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Overall, do you support the proposal for a two-way bike path on the seaward side, separated from traffic and the footpath, and the associated changes?

73% of respondents support the proposal or support the proposal with changes.
Overall support by relationship to street

I live in Wellington
- Yes: 18 (78%)
- No: 4 (18%)
- Other: 1 (6%)

I live on this street
- Yes: 6 (29%)
- No: 6 (28%)
- Other: 6 (33%)

I live near this street
- Yes: 9 (69%)
- No: 2 (16%)
- Other: 2 (15%)

My work/business is on this street
- Yes: 2 (67%)
- No: 1 (33%)
- Other: 2 (50%)

I regularly travel along this street
- Yes: 18 (43%)
- No: 40 (32%)
- Other: 69 (54%)

Other
- Yes: 2 (50%)
- No: 2 (50%)

The highest number of responses came from people who regularly travel along this street. 54% of those support the proposal and 32% do not.
19% of those who support the proposal commented that separation was important. The next two most common comments involved how the design would encourage uptake and how cyclists would still ride on the road.

24% of those who don’t support the proposal perceived the changes as dangerous.
Those who support the proposal with changes made a range of suggestions with the most common asking for greater separation between all modes.
Do you support the proposed bike path at footpath level or about 50mm below footpath level?

52% of respondents supported the proposed bike path below footpath level.
The number one reason given for supporting the bike path below the footpath level was separation from pedestrians.

Those who supported the path at footpath level commented about the potential slip/trip hazard of a bike path below footpath level.
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Do you support the proposed improvements to Evans Bay for people walking?

73% of respondents supported the improvements for people walking around Evans Bay.
Walking improvements comments by support.

For those who support the proposal, the top two comments involved separation and reducing conflict between people walking and people on bikes.

People who support the proposal with changes commented on the footpath width.

Those who do not support the proposal do not see a need for the changes.
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Do you support the proposed changes to bus stops?

- Yes: 26 (14%)
- Yes, but with changes: 13 (7%)
- No: 142 (79%)

79% of respondents support the proposed changes to bus stops.
Bus stop comments by support.

Yes comments:
- other: 1 (8%)
- safety for pedestrians: 1 (8%)
- buffer space: 1 (8%)
- traffic flow: 2 (12%)
- more info: 2 (15%)
- weather: 1 (8%)
- continuity: 3 (12%)

Yes, but with changes comments:
- other: 1 (8%)
- weather: 1 (8%)
- parking: 2 (15%)
- visibility: 2 (15%)
- traffic flow: 4 (31%)
- traffic calming: 4 (34%)
- safety for pedestrians: 1 (8%)

No comments:
- other: 1 (8%)
- low issues: 2 (17%)
- parking: 3 (25%)
- traffic flow: 4 (34%)
- traffic calming: 4 (34%)
- safety for pedestrians: 1 (8%)

Low issues:
- other: 1 (8%)
- weather: 2 (17%)
- parking: 4 (34%)
- visibility: 2 (17%)
- traffic flow: 4 (34%)
- traffic calming: 4 (34%)
- safety for pedestrians: 1 (8%)

Other:
- other: 11 (44%)
- 4 (34%)
- 3 (12%)
- 2 (8%)
- 1 (8%)

More info:
- other: 1 (8%)
- low issues: 2 (17%)
- parking: 3 (25%)
- traffic flow: 4 (34%)
- traffic calming: 4 (34%)
- safety for pedestrians: 1 (8%)
How important is it to connect this proposed bike path with the safer city-wide cycling network?

The perceived importance of the route shows no change from the September engagement, with 67% of respondents rating the bike path as Very important and important.
Importance comments by high and low importance
(High = ‘very important’ and ‘important’, Low = ‘low importance’ and ‘not important’)

41% of respondents who rated the changes as high importance commented about either safety, connection to the network and the importance of the link between the eastern suburbs and the CBD.

33% of respondents who rated the changes as low importance commented that there were very few issues with the current layout and believed effort should be out into other areas.
'Any other' comments by support

Yes comments
- parking (28%)
- scenic route (17%)
- bus stop (17%)
- path narrow (16%)
- continuity (10%)
- signage/communication (10%)
- landscape/environment (10%)
- visibility (10%)
- other (4%)

No comments
- parking (15%)
- retain layout (11%)
- other (11%)
- other issues (11%)
- cost vs benefit (11%)
- minority cyclists (11%)
- other (11%)

Yes, but with changes comments
- traffic calming (20%)
- other (14%)
- continuity (10%)
- bus stop (10%)
- communications with residents (10%)
- parking (7%)
- truck route (7%)
- signage/communication (7%)
- landscape/environment (7%)
- cyclists on road (7%)
- visibility (7%)
- surfacing (7%)

Not answered comments
- parking (50%)
- truck route (17%)
- visibility (16%)
What is your primary relationship to this street?

- **I live in Wellington**: 23 (12%)
- **I live near this street**: 14 (7%)
- **I live on this street**: 21 (11%)
- **I regularly travel along this street**: 128 (66%)
- **Other**: 4 (2%)
- **My work/business is on this street**: 3 (2%)

66% of respondents regularly travel along the street, which is similar to the September engagement.
40% of respondents came from Hataitai, Miramar, Roseneath and Newtown.
Demographics of respondents

Age of respondents

- 19-29: 2 (1%)
- 30-39: 116 (62%)
- 40-49: 68 (37%)
- 50-59: 2 (1%)
- 60-69: 9 (5%)
- 70-79: 108 (56%)
- 80+: 85 (44%)

52% of respondents are aged between 30-49

Gender of respondents

- Female: 116 (62%)
- Male: 68 (37%)
- Other: 2 (1%)

Individual vs organisational respondents

- As an individual: 188 (95%)
- On behalf of an organisation: 9 (5%)

Would you like to be informed if there is an opportunity to talk to Councillors about these changes?

- Yes: 108 (56%)
- No: 85 (44%)
Appendix:
Theme Descriptions
Overall, do you support the proposal for a two-way bike path on the seaward side, separated from traffic and the footpath, and the associated changes?

- Lack of trust – A lack of trust in the process has an impact on support for these changes
- Current layout inadequate – The current layout of this area is not adequate for use
- Safety improvement needed – It is important to make safety improvements to this street
- All ages – Changes to this area will make it better for all ages
- Scenic route – This route has scenic views
- Crossing points – Safe crossing points need to be considered in this area
- Continuity – It is important to consider how changes to this area will continue to other streets
- Alternative – There is an alternative solution for this area.
- Separation – Separation of transport modes should be considered when making changes
- Road width – These changes will have an impact on the width of the carriage way
- Cyclist speed – The different speeds of cyclists are an important consideration in this area
- Landscaping – The landscaping and environment in this area is important

- Buses – Buses are an important road user to consider in this area
- Cyclists on road – Cyclists will still want to ride on the road alongside these changes
- Traffic flow – These changes will impact the flow of traffic on this road
- More info – More information is required on the changes to this area
- Encourage uptake – These changes will encourage the uptake of people on bikes
- Truck route – This area is important as a route for trucks
- Changes dangerous – The proposed changes will be dangerous and reduce safety in the area
- Popular route – This is a popular route for people on bikes
- Low use – There are few users of this street to warrant changes
- Noise – These changes will have an impact on noise levels for residents
- Layout adequate – The current layout of this area is adequate for use
- Loss of parks – The reduction of parking in this area is not acceptable
Do you support the proposed improvements to Evans Bay for people walking?

- **Separation** - Separation of transport modes should be considered when making changes
- **Reduce conflict** – Changes to this area should reduce conflict between pedestrians and people on bikes
- **Scenic route** – These changes will make the most of scenic views in the area
- **Continuity** – It is important to consider how changes to this area will continue to other streets
- **Alternative** – There is an alternative solution for this area.
- **Crossings** – Safe crossing points need to be considered on this street
- **Bus stops** – The space given to bus stops and their interaction with the cycle lane should be considered when making changes.
- **Cantilever** – This path should be cantilevered
- **Footpath width** – Consideration should be given to width of the footpath in this area
- **Low issues** - There are few issues in this area to warrant changes
- **Traffic calming** – Traffic calming measures are required in this area
Do you support the proposed bike path at footpath level or about 50mm below footpath level?

- Low issues - There are few issues in this area to warrant changes
- Angled/bevelled - Any difference in path level should be angled
- Slip/trip hazard - Path levels could present a trip or fall hazard to pedestrians and people on bikes
- Separation - Separation of transport modes should be considered when making changes
- Avoid hazards - The level of the cycle path needs to allow space for people on bikes to swerve in order to avoid hazards
- Passing - The level of the cycle path needs to allow space for people on bikes to pass each other
- Best practice - Best practice should determine the level of path used
- Surface - Consideration should be given to the surfacing of the path
- Drainage - Consideration should be given to drainage needs along the path
- Alternative - There is an alternative solution for this area.
- Reduce conflict - Changes to the level of path should reduce conflict between pedestrians and people on bikes
- Level with road - The path should be level with the road instead
Do you support the proposed changes to bus stops?

• Low issues - There are few issues in this area to warrant changes
• Weather – The weather in the area should be considered when changing bus stops
• Continuity – It is important to consider how changes to this area will continue to other streets
• Buffer space – It is important to have a buffer space around bus stops
• Parking – Changes to bus stops will have an impact on parking
• Traffic flow – Changes to bus stops will have an impact on the flow of traffic
• Visibility – Visibility needs to be considered when making changes to bus stops
• Traffic calming – Traffic calming measures are required in this area
• More info – More info is required on the changes to bus stops
• Safety for pedestrians – The safety of pedestrians should be considered when making changes to bus stops
How important is it to connect this proposed bike path with the safer city-wide cycling network?

- Leisure/recreation – This is a great route for leisure/recreational cycling
- Cost vs benefit – The cost of these changes should be considered against their benefit
- Great harbor way – These changes are important as part of the Great Harbor Way
- Cyclist speed – The different speeds of cyclists are an important consideration in this area
- Continuity – It is important to consider how changes to this street will continue to other streets
- Communication with residents – Any changes to this area need to be communicated to residents
- Other issues – There are other issues in this area that have not been considered or are more important
- Whole network – These changes need to be considered within the whole network
- Truck route – This area is important as a route for trucks
- Eastern suburbs – This area is important to access the Eastern Suburbs
- Low issues - There are few issues in this area to warrant changes
- Weather – This area experiences extreme weather that has an impact on its use
- Public transport – Public transport has an impact on the importance of these changes
- Safety – Safety is important to consider when making changes to this area
- Pro-cycling - Facilitating cycling is important, therefore making these improvements is important.
- Cars priority – Cars should be the priority users in this area
- Cyclists on footpath – Cyclists on the footpath is an important issue in this area
- All transport modes – The impact on all transport modes in this area should be considered
- Landscape/environment – The landscaping and environment of this area is important to consider
Other

- Scenic route – This route has important scenic views
- Other issues – There are other issues in this area that have not been considered or are more important
- Minority cyclists – Cyclists are a minority user in this area
- Bus stop – The bus stops in this area need to be considered
- Communication with residents – Any changes to this area need to be communicated to residents
- Parking – The availability of parking is important to consider
- Continuity – It is important to consider how changes to this street will continue to other streets
- Truck route – This area is important as a route for trucks
- Low issues - There are few issues in this area to warrant changes
- Signage/communication – Signage should be considered alongside these changes
- Cost vs benefit – The cost of these changes should be considered against their benefit
- Landscape/environment – The landscaping and environment of this area is important to consider
- Cyclists on road – Cyclists will still want to ride on the road alongside these changes
- Visibility – There are problems with visibility on this street
- Traffic flow – These changes will impact the flow of traffic on this road
- Surfacing – Consideration should be given to the surfacing of the path and road for these changes
- Traffic calming – Traffic calming measures are required in this area
- Retain layout – The current layout of this area should be retained
- Path narrow – The proposed path is narrow for its intended use
- Other bike facilities – Other bike facilities should be considered alongside the changes
- Maintenance – The future maintenance of the path needs to be considered