

Eastern Bays Shared Path - Summary of Submissions

| Submitter Number | Submitter Name | Support Oppose Neutral | Heard Yes/No | Grant Decline Conditional | Submission Summary | Theme | Notes |
|------------------|---|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|---|---|---------------------|
| 1 | Frank Vickers | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as it will protect against Climate Change effects including sea level rise, storm surges and higher intensity weather events. | Resilience Climate Change | |
| 2 | Fabian Beveridge | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as it will improve cycle safety. • Notes that trees should not be removed, or if they are that new trees are planted to mitigate the effects. • Notes that he would spend more time in the Eastern Bays and Remutakas if the cycleway goes ahead | Safety Amenity | |
| 3 | Fiona Hodge | Support | No | Grant | Supports the proposal as it will: • Improve transport options and safety; • Improve access to East Harbour amenities; • Reduce traffic congestion and emissions; • Improve resilience and better protect against storm surge and other impacts of climate change; • Encourage recreation, visitors and tourism in the area. | Safety Climate Change Resilience Amenity Tourism Economic benefit Alternative transport modes | |
| 4 | Matthew Harker | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as it will improve safety and community enjoyment. | Safety Amenity | |
| 5 | Peter Graham Harvey | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as it will improve cycling and walking facilities as well as pedestrian, cycling and road safety. Includes photographs showing the current narrow and unsuitable footpath in Lowry Bay. | Safety Alternative transport modes | |
| 6 | Steve Bielby | Support | Yes | Grant | • Supports the proposal as it will improve cycling safety in an area where traffic volumes have increased, driver behaviour is worsening and vehicles are causing noise and danger. • Support is conditional on a good design for climate change, fish passage, penguin and other wildlife, and community/pedestrian access. | Safety Penguins Fish passage Connectivity Infrastructure | Conditional support |
| 7 | Powerco Limited | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as it will protect infrastructure within the road corridor, including Powerco's natural gas infrastructure located within and adjacent to Marine Drive. Requests that prior to the commencement of works, the gas pipeline is demarcated with any works encroaching within 3m to be discussed with Powerco. | | |
| 8 | Bart Ludbrook | Support | No | Grant | Supports the proposal as it will: • Improve transport safety and congestion • Improve access to East Harbour amenities • Encourage recreation, visitors and tourism in the area. | Safety Climate Change Tourism Amenity Resilience Connectivity Economic benefit | |
| 9 | David Graham Carroll | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal due to environmental aspects (including penguin access) and improved safety. • Believes the most urgent section is at Windy Point (between Days Bay and Rona Bay) as the pathway vanishes and walkers/cyclists are vulnerable to road traffic, followed by Lowry Bay (especially around the bus stop area). Believes these two sections should be constructed first. • Additionally, wants signs implemented at both ends of Windy Point to highlight the hazardous sections. | Penguins Safety Signage | |
| 10 | George W. Gibbs | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal in the interests of safety for all road users. | Safety | |
| 11 | Peter Law | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as believes the current walking/cycling facilities are inadequate for mixed use, particularly with high visitor numbers to the area. | Safety | |
| 12 | Kathleen and Jeff Hobbs | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the application to improve transport options. • Would like the current steps located by the service station in Sunshine Bay to be retained rather than moved 40m north on a less visible and more dangerous corner. • Would like the seawall to continue along the front of Sunshine Bay service station towards the south of Sunshine Bay rather than the proposed rock revetment structure. • Where practical, they would like the demolition rubble deposited into the Bay decades ago removed as it is an eyesore and hazard to beach users. | Safety Beach access Seawall design | Conditional support |
| 13 | Norman Bruce Spedding | Support | No | Grant | Supports the proposal as it will: • Improve resilience to current and future emergencies, including in relation to sea level rise, which is critical as it is the only route in and out of the Bays • Encourage more people to walk and cycle the route, which includes health and safety benefits and reduces the pressure of more vehicles on a narrow link • Enable commercial benefits fitting in with the Great Harbour Way and the Remutaka Incline to create an internationally ranked tourism attraction which will bring appropriate and sustainable commercial benefits to the region • Preserve and enhance the unique recreational asset | Resilience Economic benefit Health and safety Tourism Amenity Alternative transport modes | |
| 14 | Eastbourne Community Board (Virginia Horrocks and Belinda Moss) | Support | Yes | Grant | • Supports the proposal and notes that local support for the project was shown in the community survey of 2014, where the Shared Path was ranked the most important issue for the Eastern Bays. • Safety concerns in the community have grown with more people cycling and walking. These modes of travel are becoming increasingly popular with people wanting to reduce their carbon footprint. All road users are at risk with the current facilities being extremely narrow in some parts. • Second in importance to the community is the need to plan for climate change and the inevitable sea-level rise. • With declarations of climate emergency by three Hutt City community boards as well as HCC, the Eastbourne Community Board intends to follow these declarations and encourage car sharing and active transport. An impediment to this is the lack of safe facilities for cyclists and pedestrians. • This project is an essential part of planning for climate change in the region • The proposal would be a vital element of connecting the Bays to one another as well as the wider region. • Would encourage greater levels of active transport and recreation which would have health benefits for the whole community. • The new Wainuiomata Shared Path would be a great link to a safe cycleway around the Bays. Would create new recreational opportunities for cyclists beyond the existing Pencarrow trail. Would provide an important link in the Remutaka Cycle Trail. • With the new electric ferry expected to be in service mid-2020 more tourists and commuters would be expected in the area, they would be more likely to walk or ride to the wharf if it were safe to do so. Would encourage more visitors and economic growth. | Safety Climate Change Resilience Amenity Health Tourism Connectivity Economic benefit Alternative transport modes | |
| 15 | Peter Broomfield Hodge | Support | No | Grant | No detail given on nature of, or reasons for their submission. | | |
| 16 | Alison Hodge | Support | No | Grant | No detail given on nature of, or reasons for their submission. | | |
| 17 | Dean Riley | Support | No | Grant | Supports the application as it will: • Improve safety • Help protect Marine Drive from storm events • Create thriving business areas • Reduce congestion and vehicle operating costs • Increase recreation and tourism opportunities | Safety Resilience Amenity Tourism Economic benefit | |
| 18 | Lorraine Girvan | Support | Yes | Grant | • Supports the proposal to improve cycle and pedestrian safety, particularly for young families and elderly residents and users. Speed limit to be appropriate for safety of residents accessing properties along Marine Drive. • Will discourage the use and reliance on cars. • Would like beach access in each bay to be retained • Would like allowances to be made where possible for greater space on the road at bus stops. • Would like the seawall to reduce wave impact and shingle flows in the bay and on the road. | Safety Amenity Beach access Seawall design Health Speed limit Bus shelter | |
| 19 | Briar Bloomfield | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as would like to walk safely around the bays and currently some parts are very narrow and dangerous | Safety | |
| 20 | Mike Henderson | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as it will improve the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, residents, and vehicles. • Supports the use of sea wall protection structures to protect the pathway and its users who naturally are more inclined to walk along the seaward side of the road. • Believes the benefits for the community and safety of the public outweigh the loss of parking. • Would like the speed limit lowered to 50km/h and consistent through the bays to improve safety in high foot traffic areas. | Safety Amenity Seawall design Resilience Parking Speed limit | |
| 21 | Tom Lynskey | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal, particularly for a path between Days Bay and Eastbourne where the beach is not highly used. • Does not want beach access to be compromised by the path. | Beach access | |
| 22 | Ingrid Horrocks | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as it will provide an excellent recreational facility for cyclists and walkers. • Will improve safety of cyclists as the current situation is very unsafe. • Believes the proposal will be a vital part of future-proofing the Eastern Bays against the impacts of climate change. Notes that the combined opportunity to improve the road, increase resilience, as well as add great benefit to the community is a win-win scenario. | Safety Amenity Climate Change Resilience | |
| 23 | Gene Clendon | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as will improve the safety of all users. • Believes it would provide a sorely missing non-motor vehicle based option and would increase numbers of active transport users which would have health benefits. • Increased active transport would result in reduced vehicle use and consequentially reduced emissions. • Would improve the transport network resilience and better protect against storms and other such events. • Would increase the accessibility of the Great Harbour Way and Remutaka cycleways | Safety Amenity Health Climate Change Resilience Alternative transport modes | |
| 24 | Kate Wright | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as it will improve the safety of users. Notes the current facilities are highly unsuitable for her family to safely cycle on. • Existing facilities do not encourage people to safely commute from the Eastern suburbs into Lower Hutt and Wellington. | Safety Connectivity Alternative transport modes | |
| 25 | Elizabeth Knight | Support | No | Grant | • Supports the proposal as it will improve the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Notes that the current facilities are inadequate and dangerous meaning her children cannot safely cycle to school. The Pathway would allow an opportunity to do so. • Would like to see parking issues at Days Bays and Eastbourne addressed, particularly over the summer months. Notes that people mainly visit the area via car due to restricted bus/ferry timetables on the weekends further compounding the issue. • Would improve resilience during weather events, particularly in light of climate change. | Safety Parking Climate Change Resilience Alternative transport modes | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---------------------|-----|---------------------|--|---|---------------------|
| 26 | Sarah Turk | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will connect the Bays, as well as providing a connection to Lower Hutt and Petone. It will allow for people to lessen pollution. Currently using the pathway for walking/cycling is not safe - has had 3 near misses. Notes that Lowry Bay is a particularly dangerous area for cycling/walking, with its extremely narrow paths bordered by high walls. The proposal will also facilitate a reduction in emissions, as well as being an essential first step in protecting the Eastern Bays Area and the homes therein from Sea Level Rise. The proposal will enable more visitors to use the beaches and recreational facilities, and to travel by bike - as the current lack of safe pathway means that everyone drives to the Bays, and there is insufficient parking The shared pathway would also contribute to the community growing healthy and fit children, as they will be able to actively commute to school. Notes that all areas need to be seamlessly connected in a way which will allow cyclists to travel safely and with ease. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Tourism Parking Climate Change Health Connectivity Economic benefit Alternative transport modes | |
| 27 | John Meo | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal stating that it is long overdue and remains urgent on the ground of safety of residents who have no choice in using the road and visitors who wish to use the road to access recreational facilities in the area. The current road is extremely dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. He has witnessed children forced to jump off the road onto rocks to avoid being struck by vehicles, and cyclists regularly leaving the road or dismounting their bikes due to the narrowness of the road. Councillors have a responsibility to protect citizens and the inadequate facilities are failing that obligation. It is only a matter of time before pedestrians or cyclists are killed, remedial action is urgent. Current facilities deter people from walking and cycling the route and encourage greater car use, this is counter-productive to efforts to reduce emissions and adopt healthier lifestyles. The Eastern Bays has wonderful natural, forest, coastal and recreational assets but people are discouraged from accessing these with the absence of a safe shared path. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Climate Change Health Connectivity Alternative transport modes | |
| 28 | Simon Hoyle | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> supports the proposal as it will encourage more families to walk and bike close to the sea, leave their cars and provide a healthier and safer environment. The shared path will also benefit locals and visitors. It will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians, especially between Windy Point and Days Bay (and around all the Bays to Seaview). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Tourism Health Alternative transport modes | |
| 29 | Helen Lukes and Paul Haines | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as existing route is very hazardous for pedestrians, cyclists, dog walkers, prams, wheelchairs, and runners. Large vehicles on the narrow road create dangerous situations, these include cars towing boats, buses, delivery trucks. Particularly busy during school exit times, with cruise ship visitors and over the weekends White and red reflective poles along stretches of the route cause additional danger narrowing the already inadequate width. The 70km/h speed limit is too high. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Speed limit | |
| 30 | Z Energy, BP Oil NZ Limited, Mobil Oil NZ Limited | Support | Yes | Grant (conditional) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports proposal in principle as it will provide better access, transport and recreation options for the general public. It will provide safer walking and cycling opportunities and a link to the existing shared path. The submitter would like appropriate signage and infrastructure on the pathway (such as a hump or barriers) to ensure cyclists give way to turning vehicles at this location. Map of area of concern included. The submitter requires access at all times to the oil wharf and associated pipelines for ongoing inspections associated with ship deliveries, pipe maintenance and upgrades, and emergency responses. There is a potential safety issue arising from conflict between vehicles turning into Point Howard and cyclists using the new pathway behind the headland due to visibility. The submitter would like confirmation that the location and design of the pathway in this location has been safety audited. Requests that a condition be imposed on the consent requiring appropriate signage and infrastructure is provided to warn road users and pedestrians/cyclists using the shared path. Suggested methods of achieving this include a different surface texture near the intersection, give way signs and humps/barriers. Consent has been granted in 2018 for an upgrade of the existing 350NB industry wharfline with works commencing June 2020. It was acknowledged that co-ordination between major construction projects at Point Howard is needed due to space restrictions for construction vehicles and temporary structures. Draft condition 63 (contained in consent application) is supported as it required that agreement with CentrePort is obtained prior to construction work within the road reserve or port owned land at Point Howard in order to ensure access arrangements are maintained in accordance with CentrePort's proposed upgrade works. A separate condition that requires consultation with NZSOL and Z Energy is also sought. It's unclear as to whether the proposed 1m elevation of the groyne area (north of Point Howard) to enhance bird breeding areas and penguin nesting sites form part of the application for resource consent. Noted that there is an assumption that these alterations can occur as a permitted activity though assessment against district and regional plan rules has not been provided. Believes these works are at least a restricted discretionary activity as requires earthworks in the Special Recreation Zone. It is sought that construction occurring on the groyne above pipelines takes into account the risk of damage which could result in loss of fuel to the environment and loss of regional fuel supply. Support was expressed for construction in this area provided there is a condition that requires access is obtained from the marine area rather than across the pipes (by bridging or cranes). Placement of penguin boxes on the groyne is supported by the oil companies however notes that there are planning mitigation works (undertaken by NZ Oil Services for a different project) on this groyne and elsewhere in the Eastern Bays as a form of mitigation and that there is a need to consider and co-ordinate mitigation from the two projects regarding the placement of penguin boxes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure Safety Penguins Coastal avifauna | Conditional support |
| 31 | Carole Hobbs | Support | No | Grant | <p>Expressed conditional support for the proposal. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests that the steps to the beach in Sunshine Bay remain in their existing state rather than being moved to an alternate location that the submitter believes is dangerous. Notes that the current steps to the beach at Sunshine Bay are used by many, including kayakers and fishermen. Believes that the current stairs at Sunshine Bay facilitate use of the beach because there is car parking nearby and that this is useful as an alternative when Days Bay is busy. Also believes that a seawall is needed and that it shouldn't be made of stones for fear of additional debris being washed onto the road/properties during extreme weather events. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connectivity Resilience Health Tourism Seawall design | Conditional support |
| 32 | Brett Holland | Support | No | Grant | <p>Supports the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety of cyclists, pedestrians and motorists in the Eastern Bays Environmental protection of the shoreline of the Eastern Bays Tourism and economic development of the Lower Hutt Region Promotion of the health and welfare of the citizens of the Lower Hutt Region (through exercise) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Tourism Health | |
| 33 | Don Long | Conditional Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal though would like it noted that the headland is named Russo Point rather than Windy Point. Does not want Bartolo Russo dishonoured with any signage using the incorrect name Windy Point as it is of great significance to the Italian community. Would like the Russo Point fishing fleet memorialised with appropriate naming and signage along the Path. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signage Heritage | |
| 34 | David Moginie | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it would significantly increase the safety of pedestrians from the existing high-risk situation. Would be enjoyed by a range of people in the community (elderly, young families). Would provide improved beach access and encourage locals to enjoy the natural beauty of the area. Current pathway in Lowry Bay is a major safety issue for pedestrians and needs to be prioritised over other sections in the Shared Path project. Current pathway varies between 750mm-900mm is significantly less than minimum requirements set out by NZTA. The road is a key access point for each of the Bays with no alternative access. Elderly people, children and dog walkers regularly use the path which is not fit for purpose, often leading to people needing to walk on the road, or across uneven surfaces due to tree roots etc. Following storm events the pathway and road are cluttered with debris which creates further obstacles for users. Currently people often park on the beach side of the road when street parking is unavailable forcing traffic to cross the centre-line further endangering pedestrians. Given the above factors the submitter considers remedial works at Lowry Bay to be particularly urgent. Included photographs of pedestrians using the current facilities included outlining hazardous nature of the current pathway. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Amenity Resilience Parking Beach Access Alternative transport modes | |
| 35 | Derek Hall | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal but would like the boatsheds on Lowry Bay waterfront to remain as they add to the history and character of the area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boatsheds | |
| 36 | Morgan Andrew | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as the seawall will assist in eliminating debris on the road. The current walkway is narrow and dangerous. Suggests the seawall should be extended further into the sea. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seawall design Safety Heritage | |
| 37 | John Horrocks | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal following an exhaustive and considerate consultation process. The application contributes to added resilience of the Eastern Bays providing for sea-level rise adaptation and other climate change impacts such as storm surges. Notes that this only adds resilience rather than being a complete long-term solution. Proposal is in line with community support for safe walking and cycling path. As a cyclist, he often hears of near-misses and other dangers to people using the road. Windy Point is particularly hazardous. He has been involved in several incidents himself while cycling. Would be a regional resource, an extension of the Great Harbour Way and will encourage cyclists off the road where they are a hazard to themselves and other traffic. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resilience Climate Change Safety Tourism Economic benefit | |
| 38 | Sea Salt Café | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will increase safety for families and tourists to travel around Eastbourne on foot or bike. Believes the proposal would also bring more people to Eastbourne to enjoy the scenery and cafes, and would benefit the local community. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Tourism Economic benefit | |
| 39 | Miles Maitland | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as being a Lowry Bay resident and an active biker for over 5 years feels like every time they come onto Marine Drive from Cheviot Road, he puts himself at risk (due to volume of traffic on a narrow road). Believes the proposal would produce the very best scenic safe way in NZ. Will also increase number of visitors, and have a positive effect on tourism - could be "The Best Scenic Cycleway in NZ". Notes various agencies need to work together and commit to getting the path built. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Tourism Amenity Funding Economic benefit | |
| 40 | Maureen Maitland | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal due to improved safety for walkers and cyclists - road is too narrow, and the existing track is narrow. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety | |
| 41 | Margaret Campbell | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as a resident who sees increased amounts of cars and cyclist using the narrow, windy road around the Bays. Worries about knocking a cyclist when passing, and believes the construction of shared path on the seaward edge of Marine Drive would give everyone "peace of mind". | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety | |
| 42 | Anne Horrill | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve the safety concerns along the eastern bays for both pedestrians and motorists | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety | |
| 43 | Days Bay Pavilion LED | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety in the community for families and tourists to travel around Eastbourne on bike. The submission also noted that it will attract more visitors to the area who will spend money at local cafes. Acknowledges that the cycle way will also bring additional people into Eastbourne who will use the cafes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Tourism Economic benefit | |
| 44 | Lowry Bay Residents Association | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve the safety issue specifically for Lowry Bay. Notes that Lowry Bay residents feel the need to use cars to travel short distances as a result of safety concerns. This includes commuters who use the ferry at Days Bay. School children are inclined to travel by vehicle to school despite short distances. Residents are collectively in favour of the shared path, though it was noted there is a small minority who oppose the shared path due to impacts on the beach. The committee is aware residents want to ensure the shared path addresses and helps to mitigate storm surges in the north of Lowry Bay in the short term and Sea Level Rise in the long term. It was acknowledged the proposal does this. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Connectivity Resilience Climate Change Loss of beach Alternative transport modes | |
| 45 | Helen Riley | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists, pedestrians and vehicle users, noting that the current path is a safety hazard for these groups. Notes that the shared path will protect Marine Drive from storm surges. Believes the shared path will make more Eastbourne residents active and will therefore contribute to the health and wellbeing of the community. Noted that the path will enhance the environment where possible and will provide a base for future resilience work. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Resilience Health | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------|---------|-----|-------|---|--|---------------------|
| 46 | Cycling Action Network | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve the safety of cyclists, pedestrians and people on scooters. It was emphasised that the current safety hazard has existed for a long time and that this particular solution is needed. Notes that the shared path will provide a means of transport if the road is closed to motorised vehicles. Acknowledges that the shared path will improve connectivity with the Great Harbour Way for cyclists and pedestrians. Believes tourism will be encouraged through the amenity value associated with the shared path. Believes that the shared path will facilitate a modal shift towards active transport modes and that this will reduce traffic congestion. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Resilience Tourism Amenity Alternative transport modes | |
| 47 | Hilary Keenan | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes north and south bound Lowry Bay bus shelters located on Marine Drive be moved from their present position to the Kaikoura Path lay-by adjacent beach side. Believes new bus shelters will ensure safety and protection from vehicles and will be less exposed to tidal surges. Emphasised improved safety for children in particular. Noted there is currently no shelter at the existing south-bound bus stop. Believes relocation of the north-bound bus stop will mitigate danger for bus passengers intending to cross the Cheviot Road/Marine Drive intersection. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Bus shelters | |
| 48 | Tom Murphy | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Notes that improved safety will make active transport modes a more viable choice for pedestrians, cyclists and school children when they travel to locations within and outside the local area. Emphasised that the shared path will form a 'vital link' between the bays, Eastbourne Village, Petone, the Hutt Valley and Central Wellington. Believes this will prepare the local community for climate change and extreme weather events. Thinks that the proposal will improve regional connectivity with reference to the Great Harbour Way and Remutaka Cycle Trail. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Connectivity Climate Change Resilience Alternative transport modes | |
| 49 | Jodene Onslow-Osborne | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as the improved safety will encourage more people to use active transport modes. Notes the importance of providing accommodation for penguins who nest in the area. Believes that connectivity with the Great Harbour Way and Remutaka Cycle Trail will increase accessibility to Eastbourne for tourists. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Penguins Tourism Connectivity Alternative transport modes | |
| 50 | Debby McColl | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for walkers, runners cyclists, and vehicle users. Notes that it will improve connectivity with the Wellington Harbour and Remutaka cycle trails. Emphasises the importance of strengthening the seawall in relation to climate change and sea level rise. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Connectivity Climate Change Seawall design | |
| 51 | Kyle Christensen | Support | No | Grant | No detail given on nature of, or reasons for their submission. | | |
| 52 | Elaine Richardson | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists and bus drivers. Believes that native birds and other wildlife will need to be protected before and after the project. Notes that resistance to Sea Level Rise will be a positive benefit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Penguins Coastal avifauna Climate Change Resilience | |
| 53 | Jo Cullhane | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal but suggests that it should be illegal for cyclists to use the road once the shared path is completed. Emphasises the importance of retaining a bus shelter at Mahina Bay. Only talked about safety in relation to the position of the Mahina Bay bus stop and the implications of relocating it. Would like to have the Mahina Bay Beach replenished as part of the works. Would like the power lines relocated beneath the ground and the lamp posts to be moved away from the seaward side of the road reserve. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Amenity Ecological Bus shelter Infrastructure Beach renourishment | Conditional support |
| 54 | Saul Duff | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Emphasised that the shared path was a necessity. Noted the psychological impact that his fear of hitting pedestrians when cycling on Marine Drive has on him. Believes heightened safety for pedestrians and cyclists through the shared pathway will lead to a more evenly distributed modal split. Mentioned that people will drive less and carbon emissions will decrease. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Climate Change Health Alternative transport modes | |
| 55 | Elizabeth Moginie | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Believes the shared path will provide leisure opportunities and increase tourism and appreciation of the harbour. Mentioned that it will improve connectivity between walkways. Includes photos of current path width and proximity to traffic | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity Safety Tourism Connectivity Economic benefit | |
| 56 | Moya and Kevin McCarten | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for pedestrians, vehicle users and cyclists. Notes that biking isn't a viable transport mode in light of the safety risks associated with use of existing infrastructure. Believes that this will lead to increased uptake of cycling and that this will have positive health effects on the community. Notes that impacts on the beach at Lowry Bay are a "small price to pay" for the improved safety through the shared path. Believes the shared path will draw more visitors to Eastbourne. Believes the shared path will alleviate risks associated with storm surges and Sea Level Rise. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Connectivity Health Tourism Climate Change Resilience Alternative transport modes | |
| 57 | David Reid | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Believes the shared path should also mitigate effects associated with strong wind conditions and subsequent safety implications for users of the path. Believes a well constructed path would enhance the visual appearance and stability of the shoreline. Suggests installation of ducts in the seawall for penguins. Notes the submission process is "unnecessary bureaucracy" that presents a barrier to "sensible urban development". Supports the proposal as it will protect the road whilst being a "wonderful asset" for the wider region. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Amenity Penguins Resilience Seawall design | |
| 58 | Jocelyn Christian Turnbull | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Notes that safety issues detract from the viability of cycling as a transport option around the bays. Believes the shared path will enable a more 'eco-friendly' lifestyle and provide fitness opportunities. Describes that connectivity to Pencarrow Lighthouse will improve as a result of the shared path. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Climate Change Health Connectivity Alternative transport modes | |
| 60 | Bjorn Johns | Support | No | Grant | Believes negative impacts associated with construction are outweighed by benefits of the path and supports the proposal as such. No specific points were raised. | | |
| 61 | John Selwyn | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will raise the general level of fitness for local residents and have positive health benefits as a result. Also emphasised that the current roadway is unsafe for cyclists and restricts them from choosing to use it. Noted that the shared path will raise property values and that subsequent higher rates could fund the construction. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Safety Funding Alternative transport modes | |
| 62 | Derek Stannard Wilshere | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and mobility vehicle users. Believes it will allow for improved resilience in relation to storm surges and debris. Mentioned the current NZTA policy for shared paths has sufficiently aided the formation of the proposed shared path. Is satisfied that the proposal will recognise the unique marine and coastal environment, including the value and needs of seabirds. Notes that the proposal recognises the impending risks of climate change. Believes the shared path will improve connectivity between the bays and to other parts of the region. Believes the proposal protects the "cherished values" of various beaches in Eastbourne. Noted that progress has been "painfully slow". | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Resilience Connectivity Coastal avifauna Penguins Loss of beach | |
| 63 | John Arnold Butt | Support | Yes | Grant | <p>Supports the proposal. The submission didn't contain reasoning for support. Support was highly conditional and stated a number of recommendations and areas of critique in relation to the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggests that the design should have a 200mm height separation from the road for safety purposes. It was also noted that raising the height 200mm would be useful in relation to Sea Level Rise. Believes the Okiwī Iti Bay Beach should be considered for re-nourishment and planting as part of the proposed works. Noticed the steps opposite 731 Marine Drive aren't included for replacement in the proposed works and should be. Emphasised importance of testing the beach sand at Okiwī Iti Bay for molluscs, noting that this hasn't been done. Noted that there was a missing paper that should be referenced in the report (HCC in 2009 by J Dahm). Notes that penguin and other bird habitat should be protected and that a barrier should exist to prevent penguins from crossing the road. Expressed concern about erosion occurring beneath the wall. Emphasised importance of beach access and that this should not be reduced as a result of the shared path. Noted that the current road is unfriendly to pedestrians, and that it discourages tourists from visiting Eastbourne Village. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate Change Resilience Safety Penguins Coastal avifauna Beach Access Tourism Seawall design Beach renourishment | Conditional support |
| 64 | Daniel Charles Gentry | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve the safety issue for cyclists and pedestrians. Noted that safety problems associated with the road have detracted people from using active transport modes. Cited an example of a death that occurred on the road at Lowry Bay as a result of the 'inadequate' existing pathway. Noted that the shared path will improve connectivity for cyclists and will make it easier to commute and use the shoreside for recreation. Mentioned that the proposal will provide 'critical' storm protection. Believes that the proposal sufficiently takes into account its environmental impact. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Connectivity Resilience Amenity Alternative transport modes | |
| 65 | Martin Angus Gribble | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal primarily due to the safety issue. Believes that environmental considerations, including sediment and penguin habitat, have been sufficiently considered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Penguins Coastal avifauna | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---------|-----|-------------------|--|--|--|
| 66 | Michael Sheridan | Oppose | No | Decline | <p>Does not support the proposal as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No "Low Cost Option" has been proposed. NZTA rules have not been complied with particularly with regard to speed (refer Section 8, 8.2; (Sect 8.1(2)(a)(i)). It is suggested that the 70 km/h does not fulfil these obligations as described. There is an increasing use of electric bikes. Modern electric bikes now offer speeds ranging from 25 km/h to 45 km/h. Estimate of future use of cycleway is very poorly detailed. See VictoriaWalks.org.au which highlights carrying capacity of the paths at which problems arise; accidents occurring with pedestrians and other users; speeds of bikes along the paths. No attempt has been made to estimate the existing sea wall asset life. <p>The following "low cost and simple to implement" recommendations were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A "non-exclusive marked lane" for use by cyclists and motorists. This assists in motorists recognising the presence of cyclists. Example quoted from Loch Lomond where non-exclusive lanes are in place. A separate pedestrian pathway would be constructed to improve safety and experience for both pedestrians and cyclists. More signage to warn motorists of cyclists should be implemented. Especially at blind bends. Speed reduction to match NZTA rules reduces risk of serious injury to cyclists. Road edge conditions could be improved for cyclists. Sea wall construction should be built to match its asset life cycle and timed to match sea level rise predictions. | Safety Climate Change Infrastructure Speed limit Seawall design Signage | |
| 67 | Robyn Attewell | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve the safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists using the road. Notes that this will encourage members of the community to exercise more. | Safety Health | |
| 68 | Jessica Mills | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes the proposal has addressed all of the potential issues that could arise but did not stipulate specific reasons for support. | | |
| 69 | Michelle O'Shannessy | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles. Believes that cyclists using the road contribute to traffic congestion during peak hours. Noted that the existing walkway around York Bay is busy with pedestrians in summer, and that this attracts cyclists to use the road and expose themselves to danger. Believes the seawall will aid resilience with reference to storms and debris. It was also noted that the current road can become inundated during storms and that this can attract motorists to use the wrong side of the road to avoid sea water and spray. | Safety Resilience Tourism Connectivity | |
| 70 | David Moss | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Emphasised that the portion of road between Windy Point and Point Howard is particularly unsafe for cyclists due to the high speed limit of 70 km/hr. Believes increased connectivity between Eastbourne and other regional cycleways will increase bike usage and reduce car dependence as a result. Notes that recreational bike riders use the Burden's Gate - Pencarrow Lighthouse trail but unfortunately because of existing facilities in eastern bays that almost all of those riders have travelled to the path by car Suggested that the shared path would be more effective in reducing car dependence if a cycleway from Point Howard to Petone was constructed. | Safety Connectivity Speed limit | |
| 71 | Belinda Moss | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will alleviate the issue of safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Believes current safety issues force people to use vehicles to commute and travel to school despite an initial preference towards biking and walking. Emphasised the safety issue in relation to the pedestrian pathway on Marine Drive which was described as too narrow with overhanging vegetation and proximity to vehicles making things very dangerous. Regularly rides to Pencarrow Lighthouse but drives to Eastbourne to get there. Mentioned that connectivity will improve for cyclists once the Eastern Bays are connected to the rest of Wellington's cycle infrastructure. Noted Lowry Bay as having a particularly severe circumstance in relation to safety of pedestrians and cyclists and the need to use vehicles to travel short distances | Safety Connectivity Alternative transport modes | |
| 72 | Susan Haines | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Noted that the north end of Lowry Bay should be prioritised in the proposal for construction before other areas should development be staged. Noted that the shared pathway and seawall will protect the road from impacts of climate change. Expects that the shared pathway would improve the health and wellbeing of people in the community. | Safety Climate Change Health Amenity | |
| 73 | Janet Hay | Support | No | Grant | <p>Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians but believes that "interim solutions" are required in order to improve safety prior to completion of the work. Believes interim outcomes would provide time for the formation of a quality long-term outcome to address climate change and subsequent Sea Level Rise. The following recommendations were listed as potential interim solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating 2m wide boardwalks that will allow for continuity of the pathway in areas when it becomes too narrow for cyclists and pedestrians to use it safely. Proposed boardwalk structures should have a 10-15 year life span and should be constructed at the beginning of the 35 year shared pathway project. Areas that were emphasised for implementation of boardwalks as an interim solution were Lowry Bay, Days Bay, Mahina Bay and the area between Days Bay and Windy Point. It was emphasised that the areas around bus stops are made safer for pedestrians in the interim. Suggestions were made to widen pathways around bus stops through use of boardwalks. It was suggested that Days Bay be included in the proposal as access along the seaward pathway is not continuous. Numerous issues associated with the safety of pedestrians and cyclists were noted in Days Bay with photos. | Safety Resilience Climate Change Bus shelters Seawall design | |
| 74 | Jessica Nickelsen | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Noted that the volume of traffic combined with the narrow pedestrian pathway has caused safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists. It was noted that safety issues detract from the viability of using active transport modes. It was noted that increased uptake in active transport modes would reduce traffic congestion. Believes that the shared path will increase the extent residents and tourists will be able to use the shore-side for recreation and that this will have social benefits. Believes that the sea wall will improve resilience to king tides and storm surges and that this will reduce traffic congestion during these times when the road would otherwise be inundated. Notes Sea Level Rise as a threat and acknowledges the proposed shared path and sea wall as a solution. | Safety Resilience Climate Change Amenity Tourism Alternative transport modes | |
| 75 | Jennifer Packer | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for pedestrians. It was noted that the recent introduction of double decker buses has heightened safety concerns for pedestrians. Other factors that have influenced safety concerns were noted, these included road works, vegetation trimming and accidents. | Safety | |
| 76 | Michael Rumble | Oppose | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the proposal purely because of the negative implications for penguin habitat. Believes that two of the three nesting areas provided as part of the project are unsuitable sites. Emphasised that the Penguin Haven (rebuilt in 2015) should be a model for the type of haven required for penguins. Suggested that having more havens and adding nest boxes into the seawall would detract penguins from crossing the road to reach their traditional nest site. Recommends that a draft Penguin Mitigation Plan is added into the hearing process. | Penguins | |
| 77 | David and Alison Carew | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Notes that the footpath is not wide enough which leaves cyclists and pedestrians exposed to oncoming traffic. Notes safety issues for motorists who have issues avoiding pedestrians, cyclists, other vehicles and buses on Marine Parade as a narrow road. Believes the seawall will improve resilience of the road for extreme weather events and Sea Level Rise associated with climate change. Believes that improved resilience will ensure the continuous operation of the road in a civil defence emergency. Believes that the shared path will increase visitor numbers to Eastbourne. | Safety Resilience Climate Change Tourism Economic benefit | |
| 78 | Sam Rudge | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Believes that the shared path will promote walking and cycling and that this will contribute to a more evenly distributed modal split. Believes that increased uptake of active transport modes will have positive health effects. Notes that reduced vehicle use will help reduce emissions. Believes that this will improve resilience of above and below-ground infrastructure with respect to climate change and extreme weather events. | Safety Climate Change Resilience Health Alternative transport modes | |
| 79 | Wellington Water Limited | Neutral | No | Conditional grant | <p>Wellington Water Ltd (WWL) is neutral to the proposal, with the submission raising the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are up to three sewer pipe lines and two bulk water supply mains within the Marine Drive road corridor. In addition, there are 15 scour valves that open to the coast which may need to be extended within any new seawall design. WWL has an interest in ensuring these assets are protected from damage and disturbance during construction. It was noted that the number and volume of buried assets in the road reserve mean there's minimal space for establishment of new underground water infrastructure, including a new resilience bulk water upgrade project linking Pt Howard and Lowry Bay. Therefore, WWL expressed interest in exploring opportunities to include the laying of pipelines within the widened road reserve in the future. It was noted the proposed sea wall will cross culverted streams that drain to the coast. The submission therefore suggested that signage and informational displays about these streams could be created. In addition, variances in material on the shared path could be implemented to notify a user when they are crossing a stream. Further to this, it was suggested that streams should be exposed to daylight where practicable. It was also recommended that water sensitive design principles be incorporated in the stormwater design. WWL believes that this will mitigate the effects of contaminants in runoff from the road. It was noted this initiative could be incorporated into landscaping which is already proposed. The submission concluded by suggesting that consenting authorities consider the application of conditions and controls that address the recommendations and issues contained in the points above. | Infrastructure Freshwater ecology Amenity Seawall design Signage Stormwater design | |
| 80 | East Harbour Environmental Association Incorporated | Oppose | Yes | Decline | <p>Opposes the proposal as it's believed it would cause unnecessary damage to the coastal environment. Reasoning for this stance is listed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's believed the proposed width of the shared path in Mahina Bay, York Bay and Lowry Bay extends unnecessarily onto the beach. It was suggested by EHEAI that path width should not exceed 2.5m. It's believed use of heavy machinery on rocks and beaches will cause significant damage to coastal formations and their flora and fauna and that the application does not account for this. It's believed the current consent duration of 35 years is too great as no re-appraisal of the damage done to the coastal marine area can be undertaken - and stopped if damage is too great. A shorter duration of 10 years was suggested. Scouring of the beach sand and gravel in York Bay is expected to occur as a result of the construction of the path and its proposed form. It was noted this could lead to 'complete destruction'. Believes access to the CMA will be more restricted. Noted the possibility of cars parking on the shared path which would hinder its function as a route for active transport modes. Believes this will happen irrespective of legality. Opposes the use of double and triple curves in the form of the wall along beaches due to scouring. Also notes walls won't be able to be used as back rests which will limit enjoyment. Believes re-positioning of bus stops is not informed and will reduce bus patronage. Concerned about the removal of a pohutakawa tree in York Bay. It was noted these are hard to grow in exposed coastal areas. Rip-rap rock islands and other artificial structures to absorb the power of wave swells instead of the shared path were suggested. | Penguins Coastal avifauna Intertidal ecology Amenity Beach Access Loss of beach Resilience Parking Bus shelters Path width Consent duration Beach renourishment Seawall design | |
| 81 | Ann Percy | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will create recreational opportunities and improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Believes that current infrastructure makes it difficult to walk along the waterfront. Believes that recreational opportunities will have health benefits for the wider community. Notes that this will improve regional access to Eastbourne and that this will attract visitors. Believes council rates are high and that better footpath access is therefore warranted. | Amenity Safety Health Connectivity Tourism Economic benefit | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|---------|------------|-------------------|---|---|------------------------|
| 82 | George Tuffin | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Believes risk assessment indicators are within acceptable levels and that the consultation process was exhaustive. Notes the pathway around Windy Point as particularly hazardous and emphasises this as a priority for "early remedial action". Believes the shared pathway will reduce the amount of debris washed onto the road and that this will improve driving conditions for motorists. | Safety Connectivity | |
| 83 | Robert Watt | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety and create recreational opportunities. Notes that it would be nice to bike and walk to Days Bay and Sunshine Bay but that this isn't currently possible due to safety issues associated with existing pedestrian/cycle infrastructure. | Safety Amenity Alternative transport modes | |
| 84 | Nigel Oxley | Oppose | Yes | Conditional grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the application for reasons associated with amenity, safety and suitability for experienced cyclists. Disagrees with the creation of a visual barrier to the sea and notes the amenity value of having an unobstructed view of the harbour when travelling around the bays. Believes that cycling and walking aren't compatible with one-another regarding speed and subsequent safety concerns associated with the risk of collision. Believes the cycleway and walkway should be grade-separated and that this will direct pedestrians to remain within the area allocated for walking. Noted that walkers are typically unaware of cyclists that approach from behind. Believes the shared path needs to extend throughout the entirety of Days Bay to provide a safe passage for cyclists and pedestrians. Believes there are not enough safe opportunities for cyclists to negotiate their way across the road and that the pathway is not wide enough for a section for crossing. Accepts width restrictions but also notes that the shared path could be wider at some locations, particularly the "pinch" of the bays. Emphasised the need for a grade separation between cycle and pedestrian paths in areas where the pathway width reduces to 2.5m. Signage to alert cyclists of "pinch areas" was suggested. Opposed to removal of the Pohutakawa tree at York Bay. | Safety Amenity Connectivity Atkinson tree Path width | Conditional opposition |
| 85 | John Gibb | Oppose | No | Decline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the application in its present form as it is believed the application does not present sufficient reason to reclaim the foreshore. Believes the shared path width of 3.5m is not wide enough to accommodate the ways in which different groups of people will want to use it. Notes that the existing landward footpath at Windy Point combined with the 3.5m shared path will be excessive. Notes that the path varies in width and believes that continuity of the same path width is needed. It was suggested that a smaller width of 2.5m (excluding pinch points) would allow for this. Notes that the Days Bay section to the north of Ferry Road is not in the plan and believes that it should be. Notes that the section from Point Howard to the Seaview Marina was not in the plan and that it should be, and that the current path is too narrow and dangerous for two bikes to pass. Believes that there should be space made available for cyclists to use the road in the event of extreme weather as being near the ocean is not practical due to breaking waves and debris. Notes that minor improvements could be made to the road to make it safer for cyclists. Believes that there has been a lack of 'proactive work' including remedial work at road edges, introduction of signage, and driver education. It was suggested signage be implemented at Point Howard and Windy Point with particular reference to 1.5m clearance requirements for motorists passing cyclists. | Safety Connectivity Intertidal ecology Amenity Path width Signage | |
| 86 | Sheryl Selwyn | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and motorists. Notes that the road is narrow and has inadequate margins to safely accommodate cyclists and vehicles. Believes drivers are impatient and that it is difficult to gauge safe driving behaviour. Believes that it makes sense to encourage the use of bikes for both recreational and commuting purposes. Notes that increased physical activity will result and that this will decrease stress on hospitals. Believes that other bike path options in Lower Hutt are limited. | Safety Amenity Climate Change Health Alternative transport modes | |
| 87 | Karn and Haley Holmes | Oppose | No | Decline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the application as it proposes to move the roadway closer to their property. Believes people not directly affected by the road shift have influenced the proposal to move the road in this direction. Believes increased proximity to the road will make the entrance to their property unsafe when coming and going despite assurances that the proposal will not adversely affect them. Believes safety issues associated the 70km/hr speed limit will be exacerbated by shifting the road closer. Suggests that the original proposal where the road shifts less is preferable from a safety perspective and that the shared path should extend outwards more into the seaward side. | Safety Amenity | |
| 88 | Antony Robert Irvine | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the application as it will improve safety for users of active transport modes which should be encouraged. Notes that adverse impacts on wildlife should be minimised, using penguins as an example. | Safety Penguins | |
| 89 | Gianne Fiona Sealey | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the application as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Notes that the shared pathway will also help protect the road from issues associated with climate change such as erosion. Believes it will encourage people to cycle to work and that this will have positive physical and mental health effects. | Safety Climate Change Health Alternative transport modes | |
| 90 | Anthony Fielding Willis | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal for reasons associated with resilience and perceived immediate benefits. Believes long term resilience benefits will include the protection of the Eastern Bays from Sea Level Rise, better options for routing services within the path corridor, and improved local business viability from heightened visitor traffic. Believes immediate gains include improved safety for non-fossil fuel users of the path and reduced costs of maintaining sections currently affected by waves and debris. Notes healthier transport options will be enabled. | Safety Resilience Tourism Health Economic benefit Alternative transport modes | |
| 91 | Cycle Wellington | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the application as it will increase resilience and improve safety. Notes pinch points along the current road as a safety issue. Believes a consistent shared path will enable more people to walk and bike between Eastbourne and Petone. Believes increased access to the Remutaka Cycle Trail and Great Harbour Way will increase the amount of visitors to the area. This will be further aided by the recreational opportunities created by the shared path. | Safety Amenity Connectivity Tourism Economic benefit Alternative transport modes | |
| 92 | Liz Lander | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will have resilience and health benefits. Emphasised that it will enable access to Petone and Lower Hutt in the event of a natural disaster. Noted the wider community will benefit from recreational opportunities created by the shared path and that this will have physical and mental health benefits. Noted visitors to Eastbourne will be less likely to need cars. It was emphasised this will reduce fossil fuel emissions and congestion. Emphasised that the needs of the local penguin population need to be taken into account. Noted that the approval and proposal development processes have been slow. | Resilience Health Penguins Climate Change Alternative transport modes | |
| 93 | Derek Lander | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve the safety issue, have recreational benefits and attract visitors. Notes that it will make walking and cycling around the harbour safer. Believes it will create an enjoyable exercise option. Requested that the proposal also allows for local penguins. | Amenity Safety Tourism Economic benefit Penguins | |
| 94 | Graeme Hall | Support | Not stated | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve transport options within the Eastern Bays and to the Hutt Valley. Believes the sea wall is required around the balance of the Eastern Bays to provide protection from the sea, especially during extreme weather events. Believes the shared path will utilise surrounding natural assets to attract tourists. Noted substantial infrastructural impediments for cycling and walking activities between Eastbourne and Point Howard. Noted benefits associated with walking and cycling. Believes the shared path will have network benefits in terms of its integration with other walking/cycling infrastructure in the region including the Great Harbour Way. In addition, it was noted NZTA, HCC and WCC are investing more in this area. | Connectivity Resilience Health Tourism Amenity Alternative transport modes | |
| 95 | Alison Furminger | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as current pedestrian and cycle infrastructure around the bays is limited. Emphasised safety issues for children who want to cycle to school from Lowry Bay and notes that this detracts them from doing so. | Safety Alternative transport modes | |
| 96 | Virginia Horrocks | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve the safety issue for cyclists, pedestrians and motorists. Notes that vehicle traffic is reluctant to pass cyclists on narrow sections of the road. Mentioned that bus drivers expressed difficulty driving on the road and that this has negative implications on their punctuality. Emphasised that safety issues associated with the road detract people from cycling and walking. Noted that Windy Point was a particularly dangerous location for cyclists. Believes the proposal is a means of protecting the area from Sea Level Rise and extreme weather events. | Safety Climate Change Resilience Alternative transport modes | |
| 97 | San Antonio School | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety. Particularly concerned with the ability to provide safe transit by foot, scooter and bike for parents, children and teachers of San Antonio Primary School. Noted insufficient separation of high speed traffic from pedestrians on the current road and that this is unsafe. Believes the shared pathway will improve resilience of the community regarding extreme weather and emergency events. Believes the shared pathway will benefit the safety, health and well-being of the Eastbourne community, particularly for children. | Safety Resilience Health | |
| 98 | Peter Green | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists, walkers and disabled people. Believes the proposed shared path will enable the waterfront around the bays to operate as a tourist attraction and that the current path is not wide enough to allow for this. Notes Windy Point as particularly dangerous. Believes this is because the path on the seaward side of the road is too narrow and exposes its users to oncoming traffic. Believes children cycling to school are greatly affected in this area. | Safety Tourism Economic benefit | |
| 99 | Jane Mautner | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Noted current infrastructure and associated safety issues restrict children from cycling to school. Emphasised areas at Windy Point, Mahina Bay and Lowry bay as particularly unsafe due to the narrow pathway (20cm wide). Noted pot holes, extreme weather and beach debris along the existing route as additional safety hazards for cyclists. Discussed recreational and health benefits associated with cycling around the bays. | Safety Health Path width | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|---------|------------|-------|--|---|--|
| 100 | Genevieve Packer | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Believes current safety issues infringe on the extent surrounding natural assets can be enjoyed and appreciated. | Safety Amenity | |
| 101 | Edward Newman | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve access and safety for users of mobility scooters. Mentioned that the shared path would also be beneficial for pedestrians, cyclists and wheelchair users. Believes the shared pathway will help grow tourism in the area. | Safety Tourism Economic benefit | |
| 102 | Christine Guthrie | Support | Not stated | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that the narrow pathway is dangerous due to minimal separation between pedestrians and vehicle traffic. | Safety | |
| 103 | William Guthrie | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasised that the narrow pathway for pedestrians is a deterrent for those walking around the bays. Believes the shared pathway will enable more people of all ages to walk and cycle and appreciate the harbour scenery. Believes that the shared path will attract visitors to the area. | Safety Amenity Tourism Economic benefit Alternative transport modes | |
| 104 | Stephen Cobb | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that the route is currently perceived as too dangerous for young children. Believes the shared path will increase uptake of cycling in the community. | Safety Health Alternative transport modes | |
| 105 | Simon Lamb | Support | No | Grant | No detail given on nature of or reasons for their submission. | | |
| 106 | Sarah Anne Crawford | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal for reasons associated with safety, climate change, population growth, amenity and health. Believes population growth and its association with increased car ownership rates and larger vehicles have and will continue to make the existing path more dangerous. Notes the proposal will result in increased activity levels for residents and address the health problem of obesity. Noted that improved safety circumstances will make it acceptable and enjoyable for people to walk around and enjoy the harbour. Notes there are no barriers to entry and that the path will be a useful asset for pedestrians with prams and young children. | Safety Amenity Health Climate Change Alternative transport modes | |
| 107 | Ross Hawarth | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that it is particularly unsafe to cycle on the road around Windy Point, instead opts to cycle on the pathway. Emphasises that the area around Windy Point desperately needs the shared path. | Safety | |
| 108 | Ron Pol | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety and encourage residents to take up cycling. Believes the current situation is unsafe and discourages people from cycling. Suggests that the cycle path is constructed to facilitate penguin passage between the land and sea. Suggests that the shared path should help mitigate climate change effects on infrastructure such as roading and piping. | Safety Penguins Climate Change | |
| 109 | Rodney Garrett | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that the distance between pedestrians and passing traffic is small between York Bay and Eastbourne and that this is dangerous. Emphasised that there are worse safety conditions during winter time due to poor visibility. Believes a safe walkway will encourage more people to walk and cycle and use the beaches. | Safety Alternative transport modes | |
| 110 | Richard and Honor Kemp | Support | No | Grant | No detail given on nature of or reasons for their submission. | | |
| 111 | Rachel Garrett | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety. Notes the area between York Bay and Eastbourne as particularly unsafe for children. Describes that it is difficult for children to get to school in Eastbourne by walking or cycling. | Safety Alternative transport modes | |
| 112 | Philippa Bouller | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for residents and visitors to the Eastern Bays. Mentioned that motorists frequently cross the double yellow line to create space for cyclists and current road is too narrow to accommodate both. Mentioned that it isn't unusual for vehicles to crash into the sea at Windy Point. | Safety | |
| 113 | Patricia Sarginson | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety. Believes safety problems arise from narrow roads, increased traffic and introduction of double-decker buses. | Safety | |
| 114 | Murray Gibbons | Support | No | Grant | No detail given on nature of or reasons for their submission. | | |
| 115 | Muritai School | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety. Notes that it is currently too dangerous to use the pathway around the bays, so the majority of children are driven to school. The shared pathway would allow the school to make use of the local area in their 'education outside the classroom' programme. It's believed the shared path will improve storm resilience. Parents of school children will be able to reach out to them in the event of a serious weather event when access to the school from other bays may otherwise be obstructed. It was noted that the shared path will benefit other school-age children, including those at high school in Lower Hutt. It was mentioned that the shared path would have health benefits for children. | Safety Resilience Health Education Alternative transport modes | |
| 116 | Merrin Neilson | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted there is little space between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. Noted power poles as an additional obstacle for pedestrians and cyclists on the existing path. | Safety Infrastructure | |
| 117 | Megan Turner | Neutral | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neutral to the proposal for reasons associated with coastal habitats, Sea Level Rise and safety. Believes pedestrians and cyclists are too close to vehicle traffic. Concerned about the effects of the shared path on the habitat of the Little Penguin. Believes that Sea Level Rise may render the path useless in the long-term. | Safety Penguins Climate Change Intertidal ecology Seawall design | |
| 118 | Mary Howarth | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists. Notes the pathway is too narrow for cyclists. Noted distractions to cyclists along the pathway can easily be fatal. Cited an incident she personally witnessed. Believes cars are not observing the speed limit. Believes there is an urgent need for the shared path. | Safety Speed limit | |
| 119 | Mark and Sally Velvin | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety. Believes the portion of Marine Parade that passes through Lowry Bay is particularly dangerous because it does not have a safety barrier to prevent children from entering the road from the beach. Believes there is not currently a suitable seawall. Noted that during high tide sea wash over the road can make driving conditions even more dangerous. | Safety Resilience Seawall design | |
| 120 | Margaret Turner | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as they would like the opportunity to walk safely around the bays. | Safety | |
| 121 | Leonard McNaught | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will make younger people more active. Believes that current safety issues detract younger people from cycling around the bays. Believes current safety circumstances around the bays for cyclists and pedestrians are "the weakest part of life in the bays". Supports the improvement of healthy communications between the bays as a priority over all other concerns for residents and visitors. | Health Safety Alternative transport modes | |
| 122 | Keith and Ronelle Bolton | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal due to the safety issue for pedestrians and cyclists. Noted that there are inadequate sidewalks for pedestrians in Lowry Bay in particular. Believe the current situation is inadequate and unsustainable. | Safety | |
| 123 | Katharine Good | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Safety concerns have restricted the submitter to cycling in the area between Rona Bay and Burdens Gate. Noted concerns of being cut off from the hospital during an extreme weather event or disaster. Mentioned that the shared path will improve resilience of the community to storm surges which will reduce the chance of road closures. Supports plans to protect the community from Sea Level Rise. Is confident that the proposal takes into sufficient account environmental impacts of the proposed path, including creation of more resilient penguin breeding sites. | Safety Resilience Climate Change Penguins | |
| 124 | Karen Wakelin | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that the footpath is narrow for cycling and walking. Believes the shared path is essential given current issues associated with climate change and the need to encourage physical activity. | Safety Climate Change Health | |
| 125 | Joanne Salisbury | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes the proposal will improve safety for cyclists, pedestrians and motorists. Believes narrow sections of Marine Parade create dangerous conditions for everyone. Believes cyclists and pedestrians often veer towards the road when the existing path ends/narrows without checking for oncoming vehicles. Believes the Little Penguin needs to be accounted for in the design which should allow for easy access to and from the ocean. | Safety Penguins | |
| 126 | Jill Nalder | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists. Believes that the shared path will also provide a buffer from wave action, high tides, storm events and Sea Level Rise. | Safety Resilience Climate Change | |
| 127 | Jeanine Reid | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feels uncomfortable riding around the bays and needs to be hyper vigilant to the path width, standard, traffic and pedestrians given the narrow width of the pathway. Believes that the safety issues limit access to the Pencarrow Bike Ride. It was also noted that safety issues make this part of the Remutaka Cycleway difficult and that this detracts people from using and seeing it as a local attraction. Noted resilience benefits regarding extreme weather events influencing the extent emergency services can access Eastbourne. Notes that people can already see the impacts of seawalls in the area and accept the visual impact knowing the benefits the seawall can create. | Safety Connectivity Resilience Amenity | |
| 128 | Janice Heine | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted personal health problems with arthritis influence the extent balance can be maintained whilst cycling on Marine Parade, particularly in adverse weather. Noted that the road pinches outwards at Lowry, Mahina and Sunshine Bay and that these are the most dangerous sections of the road. Believes the shared path will provide protection from wave action and extreme weather events and that Sea Level Rise will make this more of a necessity. Suggested another way to protect the road could be to construct surf breaks or breakwaters to absorb energy from the wave movement. Suggested making the land-side of the road wider, shifting the vehicle lanes inwards from the ocean, and using the sea-side road reserve for the shared path. | Safety Health Resilience Climate Change Rip rap islands | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---------|----|------------|--|--|--|
| 129 | Jamie Power | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the importance of protecting the foreshore and coastline, safety, attracting visitors to the area, and the ability of people to move safely around the bays. Believes the shared path will improve safety conditions for local residents, particularly school children who would be able to bike to school. Believes the path would draw visitors to the area supporting local companies. | <p>Safety Tourism Alternative transport modes Economic benefit</p> | |
| 130 | Jackie and Keith Levy | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the amenity value associated with the harbour and the enjoyment received cycling alongside it on portions of the shared path that are not dangerous. Mentioned that it is great to cycle from Days Bay on the walkways into the Hutt City, across Ewen Bridge and down the southern cycle track of the Hutt River to the coast. Has previously used the facility to ride to the top of the Remutaka Incline Cycle Track | <p>Safety Amenity Health</p> | |
| 131 | Hilary Beadle | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the speed of cars combined with the lack of space for cyclists and pedestrians is a concern but believes this can be solved with the shared path. | <p>Safety</p> | |
| 132 | Harold Knight | Neutral | No | Not stated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neutral to the proposal for reasons associated with sea spray onto the roadway. Believes there are currently two areas in particular that present safety issues for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians in adverse weather conditions. Lowry Bay as one example. Attached photos of areas of the bays showing encroachment of the tide. Notes that waves rise higher than vehicles during even mild weather conditions and that the sea encroaches on the road. Believes some portions of the road are shaped poorly and do not allow for drainage in the event of sea inundation especially Lowry Bay. Believes the proposed shared path is overly exposed to the ocean and will be uncomfortable for pedestrians and cyclists in the event of a moderate swell. Suggested implementation of a higher barrier to prevent the sea from splashing onto the road and provided an indicative sketch. | <p>Infrastructure Safety Seawall design</p> | |
| 133 | Hamish Morison | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Believes that the risk of serious injury or death as a result of current path is high. Believes that the bays should be safe for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly for visitors in the summer months. Notes that the process of constructing a shared path has been slow and that the York Bay section raised hopes and then ground to a halt. Believes that the increasing popularity of the beaches, bush walks, galleries and cafes/restaurants in Days Bay warrants safer infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians. | <p>Safety Tourism Amenity</p> | |
| 134 | Gerard Christie | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal for reasons associated with safety, health and motives to reduce emissions. Would like younger children to realise the health benefits associated with cycling but believes the road is too dangerous. Notes cars are needed for short distances because it isn't safe to walk around the bays. Believes the shared path will reduce car trips and emissions and that this will benefit the environment. | <p>Safety Health Climate Change Alternative transport modes</p> | |
| 135 | Francesca O'connel | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Notes that roads are too windy and narrow to accommodate cars, pedestrians and bikes and that this is unsafe. Believes the shared path will allow school children to bike to school and that they cannot currently. Notes an improved sea wall will protect the road from debris after a storm. Believes for reasons associated with climate change that the need for a sea wall will increase in the future. | <p>Safety Climate Change Seawall design Resilience Alternative transport modes</p> | |
| 136 | Finn Connel | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes has nearly been hit by motorists and the current road is inadequate for cyclists and pedestrians. | <p>Safety</p> | |
| 137 | Felicity Lovell | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like her children to be able to safely bike to school from Lowry Bay but believes this isn't currently possible. Believes the cycle way would allow children to safely sit on the beach at Lowry Bay. | <p>Safety Amenity Beach Access</p> | |
| 138 | Elsbeth Cotsilinis | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the current path is not safe for pedestrians or cyclists. Believes buses and trucks speed around corners and have poor visibility of the road. Notes there is no alternative access road either. | <p>Safety Connectivity</p> | |
| 139 | Elizabeth Palmer | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes the proposal would make it much safer for cyclists given the lack of width on the existing path Believes cars cannot overtake cyclists without having to cross the centre line of the road. Believes there is urgent need to reduce the amount of sea water getting onto the road and that this currently creates a severe traffic hazard as cars swerve into the oncoming lane. Believes the amount of debris deposited on the road from waves is a safety hazard. Notes that this debris requires regular clearance by the Council. Suggested implementation of passing bays if there is enough space. | <p>Safety</p> | |
| 140 | Elizabeth Knightly | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that effects of global warming will increase. Notes that more people should be biking and using buses. | <p>Safety Climate Change Alternative transport modes</p> | |
| 141 | Elaine Skyes | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States it is very dangerous to cycle or walk from Eastbourne to Days Bay. Notes witnessing numerous near misses and accidents involving cars/buses or people cycling/walking. | <p>Safety</p> | |
| 142 | Edward Mills | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal but wanted to contribute additional comments. Pleased to see the alterations/positioning of the path at Point Howard retains carparks for summer/winter visitors. Also pleased with the bus stop positioning at this location along with the large out crops of rock. Believes proposed curb of 200mm is ugly, does not offer protection, and that vehicles will be launched onto the beach upon hitting it. Suggested use of bollards would be a better system. Believes concrete waste from the existing foreshore should be removed or buried out of sight. | <p>Safety Amenity Bus shelters Parking</p> | |
| 143 | East Harbour Kindergarten | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> East Harbour Kindergarten supports the proposal as it will improve safety for children, parents and teachers. Encourages development of healthy habits and fitness but believes the current pathway is too dangerous for children and parents to use. Believes the lack of a usable pathway reduces community resilience to emergencies. Notes that tidal surges can close the only road accessing Eastbourne. | <p>Safety Health Resilience Alternative transport modes</p> | |
| 144 | Diane Cheyene (on behalf of Days Bay Residents Association) | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety - notes safety as the primary concern. Believes children should be able to ride safely to school instead of being driven which will reduce the number of cars on the road. Believes cyclists, wheelchair users, runners, walkers and those with prams need a vital link with the Bays, Petone, the Hutt and Remutaka Cycle Trail. Notes Days Bay is visited by many and that this is one of the reasons there has been many avoidable accidents and near misses. Notes introduction of double decker buses as an additional source of danger for cyclists. Emphasises that the area north of Windy Point is particularly dangerous. Strong agreement from residents that the shared pathway proceed | <p>Safety Connectivity Tourism Alternative transport modes</p> | |
| 145 | Diana Gibbons | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is a frequent cyclist on the road between Lowry Bay, Eastbourne and Petone. Notes that cyclists compete for space with vehicles travelling in the same direction. Notes cars pass cyclists with very little space. Notes being subject to road rage from motorists when using the road lane to cycle. Supports the proposal as believes the shared path is a safe hassle free way to enjoy Wellington Harbour. | <p>Safety Amenity</p> | |
| 146 | David Sykes | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to use e-bike to ride to Petone using the new shared path. Hopes the shared path will reduce the volume of vehicular traffic. Feels the path will be of great benefit to the residents and visitors. Hopes that it isn't possible for the shared path to be used by cars for parking. | <p>Safety Congestion Parking Alternative transport modes</p> | |
| 147 | Dave Devos | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No detail given on nature of or reasons for their submission. | | |
| 148 | Alison Gandy (for Point Howard Association) | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians and result in less cars being used for short trips. Believes it will enable less confident cyclists to cycle around the bays. Notes renourishment of the Point Howard Beach is a necessity to retain Point Howard Association support and that this beach is a community asset. Car parking must also be retained near Point Howard Beach so motorists are not tempted to park on the shared path during busy days. | <p>Safety Amenity Beach renourishment Alternative transport modes Climate Change</p> | |
| 149 | Clare Garrett | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes current situation means walking from York Bay to Eastbourne is unsafe. Believes the shared path will enable them to take their grandchildren for walks. Notes that bus and car traffic is too close to pedestrians and cyclists. Believes the bays would be used more for swimming as people could walk between them. Believes people would walk more and leave their cars at home. Notes that currently drives to Eastbourne daily to go for a safe walk. | <p>Safety Amenity Alternative transport modes Climate Change</p> | |
| 150 | Alister Harrison | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly walks and cycles along the waterfront and notes current facilities sub-standard. Notes that there is not enough space between pedestrians and cyclists. Believes that if we want to encourage people to get out of their cars space and infrastructure needs to be provided. Restoration of Point Howard Beach after the path is built was emphasised as important. | <p>Safety Amenity Beach renourishment Alternative transport modes Climate Change</p> | |
| 151 | Christine Reynolds and Ken Redmond | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted elderly people, children, people with hearing issues, people with prams and wheelchairs as being at risk from collisions with cyclists. Believes cyclists display a lack of concern for the safety of pedestrians. Wonders what can be done to separate cyclists and pedestrians for improved safety. Believes Ebikes and E-scooters should be banned from using path if constructed. | <p>Safety Amenity</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---------|------------|---------|---|---|---------------------|
| 152 | Charlotte Hargreaves | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes that the current path is not wide enough for cyclists. Worries about kids cycling to school. Notes that when cyclists decide to use the road that they are in danger from cars who want to overtake. Notes current pathway is disconnected and poorly constructed. Concerned about interaction with buses and speed of traffic. Believes the shared path would be an asset to the bays and that it would be greatly used by visitors and locals. | Safety Amenity Tourism Connectivity | |
| 153 | Anne Duncan | Support | No | Grant | No detail given on nature of or reasons for their submission. | | |
| 154 | Anne and Graham Seabrook | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States no reason to delay construction of the path as it is consistent with Govt. policies Believes environmental effects are minimal compared to not doing anything Supports the proposal as it will improve safety, have resilience benefits and encourage active exercise. Notes that safety issues associated with the road and narrow path detract pedestrians from walking on it. Worries about buses and bus drivers, especially double decker buses, having to navigate the road and weave through cars, trucks and bikes. Believes that not constructing the shared path would contradict the climate crisis declared by many NZ councils and would be in conflict with Govt policies. Believes the shared path would improve resilience to extreme weather events. Noted that the community is reliant on access to external services during emergencies. Notes a shared path with the appropriate engineering features would increase the resilience of the bays to climate change. Notes that the shared path as part of the Great Harbour Way will be an amazing tourist and recreational facility. | Safety Resilience Climate Change Tourism Amenity Policy Alternative transport modes Seawall design | |
| 155 | Andrew Cleland | Support | No | Grant | No detail given on nature of or reasons for their submission. | | |
| 156 | Terry Webb | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully supports the proposal for a shared path around the bays. Notes that residents are concerned about local impacts on the foreshore, especially beaches. Believes that benefits outweigh negative impacts. Notes car usage will reduce and that this is currently too high to be sustainable. | Safety Beach loss Climate Change | |
| 157 | NZTA | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it aligns with the four strategic priorities of the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport, safety, access, environment and value for money. Supports the assessment undertaken against the four strategic priorities in the AEE. Notes that NZTA has not undertaken a wider analysis of the project's environmental impacts. Once consenting is complete the Windy Point section (Days Bay to Eastbourne) has been identified as likely to receive funding from the National Land Transport Fund. At request of the HCC, funding from the urban cycleways fund was reallocated to the Beltway and the Waiuimomata Hill Shared Path walking and cycling projects (notes this differs to information provided about funding in the AEE). | Funding Policy Safety Connectivity Amenity | |
| 158 | Sally Bain | Support | Not stated | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal but expressed specific concerns in relation to wildlife and safety. Concerned possible mitigation measures such as building habitat or better animal control have been excluded unnecessarily from the scope of the project. Concerned proposed construction of habitat on the rock rip rap will cause further destruction of established nesting habitats. Fears the shared path will only improve resilience for a finite period. Believes cars will soon be swept off the road if sufficient action is not taken. Notes health risk for council staff who have to clear debris. Believes there has been inadequate planning for car parking along the path and wants to see commitment to no parking and dogs on leads bylaws. Believes that despite public disapproval railing may be needed on the path for safety and the public needs more transparency about its design. Supports the proposal but emphasises a need for better mitigation for penguins. <p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes the best solution would be to install rock rip rap islands where the sea wall experiences the most impact during adverse weather. Believes rock islands would suppress waves and gravels which currently blocks drains and pipes and will slow down loss of sand reducing need for beach nourishment. Notes such islands have been incorporated into the shared path between Ngauranga and Petone. Believes implementation of this solution will create habitat. Suggested implementation of a trial rip rap rock island of 30m at Sorrento Bay. | Penguins Coastal avifauna Resilience Safety Climate Change Amenity Parking Rip rap islands Safety barrier | Conditional support |
| 159 | Te Aranui O Pōneke, The Great Harbour Way Trust | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed full support for the proposal for reasons listed as follows: Believes continuity of an essential link between the bays, Lower Hutt and Wellington will address a substantial amenity absence. Supports and commends HCC in its proposal to construct 4.4km of shared path between Point Howard and the northern end of Days Bay, and between the southern end of Days Bay and Eastbourne. Cites merit in developing the pathway in a way that is consistent with design elements of the Great Harbour Way including the linear park concept and branded signage. Notes significant health benefits of walking and cycling. Wants transparency with funding and the investment components of the path. Notes amenity value in conjunction with resilience outcomes such as protecting the road, shoreline, and wildlife against impacts of climate change. Believes sea wall infrastructure should be adaptable for sea incursions to be moderated/rebuffed in the future. <p>RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes there should be separation between cyclists and pedestrians. Suggests that in absence of this that a path width of 5m would be suitable though spatial constraints are noted. Urges consideration of slower, more vulnerable groups including the elderly, disabled and children. Suggests design and signage to encourage those on bikes and scooters who want to travel faster to use the road instead. Suggests implementation of different amenities including drinking fountains, rest areas and wayfinding/distance signage where space allows. Visual travel counters to track walking and cycling uptake. Suggests HCC should find a way to create a separated shared path on the Waione St Overbridge to aid connectivity between the bays and the rest of the network. Refers to needing to be consistent with a Landscape Architect report undertaken by Boffa Miskell regarding the design standards and amenities of the shared path. Includes a description of all desired amenities (refer full submission for details). | Amenity Resilience Connectivity Safety Health Ecological Climate Change Beach Access Path width Seawall design Funding Signage | |
| 160 | Fiona Christeller | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal but believes the design can be more responsive to local areas with specific reference to York Bay. Emphasises the importance of Atkinson Tree which provides shade for beach users. Believes the tree has symbolic value. Suggests the shared pathway should narrow at the tree and along the main part of the beach at York Bay. Notes steps to beaches have been reduced and that there aren't any proposed for York Bay. Current steps allow for beach access and safe shelter for children waiting for care givers after getting off buses. Suggests steps be re-included and that a new ramp should be built for boats (2mx2m) Cannot understand why the path does not continue to the northern end of Days Bay. | Amenity Beach Access Safety Atkinson Tree Boat ramp Path width | |
| 161 | Department of Conservation | Oppose | Yes | Decline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the proposal as it does not take a precautionary approach in line with NZCPS 2010. Believes the proposal does not adequately address potential adverse effects on coastal vegetation, avifauna foraging habitat and penguin habitat. <p>COASTAL VEGETATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that at the southern end of Lowry Bay is the only known area of sea grass in the Wellington Harbour and that it is a threatened species (Schedule F5 in PRNP). Believes potential effects on seagrass include sedimentation, physical disturbance and smothering from movement of deposited material and that any effects on sea grass need to be in accordance with Policy 11 of the NZCPS and Policy P31, P32, P40 and P41 of the PNRP. Believes measures to avoid effects on seagrass need to be attached as conditions of consent rather than Management Plans. <p>LOSS OF AVIFAUNA FORAGING AREAS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avifauna at the site include two nationally threatened species (Reef Heron and Caspian Tern), one regionally threatened species (Variable Oyster Catcher). Nine at risk species also inhabit the site, these are the Northern Giant Petrel, Fluttering Shearwater, Black Shag, Little Black Shag, Red-billed Gull and the White-fronted Tern. Notes the section of coast at the northern end of Days Bay to Point Howard is listed in Schedule F2c of the PNRP as Significant Habitats for Indigenous Birds in the CMA. Policy P40 of the PNRP requires these be protected/restored. Policy 11 of the NZCPS directs adverse effects on these habitats be avoided. Believes Policies 32 and 40 and Schedule 6 of the PNRP are contravened and that the proposal is contrary to relevant policies of the PNRP and NZCPS. Notes 5000m2 of shorebird foraging habitat will be lost and further adverse effects on avifauna will arise from dogs and pedestrians during operation of the path. Believes the proposed breeding area of 500m2 at the seawall breakwater inadequately mitigates adverse effects because it is already a breeding area and will result in a net loss of 4500m2. Further breeding areas on the Seaview Marina will compound demands on existing habitat. <p>LITTLE BLUE PENGUINS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes 12-14% of the population of little blue penguins in Wellington Harbour live within the application area and there are more than 100 little blue penguins impacted by proposed works. Wants alternative nesting sites made available to offset disturbance caused by construction. Notes proposed alternate breeding areas of 500m2 and 400m2 at Seaview Breakwater and Whiorau Reserve and that proposed breeding areas will not adequately address adverse effects as they are already used as breeding areas. Feels this will place increased pressure on the reserve. Believes mitigation measures in the Penguin Management Strategy need to be included in the conditions of consent. Believes additional mitigation measures need to be taken to address the threat of pedestrians and dogs beyond provision of signage such as building barriers. Also believes the applicant needs to undertake additional measures to reduce likelihood of penguins being struck by vehicles. Suggests installing penguin proof gates and investigating step height. Believes adverse effects on penguin habitats need to be avoided as per Policy 11 of the NZCPS and Policies P31, P40 and P41 (and Schedule G) of the PNRP and as it stands the application does not adequately mitigate or offset potential or actual adverse effects. <p>FURTHER STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes sections 6(a) and (c) of the rma are contravened along with Objective 5.1.3, Policy 6.2.2, Objective 7.1.2 and Policy 7.2.1 of the RPS. Wants proposal declined unless suitable conditions and mitigation measures are imposed. | Penguins Coastal avifauna Policy Seagrass | |
| 162 | Roger Brown | Oppose | No | Decline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to relocation of north-bound bus stop and loss of Pohutakawa in York Bay. Objects to excessive width of the shared pathway and believes the existing width of the pathway should be continued. | Atkinson Tree Path width Bus shelter | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---------|-----|------------|--|--|---------------------|
| 163 | Ruth Gilbert | Neutral | No | Not stated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed conditional support for the proposal. If conditions are not adhered to then it was stated that the submitter is opposed. Conditions are listed as follows: <p>REDUCED PATH WIDTH:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes the width of the shared path should be reduced to 2-2.5m for the entire length for consistency and to minimise beach loss. Believes 2-2.5m width is sufficient for pedestrians and the current number of cyclists. Believes there is no reason why cyclists and pedestrians have to be separated and cannot use a shared area whilst giving way to one-another. Believes there is no reason the path should vary from 3.5m to 2.5m wide. Believes mitigation through "beach nourishment" will not be effective and that beaches will reduce over time and there is no commitment to ongoing beach nourishment. <p>EXCLUSION OF RAILING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes railing should not be used and that proposed railing over-regulates a natural and normal risk to daily life. Notes railing is a visual pollutant and creates a barrier to the views of the sea and natural environment. Believes debris may get stuck in railing after a storm. <p>ADHERANCE TO RECOMMENDATIONS IN ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes recommendations in environmental reports produced by consultants need to be adhered to. Has not seen anywhere in the application that states they will be adhered to. Believes recommendations of scientific experts on fish, bird and other environmental mitigations could be ignored. <p>ADDITIONAL CONCERNS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future Sea Level Rise and extreme weather events will contribute to loss of beaches. Notes amenity value associated with living near the beach and acknowledges its value to the wider region. Concerned about the beach being diminished as a result of the shared path. Concerned about disruption of habitat for sea life and birds. Explicitly mentions Little Blue Penguin habitat and does not believe proposed nesting sites at seaview marina are realistic. Believes the path will only reduce congestion if strategies and policies are in place to incentivise people not to use their cars. Believes less cars will make the road safe for cyclists and allow for a reduced path width exclusively for pedestrians. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity Penguins Coastal avifauna Beach Access Path width Beach nourishment Safety barrier Loss of beach | Conditional support |
| 164 | Graeme Lyon | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal for reasons set out in the summary. Believes that despite some damage, effects will be minor. Suggests beach enhancement if possible. If Lowry Bay Beach is widened, is prepared to assist with increasing the current single dune plant to encourage and maintain beach dunes. Believes the road should be raised well above high tide level at the southern end of Lowry Bay. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resilience Beach nourishment | |
| 165 | Mark Drager | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Expresses concern for the safety of vulnerable users, including children travelling to/from school. Believes the narrow width of the path in conjunction with high speed limit of 70km/hr increases risk of fatalities. Believes safer conditions would encourage more residents to take up cycling and walking as physical exercise. Notes this would provide for much needed resilience to protect road infrastructure already impacted by climate change. Notes that the sea splashes onto the road in both directions. Believes that this, in conjunction with debris and sand deposited on the road creates safety issues for road users. Stated support for a well designed seawall to protect the road, its users, and surrounding properties and to provide safe access during weather and emergency events. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Resilience Climate Change Health Seawall design Alternative transport modes | |
| 166 | William Baisden | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Emphasised the need to maximise the width of the path to allow for anticipated growth in the uptake of e-bikes and e-scooters. Believes current and future use benefits outweigh concerns held by locals. Believes ephemeral beaches in York Bay are under used, and should receive appropriate mitigation where possible but not to the detriment of safety and regional goals for safe walking/cycling. Believes a barrier to prevent falls from height is not needed. Thinks this is aesthetically undesirable. Notes this decision should be monitored to determine whether a barrier is necessary. Believes total width should be increased to 2.85m in locations where this is recommended. Believes assessments and mitigations are ad hoc and piecemeal. Notes rate payer funding was prioritised for this. Believes there should be an integrated coastal management plan administered by HCC, GWRC, DOC and local community organisations. Commends HCC for designing to consider Sea Level Rise. Believes curved wall shape makes a considerable difference in York Bay in preventing sea incursion during high tide. Wants decision makers to consider high tide conditions rather than normal conditions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Climate Change Resilience Amenity Path width Alternative transport modes Safety barrier Monitoring | |
| 167 | Terence Pinfold | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists. Believes safety conditions on the shared path will encourage more people to take up cycling. Believes road should be pushed towards the land to reduce beach loss. Notes that this has occurred in York Bay at present. Wants path to reduce to 2.5m wide on the south side of York Bay as there is only a small amount of beach at present and believes the shared path will further reduce the width. Does not want railing constructed. Believes this is unnecessary, costly and unsightly. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Beach Access Amenity Path width Safety barrier Alternative transport modes | |
| 168 | Richmond Esmond Atkinson | Oppose | No | Decline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the proposal for reasons listed below: Does not believe the path is wide enough for the use of new-generation e-bikes and e-scooters which travel quickly and pose safety risks. Believes if faster users stay off the path and choose to use the road that financial and ecological costs are not justified as the path will be under utilised. Notes safety hazard of bikes transitioning between the shared path and the road. Believes use of beaches will be further restricted and in some instances extinguished. Believes lowering the speed limit should occur. Notes that this will decrease the speed difference between modes, reduce fuel consumption and encourage drivers to use alternate transport modes. Believes the wider path exposes the sea wall to higher-energy wave impacts which could result in more airborne spray. Notes deflected waves make swimming and boating less enjoyable. Believes that HCC will almost certainly have to raise the road level via infill behind a seawall add on. Believes the wider path will require more infill and that this will allow for additional carriageway width on the landward side of the road. Does not want York Bay beach to diminish for recreational reasons. Concerned about changes to the York Bay bus stop detracting people from using it through increased exposure to adverse weather. Opposes removal of tree in York Bay. Believes the proposed ramp in York Bay is too narrow for sailing boats. Mentions current ramp is of sufficient width for this. Believes proposed beach enhancement will only have temporary benefits. Believes merit in offshore rip rap islands to reduce extent of beach loss, biodiversity losses and to aid wave attenuation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity Safety Atkinson Tree Speed limit Loss of beach Boat ramp Rip rap islands Beach nourishment | |
| 169 | Robert Ashe | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists, pedestrians and motorists. Noted anxiety associated with the safety issue was common for all road users. Does not believe there is safe passage for vulnerable road users unless they use buses or drive. Believes the current road shoulder does not provide for those who cannot freely drive cars around the bays, including children and elderly. As part of oral submissions wishes to show video of child riding along current path. Notes only route from Eastbourne to Wellington is under threat from rising sea levels and extreme weather events. Believes the seawall will help mitigate against the worst impacts of climate change. Believes the proposed shared pathway will encourage sustainable travel behaviour and reduce emissions. The shared path will connect with and complete The Great Harbour Way and the Remutaka Cycle Trail. It's believed this will increase the amount of people who use these routes and have regional economic benefits. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Connectivity Climate Change Seawall design Alternative transport modes | |
| 170 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | Oppose | Yes | Decline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the proposal due to adverse effects listed below: Particularly concerned about adverse effects to seagrass and the little penguin. Notes these must be avoided under Policies 11 and 13 of the NZCPS. Believes conditions for mitigation and remediation are uncertain and inadequate to protect indigenous biodiversity values of the coastal environment. Believes mitigation measures outlined in the AEE are not apparent in the conditions of consent. In particular, the condition for the CEMP to avoid as far as practicable is uncertain with respect to Policies 11 and 13 of the NZCPS. Noted a draft CEMP with sufficient details to make a decision on the adequacy of avoid/remedy/mitigate measures has not been provided. Seeks that the application is declined unless design and conditions can sufficiently address adverse effects set out in the NZCPS and provide appropriate mitigation and remediation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intertidal ecology Penguins Coastal avifauna Policy | |
| 171 | Lawrence Ludbrook | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve pedestrian safety and aid connectivity. Notes that the road is narrow and that this is hazardous to pedestrians and inconvenient for vehicles. Believes a shared path will make it easier to access Eastbourne. Notes wider benefits for the residents of Wellington Region who will be attracted to the area. Believes Wellington needs more attractions for visitors and residents. Believes the shared path, in conjunction with the path to Butterfly Creek, will enhance the area's attraction. Believes the shared path will facilitate uptake of environmentally friendly transport modes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Connectivity Tourism Amenity Climate Change | |
| 172 | Robyn Flynn | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Noted that it will encourage more people to walk and cycle. Noted that it will help protect the road from the sea and prevent closures in adverse weather conditions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Resilience Alternative transport modes | |
| 173 | Carol Lough | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal overall but raised a series of points relating to aspects of the proposal to which the submitter is opposed. Believes the 2.5m path will encroach excessively on the York Bay Beach. Believes beach nourishment work will not be effective. It's believed coastal currents will erode new gravel. It was also noted that gravel is not of the same texture as existing sand, and that this detracts from the amenity value of the York Bay Beach. Opposed to removal of the Pohutakawa Tree in York Bay because it has a practical purpose (shading) and amenity value (attractiveness). Opposes size reductions in the York Bay boat ramp. Notes this is an important community asset and services the elderly/disabled. Suggests a path width of 1.5m on the landward side of the Pohutakawa alongside York Bay Beach (south of the existing bus stop) to avoid adverse effects. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity Beach Access Atkinson Tree Path width Beach nourishment Loss of beach | |
| 174 | Morgan Sissons | Oppose | No | Decline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favour of a shared path but opposes the proposal in its current form for the following reasons: Believes feedback to council representatives from York Bay residents in 2018 has not been included in the latest proposal. Believes the Atkinson Pohutakawa Tree should be retained for its amenity value (attractiveness), and functional value (shading). Believes there should be a 2.5m - 3m path instead of a 3.5m one. Notes that this is important for retaining beaches for recreational use. Believes the perceived need to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians has led to a proposed path width where beach size is compromised. Believes retention of a useable sized beach at York Bay will have health and wellbeing benefits. Notes the wider path will allow for cyclists to travel fast, putting pedestrians at risk. Notes there should be more steps accessing the York Bay Beach and the location of proposed access by the bus stop is not ideal. Notes recent reports from Auckland that shared paths result in increased speed for cyclists and more risk to pedestrians. Wants HCC to learn from experience. Noted the new replacement bus shelter exposes its users to adverse weather more than the existing one and that the new stop should encroach on the shared path rather than the beach. Believes the width of the proposed boat ramp at York Bay is insufficient, noting that the existing size of the boat ramp (1.7m) is barely sufficient. However, supports proposed parallel orientation of the ramp. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity Beach Access Health Safety Atkinson Tree Path width Bus shelter Boat ramp Loss of beach | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---------|-----|------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 175 | Margaret Sissons | Oppose | Yes | Decline | <p>SAME AS #174</p> <p>In favour of a shared path but opposes the proposal in its current form for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes feedback to council representatives from York Bay residents in 2018 has not been included in the latest proposal. Believes the Atkinson Pohutakawa Tree should be retained for its amenity value (attractiveness), and functional value (shading). Believes there should be a 2.5m - 3m path instead of a 3.5m one. Notes that this is important for retaining beaches for recreational use. Believes the perceived need to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians has led to a proposed path width where beach size is compromised. Believes retention of a useable sized beach at York Bay will have health and wellbeing benefits. Notes the wider path will allow for cyclists to travel fast, putting pedestrians at risk. Notes there should be more steps accessing the York Bay Beach and the location of proposed access by the bus stop is not ideal. Notes recent reports from Auckland that shared paths result in increased speed for cyclists and more risk to pedestrians. Wants HCC to learn from experience. Notes the new replacement bus shelter exposes its users to adverse weather more than the existing one and that the new stop should encroach on the shared path rather than the beach. Believes the width of the proposed boat ramp at York Bay is insufficient, noting that the existing size of the boat ramp (1.7m) is barely sufficient. However, supports proposed parallel orientation of the ramp. | <p>Amenity</p> <p>Beach Access</p> <p>Health</p> <p>Atkinson Tree</p> <p>Path width</p> <p>Bus shelter</p> <p>Boat ramp</p> <p>Safety</p> | |
| 176 | Jonathan Marwick | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal for reasons associated with safety of pedestrians and cyclists and emission reductions. Notes carbon dioxide emissions will reduce from increased uptake of walking and cycling. Notes emission reductions will benefit the environment and the economy in the long run. Believes adverse effects of the shared path on avifauna should be mitigated as much as possible. | <p>Safety</p> <p>Climate Change</p> <p>Coastal avifauna</p> <p>Penguins</p> | |
| 177 | Judith Lawrence | Neutral | No | Not stated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neutral to the proposal for reasons associated with beach size, monitoring period and speed limits. Believes the shared path will diminish the size of Point Howard Beach. Expressed concern for wellbeing of resident wildlife including oyster catchers and penguins. Believes proposed mitigating actions are solely to offset impacts of the shared path and that they should further enhance the environment instead. Believes the proposal does not comply with NZCPS Policy 10, Policy 11 and RMA Section 5(1), Section 2(d) and Section 6(a). Believes monitoring should last longer than two years. Notes safety issues of having a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians and that these transport modes are not compatible. Seeks a reduction in the speed limit to 30kph at Point Howard. Seeks encroachment on the road at Point Howard to accommodate the shared pathway instead of the beach. Suggested a longer monitoring period whereby a review is undertaken after two years to determine whether continuous monitoring is needed. Believes this will aid the development of additional pathways and adaptive infrastructure. | <p>Penguins</p> <p>Coastal avifauna</p> <p>Safety</p> <p>Amenity</p> <p>Speed limit</p> <p>Policy</p> <p>Monitoring</p> <p>Intertidal ecology</p> <p>Loss of beach</p> | |
| 178 | Teresa May Walton | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed full support for the proposal as it will improve safety for road users. Believes the road poses unacceptable health and safety risks for users and is dangerous. Personally involved in a cyclist accident in 2012. Noted having to stop suddenly on bike which resulted in serious injury. Believes upgrading the existing pathway should be prioritised by the council. | <p>Safety</p> <p>Health</p> | |
| 179 | Geoffery Rashbrooke | Oppose | Yes | Decline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the proposal due to perceived lack of environmental sensitivity and internal contradictions that need resolution. Notes buses carry large amounts of commuters and have attracted people to the area for decades. Believes the original proposed pedestrian oriented walkway did not impinge on the existing bus system. Believes that use of this walkway by cyclists and mobility vehicles is feasible provided pedestrian priority was understood by users. Notes that having cyclists passing close to the bus stops at 20+kph will negatively effect people waiting for buses. Does not believe the cycle lane should extend in front of bus stops. Notes that cyclists won't go around buses/stops on the road due to high speed limit. Believes speed restrictions for cyclists should be imposed in front of bus stops. Suggests judder bars before each stop to encourage lower speeds. Does not support the design and feels the path has been over-engineered by a road engineer to account for commuter cyclists which was not the original intent of the proposal Believes relocating Mahina and York Bay bus stops will discourage people from using the bus, and encourage increased vehicle use contrary to Policy 57 of the RPS. Notes that existing bus stops are located near logical crossing points. Believes the speed limit on the road should be reduced to 50kph before the shared path gains consent. Believes the proposal will not reduce debris and sea incursion on the road. Believes beach replenishment will need to be continuous as increased scouring will occur (uses recent York Bay seawall as an example). Believes gravel material for beach replenishment will be transported to the top of the sand in Mahina Bay and reduce enjoyment of recreational users. Reduced steps to the ocean have led to the conclusion that beach access will decrease. It's believed a narrow path would allow for heightened beach access. Believes enhanced sea walls are needed but thinks proposed ones will not prevent road closure during adverse weather and high tide. Believes selection of concrete as the primary material is excessive and that the subsequent cost of construction is unreasonable. Does not believe the proposed design is attractive and would prefer a wooden walkway. | <p>Connectivity</p> <p>Resilience</p> <p>Amenity</p> <p>Beach Access</p> <p>Bus shelters</p> <p>Speed limit</p> <p>Policy</p> <p>Seawall design</p> <p>Beach renourishment</p> <p>Safety</p> | |
| 180 | Hugh Walcott | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety for cyclists. Believes larger vehicles and increased traffic have exacerbated safety issues. Notes that son uses the road to bike, fears for his safety. Endorses the shared path's 3.5m width for safe passage of cyclists and pedestrians. Believes the project needs to be prioritised. | <p>Safety</p> <p>Path width</p> | |
| 181 | Kate Wilson | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety. Notes the path through Lowry Bay is particularly dangerous for cyclists. Believes connectivity with the regional cycle network will have benefits for tourism and transport. Noted there would be many economic benefits. Emphasises that the shared path has to be 'done well' for these benefits to be realised. | <p>Safety</p> <p>Connectivity</p> <p>Tourism</p> <p>Economic benefit</p> | Late submission |
| 182 | Warren Owen | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal for reasons associated with health, safety and Sea Level Rise. Notes the growing problem of obesity and the necessity of fostering running, walking and cycling. Believes a healthy ecosystem could emerge in and around the sea wall if well planned. Notes Sea Level Rise as a threat and cites the proposed sea wall as a solution. | <p>Safety</p> <p>Health</p> <p>Intertidal ecology</p> <p>Resilience</p> <p>Alternative transport modes</p> | Late submission |
| 183 | Virginia Saunderson | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will have safety, health and environmental benefits. Believes it will encourage people not to drive and increase their physical activity. Believes pedestrians and cyclists are vulnerable to collisions with vehicle traffic. Notes that the existing path is too narrow and requires people to cross the road where there is no path. Believes children will gain more independence from being able to move freely and safely around the bays. | <p>Safety</p> <p>Health</p> <p>Alternative transport modes</p> <p>Connectivity</p> | Late submission |
| 184 | Andrea Jensen | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve safety and enable cycling as a viable mode of transport. Does not feel safe around Windy Point. Supports the proposal as it will enable healthier lifestyles. Narrow footpath means cyclists have to dodge pedestrians, dogs, driveways and bins. | <p>Safety</p> <p>Health</p> <p>Alternative transport modes</p> | Late submission |
| 185 | Doctors for Active Safe Transport | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal for reasons associated with health and safety. Believes high levels of obesity are more pronounced in areas where active transport isn't popular. Notes that the shared path will address the need for more people to rely on active transport modes. Believes people must be encouraged to use active transport modes beyond the construction of supporting infrastructure. Cultural change was emphasised. Believes fear of cycling arises from causes other than the actual risk of injury. | <p>Health</p> <p>Safety</p> <p>Alternative transport modes</p> | Late submission |
| 186 | Hutt Cycle Network | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal for reasons associated with connectivity, safety, amenity and wellbeing. Believes that this will cater for population growth without congestion. Believes increased physical activity will be encouraged and that this will have health benefits. Believes the quality of recreational activity will increase. Notes the health issue of obesity. Believes HCC needs to get people exercising as such. A complete network is perceived to be needed, it's understood this will occur through the proposed shared path regarding its connectivity with the Great Harbour Way. Believes people will not take up cycling and walking more without the provision of appropriate infrastructure. Suggests a longer consent period as it is believed above mentioned benefits cannot be realised without sufficient planning. | <p>Safety</p> <p>Health</p> <p>Amenity</p> <p>Connectivity</p> <p>Consent duration</p> <p>Alternative transport modes</p> | Late submission |
| 187 | Jonathan England | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will create a continuous cycle and pedestrian path around the harbour. Believes this will make cycling between the Eastern Bays and Wellington more appealing. | <p>Connectivity</p> | Late submission |
| 188 | Phyllis Heather Mossman | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal as it will improve the safety issue for cyclists and pedestrians. Notes that they enjoy cycling but find the road too dangerous. Believes the shared path would encourage more people to exercise, given the safer environment. Hopes it will result in less sea inundation when adverse weather and high tide coincide. Believes it will be good for tourism. | <p>Safety</p> <p>Health</p> <p>Tourism</p> <p>Economic benefit</p> <p>Climate Change</p> <p>Alternative transport modes</p> | Late submission |
| 189 | Ann Elizabeth Bell | Oppose | No | Decline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlighted concerns about the lack of time provided to make informed comments on application. Expressed general concern about emissions associated with concrete and the use of concrete. Noted that Eastbourne residents will be unlikely to change behaviour unless vehicles are banned and the current roadway is made into a cycleway/pedestrian track. | <p>Climate Change</p> <p>Discharges</p> | |
| 190 | Bruhlmann Gertrud (Trudi) | Oppose | No | Decline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally supportive of the need to have a shared path from Eastbourne to Pt Howard. However, believes shared path design is excessive. Notes that existing path at York Bay is too wide and that money on constructing the path to that standard in that location could have been much better spent elsewhere. Opposes the duration of works on the basis of concerns about ongoing disturbance and discharges of contaminants to foreshore during maintenance. Notes that shared path will be flooded more frequently and might not be usable in 35 years. | <p>Safety</p> <p>Funding</p> <p>Intertidal ecology</p> <p>Seawall design</p> <p>Consent duration</p> <p>Path width</p> <p>Discharges</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|---------|-----|-------|--|--|--|
| 191 | Ian and Paddy Orsborn | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that pedestrian access has always been problematic and increased traffic makes walking dangerous. Have been following development of the path for years and want improvements to be completed ASAP. Believe seawall would be hugely beneficial for families and visitors as it would reduce vehicle access to the beach which has been a problem for some time. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Beach access Alternative transport modes | |
| 192 | Petone Community Board | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that there is a major need for a safe shared walking and cycling path because the current path is too constrained and dangerous. Path would be part of Great Harbour Way and likely to increase tourism to Petone. Path will encourage cycling and reduce number of vehicles on the roads. Particularly supportive of the use of curved seawalls to reduce wave overtopping. Want to see protection of sensitive coastal environment including protection of little blue penguins. See the path as contributing to the resilience of the Eastbourne Community and buying time to work on long term management of climate change effects. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Tourism Economic benefit Resilience Penguins Health Climate Change Seawall design | |
| 193 | Timothy Grubb | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favour of the shared path. Notes feels trapped in York Bay because walking around the bay feels dangerous. Notes drivers are aggressive and there is little space to walk. Notes that the mitigation strategies are sufficient. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Alternative transport modes | |
| 194 | Avril Boswell | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes existing footpath is extremely narrow. Notes aggressive nature of drivers and buses towards cyclists using the existing path. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety | |
| 195 | Rob Badcock | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes the proposed shared path as critical infrastructure to provide resilience and safety for walkers and cyclists. Believes the seawall being built will protect the road from strong tides and waves. Notes the path will provide economic benefit and linkages to the Great Harbour Way and will encourage tourism. Notes that lack of safe infrastructure has hindered the only way of reducing congestion through Petone foreshore. Believes the shared path will encourage a modal shift and help reduce congestion. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Connectivity Economic benefit Alternative transport modes Resilience Climate Change Tourism | |
| 196 | Peter Healy | Support | Yes | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly in favour of the path. Would like no harm to come to the beach or Pohutakawa at York Bay. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of beach Atkinson Tree | |
| 197 | David Bamford | Support | No | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal in full. Notes huge advantages to the Wellington Region with regard to safety, health, recreation, tourism (linking eastern bays to Remutaka Cycleway). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Health Economic benefit Tourism Connectivity | |
| 198 | Joanne and Jack Doherty | Support | | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support shared pathway Our main request is that the area on the corner between Sunshine Bay and Mahina Bay is retained because many people access this little corner beach for leisure, picnics, the rocky shore, diving and fishing and it is one of the few areas where vehicles that service the road can park, or turn around Request the retention of access to the beach and parking at the point between Sunshine and Mahina Bays Support a 50km/h speed limit around the bays Path must ensure safety for walkers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beach access Loss of beach Speed limit Safety | |
| 199 | Bronwen Dracup | Support | | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports a safe shared path for cyclists and walkers from Burdens Gate to Petone. Very keen on the idea of parts of the structure helping to turn the power of the waves thus reducing erosion and helping with resilience. Hopes that in the interests of safety that Days Bay will be considered at a later stage in the not too distant future. Notes current patchy provision necessitated getting off my bike frequently and unexpectedly on a trip to Petone. Fully supports path and hopes it will be completed speedily | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Resilience Alternative transport modes | |
| 200 | Harvey Calder | Support | | Grant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-used submission on the Hutt City Council Annual Plan 2016-2017. Believes action is needed to improve the cycle and pedestrian connection between Eastbourne and Days Bay Believes this will improve the safety of the community and tourists Believes that this will enhance connectivity between the bays Wants to see more people using active transport to get around the bays Notes the path needs to allow for little blue penguin nesting Requests a breakwall or reef be added to the design Notes current path is dangerous, narrow, incomplete and needs expansion to support its high levels of use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Resilience Connectivity Penguins Seawall design | |