarding women’s perceptions of safety  
• Section 1 - include e-scooters.  
• In section 3 - include mention/pictures of intersection treatments, hook turns and cycle signals.  
• In section 9 - add continue ongoing sweeping and maintenance to table.                                                                 |
|-----|--------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 70  | Eileen Collins           | YES           | YES            |                | Better  | • Narrow cycle lanes with or next to parking do not work so we should encourage off street parking in residential areas.  
• With all new developments it should be mandatory that they provide adequate and safe pedestrian and cycle infrastructure.  
• Bike projects overseas such as New York City 9th Ave have showed that cycle lanes are more valuable than parking spaces.  
• Research has shown that dedicated traffic signals are an effective way to provide safe passage for people on bikes at intersections as it allows them to go ahead of traffic.  
• These would be an ideal safety mechanism for high traffic intersections.  
• Need to make it clearer where cycleways are, e.g. paint all cycleways green and have consistent signage.  
• Increase road user education e.g. explain sharrows.  
• Do not feel that we should be encouraging e-scooters here in Palmerston North. |                                      | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 71  | Anne Louise Clouston     | YES           | YES            | NO             | Better  | • It is important to provide a safe, convenient and comfortable way to travel for all ages and abilities if we want to increase cycling within the City.  
• In order to do this, we need better cycling infrastructure and end of route facilities as well as cultural change  
• It supports the GPS for Land Transport which support a shift away from car dominance to choice, with multi modal forms of transport.  
• More than ever, we as individuals and as a City all need to be actively involved in reducing carbon emissions and protecting the planet.  
• We also need to be looking after our own health and wellbeing and Active Transport is a time and financially effective way of achieving this.  
• We need to widen and connect cycle lanes within our City to the highest possible standard.  
• We need to allocate funding to ongoing assessment and maintenance of the network if this has not been done.  
• Perhaps a contract could be linked to programme 1470.  
• The proposed cost of wayfinding signage seems very expensive compared to other programmes such as 114, 648 and 1442.  
• Signage should be done after programmes 1349, 1444.  
• Featherston Street should not be upgraded without also upgrading the links surrounding it. | • Noted; many comments and responses similar to those associated with submission no. 69.  
• Programme 1470 cycle lane sweeping is associated with a contract.  
• Signage can be done prior to path sealing work around Dittmer Drive; the proposed cost of signage is not separately listed in the Masterplan  
• Based on safety record alone, Featherston Street is a high priority for treatment even if surrounding links cannot be done at the same time.  
• Refer general Botanical Road response.  
• Refer general separated cycleways response.  
• Refer general parking response.  
• Evidence reported by NZTA to the Active Modes Infrastructure Group (AMIG) concerning e-scooters does not show that they have a significantly different risk profile than other active modes. | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Section 1 - discuss e-scooter pros/cons and how cycleways may be the logical place for these.  
• Section 5 - include and explain Botanical Road planning considerations.  
• Section 6 - add photos of Manawatu River Path signs and markings encouraging courteous sharing of pathways (as per response to submission 2). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Hugh Francis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Avid cyclist who rides twice a week (140km) around both the rural and urban roads of Palmerston North. It is amazing to notice the huge increase in the number of motor vehicles on the local roads in the last 2 years and bike lanes are needed for sure. Ball has been dropped and is not rolling fast enough, other cities are doing much better than Palmerston North</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Waldegrave Street needs traffic calming measures and removal of on street parking, could be done as part of the Cuba Street and Arena redevelopment.
- Leading on from upgrading Featherston Street, it would then be natural to upgrade Botanical Road as another main arterial route and link to the suburbs. This would also link to the Pioneer Shared Pathway and onto the Riverlink Pathway. This provides a connected and safe Active Transport Route catering for all levels of Cyclists.
- Protected and separated cycleways are more likely to increase cycle uptake.
- Research has shown that if you can get women and children on bikes it means that you have a safer, healthier and more vibrant city.
- Research has also shown women are more concerned about the lack of safety around cycling.
- Main priority should be safety at roundabouts and intersections with protective cycle infrastructure in place such as advance boxes, head start cycle lights and removal of car parks within transport corridors.
- Remove on-street parking for safe, consistent cycleways
- Couple quality cycleways with road user education.
- Education needed for new infrastructure e.g. sharrows. We should also be encouraging use of walking for shorter distances and public transport with cycle racks for longer distances.
- There also needs to be better dog control laws and reinforcement of them so dogs are on short leads and beside their owners on shared pathways.
- Do not think electric scooter should be introduced into the City as evidence shows they are dangerous.
- Need better safer infrastructure for Active Transport
- Multi model good quality transport infrastructure should automatically be part of any new housing and business development and redevelopment and should interconnect with any existing parts of the network.

See Part 1 for general responses to multiple submissions

Council officer analysis / comments

Council officer recommended changes

This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.

The recommended improvements will be passed on to the relevant Council department, including:
- Paint markings on Hugh Francis.
- Vogel Street seal condition.
|-----|-----------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 73  | Annette Nixon | NO NO | - | Better | • Has rung the Council multiple times regarding road and footpath markings that need to be repainted and nothing seems to happen.  
• Roundabouts are an area of concern, where many accidents have taken place with motorists trying to compete with cyclists. A sign on the road may help that shows motorists should give way to cyclists.  
• Vogel Street needs attention and can be seen as an arterial route from Main Street through to the shared pathway from Bunnings to Roberts Line, and eventually out to Bunnythorpe.  
• The seal on Vogel Street is breaking up and rough and is especially bad close to the kerb where cyclists are riding.  
• There needs to be a bike lane each side that is clearly marked, and parking restricted in certain areas along the street.  
• Higgins need to be briefed by PNCC to ensure the bitumen mix is made as smoothly as possible right to the curb.  
• The Masterplan needs to be more widely publicised.  

|  |  |  |  |  |  | • In addition to letter drops, public drop-in / open house sessions advertised via signs along the street will be considered for all future multi-modal infrastructure projects.  
• Traffic and parking surveys are time stamped.  
• Elderly residents can and do continue to walk, scoot and cycle well past the time when they cannot legally drive  
• Refer general parking response.  
• Cycle stands are included in section 6, page 18, and given a full page in the online interactive map  
• It is not possible to prevent all occurrences of cycles being parked in a manner that obstructs footpaths, the same way it is not possible to prevent all occurrences of motor vehicles being parked on footpaths.  
• The accessways from Newbury St and Winchester St are already open (the former provides a direct link to the community centre, albeit long and narrow), an accessway from Panako Place is not planned. Staff requested funding at the last 10 Year Plan (a programme to Council) to open it up and it was declined.  

This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Shared path behaviour markings text and image added  
• Section 9 - project added to investigate making access to Manawatu River Path easier for people on bikes |
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**Urban Cycling Network Masterplan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did the traffic survey carried out note the time vehicles were stopped?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADDITIONAL SUBMISSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from Awapuni ratepayers have come to hand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>While there is general support for the vision and the increased ability for people to safely cycle the implications and impact of current activities indicate a lack of joined up thinking and consideration for the effects this may have on other members of the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The race to get this work done does not include recognition of other PNCC strategies such as A Connected and Safe Community, An Enabling Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Safe and connected community is greatly enhanced by the village services and interactions provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further work is required on priority cycle routes that do not take cyclists into heavy traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other cities designate quiet roads as cycle routes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local communities are losing amenities in the rush to complete work e.g. loss of bus shelters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave current roadside parking in place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition of the importance of suburban shopping village services and amenities and recognition of Mid Central Health's &quot;Aging in Place&quot; strategy which encourages older people to continue living in their own homes and accessing local services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disappointed there is not an opportunity to address these matters at a hearing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>Any improvement is good, however there needs to be more development.</td>
<td>This Masterplan is related to the urban network only.</td>
<td>This submission is noted. No change is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The road to Arapuke needs to be paved as it is dangerous. PNCC is failing the community by not providing safe access to the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage mountain biking as there is strong interest in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Jay Hunter</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Doesn't ride their bike because it has to be ridden on the road and feels this is extremely dangerous and not worth the risk.</td>
<td>Decisions around the topics of footpath cycling and optional use of helmets are not within the jurisdiction of the Councils decision making powers.</td>
<td>This submission is noted. No change is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposes the Council makes it legal to ride on the footpath outside the CBD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An individual should choose whether or not to wear a helmet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feels PNCC needs to think outside the box and consider the two changes highlighted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is an opportunity here to lead the nation when it comes to cycling bylaws and public relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Stephen Legg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider the need for a safer and independent cycle route from town out to Arapuke cycle park avoiding the main roads -- Old West Road and Kahuterawa Road.</td>
<td>This Masterplan is related to the urban network only.</td>
<td>This submission is noted. No change is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 77  | Sherlie Gaynor   | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better | • Cycling along these roads mentioned is hazardous for cyclists.  
• To further encourage greater usage of these routes, a cycle way that is separated from the roads would enhance cycling safety.                                                            | • Agreed.                                                                                       | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• In section 3 - include mention/pictures of intersection treatments, hook turns and cycle signals.  
• In section 9 - add continue ongoing sweeping and maintenance to table.                           |
| 78  | Tim Hesketh      | YES           | NO             | YES            | Better | • There are numerous advantages of cycling, such as cost reduction for individuals, great for one’s health, less traffic.  
• Should get people using what we have first, then build from there.  
• Tell Higgins to keep their road work signs out of existing cycleways and sweep the cycleways regularly.                                                                    | • References to health benefits will be added.  
• Temporary traffic management practices are a continual issue (cones placed in the space needed to ride) and education of contractors is ongoing.                        | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Update Figure 3 to strengthen mentions of climate change  
• Add the topic of health to Section 1                                                                                                                        |
| 79  | Amy Robertson    | YES           | NO             | NO             | More   | • Funding should be put back into making a footpath with a shared cycle lane out to Bunnythorpe, as there needs to be one all the way out to there.                                                                   | • Refer general rural path links response.                                                       | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Section 4 - clarify geographic scope.                                                                                                                      |
| 80  | Thomas Ranford   | NO            | NO             | NO             | More   | • It favours the city only, leaving roads like Railway road completely out.  
• Although it is important to make urban streets safe, I would like to see it spread over a greater area.  
• Encourage cyclists to respect motorised traffic drivers have a better opinion and therefore safer attitude to cyclists.  
• Dismay at the deferment of the railway road cycle path to Bunnythorpe and Fielding. Even a one metre paved shoulder would make it a safer ride until a more permanent cycleway could be funded. | • Refer general rural path links response.                                                       | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Summary - add context around the relationship of the Masterplan to the rural path link projects |
| 81  | James Lyon       | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better | • Citi bikes – an idea to encourage more cycling in the City.  
• If submitter means bike share as in Washington DC, then this is typically a private sector initiative. Council would likely consider any such proposals; however, the relatively small population of Palmerston North may make the proposition hard to economically justify for such operators. |                                                                                                  | This submission is noted. No change is recommended.                                             |
| 82  | Toni Julian      | NO            | NO             | NO             | More   | • We pay rates in the rural community of Bunnythorpe I would like to have another option to get to work - Not just a really bad public transport service and my car - Safe walkways and cycle ways.  
• Refer general rural path links response.                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                  | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Section 4 - clarify geographic scope.                                                                                                                     |
| 83  | Dale O’Reilly    | NO            | NO             | NO             | More   | • Doesn’t agree with the vision statement because it only talks about the City.  
• Return the funding to the Bunnythorpe to Palmerston North shared pathway and build that first.                                                                                         | • Refer general rural path links response.                                                       | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Section 4 - clarify geographic scope.                                                                                                                     |
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|-----|------------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 84  | Evan Davies      |               |                |                 | Better       | - The traffic needs space to move about the city.  
   - More streets need to be four lanes. This will clear the traffic gridlock. Allow, at traffic islands, room for the traffic to turn left and go straight or to turn right.                                                                 | This view is not supported by the evidence; refer to the concept of induced traffic.                                                                         | This submission is noted. No change is recommended.                                                                                                           |
| 85  | Martin Baldwin   | NO            | YES            | YES             |              | - To encourage people to consider cycling is a bit weak.  
   - A network won’t necessarily reduce risk.  
   - This project is overdue.  
   - The risks involved must be mitigated.  
   - The document seems focused on people cycling to work. The fun and recreational aspects of cycling must also be promoted.  
   - Completing the city circuit should also be an absolute priority.  
   - There needs to be a creative solution found to join the two ends of what is a true asset to the city.  
   - Cycling into George Street to enjoy the cafes could be encouraged by providing obvious places to leave a bike that are out of the way of pedestrians. | In terms of tone, the Masterplan needs to strike a balance between text and images about recreation and transport. The draft page 8 illustrates recreation is one of the four main trip types.  
   - As noted on draft page 6, the city circuit has been under construction since MATS – but the on-street network has not been well-connected (only the "low-hanging fruit" has been implemented).  
   - George Street has a high density of public cycle parking as it is. There will always be a tension between cycle parking stands and pedestrian space, but stands are typically installed in the "street furniture zone" to be clear of the pedestrian "through" zone. | This submission is accepted. No change is recommended.                                                                                                        |
| 86  | Tania Brown      | YES           | YES            | YES             |              | - The more people we can get cycling the safer it will be and then will encourage others to take up cycling  
   - Good to see Kelvin Grove included in the plan, and the some of the other areas are high school traffic areas, would be good to see care givers encouraging children to bike to school.  
   - If it is safer more people will cycle.                                                                                                                     | Noted.                                                                                                                                                       | This submission is accepted. No change is recommended.                                                                                                       |
| 87  | Fraser Rolfe     | YES           | YES            | YES             | Better       | - Human-powered transport is set to become much more prevalent. We need the infrastructure in place to make it as safe as possible.  
   - Speed and convenience are important, but safety is paramount.  
   - The sooner the better.  
   - A painted path provides a false sense of security.  
   - More publicity about the dangers of ‘distracted driving’ could make riding less dangerous.  
   - More 40 km/h and 30 km/h zones would be very cheap to implement.  
   - As the driving population ages, a lower speed limit will give everyone more time.  
   - Encouraging use of the bus service will remove cars from the road, which may encourage more cycling.  
   - It’s possible that the central government will mandate a reduction in the urban speed limit. This will help with the integration of human-powered and autonomous transport, reduce fuel consumption and noise, and may also have a bearing on what kinds of infrastructure work is necessary. | Council may improve safety for all road users as well as encourage more cycling if speed limits and operating speeds were reduced; this would be given effect through the Speed Limits Bylaw and by an update & funding of the Local Area Traffic Management Policy 2003 (as noted on draft page 24)  
   - Refer general separated cycleways response.                                                                                                                                                                      | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
   - Section 7 - Include mention of national legislation changes supporting lower speed limits.                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                    |
| 88  | David C Chapple  | NO            | NO             | NO              | Better       | - Increased cycleways should not be at the expense of the reasonable expectations of the community, including at the College Street is current work and not the focus of this higher-level strategic Masterplan consultation. |                                                                                                                                                                 | This submission is accepted. No change is recommended.                                                                                                       |
### Item 10 - Attachment 2

#### Summary of Submissions and Analysis

**Urban Cycling Network Masterplan**

|-----|-----------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 89  | Chris Larking | NO            | NO              | NO            | Better  | • It is not up to PNCC to be encouraging people to cycle, your job is to maintain local road and stormwater.  
  • There are enough cycleways in Palmerston North.  
  • Put the money to better use such as extra parking in the City centre. Could build a multi parking lot, or another stand that is covered at the show grounds.  
  • Just do what you were elected for.                                                            |
| 90  | Heather Knox | YES           | YES             | NO            | More    | • Move Maxwells Line to a higher priority, as the area around the Four Square is unsuitable for cyclists. Wide road with nowhere for pedestrians to cross.  
  • Needs a few islands or zebra crossings.  
  • Current cycleways need to be extended.  
  • When building more make them better.  
  • Take a 'whole family' approach towards active transport to school and work, including children and their parents.  
  • If there are less parents driving to school, it makes it safer for everyone.  
  • Concerned about the lack of clear targets on page 25. Would be disappointed if it turned into another Plan with no clear actions or dates.  
  • Would support all of PNCC Councillors being encouraged to use bikes.  
  • People need to see more action and more people out there on their bikes.                   |
| 91  | Phil Etheridge | YES          | NO              | NO            | Better  | • Cycleway disappears at the most important point, which is approaching The Square.  
  • There are other points where the network stops abruptly, such as at the end of Fitzherbert Ave, which is very difficult to turn right off if heading north.  
  • We need safer cycleways to encourage more people to cycle.  
  • Separate cycle paths from motor traffic.  
  • Undertake more maintenance to encourage more people to cycle, such as repairing potholes and uneven surfaces. |

**See Part 1 for general responses to multiple submissions**

- Council officer analysis / comments
- Council officer recommended changes

- Opposition is noted.
- Refer general parking response.

This submission is noted. No change is recommended.

- The Census 2018 data is not yet available; should the journey to work by bicycle continue to go down from 2013, then an aggressive target may not be achievable. Targets will be reviewed when data is available (including “before” travel mode data for selected schools, a current action)

This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:
- Section 8 - update network length data

- Within the central city, the current (separate) programme and strategy envisions a lower speed shared use environment; nevertheless, the Masterplan includes specific improvements for cycling access to the shared spaces within The Square itself.  
  • Refer general cycle signals response.

This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:
- Page in section 4 to be added to address Ring Road and central city, including reduced speeds.  
  • Section 3 - include mention/pictures of intersection treatments, hook turns and cycle signals.
## Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

### Urban Cycling Network Masterplan

|-----|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 92  | Jeremy Corroenne| YES            | YES            | YES            | Better        | - The vision statement needs to be simplified so it is impactful and easy to share.  
- A bigger part of the budget needs to go towards education, encouragement and better cycle parking across town.  
- Main barriers to cycle in Palmerston North are safety related.  
- Culture change is a top priority.  
- Roundabouts are an unsafe hotspot for cyclists with cars not respecting priorities or going too fast.  
- Specific cycle lanes at roundabouts or improving signage or warning signs would help.  
- Not enough cycle parking solutions.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Refer general road roughness response.  
Refer general parking response.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
- Section 1 - enhance discussion of safety barriers and benefits.                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 93  | Juliet Thomas   | YES            | YES            | YES            | Better        | - Roads have been long dominated by cars, but as our climate and society changes we need to be proactive and put cycling first.  
- Agrees with the proposed network because it provides safer options for cyclists on key routes.  
- The draft phasing plan seems sensible and well thought out.  
- Rough road surfaces make cycling really unpleasant, whereas smooth surfaces offer little resistance and make it easier.  
- Giving cyclists priority on the roads, promoting cleaner uses of energy, and having more safe and secure parking, ideally under cover would encourage more cycling.  
- It is heartening to know FMCC has prioritised cycling for some years and are committed to making it an easier option.  
- Ideally it will be peoples first transport option, not cars.  
- Looking forward to the removal of on street parking in College Street  
- Cars block visibility, cause noise, pollution and block access.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                           | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
- Section 1 - add references to climate change.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 94  | Chris Teo-Sherrell | YES            | YES            | YES            | Better        | - Congratulations on another mostly clear, concise plan, things have improved.  
- Supported: Focuses on the urban realm, mostly on street facilities designed for use by people cycling for everyday purposes. Never found any evidence for increased recreational cycling leading to increased utility cycling.  
- It sees expenditure on providing infrastructure for utility cycling as an investment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Maps are illustrative, full detail is only available in the interactive online map.  
Main Street West leverages previous investment in Longburn and Pioneer Hwy paths and leads directly to the Square, Church Street has a substantial parking demand and removal of parking on Church Street is not likely to be supported by the community or Council. Main Street West on-street parking is not in high demand due to adjacent parking lanes. | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
- Section 5 - include and explain Botanical Road planning considerations.  
- Section 3 - include content about traffic signal phases and hook turns.  
- Section 9 - include "ongoing" in actions for communications.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognises the need to provide suitable infrastructure and to change the culture of road use in Palmerston North.</td>
<td>Ferguson Street is not in the top 10 corridors but is a popular route, minor improvements to cater for confident riders are possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision: the outcome of people choosing to cycle more often is desirable, views it as a very low expectation. Level of return on investment is important in prioritising expenditure.</td>
<td>Summerhill proposal includes indented parking and pedestrian median refuges – therefore incompatible with physical separation (unless all trees are removed, and entire street is rebuilt).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least two approaches to strengthening the vision that could be used</td>
<td>Agree that Park Road West duplicates nearby College St &amp; Manawatu River Path. However, the existing cycle lane is below minimum standard. Removing it will be unpopular, so it is proposed to upgrade what exists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include a word such as significantly or dramatically to show that the intention is that a lot more people will choose to cycle more often as a result of implementing the plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatively (and the submitters preference) a time-specified, numerical target could be included in the vision statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Network map on page 12 looks incomplete compared with the interactive map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed network appears to provide good coverage of the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is little need to provide facilities along Ferguson once College is equipped. Would be better to divert the funds to getting College done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park Road west is another proposal that appears of low priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summerhill warrants separated cycle lanes. Alternatively, lowering the speed limit further might make a simple buffered lane appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggests the focus be on ensuring that the busiest roads that cannot readily or suitably be avoided by people on bikes be the focus over the first few years. Suggest doing a middle ring road to enable a large number of people to gain some benefit and then could be followed by relatively short additions to reach out even further.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supports the timing of Featherston, College and Cook components.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not support the Park Road west and Main Street west proposals (College &amp; Church are adequate). Instead, funding for those should be diverted to Botanical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waldegrave is the better choice for a link from Cuba to Featherston Street as it is already equipped with lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parts of Cuba Street can easily wait until the details of the Arena Masterplan are decided upon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agrees with Milson Line but not with Maxwells Line being in this first tranche.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supports Te Awe Awe being completed to a high standard as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education and encouragement programs need to be started immediately and be ongoing not just in October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Kevin Palmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bike stands are important at destinations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Combination of both good quality and more cycleways should be installed in this first tranche.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In terms of standard, intersections need to be treated as well as mid-block sections of street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• At all traffic signal controlled intersections there should be phases for bike riders only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inside the roundabout and just before it, there should be signs indicating the place where riders and drivers should merge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Little detail on the speed management that needs to accompany infrastructure provision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Neighbourhood greenways could be made much for effective by making some streets semi-permeable to traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The targets on page 25 are not ambitious for the length of CNG standard cycleways and greenways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The target of a decreasing trend in the number of fatal and serious injuries is positive but inadequate. Should be aiming for zero crashes by 2030.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Addressing perceptions of people who cycle every October seems odd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Bike Rider</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What do the primary route cycle signs that are up really mean?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Is there a map of them somewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What data has been collected to indicate they are used as primary cycle routes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Why were those routes selected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Jenny Johanson</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>• The most used cycleway in the City (from Fitzherbert Bridge to Massey) is dangerous and has tree roots growing on the track which could cause accidents. Has been told by Council that there is no money to repair at the moment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme 1349 and 1444 are available for river path sealing upgrades.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer general path surface response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Frank Goldingham</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encouraging cycling is good for the environment and people’s health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure cycleways are very safe to encourage cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• As noted on page 4. Agree that more needs to be said about health benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All green painted cycle lanes meet or exceed NZ guidelines and are sufficiently wide to avoid car doors. It is only dangerous in such wide cycle lanes if riders “hug” the left side of the cycle lane. Refer the official NZ code for cyclists (page 21 of the Masterplan).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer general separated cycleways response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Council is aiming for new subdivisions to be walking and cycling-friendly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

#### Urban Cycling Network Masterplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Sheree Glasgow</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>- A cycleway would be more beneficial.</td>
<td>It is unclear what is meant by this comment, as the Masterplan intends to introduce more established cycle lanes into the Urban area of Palmerston North.</td>
<td>This submission is noted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 100 | Neil Ward          | YES           | YES               | YES               | More         | - Any support and encouragement to cycle and/or to not drive a car is good news.  
  - A slow start focused on an end goal is good, can't do everything at once,  
  - Both more, and better quality cycleways are important.  
  - Physically separate lanes can be made safer by hard berms to keep cars off cycle lanes. This gives cyclists a psychological advantage by being protected.  
  - When approaching roundabouts, cycleways disappear, and cyclists are forced into the vehicle lane, causing a blind spot with cyclists having nowhere else to go.  
  - Separate cycle lanes are needed all the way to the roundabout separated with a hard berm, so cars are not able to cut the corner and hit cyclists.  
  - More separate lanes are needed in places.  
  - Some work needs to be done in conjunction with both PNCC and employers to provide covered or sheltered, secure parking for cycles and shower/changing rooms at a place of work.  
  - Would be happy to draw up some designs of roundabout cycle lanes. | Refer general separated cycleways response.  
Roundabout cycle lanes are not safe; refer Austroads (2014) Assessment of the safety of cycling in roundabouts | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
- Section 3 - include mention/pictures of intersection treatments, explain why roundabout cycle lanes are undesirable (except where cycles are not turning, e.g., a leg is a motorway ramp).  
- Include Austroads research on roundabouts in Section 3 intersections discussion and reference list |
| 101 | Shane Telfer       | YES           | NO                | NO                |              | - In part 1 – safety is not mentioned (cyclists need to feel safe).  
  - Culture can’t be changed by education and encouragement.  
  - Just build the facilities and people will come, provide safe facilities.  
  - The draft plan focuses on corridors and this is a mistake. The focus needs to be on hubs, and corridors will flow naturally.  
  - Focus on corridors and people will have nowhere to ride.  
  - The central city needs to be a hub.  
  - Redesign Cook Street and on to the Square via Church Street with world class infrastructure.  
  - Have some vision, one side of Cook Street for cars, the other site for parking and active transport.  
  - City centre and He Ara Kotahi are absent.  
  - Improve bike parking at commercial facilities.  
  - The Plan lacks vision and ambition, keep up with other urban centres in NZ by building some amazing infrastructure. | Safety is mentioned six times in section 1 but will be further elevated in revisions.  
Disagree, marketing is one part of the equation when it comes to changing culture. However, we will add mention of infrastructure in the bullet point on culture on page 2.  
Unclear what “hubs” are. Refer to the CNG for planning and design of cycle networks:  
The submitter’s idea for Cook Street would require the entire budget for total redesign of intersections (rather than the planned minor upgrades). Church Street is effectively a heavily utilised parking street at present and there would likely be a strong backlash to reconfiguration; we would need to signalise Cook / Church and put a path in the Railway Reserve (or lose hundreds of car parks). It is easier and will be more comfortable to link to Main Street.  
Regarding vision and ambition, the Masterplan has received accolades from none other than Bike Auckland and Pippa Coom; | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
- Section 1 - enhance discussion of safety barriers and benefits.  
- Add mention of infrastructure in the bullet point on culture on page 2. |
|-----|---------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 102 | Colin McKenzie            | YES           | NO             |                | Better  | • The vision should be more about the coming continuum of transportation modes.  
• We are moving away from discreet modes such as cycle and walking will all manner of electric transport coming our way.  
• Cycling vision cannot stand alone, needs to integrate with a multimodal vision.  
• The focus should also integrate with a more liveable city concept.  
• Botanical Road is missing from the Plan.  
• Needs to be a focus on Safe access paths to the new commuter bridge.  
• The unsealed path is great for recreational cycling, but not that good for commuting.  
• If a cycleway is of lesser quality, it is of no particular advantage.  
• Fewer better quality but connecting separated cycleways allow cyclists to choose their route for maximum safety.  
• To encourage more cycling, close some city streets from cars altogether.  
• A second vehicle bridge around Maxwell’s line area to get through traffic out of town will do wonders for cycling and road safety in general. | https://twitter.com/pippacoom/status/1143385160714342400 |  
• Multimodal vision is in the strategic transport plan:  
• The strategic transport plan is being reviewed by council and is out of scope of this Masterplan  
• Refer general Botanical Road response.  
• The path to Linton is unsealed due to budget constraints. It also provides a more comfortable surface than asphalt or concrete for soldiers who are running, and the heavy fall leaf drop in the forest section may be less slippery with an unsealed surface. That said, Council will monitor the maintenance costs and consider upgrade to sealed surface.  
• Refer general path surface response.  
• Lesser quality does not necessarily mean unsafe. Paint and posts can provide the same safety as more expensive kerb separators.  
• Refer general separated cycleways response.  
• Totally car-free city streets is probably a step too far for a provincial NZ city given our current culture. Even Auckland is doing shared spaces rather than total exclusion of motor vehicles.  
• Second road bridge is out of scope for this near to mid-term Masterplan.  
This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Section 5 - include and explain Botanical Road planning considerations.  
• Include images of the new He Ara Kotahi bridge and explanation of how it will be linked. |
| 103 | Florentine van Noppen     | YES           | YES            | YES            | Both    | • Can only become ingrained in the culture if the infrastructure is available and people know how to safely navigate it.  
• Looks like a decent start to improve the network.  
• Constructions around traffic lights could be hugely improved and considered.  
• Should be a combination of both better quality cycleways and more cycleways.  
• There are places where there are no cycleways that could really use them, but also even in places where there are cycle lanes, does not always feel safe.  
• In addition, sometimes cycleways only facilitate 1 direction.  
• The education component of this plan will be very important.  
• Has an issue with the statement in page six “Our streets should be designed to be forgiving of road user mistakes”, difference between making mistakes and negligence.  
• Car users should be targeted in education, and possibility a campaign against this behaviour or higher fines. | https://www.nzta.govt.nz/media/3130983/strategic-transport-plan-2018.pdf  
• The strategic transport plan is being reviewed by council and is out of scope of this Masterplan  
• Refer general Botanical Road response.  
• The path to Linton is unsealed due to budget constraints. It also provides a more comfortable surface than asphalt or concrete for soldiers who are running, and the heavy fall leaf drop in the forest section may be less slippery with an unsealed surface. That said, Council will monitor the maintenance costs and consider upgrade to sealed surface.  
• Refer general path surface response.  
• Lesser quality does not necessarily mean unsafe. Paint and posts can provide the same safety as more expensive kerb separators.  
• Refer general separated cycleways response.  
• Totally car-free city streets is probably a step too far for a provincial NZ city given our current culture. Even Auckland is doing shared spaces rather than total exclusion of motor vehicles.  
• Second road bridge is out of scope for this near to mid-term Masterplan.  
This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Section 3 - include mention/pictures of intersection treatments, hook turns and cycle signals. |
| 104 | Davide Fraccasola         | YES           | YES            | NO             | Better  | • Reduce the capacity to drive in the city centre.  
• Traffic free areas increase bikes appeal.  
• Agreed that the draft did not contain enough information about intersections.  
• Page six reference to mistakes is aligned with national road safety strategy: https://www.saferjourneys.govt.nz.  
• The strategic transport plan is being reviewed by council and is out of scope of this Masterplan  
• Refer general Botanical Road response.  
• The path to Linton is unsealed due to budget constraints. It also provides a more comfortable surface than asphalt or concrete for soldiers who are running, and the heavy fall leaf drop in the forest section may be less slippery with an unsealed surface. That said, Council will monitor the maintenance costs and consider upgrade to sealed surface.  
• Refer general path surface response.  
• Lesser quality does not necessarily mean unsafe. Paint and posts can provide the same safety as more expensive kerb separators.  
• Refer general separated cycleways response.  
• Totally car-free city streets is probably a step too far for a provincial NZ city given our current culture. Even Auckland is doing shared spaces rather than total exclusion of motor vehicles.  
• Second road bridge is out of scope for this near to mid-term Masterplan.  
This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Section 3 - include mention/pictures of intersection treatments, hook turns and cycle signals. |
## Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

### Urban Cycling Network Masterplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Submission key points</th>
<th>Council officer analysis / comments</th>
<th>Council officer recommended changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 105 | Kenneth Bidlake | |       |       |        | • Priority streets look reasonable since they are high traffic and a required route for schools.  
• Not sure both Cuba and Main West need to be a priority since they are close together.  
• Would go with Campbell rather than Waldegrave since it already has quiet residential features.  
• Milson Line is good as it feeds schools but also links with the Mangione Path which is forced on road there.  
• Longer term some of the smaller cycleways could wind through smaller streets rather than be routed on the typical driving routes.  
• Road markings could be used to encourage riders onto smaller streets where traffic is naturally slower and sparser.  
• The section of cycleway on College Street from Maxwells Road to Botanical Road currently in progress should not reduce parking around the Pitama Road shops.  
• Strongly thinks better cycleways are needed rather than more.  
• Separated cycleways are the only type that will really encourage those without confidence onto busy roads.  
• Sharrow, buffered cycle lanes and cycle lanes do little for rider confidence and confuse and frustrate motorists.  
• Thinks parents are driving the reluctance for children to bike because of a perception that roads are dangerous for cyclists.  
• More bikes would naturally slow motorists.  
• Other thing stopping students is laziness or vanity, seen as uncool.  
• One footpath in major streets could be used as a cycleway cheaply and safely.  
• Link the shared pathways that we have, PNCC doing a great job and could work with Manawatu Mountain Bike Club or submitter in this area.  
• It is key that the Milson end of the Mangione path links off road.  
• Looking at the long term plan it would be great to have Linton pathway looped back to an Old West Road cycleway and so feed mountain biking trails at Arapuke Park.  
• A cycleway down Tiuitlea Road and back up Kahuterawa Road would link up to Greens Road.  
• The Massey pathway could be modified slightly to allow mountain bikes, and link with the Old West Road cycleway without using Summerhill Drive. | • Cuba Street serves the Arena, while Main West links directly to Longburn & Pioneer Highway paths.  
• The idea of the neighbourhood greenway (quiet residential street) network illustrated with purple lines is consistent with the submitter’s view.  
• Refer general separated cycleways response.  
• Refer general network density response.  
• There is contrary evidence regarding motorist understanding of sharrow and cycle lanes. Refer to the CNG and NACTO.  
• A Linton Path extension to create a loop with the newly widened shoulders on Old West Road is a proposed future link.  
• Standard width footpaths are not legal for cycling under national legislation, and not appropriate for cycling in any case. Refer CNG.  
• Turitea/Kahuterawa/Greens road routes are low traffic volume and topographically challenging and therefore it is not cost effective to build separate cycleways. They also serve relatively few homes and businesses, so would realise only recreational benefits (rather than recreational AND transport benefits). Therefore, they have not been included in this Masterplan – a separate mountain biking/tourism/recreation-focused case is worthwhile.  
• Refer general rural path links response.  
• Refer general path surface response.  
• Cycle parking takes many forms. The photo in the Masterplan of a portable enclosed parking structure is an illustration of one type. See the interactive online map for a legend indicating the various types and locations of cycle parking. | • A page is to be added to section 4 to address Ring Road and central city, including reduced speeds.  
• This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
• Section 7 - include mention of educating parents along with Bike Ready discussion. |
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**ITEM 10**

**ATTACHMENT 2**
### ITEM 10 - ATTACHMENT 2

#### Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

**Urban Cycling Network Masterplan**

|-----|-----------|---------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 106 | Matthew McKenzie |               |                |               |              | • Pathways at Ashburton should consider the new highway, new bike path and possible use of the old Saddle Road and Saddle Road Bridge.  
• Pathways may be better with a limestone surface to keep rider speeds down and should have clear signage regarding right of way and etiquette.  
• Cycle parking can be uncovered, and cheap, important locations are outside cafes, toilets, on or near pathways and outside bike shops and urban shops. | • Refer general Botanical Road response.  
• Prioritisation has been conducted based on over twenty different datasets including but not limited to available widths, traffic volumes, parking, origins and destinations (land use), and whether the link leverages previous investments. The submitter is welcome to contact staff for a personal tour of the mechanics of the prioritisation.  
• JFK Drive cycle lanes have been deleted in a recent real as parking removal or "road diet" (four lanes to two lanes) options for a large area of residential land use is not considered to have a low benefit versus the impacts on the community.  
• Refer general separated cycleways response.  
• It is agreed that the type of facility and allocation of road space should be evidence based; however in New Zealand there is a legal requirement to consult with the community under the Local Government Act. There is also a need to maintain “social license to operate” which means that if the majority of the community is not "brought along" then political support cannot be maintained over the long term.  
• Many Palmerston North collector roads are 31m wide from kerb to kerb. This is insufficient space to provide separate cycle lanes and also provide parking; even with parking only on one side, one of the cycle lanes will be too narrow. The only solution on such streets to provide parking on one side and cycle lanes is to indent parking, or to reconfigure the entire street (affecting stormwater drainage, street trees, etc). The latter is extremely costly – but when a street is due for kerb and channel renewal then a separated cycleway is possible. | This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Section 5 - include and explain Botanical Road planning considerations.  
• Section 4 maps - distinguish buffered & separated cycle lanes. |

---

**Notes:**

- Pathways at Ashburton should consider the new highway, new bike path and possible use of the old Saddle Road and Saddle Road Bridge.
- Pathways may be better with a limestone surface to keep rider speeds down and should have clear signage regarding right of way and etiquette.
- Cycle parking can be uncovered, and cheap, important locations are outside cafes, toilets, on or near pathways and outside bike shops and urban shops.
### ITEM 10 - ATTACHMENT 2

#### Summary of Submissions and Analysis

|-----|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 107 | Emma Hughes | YES | YES | NO | Better |  | - Funding should be increased so we can build infrastructure that is both high quality and safe.  
- To encourage more cycling, there should be lower speed limits to make it safer for people biking, place bollards in residential streets and change the District Plan to make new shopping bike and pedestrian accessible and prioritised.  
- Mistakes in the document – Buffered cycle lanes are not the same as protected cycle lanes.  
- Disagrees with the level of constraints on some of these roads, the physical constraints on the Palmerston North roads are low. |  |  |  |  |

- Noted.  
- This submission is accepted. No change is recommended.

| 108 | Lorna Maurer | YES | YES | YES | Better |  | - The current cycle ways should be made safer and more user friendly before introducing more.  
- Continue with the cycling in schools programme. Have programmes that promote cycling in the workplace, so that more adults consider biking to work.  
- Desperately to see a safe cycling route to and from Ashhurst to Palmerston North. Currently it is not a safe cycle route. |  |  |  |  |

- Noted.  
- As stated in the Masterplan on page 21, the Bikes in Schools (BIS) programme is a supported activity, with nine schools currently participating and more expected to join in the near future.  
- Refer general response regarding rural path links.  
- This submission is accepted. No change is recommended.

| 109 | Selwyn Yorke | YES | YES | YES | More |  | - We need our roads to be safer for cyclists.  
- Keep it simple and low cost, and more quickly. |  |  |  |  |

- The purpose of this Masterplan is to make riding a bike safer for all Palmerston North residents.  
- This submission is accepted. No change is recommended.

| 110 | David T S Hayman | YES | YES | YES | Better |  | - Increased cycling will reduce traffic use and improve human health.  
- Widen and connect cycle lanes on higher traffic routes seems essential to achieve the aims.  
- An overall better connected community will help further these aims. |  |  |  |  |

- Page 16 should say “Investigation and concept design” not “Investigation or concept design”.  
- As funding is limited, Council can either build more kilometres of lower cost (so called “paint and posts”) treatments or fewer kilometres of higher cost (concrete separator kerbs, indented parking where required, etc). The latter is “better” in terms of the look and feel of a given  
- This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
  - Update Section 1 and Figure 3 to strengthen mentions of climate change and health.
### Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

#### Urban Cycling Network Masterplan

|-----|-----------|---------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 111 | David Winter | YES | YES | YES | Better | - Wonder why the 'investigation on concept design' cannot all be done together, and timelines altered accordingly?  
- Does not see why it has to be an either/or in terms of better quality cycleways or more, but if by better it means widening and connecting the main routes, that would be a priority.  
- To encourage more cycling, ensure there are easy to use bike stands in good locations and good safe cycleways to the schools.  
- Strongly supports the goal. | street as it is permanent, but not "better" in terms of geographic coverage. | - Section 5 - correct "Investigation and concept design". |
| 112 | Neil Spencer | YES | YES | YES | Better | - More trips taken by bike lead to less traffic, lower environmental impact and better physical and mental health for Palmerstonians.  
- High quality cycleways covering key routes are more important than more average quality cycle lanes.  
- To encourage more cycling, encourage places of work to provide facilities, educate motorists. | | | |
| 113 | Rachel Keedwell | Better | | | | - Broadway Avenue has some aging infrastructure and is planned to be assessed for general safety improvements and streetscape renewal, contingent on National Land Transport Fund (NLTF) funding availability. It is not just the safety of people on bikes that needs to be addressed. At the time of the draft Masterplan writing, it was programmed for work under a separate budget (TEFAR), which has now been declined by the NZ Transport Agency. A new application will be made in year 4 of the current LTP. | - This submission is accepted. No change is recommended. |
| | | | | | | | | | |

This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
- Section 4 - revise text to describe Broadway Avenue project as a multi-modal safety & streetscape upgrade, separate from this Masterplan.

This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
- Section 3 - Include content about intersections, traffic signal phases and hook turns, roundabout design  
- Separate from the Masterplan, reconsider the Primary Route signs.

---
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**Note:**
- The table above contains a summary of submissions and analysis for the Urban Cycling Network Masterplan. Each entry highlights key points of each submission and comments from council officers. Where applicable, changes recommended by the council are noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>terms of the length of the network and the bikes in schools programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What about an additional target looking at journey planning to schools or percentage of students biking to school at each of the schools where programmes have been implemented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rates of injury and death – we should be aiming for zero, not just a decreasing trend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There are discrepancies between what was listed in the Masterplan and what is on the arccis.com interactive map.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Important area of the network that is not adequately covered is intersections, and how they can be improved for cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• High priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Finish the entire length of College Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Featherston Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Botanical Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Intersection of Cook Street and Park Road into the Esplanade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o The moat of the City ring road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Cook Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Te Awe Awe Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Milton Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Rangitikei Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Lower priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Maxwells line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Cuba Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Park Road West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Waldegrave Street more important than Campbell Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Main Street West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strongly recommend traffic lights with separate signals for cyclists instead of hook turns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Speed limits should be lowered within the ring road to make the inner city safer for cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Standardised approach to roundabouts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Behavioural and cultural change is important, the Masterplan is not allowing enough of a focus in this crucial area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The culture shift needed will require much greater investment than an annual advertising campaign.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Changing the infrastructure alone does not make enough of a difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Certain types of cycle infrastructure can result in the traffic speed being lower.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The language used to promote the changes contained in the Masterplan will need careful attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• As implementation of the Masterplan rolls out, there needs to be coordination with other parties such as Horizons to ensure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>However, Council is progressively upgrading older roundabouts to conform to best practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There are no discrepancies between the lists of corridors in the online map vs the Masterplan – the submitter may have missed projects covered in Section 4.1 or not understood that not all projects are listed in the phasing plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a difference of opinion as to whether road controlling authorities should aim for zero fatalities or a reduction. Even the international Vision Zero movement does not envision zero serious injuries, just zero fatalities. The Masterplan resolves the issue by combining fatalities with serious injuries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Primary Route signs were an NZ Transport Agency initiative to guide people on bikes to College Street. The text on draft page 18 suggests that the Primary Route scheme is not consistent with current best practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer general cycle signals response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

#### Urban Cycling Network Masterplan

|-----|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|     |           |                |                |                | More?  | their marketing is promoting the cycling message more frequently.  
|     |           |                |                |                |        | • Would like to see further resourcing put into developing travel plans.  
|     |           |                |                |                |        | • Has PNCC considered securing e-bike deals?  
|     |           |                |                |                |        | • Make sure the People on Bikes Forum is utilised fully.  
|     |           |                |                |                |        | • The way-finding signage used to date has been a waste of time.  
|     |           |                |                |                |        | • Parking is an essential factor to consider, needs to be more like the parklet on the edge of The Square.  |
| 114 | Palmerston North City Environment Trust | Yes            | Yes            | Yes            |        | • Commends Council in engaging purposively with the transport agenda  
|     | Michelle McManus Board Chair          |                |                |                |        | • The activities listed in the proposed Masterplan will invariably result in an increase in cycling rates in and around Palmerston North.  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • The overall cycling update however is very likely to remain well below what could be expected considering the demographics and topography of the City.  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • The Masterplan does not include necessary investment to understand the enablers and decision making of individual travel choices and that in its present format, it misses the opportunity to address the increasing desire for individualised, flexible and smart mobilities.  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • Strongly recommend the following:  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • An additional section in the Masterplan that details investment in marketing research around travel decision making and motivation.  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • A commitment by PNCC to a 30/40% target of all journeys into and around the City being cycling/walking ones by 2024.  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • The initial sectors targeted for such research are Palmerston North Hospital, the PNCC and school pupils in Y5-Y12.  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • Greater vision around the intention to improve the safety and wellbeing of all public road and pathway users.  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • Investigate the cause(s) of the 50% reduction in daily cycle traffic during the 2 years of 2013-2015.  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • An integrated approach within infrastructure.  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • A co-ordinated approach with Horizons to sustainable travel behaviour for the reopening of the Manawatu Gorge access.  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • Conversations around issues such as minimising the frequency that vehicles cross cycle pathways, the dangers of roundabouts and main highways, the impact of compulsory helmets on cycling rates in school children, increasing the enjoyment accessibility and convenience of cycling/walking.  |
| 115 | Jonathan Marshall                      | YES            | YES            | Yes            | Better | • Agrees with vision statement, particularly like the focus on all ages and abilities, and the clear indication that this is to be supported by speed and parking management, and land use  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • Refer general separated cycleways response.  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | • Much of the Ring Road had cycle lanes up to the early 2000’s but has been redesigned for six or more vehicle  
|     |                                       |                |                |                |        | |

This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More?</td>
<td>planning. And the indication that it's about culture change and choice.</td>
<td>travel and parking lanes over recent years as a motor vehicle priority route. The benefit of this is that motorists can be discouraged from driving through the city centre and instead directed around it. The Masterplan does include plans to improve the ability to cross the Ring Road.</td>
<td>Add a page in section 4 to address Ring Road and central city, including reduced speeds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The linking to speed management and land use planning is crucial.
- Dropping speeds is the cheapest and easiest way to achieve this, as removing the ability to rat-run.
- Do I agree with the proposed network - regarding the long-term plan, in general, yes.
- The focus is largely on arterials, which is where the evidence suggests there are the most crashes. Most crashes are on the proposed network. This is excellent, as these are the streets being addressed.
- By focusing on arterials, you automatically get a connected network that covers the city the fastest.
- The downside to this is that arterials are dominated by vehicle traffic, and generally have a limit to how much they can be calmed, as they're the most well-used routes.
- Fully separated cycleways on these streets is essential. I note that in many cases this is not what is proposed. This is just not good enough.
- In the Netherlands they recommend any street over 2,500 vehicles per day should have separated infrastructure.
- In most of the cases, separated infrastructure should be possible.
- In the meantime, if separated infrastructure is too expensive, then the space should be taken immediately and a buffered solution with temporary bollards/planters etc used as an interim measure.
- Put it inside parking if at all possible to ensure further separation.
- The reason for the focus on separated infrastructure is we know that painted cycleways are not safe and may be worse than no cycleway.
- An overview of the long term vision map exposes several gaps. The most obvious of these is the 'outer square' of Pitt, Grey/Walding/Ferguson/Princess. These are large roads with plenty of space that could be reallocated to people.
- In addition, anywhere where the network goes from 'separated' or 'buffered' down to just paint (or worse, nothing at all) is a gap that needs to be filled. To encourage cyclists of all ages and abilities, you need to minimise exposure to perceived risk and thus maximise separation for the entire journey.
- Would suggest prioritising the taking of space first together with buffered solutions in the interim while longer term, higher quality solutions are worked on in parallel.
### Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

#### Urban Cycling Network Masterplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Malcolm Todd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Better quality, no question. The evidence clearly shows that paint alone is no safer and may in fact be more dangerous. Thus, we need separated (i.e. better quality) from the get go. The simple question you should ask: Would you allow your 6 year old to ride here alone? If the answer is no, redesign. The simple answer is discourage driving! The more nuanced answer is ensure that cyclists and pedestrians have priority in the urban built environment. Way too much of our public space is dominated by vehicular traffic. Every intersection should be redesigned over time to prioritise walking, cycling, scooting and other active modes. Speeds should be reduced across the board. Traffic lights should be re-phased to prioritise pedestrians. The recent pausing in works on College St at Pitama Road shops due to fuss from the shops and church demonstrates clearly how poor Council communication has been. There will be push back on this from a vocal minority. They'll include traditional conservatives (generally older folk) and business people afraid of losing business when parks are lost.</td>
<td>Residents can report illegal parking to Council. Council has a proactive and reactive street sweeping contract. However, Palmerston North has an issue with some residents throwing alcohol and energy drink bottles out of car windows (more so than many other cities in NZ); a national change in recycling / bottle depots is potential way to address this.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No change is recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Gytha Riddell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sections of roads after Stoney Creek Road would be the most dangerous to drive in Palmerston North. No passing lines, poor visibility, very narrow road.</td>
<td>Out of scope of the Masterplan. Comments will be passed on to the relevant Council Department.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No change is recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Sheryl Kinkiri</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Safety first. Put paid showers in The Square. Bike riding training for kids. Employers need to be encouraged to support biking by providing employees with shower facilities and bike sheds.</td>
<td>There are showers available for public use in the i-Site located in The Square. It is a requirement of the PNCC District Plan (section 11.6.1(d)), that when the establishment of a commercial premises requires a resource consent, it must have cycle parking facilities on site.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Colleen Sheldon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Likes that there is more to the Masterplan than putting in cycleways and that the Council has understood the need to encourage the wider community trough behavioural change and cycle education. A culture change will be key. The map on page 13 of the Masterplan shows good levels of connectedness, however it is difficult to assess whether pinch points have been fully considered, particularly during peak traffic flows.</td>
<td>Pinch points are determined at the project investigation level. Cycle/pedestrian crossings will be considered at the project investigation level, especially for junctions of neighbourhood greenways and arterial/collector roads. Refer general separated cycleways response.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended: Section 7 - Delivery Partners: add mention of the Greasy Chain Charitable Trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

### Urban Cycling Network Masterplan

|-----|----------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 120 | Danya Anderson       | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better| • Will cycle/pedestrian crossings be used to enhance confidence and flow for cyclists? This may also help change driver behaviour.  
• Would be great to see the Park Road improvements brought forward to stage 1.  
• Targeting the student demographic is a good idea because they would initially benefit the most from safe and accessible cycleways.  
• It is important that cycleways and the sentiment of changing driver and cyclist behaviour are achieved through fit for purpose cycleways.  
• As a trustee of the Greasy Chain Charitable Trust, our organisation would like to partner with the Council to help build cycle confidence in the city through seminars that go further than current road safety. | Refer general separated cycleways response.                                                                                     | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 121 | Michael Gemmell      | YES           | YES            |                | Better| • Could do with more separated cycle lanes.  
• Make cyclist safety a priority.  
• More covered bike stands if possible.  
• Priority light signals.                                                                                                               | Refer general separated cycleways response.                                                                                   | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 122 | James Irwin          | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better| • Some roads are quite wide and would accommodate a fully separated cycleway.  
• Would advise setting a minimum standard for cycling infrastructure in terms of perceived safety for cyclists.  
• Quickly building many routes of low perceived safety may have negative impact on this project.  
• The sector of society who will be most receptive to cultural change around cycling will be school children.  
• Would like to see a focus on school transport.  
• Why not add community centres which may provide large numbers of daily commuting cycle journeys on the published corridor maps.  
• You could make circles on the map bigger for institutions with more potential for cyclist journeys.                                                                                                               | Refer general separated cycleways response.                                                                                   | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 123 | Gillian Brown        | YES           | YES            | YES            | More  | • I would rather have the safety of a cycle lane over the quality.  
• Make traffic sensors recognise bikes so you don't have to wait for a car to trigger a green light.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Refer general separated cycleways response.                                                                                   | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 124 | Kate Hill            | YES           | YES            | YES            | Better| • We need more people on bikes, we need better bike facilities and safety for kids to cycle to school.  
• Safer and better quality will encourage more people.  
• Encourage kids to school on bikes.                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Refer general separated cycleways response.                                                                                   | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
## ITEM 10 - ATTACHMENT 2

### Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

**Urban Cycling Network Masterplan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Submission key points</th>
<th>Council officer analysis / comments</th>
<th>Council officer recommended changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 125 | David Flosdorf     | YES       | YES       | More      |        | • What concerns me most while cycling is getting hit by cars, harassment of cyclists by individuals in cars and all the glass on the road. The path quality is not even in the top 10 of the problems. More cycle paths might help though.  
• Issues in Palmerston North:  
• Cyclist harassment from cars  
• Reckless Drivers  
• Glass on the streets  
• Very happy the PNCC is trying to make this city more cycle-able and I hope you have success attaching the issues I outlined. | Council has a proactive and reactive contract for street sweeping; members of the public can call to lodge a request for broken glass to be removed. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 126 | Giles Bates        |           |           |           |        | • Would like to support the submission to increase the cycleways in Palmerston North, make them better and have more of them.  
• The more cyclists we can have on our streets the more courteous drivers will become.  
• Suggest that there be a dedicated cycleway around the outer rim of Palmerston North for cyclists that is protected from the traffic, that covers a distance of 30km or 50km.  
• Encourage more cyclists, less and smaller, more energy efficient cars. | Council has been working to deliver a (mostly) pathway beltway around the city, this is shown in the online map. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 127 | Samuel Maccabe      |           |           |           |        | • Believes its time the councillors really took into consideration the rate payers as the removal of parking spaces will hurt the various business and houses in this area.  
• Will only benefit a few cyclists who do not reside in the area  
• First responsibility is to your ratepayers. | Refer general parking response.  
People who currently (or wish to) cycle are ratepayers as well. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 128 | Ryan Lean          | YES       | NO        | YES       | More   | • Think the Fitzherbert East/ Aokautere Road needs to be improved and widened for cyclists and pedestrians at places like between Poison Hill and Aokautere school.  
• Make it safer for Aokautere school kids to get to school.  
• The whole road from Palmerston North to Ashhurst needs to be made more cycle friendly. | Refer general rural path links response. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 129 | Sarah Steer        |           |           |           |        | • Supports the development of a more comprehensive urban cycle network in Palmerston North. With its flat geography, temperate climate and youthful population Palmerston North is ideally suited to a culture of cycling.  
• Any investment must be smarter than just the sum of its resources.  
• Cycle ways must be connected to each other. They must at the very least be continuous for their entire route. There is no benefit to the current practice of painting green lines on partial parts of roads and leaving difficult intersections untouched.  
• Cycles lanes need to be maintained. Painting green lines, adding barriers etc, is of minimal use if the surface is so potholed that bikes choose to not travel in the designated cycle area. | Noted. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |

---

See Part 1 for general responses to multiple submissions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Barbara Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cycle routes need to lead to places.</td>
<td>College Street (current work – not the focus of this Masterplan consultation).</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cycle routes need to be policed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All cycle investment needs to make cycling safer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Anthony Hewett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strongly oppose the proposed changes to the Awapuni Shopping Centre whereby PNCC wishes to remove 18 parks in College Street opposite the Shopping Centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Please make this a low-speed area as it is a very busy area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Julian Penny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The proposal to take away parking spaces will adversely affect the local shops.</td>
<td>Refer general parking response.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduce local speed restrictions near shopping centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Paul Collister &amp; Judith Galtry</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>• Palmerston North seems an ideal place for cycling - especially now with increasing popularity of e-bikes - but its road system is very cyclist unfriendly.</td>
<td>Refer general separated cycleways response.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposed network is not ambitious enough. It also needs to be connected with traffic calming on some streets and speed limit reductions on some especially around schools.</td>
<td>The neighbourhood greenway (quiet residential street) network is shown in the online map; implementation is dependent on elected members supporting traffic calming where needed (and potentially updating/reconfirming the Local Area Traffic Management Policy 2003); refer page 6 in the online map.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Given our climate crisis the work should be sped up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Good quality separated cycleways along city spines are crucial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Covered bike parking in town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Mary Morgan-Richards</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>• Cycling is good for the environment and good for my health.</td>
<td>Central city design is a separate project.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. The submission will be passed on to the central city design team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expand it once in place so that everyone can get home from school and work safely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Make the roads around the PN Square one-way for car traffic and add wide cycle lanes where the cars are not using the other lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Great to have a plan but let’s speed things up - there is a climate crisis that requires change -now - not tomorrow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Matt Farrelly</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>• Palmerston North has some much potential to see more residents and tourists regularly cycling.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• He Ara Kotahi is nothing short of a milestone for the City and region.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve the routes where most people are cycling already to strengthen those networks and then work on those around other flows to schools and into the square.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safety first.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The more people who cycle the healthier our population and air quality is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Robert McLachlan &amp; Steve Tinwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Professors at Massey University interested in local and global environmental issues.</td>
<td>Refer general separated cycleways response.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Applaud the creation of the Master Plan and recognize the great deal of background work that has gone into it.</td>
<td>Fitzherbert Avenue has mature trees and indented parking; given that the cycle lanes exceed the minimum width outlined in the Traffic Control Devices Manual / Manual of Traffic Signs and Markings / Cycling Network Guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

#### Urban Cycling Network Masterplan

|-----|-----------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 137 | Judith A Mackay | YES | YES | YES | More | Looks good and acknowledges the challenges that may lie ahead.  
* Studies show that some early paths are now considered too narrow, and some early greenways with sharrows have too much car traffic to be comfortable to all users.  
* A large part of the community cycles. Nationwide, 31% of people aged 15 and over cycle some-times.  
* Paint does not protect cyclists from motor vehicles.  
* The picture of Fitzherbert Avenue looks better, but it is a bit misleading as nearly the whole length of Fitzherbert Avenue has on-street parking, in addition to 4 very heavy lanes of traffic. Some left-turning drivers do not give way to cyclists going straight ahead.  
* The Master Plan showing a complete, connected network is impressive. Would like to see more detail on how the whole thing will function as a network.  
* The online tool shows a few disconnected projects, not a network. Would like to see opportunities for a more comprehensive, separated cycle network developed as is happening now in other NZ cities.  
* On-road cycleways are controversial everywhere.  
* Section 8, ‘Measuring progress’, targets can be more ambitious. An overall mode share of 1/3 active, 1/3 public, and 1/3 private transport is a common goal worldwide and has been achieved in some cities. | Documents, then major changes are not considered cost-effective.  
* Submitters may have failed to click on the second to last slide in the online map, which shows the future vision for a connected network.  
* Targets will be set once the Census 2018 and Household Travel Survey results are released by Government. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 138 | Glen Hepburn | YES | YES | YES | Better | Safe cycling is an essential key towards achieving a healthy, responsible & sustainable future.  
* Cycling safety should be part of driver licence training.  
* Slow the traffic down with more camera, speed bumps.  
* Swap roundabouts for traffic lights. Roundabouts are too dangerous.  
* Cycling should be part of the school curriculum.  
* Please complete the river cycleway to Ashhurst with tunnels to Roberts and James Line.  
* Focus on school routes. | Refer general rural path links response.  
* Roundabouts have a better safety record than traffic signals overall (including motorists) and are lower cost / more efficient at lower traffic volumes. From a multi-modal perspective and considering overall community safety, roundabouts have an important role to play in our transport network. However, traffic signals are safer than older design roundabouts and multi-lane roundabouts for people on bikes and pedestrians. Council is progressively upgrading older roundabouts and will not install multi-lane roundabouts in areas where there is pedestrian usage or no cycling route alternative. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
* Section 3 – new page on intersections |
| 139 | Collin James | YES | NO | NO | Better | Get people out of cars and onto bikes.  
* Separated cycle lanes are the only solution.  
* The phasing plan needs to be done more rapidly.  
* Take the cycle lanes into the CBD and around the Square. | Refer general separated cycleways response.  
* Refer general central city response. | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
* Section 4 - new page on the central city. |
### Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

#### Urban Cycling Network Masterplan

|-----|--------------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 140 | Sport Manawatu     | Better        |                |                 | • Move parked traffic away from the kerb, place the cyclist lanes between parked vehicles and footpaths and install cycle traffic lights.  
• Questions who the councillors are who consistently vote against having separated cycle lanes.  
• Believes the proposed Masterplan will have significant benefits for our city, including improved infrastructure, safer cycling and pedestrian routes, and importantly cultural shifts making active transport the preferred choice of travel.  
• Councils Masterplan vision aligns closely with the internal Sport Manawatu regional plan.  
• The Plan provides our City with a clear direction, and actions to get us there.  
• The proposed network provides a range of options for cyclists as a means of improved city travel.  
• The draft phasing plan appears reasonable that developments have been prioritised based on infrastructure gaps and fewer project constraints.  
• Sport Manawatu considers Council prioritising quality cycleways over more cycleways around the City.  
• For people who are economically disadvantaged or do not drive, being able to cycle safely can mean being more able to search for work, access services and retain social connections.  
• Ensure that navigating new and existing infrastructure can be done in a consistent and logical manner.  
• Provide pathways and support for cycling education for both children and adults to ensure that they are confident and competent in using the cycling infrastructure.  
• Council will play a significant leadership role with overseeing the various action areas, and the appointment of a Masterplan coordinator will provide essential oversight over key work stages, thus ensuring progress is tracked and on schedule.  
• The Plan also needs to consider the use of language when highlighting key points to the general public.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Noted.                                         | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 141 | Zachary Holmes     | YES           | YES            | YES             | • Investing in safer roads will encourage more people to bike.  
• Safer roads for cyclists could have benefits for our environment, economy and community.  
• Separate or buffered cycle ways  
• Main streets are a nightmare to be on for cyclists.  
• To encourage more cycling – community tyre pumps, places to fill water bottles, speed humps, encourage off road biking.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Refer general response to separated cycleways.   | This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:  
• Section 6 - Include a photo of a public bike fix-it station. |
| 142 | Priscilla Morgan   | YES           | YES            | NO              | More  
• Raising the level of provision for cycling must surely encourage people to cycle themselves and to allow their children the freedom to cycle.  
• The network has a good spread over the City.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Noted.                                         | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Margaret Riorden</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The timeline seems quite long especially for those streets with low constraints.&lt;br&gt;• The wider the network and the more cycleways provided, the louder is the message that bikes are a normal part of traffic flow.&lt;br&gt;• Maintain existing cycle lanes to a decent standard.&lt;br&gt;• The new bridge and pathway are a huge asset for the City.&lt;br&gt;• Shared pathways help change attitudes in the wider community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Margaret Wilde</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>• Not sure about Cook Street unless the roundabouts are sorted, particularly the one on Ferguson Street.&lt;br&gt;• Safety is important.&lt;br&gt;• Have training sessions for those who haven’t ridden a bike in years.&lt;br&gt;• Show safest routes to different parts of the City.&lt;br&gt;• Provide safe places down town to park bikes.</td>
<td>• The Cook Street corridor is entirely about the roundabouts and traffic signals.&lt;br&gt;• Bike Ready is targeted at school children. Green Rix is recommended in the Masterplan for adults but requires a community delivery partner and funding (refer Section 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Victoria Jakobs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>• Refer general speed reduction response.&lt;br&gt;• It is not legal to cycle on footpaths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Jennifer Swervy</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>• Increasing the number of people using active transport is great for the health, safety and happiness of communities.&lt;br&gt;• People who are hesitant to cycle will avoid cycling on cycleways they see as dangerous, therefore better cycleways are more important.&lt;br&gt;• To encourage more cycling – a competition to get people started with easily achievable active transport goals and prizes.</td>
<td>• There is a national competition that many Palmerston North businesses participate in: <a href="https://www.lovetoride.net/nz">https://www.lovetoride.net/nz</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>This submission is accepted. The following change is recommended:&lt;br&gt;• Section 9 - include an action for Council to participate and promote the Aotearoa Cycle Challenge every year that it is organised by Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>NZTA Sharleen Hannon</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>• You have conveyed a detailed business case in a straightforward way for the community to understand, that shows both the long term vision and the short term priorities. The interactive map is great and shows an inspiring vision that we hope will be well used across PNCC, such as by Asset Managers undertaking renewal activities.&lt;br&gt;• The evidence from other cities shows us that a key determinant of success is connectivity and we note what appears to be missing links in the network, in both the online map (e.g. Bourke Street, Queen Street and Ferguson Street and in Figure 37 in the Masterplan document (e.g. around The Square).&lt;br&gt;• There is a need for improvements being proposed as part of the ‘Active mode connectivity between Palmerston North and Feilding Single Stage Business Case’ to be incorporated into this Masterplan. Particularly Vogel Street which currently has no</td>
<td>• Ferguson Street is part of the multi-lane motor-vehicle focussed Ring Road. Refer general ring road and central city responses.&lt;br&gt;• Vogel Street is a highly constrained residential environment, with the northern segment only 10.4m wide (kerb to kerb). The average distance between driveways is 3.3m. The only way to achieve a cycleway, much less a separated one, is through major street reconstruction. The parallel Ruahine Street already has a cycle lane that exceeds minimum standards, and a link using McGregor</td>
<td></td>
<td>This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:&lt;br&gt;• Section 3 (new page on intersections): clarify programme 1257 budget of $41,000 p.a. is for minor improvements only. Major intersection upgrades to be funded through Low Cost Low Risk (up to $1M projects) or through programme 1559.&lt;br&gt;• Section 4 - remove reference to TEFAR&lt;br&gt;• Section 6 - clarify wayfinding implementation&lt;br&gt;• Section 7 - adjust Figure 23 caption&lt;br&gt;• Section 8 - revise Problem/Benefit table to incorporate the problem of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cycling facilities and forms a key part of the route between Palmerston North and Feilding.</td>
<td>and Paradise Pl will connect directly to the Railway Road shared path.</td>
<td>Inadequate infrastructure and driver behaviour as a driver of casualties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● It would be good to understand how this network sits in the context of the wider Network Operating Framework and the associated modal priorities along routes.</td>
<td>CPTED issues were considered in the prioritisation assessment and will be further considered in project-level investigations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Whether or not the current facilities along Bourke Street serve as an alternative ‘parallel’ route, in the context of prioritising Campbell Street or Waldegrave Street.</td>
<td>Based on the experience of Christchurch in implementing a wayfinding plan, a city-wide wayfinding strategy is the first step. Once the destinations and routes are confirmed, implementation will indeed be at the project level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Ministry of Justice Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principles particularly for proposed off road links should be identified and any areas needing special treatment, particularly through existing pedestrian accessways, such as Millar St south.</td>
<td>Refer general separated cycleways response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Wayfinding signage should be an integral part of the design of a project (page 18).</td>
<td>Agreed, the problem/benefit table was adjusted during graphic design and is no longer correct; it will be adjusted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● We note that TEFAR is unfortunately no longer available.</td>
<td>Figure 23 (draft Masterplan) will be re-captioned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● $43k p.a. for cycle facilities at intersections seems low (page 12).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Over time it will be great to see a greater proportion of funding spent on separated cycleways that provide a greater level of service and are more likely to attract the interested but concerned (Figure 19, page 15).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The benefit ‘fewer people being killed and injured’ associated with the 3rd problem statement ‘traffic skills, confidence, and/or fitness is lacking’ infers that poor cycling skills are to blame for deaths &amp; injuries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● There is no mention of car driver behaviour and a lack of safe infrastructure being a problem (page 25).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Please reference Figure 23 (page 20) as an NZTA publication, not MOT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

148 Arshad Javed | YES | YES | YES | More | ● Feels more safe cycling to work then driving. | ● Fitzherbert Road (SH57), Aokautere Road (SH57) and Napier Road (SH3) are not urban and therefore outside the scope of this Masterplan. However, Council has (and will continue) to advocate for safety improvements to the NZ Transport Agency (the road controlling authority for these roads) | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
|     |               |               |                |                | ● It is also good for the environment and physical health. |                              |
|     |               |               |                |                | ● More cycle ways is more important, the quality is already there. |                              |
|     |               |               |                |                | ● Some incentive schemes could be initiated to encourage people to cycle more. |                              |
|     |               |               |                |                | ● Need to promote cycling and Council initiatives at schools and work places. |                              |
|     |               |               |                |                | ● Would be great if Council considered safe cycling paths on Fitzherbert Road, Aokautere and Napier Road. |                              |

149 Margi Mitcalfe | YES | YES | YES | More | ● More cyclists means less reliance on fossil fuels and less carbon emissions. There are many other benefits of more cyclists: health, social connectivity and so on. | ● Refer standard separated cycleways response. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
|     |               |               |                |                | ● Would prefer more kerb separation, double-buffered cycle lanes, separated cycle ways and so on all the city. | ● Subsidies are operational costs that directly impact rates and must have a high cost-effectiveness; it is unlikely that subsidies for cycle gear would be supportable. |
### Attachment B (Part 2) Summary of Submissions and Analysis

#### Urban Cycling Network Masterplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active lighted signs as described by the submitter are not permitted under the Government’s Traffic Control Devices (TCD) Manual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The idea of giving random prizes to parked bikes around town sounds interesting, but any prize of value runs the risk of being taken by someone who is not the owner of the bicycle. Existing promotion programmes such as Aotearoa Cycle Challenge are considered more cost-effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totaly agree that both improved an improved network and a change of culture are needed to make cycling more attractive and safe choice for more people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are so many benefits for the community if more people are able to choose to cycle more often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There would be so many community benefits if a lot more people biked, such as a reduction of traffic congestion, lower traffic emissions (carbon and other), safer streets, less maintenance needed on the roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree that Featherston Street should be the number one priority as it is both a route for school kids and heavy traffic, not very wide, and there is the danger that at any time someone in a parked car could open their door into one’s path and throw one out in front of a vehicle coming up from behind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It seems that a reasonable balance has been struck between the cost of making all the changes that would result in a great improvement to the experience and safety of cyclists across the 36 corridors identified, the need to make improvements to the most dangerous and used routes and the desirability of being able to cover a larger part of the network by using measures such as buffered cycle lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A key purpose for cycleways is to enable people to get where they need to go safely by bike. Having more safer cycling routes (where at a minimum cyclist do not have to ride in the door zone of cars) through the City would enable that, along with a real emphasis on changing the culture so that drivers are more aware and considerate of cyclists needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost limits can be committed to, but we need to take an holistic approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Sally Pearce</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>Subsidies are operational costs that directly impact rates and must have a high cost-effectiveness; it is unlikely that subsidies for bike maintenance would be supportable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Greenfix programme seeks to encourage older adults to ride.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no legislation that requires the use of bells when approaching pedestrians. Moreover, many pedestrians cannot hear due to wind or head/earphones and regular riders are thereby discouraged from bothering to ring bells.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Agree network</th>
<th>Agree phasing</th>
<th>Submission key points</th>
<th>Council officer analysis / comments</th>
<th>Council officer recommended changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 151 | Mike Clement                                  | NO        | NO            | NO            | • Subsidise cycle repairs and bike servicing.  
• Organise more group cycling events for particular age.  
• Cycling can provide a means for elderly people to experience natural areas actively.  
• The enforcement of the use of bells by cyclists approaching pedestrians is recommended.  
• While cycle lanes are nice they also impede and inhibit vehicle traffic.  
• Many of the roads mentioned are narrow and already congested, narrowing them further in order to widen or create cycle lanes will increase the risk of vehicular accidents.  
• There are better solutions and uses for this funding: 1) create heavy vehicle bypasses around the city so trucks don’t have to come through dense residential areas 2) ensure the roads were have are maintained to a good standard.  
• Too much focus of cycling.                                                                                   | Noted.                                                             | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 152 | Tamara Reed                                    | YES       | YES           | YES           | Better  
To encourage more cycling – social media posts to educate road users around safety for all road users.  
• Creating awareness and understanding of best practice to keep everyone safe on the roads.  
• Mentions weekend warrior cycle loops that encourage groups to cycle to rural towns to support local business (e.g. Palmerston North to Feilding).                                                                 | Noted.                                                             | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
| 153 | Massey University Dr Allanah Ryan Director Sustainability |           |               |               | Massey University endorses the Palmerston North City Council’s creation of the Urban Cycle Network Master Plan 2019 and look forward to the long-term improvement of cycling infrastructure in Palmerston North and to the operation of a transport system that is safe for all users  
We anticipate that this will support PNCC’s target of a 25% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in Palmerston North by 2028.  
Massey’s Sustainable Transport Working Group is currently developing a 5-year Sustainable Transport Plan 2020-2024 covering all aspects of transport related to the University’s activities on all its campuses. In particular, this will include the preparation of a cycling plan for the Manawatū campus.  
The Massey University community in Manawatū has long been the beneficiary of a high-quality separated cycleway to the university, and facilities have recently been improved yet further with the opening of He Ara Kotahi and its connection to Massey. One remaining substandard component of this network is the intersection of Tennent Drive and Dairy Farm Road. We look forward to working with PNCC and NZTA to improve the layout at this location.  
Further cycling accessibility treatments are in design for the intersection of Fitzherbert Avenue and Te Awe Awe Street.  
As part of the Food HQ and Massey “super campus”, Council is planning a major redesign of Tennent Drive as a local street to make it easier for people on foot, bike and scooter to travel along and across it. Reference LTP Programme 1121.  
This submission is accepted. The following changes are recommended:  
• Online map - revise Tennent Drive to indicate separate project plan to narrow it and reduce speed  
• Section 4 - revise figure 16 to include Programme 1121 Food HQ / Tennent Drive  
• Section 7 - update Massey narrative                                                                                             |                                                     |                                                  |
|-----|-----------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 154 | Midcentral Health |                |                |               |         | - In terms of specific projects, we recommend that Fitzherbert Avenue be included for upgrading. This avenue gets a lot of cycle (and also car and truck) traffic, to and from the science parks and school as well as Massey University. Many people on bikes have experienced being cut off in the cycle lane by a car. A protected cycleway, cycle phase on lights, a forward stop box at Te Awe Awe Avenue, and traffic calming measures could be investigated.  
- We support the allocation of funds to maintain the Massey-bound cycleways free of glass, mud etc. | Refer general separated cycleways response.  
At the implementation stage, the community will be consulted on the type of cycleway (including physical separation) including an assessment of pros/cons for each type of treatment. The assessment will include access, safety, mode neutrality, social and community impacts. Of these, safety is the most important (by direction from the Government under the current Government Policy Statement).  
- Council will reference the NZ Transport Agency Cycling Network Guidance (CNG), which is based upon the "target audience" approach. This is explained in Section 2, Figure 11 of the draft Masterplan.  
- Refer general rural path links response. | This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase resource available for consulting with local communities on extending the cycle lanes or separated paths; or improvements to proposed greenways.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council officer analysis / comments</td>
<td>Council officer recommended changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Vijay Patel</td>
<td>Owner of Awapuni 4 Square</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned about the effect of the proposed cycle lane for Maxwells Line.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project specific consultation will be undertaken as mentioned in Section 7.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Ross Grantham, NZ Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have consulted with my Prevention Manager and Community Group Manager and Police are supportive of all evidenced based initiatives to keep our road users safe. We encourage our communities to use alternative means of transport and cycling is a great alternative as a form of exercise as well.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Green cats eyes are only approved for the use of delineating culverts (Clause 5.4(8) of the Land Transport Rule); white raised reflectorized pavement markings are used as delineators where warranted.</td>
<td>This submission is accepted. No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Media Report

DRAFT URBAN CYCLE NETWORK MASTERPLAN
We featured the Urban Cycle Network Masterplan in four posts during the consultation period on our Facebook page, which has 14,621 followers.

Our first post was boosted to appear in more feeds during the consultation period. These posts made it into a total of 52,000 newsfeeds and had a total of 976 likes/ comments/ shares (168 of these were comments).
Post Breakdown

Approximately 25% of the comments were in agreement with the vision:

Andrew Guy: Great idea! But coming from Wellington please learn from others mistakes. The good thing is plenty of room on the roads here in general.

Wayne Wolfsbauer: Put some serious money away from car infrastructure and put it into cycling. And stop constant planning with no tangible action.

Johan Slagter de Lange: Yes more people on bikes less cars on the road then I can enjoy my Harley more.

Chris Rogers: Excellent idea.

Comments 'against':

Evan Williams: Stop wasting money on the minority. Start planning something great for the city like another vehicle bridge!

Chris Price: So reading the report is seems cycling has been on the decrease since 2013 and is now at 800 according to the council. More people are taking their child to school by car. That will not change. With the width of most of the roads in P N without major work they will never be suitable for purpose. Recently people were talking about the cycle ways in Denmark. With a little bit of research you find they have dedicated 2 lane cycleways away from the road. And as for the proposed 'sharrows' With the sign in the centre of the road I bet cyclists decide that they can use it all. Just another area to avoid as far as I am concerned.

Neil Morris: God. Need the roads fixed first before cycling! Theres to many potholes on palmy roads, there would be cyclists going missing!

Mike Clement: Most of the roads in Palmy are quite narrow, and if you try to squeeze in or increase the size of existing cycle lanes then you're increasing the risk of accidents and injuries. If you want to make Palmy safer for bikes then build a heavy vehicle bypass out to the Pahautau Track and Linton so trucks don't have to drive through the city. Also spend the money on improving the quality of our existing roads. As to your suggestion it would cost $30 million to paint cycle lanes on 36 streets. What are you smoking? That seems excessive.

Jason Seath: When they start paying regos, give them a road until then use their regos to fix the roads we pay to drive on.

Christina Rosselle: Fix the roads first before fixing something that isn't broken. Cool.

This post was asking if people agree with the cycleways vision. It was seen by 30,692 individuals and had 2,582 engagements (reactions, comments, shares, post clicks, and clicks through to the website).

Other comments:

- There were 13 comments on this posting calling for road fixes before considering cycleways.
- There were 4 comments on this post calling for the completion of a Palmerston North to Fielding cycleway.
- There were 5 comments on this post calling for completion of a cycle lane between Palmerston North and Ashhurst.
Post Breakdown

We didn't get many people commenting on the topic of prioritised streets. There was only one comment in agreement:

Keiler McManamon: These are some good roads to prioritise. Good move, PNCC.

Marcia Beaumont-Smith: What about improving existing roads? For example SH57 Fitzherbert East Road, especially linking from The Pahiatua Track to SH3, now the Gorge is closed there is a lot more traffic using the road, and it gets even worse if either the Saddle or The Track get closed and people have to use it to access the alternative route. This will be a long term problem until the new road is built and needs addressing! There are some shockingly dangerous bends (which are horrible if you meet a cyclist on them, far too narrow. It's bad enough meeting a truck coming in the opposite direction).

This post was asking for opinions on the 11 prioritised streets. It was seen by 6,906 individuals and had 1,776 engagements.
Post Breakdown

We had good suggestions from the public on this post:

- Daniel Stratton: Literally just more cycleways. Each person that bikes is one less car on the road. Cycleways are cheaper than upgrading roads for cars. Get more people on bikes and local businesses and employers will soon take care of the bike parking/security issue on their own.

- Cheryl Sturm: Free hi vis vests and hi vis school/work back pack protectors handed out. Could be at an events like with sport manawatu, from library, council, schools, in conjunction with bridge/walk way opening etc.

- Luke McIndoe: Better traffic light phasing etc. I love the bike light by Mobil on Ruahine st as a good example for cyclists.

- Jason Wilcox: Actual dedicated bike paths would be safer than bike lanes. I just about took out a cyclist last week, would have been an honest mistake. Visibility impaired by parked and oncoming traffic, out front of Girls High. He was all angry. I felt like he could have slowed down, and not tried breaking (and speed records). Give him some braking room for error.

This post was asking what would encourage people to cycle more. It was seen by 8,028 individuals and had 1,484 engagements.

Palmerston North City Council
Published by Danielle Mercer | June 4 | 

We love cycling, and we’d love to see more of it happening around our beautiful city. Apart from building cycleways what else would encourage you to cycle more?

Have your say: www.pncc.govt.nz/cycleways

Get More Likes, Comments and Shares
Boost this post for $45 to reach up to 4,700 people.

8,030 People Reached 1,484 Engagements

Sue Pugmire, Rob Ormsby and 35 others 58 Comments 8 Shares

Like Comment Share

Kirsty McLeod: Maybe at the start of the warmer weather offer a free tyre pressure/road readiness check for bikes in the square or something? I bet there are loads of people (including me) that have a bike sitting in the shed which they would use if someone who knows more about bikes could tell them it’s not going to fall apart on them.

Like Reply Message 10w
Post Breakdown

We had good suggestions from the public on this post:

Thomas Carter: Protected bike lanes. Off the street or with a hard barrier. Quick way to get the space would be to restrict parking on one side of the street like the North and East sides.

Renee Taylor: I used to bike everywhere but know I feel like it's unsafe. If there were wider safer bike lanes and lighting at night time, if there were more places to lock up my bikes too, in public areas too.

Lee-Anne Croucher: Bike lanes on all streets, and please keep them clean. I bike most days, and the amount of broken glass and potholes on college street makes me veer back into the car lane which is dangerous for all. Cars actually stopping at stop signs before proceeding would also be nice. I've almost been knocked off several times over the last few months with people just not checking at intersections.

Daniel Liddle: Add cycle lanes on streets. Most streets are dangerous, going around a parked car & drivers have no room to go around you.

Darcy Lloyd-Edwards: Such a good idea! I currently live in the Netherlands where everyone cycles all the time and only 33% of homes own a car, and the difference it makes to a place and our health is incredible. We will definitely be moving back to Palmerston in the future, so knowing there could be amazing cycle systems in place around the city would be perfect.

This post was asking how we can make it easier for people to cycle more in our city. It was seen by 6,577 individuals and had 1,09 engagements.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning and Strategy Committee
MEETING DATE: 2 September 2019
TITLE: Report on Solutions to Issues Raised in Dogwood Way Petition
PRESENTED BY: Robert van Bentum, Manager - Transport and Infrastructure
APPROVED BY: Tom Williams, Chief Infrastructure Officer

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That the Committee receive the report entitled “Report on Solutions to Issues Raised in Dogwood Way Petition.

2. That the Committee endorse the implementation of the low cost parking management intervention described in the report as Option 1 – Install Passing Bays.

1. ISSUE

1.1 Dogwood Way is a 9m wide residential cul de sac road in the north-west of the city, which backs onto the airport. The road currently provides access to an existing 20 residential dwellings, which will increase to 32 once full development occurs, as well as the Julia Wallace Retirement Centre, which includes 108 residential units and an aged care facility.

1.2 The road is classified as a local road/cul de sac in Council’s roading hierarchy and as such is expected to operate as a slow speed residential environment. The road width is adequate to provide for parking on both sides of the road with a single traffic lane. Two directional flow of vehicles and particularly larger freight and commercial vehicles is problematic, particularly when there is parking on both sides of the street. Furthermore, the road has several horizontal bends which restrict sight distance encouraging drivers to drive more cautiously.

1.3 There is a high demand for all day parking on both sides of the road, both from staff working in the Julia Wallace facility as well as contractors involved in the construction of residential properties. This effectively reduces the road down to one traffic lane. Drivers report being uncomfortable with the limited visibility as well as the conflict with oncoming vehicles, which requires drivers to give way to one another. Officers have received communication from both residents of the street and Julia Wallace around these issues.
1.4 At the 6th May meeting of the Planning and Strategy of Committee, a deputation of residents from the residential units within the Julia Wallace Retirement Centre, submitted a petition to Council, asking that Council resolve the issues. The committee resolved that Officers provide a report back to the committee on possible solutions to resolve the issues raised in the petition.

1.5 This report provides detail of the consultation undertaken with the Dogwood Way residents and residents of Julia Wallace Retirement Centre on both issues and possible solutions as well as an officer assessment of the merits of the solutions and the recommended course of action.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Vehicle parking on both sides of the road, reducing the trafficable area to one lane, is a common feature of low volume and low speed roads around the city. On such roads, where parking occurs on both sides, drivers are more aware of their surroundings and typically reduce speed due to the environment and perceived road safety risk. In general, drivers typically exercise care and demonstrate courtesy to enable opposing vehicles to pass.

2.2 Residents and road users across the city frequently approach Council Officers seeking investment in active parking management to provide for passing bays or to restrict parking along some sections of the road to increase the active traffic lane width. Officers are reluctant to intervene unless there is a clear safety risk, and then do so only by implementing parking restrictions in the form of no-parking lines. Council’s Parking Management Plan makes clear the desire that provision of time limited parking is utilised only in the CD or high parking demand areas around major facilities.

2.3 A traffic survey undertaken in Dogwood Way between 3 August and 11 August 2019 recorded a weekday traffic volume of 936 vehicles per day. The highest peak hour during the survey period recorded 104 vehicles, which equates to less than 2 vehicles per minute on average. The volume of traffic recorded on this road is well within acceptable levels for a local residential street. In addition, the NZTA Crash Analysis System has no record any crashes on Dogwood Way.

2.4 The traffic survey recorded an operating (85th percentile speed) of 43km/h. This is below the posted speed limit of 50km/h and therefore does not meet the priority threshold for implementation of traffic calming treatments.

2.5 Parking use in Dogwood Way, comprises a mix of use by residents of the street, staff from Julia Wallace, visitors to Julia Wallace and contractors involved in constructing new properties along Dogwood Way. The level of parking demand results in parking on both sides of the road for approximately 150m west of the Julia Wallace facility
entranceway, during the day time hours of 9 am to 3 pm. Outside of these core work hours parking levels reduce significantly and the issues raised are not of concern.

2.6 Approximately two years ago, to provide more convenient parking for visitors within the facility, Julia Wallace Retirement Centre management requested that staff, other than senior managers and maintenance staff, no-longer utilise parking within the facility. This is estimated to have resulted in approximately 20 staff having to parking outside the facility and it appears many of these staff have elected to park on Dogwood Way. The management restriction applies until 3pm after which time evening and night staff can park within the complex. It is therefore likely that excluding the contractor’s vehicles, that most of the all-day parking is by Julia Wallace staff.

2.7 There are some unique features of the Dogwood Way situation not present in other established residential areas. Firstly, the scale of the Julia Wallace Retirement Centre, results in a significant number of commercial vehicle movements involved in delivery of goods or undertaking maintenance work. These vehicles are of such a size that they preclude overtaking in the traffic lane when there is parking on both sides of the road. Secondly in common with other active sub-division areas in the city, there are a significant number of vehicle movements associated with the development of the area and construction of new dwellings. This is unavoidable and while unfortunate will be a temporary matter which will be resolved once the development is completed.

2.8 Council Officers have received requests to address the issues in recent years and have implemented some minor changes to parking in the road. In March 2019, Officers extended the non-parking area (yellow lines) at the bend of Dogwood Way near Julia Wallace, to improve driver visibility of oncoming vehicles and assist drivers to give way to oncoming traffic.

2.9 The concerns raised by residents of Julia Wallace and Dogwood Way relate to two separate but interrelated matters namely:

- the safety concerns associated with negotiating Dogwood Way with parking on both sides of the road, limited visibility around the bend and the presence of large commercial vehicles
- the availability of on-street parking for visitors and residents between the hours of 9am and 3pm on weekdays
3. CONSULTATION

3.1 To better understand the concerns of the residents and help inform Officer feedback to Council on the potential solutions, Officers undertook the following consultation:

- Meeting held with approximately 12 Julia Wallace Residents on 25 July 2019 with two centre staff present
- Letter drop to all 20 households on Dogwood Way on 29 July 2019 which sought feedback from residents on the options of installing localised passing bays and or implementing time restricted parking on one side of Dogwood Way.

3.2 Key matters raised and discussed with the Julia Wallace residents included:

3.2.1 Residents highlighted that their primary concern was the safety issues associated with driving along Dogwood Way. The issues of parking provision and availability was a secondary concern.

3.2.2 Officers clarified that while facilities such as Julia Wallace were required to provide minimum levels of parking for staff and visitors as part of their development they were not obliged to satisfy all foreseeable parking requirements. On-street parking was available for all users including residents, staff and visitors.

3.2.3 Parking availability was becoming an issue in many parts of Palmerston North and would continue to be challenging with greater intensification of the city and medium density development. Officers explained that Council was taking a lead from other major urban centres in positively discriminating in favour of active transport modes to encourage people to rely less on cars for short distance commuting.

3.2.4 Officers explained that the solution most likely to be supported by staff and Council would be one that tackled the safety issues and reduced the conflict for traffic. The preference would either be for passing bays or installation of time limited parking on one side of the road.

3.3 Results from the letter survey to the 20 residential properties on Dogwood Way are summarised as follows:

- 17 of the 20 households provided a response – 85%
- No-parking passing bays – 5 in support (30%), 12 did not support (70%)
- Time limited parking on one side – 5 in support (30%), 10 did not support (58%), 2 – no opinion (12%)
Table 1 – Dogwood Way Resident Feedback on Options 1 and 2

Dogwood Way Residents Survey of Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Not Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passing Bays</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P120 Parking Restrictions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 General feedback included:

- Proposed changes will have no effect on the parking issue
- Proposed changes will impact negatively on resident ability to park on-street
- 14 respondents (82%) believe the on-street parking and safety issues are caused by Julia Wallace
- 8 respondents (47%) believe Julia Wallace should resolve the issues with parking on-street by either reallocating parking on-site to staff, or by purchasing adjacent land and building a carpark.
- 8 respondents (47%) indicated they wanted improvements to access/exit their own properties due to vehicles parking too close to driveways and restricting access.
3.5 Although the option to widen the road or construct indented parking was not included in the options consulted on with residents, 1 respondent proposed this solution while 4 respondents indicated they were not in support of this solution.

Table 2. : Summary of Residents Feedback/Comments

4. MITIGATION OPTIONS

4.1 In considering the possible solutions, Officers considered 3 potential options which are set out below. In consultation with residents, Officers consulted only on the two options which they considered to be merited by the problem and feasible for implementation. The option of providing indented parking is included as this was previously raised by Julia Wallace residents in their petition to Council.

4.2 Option 1: Install Passing Bays

Option 1 comprises the creation of two passing locations in the road by restricting parking in those locations and so providing locations for oncoming traffic to pass safely. The passing bays would need to be of sufficient width to allow for commercial vehicles servicing Julia Wallace and the residential development.

4.3 Benefits: The passing bays will improve visibility of oncoming traffic and reduce the likelihood of vehicles having to backup. This option retains much of the parking on-street, while still enabling all day parking to occur. The treatment is low cost and relatively simple and quick to implement.
4.4 **Impact/Issues:** Some localised loss of parking will occur on-street, reducing the quantity of parking available to staff, residents and their visitors close to their property or the retirement centre. The local loss of parking will result in a spread of parking further down the street. Currently there is no parking capacity issue, although if monitoring indicates an issue, further passing bays may need to be added in the future. The loss of parking would be permanent rather limited to the period of 9am to 3pm when the greatest conflicts occur.

![Figure 1. Option 1: Install Passing Bays](image)

4.5 **Option 2: Time Limited Parking**

Option 2 comprises the implementation of timed parking restrictions such as P120 on one side of the road, during fixed daytime hours. Time restricted parking will force all day parking users to move further down the street.

4.6 **Benefits:** Experience with time limited parking elsewhere in the city is that it will result in fewer parking cars, providing more opportunities for passing of vehicles and improved visibility of oncoming traffic. It will also improve the availability of on-street parking for visitors to the area including Julia Wallace.

4.7 **Impact/Issues:** Time limited parking restrictions will reduce the number of all-day parking spaces available on street and is likely to result in the demand for parking spreading further down Dogwood Way toward Clearview Drive. It is possible that
other nearby roads may experience an increase in parking. To ensure compliance with the time restrictions, active monitoring by Council’s Parking Officers will be required. This will be an additional cost to Council and given it is on-going cost, will require additional operating budget to be effective.

Figure 2 - Option 2: Time Limited Parking

4.8 **Option 3: Indented Parking**

Option 3 would give effect to the request made by Julia Wallace residents in their petition that the traffic lane be widened, by providing for parking on one of street by way of indented parking. In effect parking would only be permitted on one side of the street in indented parking areas rather than on the carriageway. This would require replacing the berm in part or in full with hardstand areas for parking vehicles.

4.9 **Benefits:** This option will enable two movement lanes of traffic to occur safely and improve the visibility of oncoming traffic making it more comfortable for traffic to traverse the road. This option also preserves most of the existing parking capacity within the road.

4.10 **Impact/Issues:** While this option will enable much of the parking capacity to be retained, there will be a net loss, as parking bays will require entry and exit splay. Construction of indented parking bays is costly with an individual parking space
estimated to cost roughly $15-20k per parking space installed. It is estimated that parking for approximately 10 cars could be constructed in the section of Dogwood Way from the first house in the street to the Julia Wallace entrance on one side of the road. One of the consequences of improving the trafficable width is that traffic speeds are likely to increase, with the potential consequence that the likelihood and severity of any crashes occurring within the street may increase.

Figure 3 - Option 3: Indented Parking Bays

5. **ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**

5.1 As highlighted earlier in the report, Officers have identified that there are two separate but related matters involved, namely the safety concerns of residents of Julia Wallace when driving in Dogwood Way and the availability of parking close to Julia Wallace and/or outside existing residential properties.

5.2 In respect of safety, the assessment of on-site visibility, crash history, traffic speeds and traffic volumes in Dogwood Way, provide no evidence to justify significant investment in mitigation to address resident concerns. There are many other local roads within Palmerston North with much greater traffic conflicts and more significant traffic safety issues deserving of Council investment.
5.3 Officers acknowledge that the safety concerns of residents of Julia Wallace are an issue and deserving of some mitigation. However, given that the safety issues are not reflected in any crash data, or excessive speeds, it is Officers advice that only simple low cost interventions can be justified.

5.4 Although the implementation of passing locations by way of no parking areas, had limited support from Dogwood Way residents, it is the most cost-effective solution, both because of its low implementation cost and the ease of enforcement. It is also the option with the least impact on parking availability in the street.

5.5 The second option consulted on with residents which involves the implementation of timed parking restrictions on one side of the street, would be more costly to enforce given the requirement for Parking Officers to visit multiples times during the day to ensure compliance.

5.6 In respect of parking availability, Council Officers have visited Dogwood Way on several occasions at different times of the day and have identified that while parking is well utilised close to Julia Wallace, beyond the extent of the existing residential development, there is significant unused parking capacity. There appears to be an expectation among both Dogwood Way and Julia Wallace residents that convenient and readily available parking outside their residence at most times is a level of service Council are obligated to provide.

5.7 While the availability of parking has been raised as an issue for both on-street residents and the residents of Julia Wallace, inspections confirm that there is ample parking available within 100m of the Julia Wallace entrance. Consultation with residents of Dogwood Way indicates only low levels of support for changes to parking to address the perceived safety issues. However, residents did raise concerns around parking close to accessways.

5.8 Option 3 is not supported by Council Officers and was not consulted on. Regardless of the level of priority in this case, the key risk and consequence of Council investing in indented parking in a residential street, is the precedent that will be set. There are innumerable requests sitting with Officers to address perceived parking constraints in other parts of the city.

5.9 Council Officers receive many requests for minor changes and investment in new parking infrastructure such as line marking and signs to resolve issues associated with the city’s growth. Currently there is no approved capital new programme budget to invest in new parking assets and infrastructure. Up until now, minor
parking infrastructure investments have been funded through other capital new budgets, which has impacted on the delivery of these programmes and projects.

5.10 Officers have separately reported to Council on the need for a separate capital new programme budget for minor parking infrastructure. Any budget will be 100% Council funded as any investment in parking will not be eligible for NZTA subsidy.

6. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

6.1 While the crash data, vehicle speeds and vehicle volumes on Dogwood Way do not justify significant investment in infrastructure to mitigate safety, the concerns of the residents of Julia Wallace around the visibility of oncoming traffic and the restricted ability for on-coming vehicles to pass are valid.

6.2 In the absence of any serious safety issues, Officers recommend that the option of providing for passing lanes by implemented no parking areas along the road be adopted – Option 1. The passing areas will improve safety and have only a limited impact on the availability of parking in the street.

6.3 While parking is constrained close to the Julia Wallace entranceway and outside existing properties, there is parking available further down Dogwood Way. There is no evidence of a need to manage the availability of parking in the area.

7. NEXT STEPS

7.1 Following Council confirmation of the mitigation option to be implemented, Officers will advise the residents of Dogwood Way and the Julia Wallace retirement facility of the decision taken.

7.2 If the option to be implemented is low cost, then Officers will look to programme the works to be implemented as soon as practicable.

7.3 If option 3 for indented parking is to be implemented, Officers will need to get Council approval for funding before proceeding to detailed design. Implementation timing will be dependent on funding, design services and contractor availability.

8. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

| Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide? | Yes |
| Are the decisions significant? | No |
#### ITEM 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council’s policies or plans?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommendations contribute to Goal 1: An Innovative and Growing City

The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the City Development Strategy

The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in the Strategic Transport Plan

The actions include:
- Provide transport infrastructure for growth
- Implement the proposed parking management plan
- Enforce parking rules and time limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution to strategic direction</th>
<th>The recommendations support consistent implementation of Council’s strategies which promote efficient provision of transport services to meet the needs of business, residential and wider economic growth as well encouraging a strong culture of walking, cycling and public transport use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning and Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 2 September 2019

TITLE: Pedestrian Safety Issues Quarterly Report

PRESENTED BY: Robert van Bentum, Manager - Transport and Infrastructure

APPROVED BY: Tom Williams, Chief Infrastructure Officer

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO PLANNING AND STRATEGY COMMITTEE


2. That Council approve a change to the timing of the quarterly report to October, January, April and July of each year to allow time for NZTA to update crash data.

1. ISSUE

1.1 Council has a long-standing commitment to improving safety for pedestrians in the roading network, with a focus on reducing deaths and serious injury crashes. Council has signalled its desire to create a strong culture of walking and cycling in the city under the “Creative and Liveable City Strategy.” Under this strategy the “Active and Public Transport Plan” states that Council’s goal is to see more people walking, cycling and using public transport around Palmerston North. The “Plan” also acknowledges that for this to happen Council will need to ensure road design, way-finding and planning is undertaken in a way which considers the space and safety needs of cyclists and pedestrians.

1.2 Council received a report from Officers at the June 2019 meeting of this committee, entitled Prioritising Pedestrian Safety in the Network.” The report provided a summary of a needs assessment undertaken by external consultants and recommendations for further investigation and action.

1.3 Officers proposed an action plan with a range of tasks to be undertaken to support safety improvements across the network. At the June meeting the Committee requested regular quarterly updates continue to update Council on progress with addressing pedestrian safety. This report is the first of the quarterly updates. The report considers both the 2018-19 year as a whole and quarter 4 being the period April to June 2019.
2. SCOPE OF QUARTERLY REPORT

2.1 The scope of the quarterly report has been developed to provide a brief overview and update for pedestrian safety in the following three areas:

- update crash and serious injury data
- summary of identified pedestrian safety projects
- progress with the Action Plan

3. CRASH AND SERIOUS INJURY DATA

3.1 Pedestrian crashes data extracted from the NZTA Crash Analysis System (CAS) for the 10 years from 2009 to 2018 are summarised in Table 1 below. The data is recorded by calendar year.

Table 1: Crash Data Over the Period 2009 to 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2018 (Last 10 Year)</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2018 (Last 5 Year Period)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Pedestrian crash data extracted from the NZTA crash database (CASS) for the last 4 quarters are summarised in Table 2 below. It is intended that data will be provided on a rolling 4 quarters (12 months) to provide an understanding of any trends.

Table 2: Crashes Over Last 4 Quarters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter (Apr 19 – Jun 19)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter (Jan 19 – Mar 19)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter (Oct 18 – Dec 18)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter (Jul 18 – Sep 18)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last 12 Months Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 For the last 4 quarters (2018-19 financial year) there was a single fatality and two serious pedestrian injury crashes. All three events were out of Council’s control. The fatality which occurred in the 1st quarter of the year was caused by a vehicle reversing out of a driveway and hitting a pedestrian on the footpath. Of the two serious pedestrian injury related crashes, one was located on state highway 3 (NZTA responsibility), while the second involved a car reversing from a property and hitting a child playing in the street.

3.4 Crashes involving pedestrians within the city over the last 10 years are widely distributed with few locations experiencing multiple pedestrian crashes. Figures 1 and 2 provide an indication of the location of pedestrian injury crashes within the city.

Figure 1: Heatmap of Crashes in Palmerston North City 2009-2018
Figure 2: Indicative location and severity of crashes 2009-2018

Note: Clusters of crashes shown in figure 2 have been grouped by NZTA’s Crash Analysis System (CAS) and do not necessarily mean that all of the crashes in a cluster occurred at the same location.
4. **IDENTIFIED PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

4.1 There are range of projects currently in design and development by Council officers, which include improvements to pedestrian safety. The projects which are either in design or planned for construction in 19/20 are summarised in Table 3.

**Table 3: Current Council Projects with Pedestrian Safety Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme / Project No:</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Planned Construction</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>244 / 1549</td>
<td>Square East - CBD Streetscape works</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 / 1373</td>
<td>Benmore Avenue – Pedestrian Crossing Point</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 / 871</td>
<td>Ruapehu Street, Outside Peren Park - Pedestrian Crossing Point</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578 / 2106</td>
<td>Monrad / Pencarrow /Ronberg Street - New Roundabout</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 / 1256</td>
<td>Walding Street / Taonui Street – Intersection Modifications</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 / 1218</td>
<td>Pioneer / Lyndhurst / West – Intersection Modifications</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 / 870</td>
<td>Wood Street – Midblock Pedestrian Central Point</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 / TBC</td>
<td>James Line - Central median islands between Railway Line and Brooklyn Heights Drive</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636 / 1737</td>
<td>Aokautere Drive – Footpath from Petersens Road to Polson Hill Drive</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358 / 1939</td>
<td>Aokautere Drive - Shared path on south side between Pacific Drive and Johnston Drive</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1440 / 1583</td>
<td>Cuba Street Urban Streetscape Improvement - Upgrade between Rangitikei to George Street</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 / 692</td>
<td>Te Awe Awe /Albert Street - Roundabout Renewal</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324 / TBC</td>
<td>Park Road / Cook Street - Intersection Upgrade</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361 / 2117</td>
<td>Turitea Road - Pedestrian Steps near Valley Views</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910 / TBC</td>
<td>Ferguson -Linton Street to Pitt Street) - Road Widening and Traffic Signals</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 In addition, there additional projects which have been identified by Council Officers as priority projects for inclusion in the next Long Term Plan. These include:

- Long Melford Road near Mudgway Place – Pedestrian Crossing Point
- Broadway Avenue - Pedestrians between Princess Street and Albert Street
• Albert Street / Broadway Avenue – Roundabout Renewal

• Square / Church Street / Fitzherbert Avenue – Pedestrian signals reprioritisation

4.3 The projects identified do not directly correspond to locations where pedestrian crashes have occurred, as pedestrian injury crashes are often random and unrelated to local roading issues. Instead locations for upgrades have been identified by considering areas with significant pedestrian volumes and potential for conflicts and locations where there are significant deficiencies of gaps in infrastructure such as for example desired crossing locations on roads with high traffic volumes and well utilised pedestrian routes with long crossing distances.

4.4 These projects are only indicative and are not accounted for in the budget at this time. Further planning is required prior to the projects being included in the programme of work.

5. ACTION PLAN PROGRESS

5.1 The action plan included in the June 2019 report to this committee is reproduced below in Table 4 with an indication of the status of each action. At this stage 3 of the 10 actions are complete, with the remaining 7 still on schedule to be completed in the nominated time frame.

Table 4  Pedestrian Safety Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Area</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Progress / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Solutions</td>
<td>Inspections and audits of existing facilities – annually – March each year.</td>
<td>Annually – March each year.</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic signal timings and protection for pedestrians</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review priorities for pedestrian safety interventions annually using latest crash data and service requests.</td>
<td>Annually – February each year.</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review current provision of pedestrian crossing facilities on Ruahine, Rangitikei Street, Featherston Street and the “Ring Road”.</td>
<td>September 2019 (report back to Council).</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review driveway and off-street parking standards and requirements to better</td>
<td>October 2019.</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITEM 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prioritise pedestrian safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review pedestrian safety at roundabouts</td>
<td>February 2020.</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support design for liveability which promotes pedestrian safety, access and convenience.</td>
<td>On-going.</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure pedestrian connectivity and key links in high pedestrian use areas are identified and included in planning and engineering solutions e.g. CBD / Neighbourhoods / Hospital / Massey Food HQ</td>
<td>Include specific case studies within the “Roads and Streets Framework” programme which address key pedestrian rich places – August 2019.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider pedestrian and active transport needs as part of the “Speed Limits Bylaw Review” currently underway – June 2020</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education / Travel behaviour change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to support school and work place travel plans</td>
<td>Consider school communities / hubs in the specific case studies within the “Roads and Streets Framework” to provide infrastructure to achieve step change – August 2019.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage with school bus travel providers to consider how to expand use and uptake as well as safety outcomes – on-going.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **NEXT STEPS**

6.1 Officers will continue to monitor and report on a quarterly basis on pedestrian safety across the network and continue to implement the action plan as adopted by Council.
7. **COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the decisions significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council’s policies or plans?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommendations contribute to Goal 2: A Creative and Exciting City

The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the Creative and Liveable Strategy

The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in the Active and Public Transport Plan

The actions include:

- Undertaking remedial work in areas with high crash or safety concerns, taking into consideration context-sensitive design (based on road function, adjacent land use and user routes).
- Identifying and implementing pedestrian and cycle focussed improvements to intersection and road crossings.
- Upgrading on a prioritised basis, pedestrian routes, connections and road crossings.

| Contribution to strategic direction | The quarterly update provides Council with confidence that the package of projects and actions will deliver enduring and sustainable improvements in pedestrian safety across the network. |

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil
COMMITTEE WORK SCHEDULE

TO: Planning and Strategy Committee
MEETING DATE: 2 September 2019
TITLE: Committee Work Schedule

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO PLANNING AND STRATEGY COMMITTEE

1. That the Planning and Strategy Committee receive its Work Schedule dated September 2019.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Work Schedule 🔗
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Estimated Report Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Officer Responsible</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Date of Instruction/Point of Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>TBA March-April 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May-June 2019</td>
<td>Pedestrian Safety Action Plan</td>
<td>Chief Infrastructure Officer</td>
<td>Clarification of consultant recommendations being undertaken</td>
<td>21 November 2016 clause 76.2 3 September 2018 clause 56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>May-June 2019</td>
<td>Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2019 – deliberation on submissions</td>
<td>Chief Infrastructure Officer</td>
<td>Moved to June due to amount of submissions received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td>Priority intersections and safety treatments across City</td>
<td>Chief Infrastructure Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 March 2019 clause 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Report Date/Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>TBA 2020</td>
<td>Effectiveness of Council's Youth Engagement</td>
<td>General Manager Strategy and Planning</td>
<td>Council 25 March 2019 Clause 22.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td>Report on proposal to create a Science and Sustainability Champion in the organisation</td>
<td>General Manager, Strategy and Planning Chief Infrastructure Officer</td>
<td>Committee of Council 20 May 2019 clause 8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>Pedestrian Safety Issues quarterly report</td>
<td>Chief Infrastructure Officer</td>
<td>5 June 2019 Clause 40.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Palmerston North Civic and Cultural Precinct Masterplan – timeline and costings including library options</td>
<td>General Manager, Strategy and Planning Library options to be developed</td>
<td>1 April 2019 clause 16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>TBA September 2019</td>
<td>Solutions on the issues identified in the Dogwood Way petition</td>
<td>Chief Infrastructure Officer</td>
<td>6 May 2019 clause 24.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>TBA February/March 2020</td>
<td>District Plan and school travel</td>
<td>General Manager, Strategy and Planning</td>
<td>6 May 2019 clause 32.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>Concept plan regarding the play activity in The Square</td>
<td>General Manager, Strategy and Planning Links to Masterplan Needs to follow play policy</td>
<td>Committee of Council 28 May 2018 clause 3.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>