



Submission of the Hutt Cycle Network on

Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan

April 2025

To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

Via email to district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz.

1. This is a submission from Hutt Cycle Network % Jo Clendon on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.
2. My email address for service is jo@clendon.org
3. I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
4. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to, my submission on those provisions, and the decisions I seek are shown in the below table. I also seek all further, alternative, necessary, or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission.
5. I wish to be heard in support of my submission.
6. If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Introduction

7. Hutt Cycle Network advocates for the increased use of active transport modes, including cycling, within Hutt City.
8. We support Hutt City's Integrated Transport Strategy which acknowledges the impacts of changing technology (e.g. ebikes), population growth, and climate change on our transport networks and priorities. The Integrated Transport Strategy aims to make our streets people-focused and livable as well as encouraging people to rethink how & when they travel. The Transport Chapter of the District plan must support the implementation of this strategy.
9. Our built environment has a huge impact on people's willingness to use active transport modes. [Perception of safety](#) is a key determinant of whether people choose to bike or not. Our built environment can have a huge influence on that perception of safety.

10. Driveways are a particularly risky area for pedestrians, micro-mobility users and people on bikes. Increased visibility at driveways is essential for encouraging people of all ages and abilities to ride, and parents to allow their children to bike to school.
11. End-of-trip facilities (such as secure parking, lockers and showers) and trip facilities (such as shelter, water and toilets) are important infrastructure to support cycling. Bicycle theft is a growing problem in our city, and secure bike parking is a priority for bike users.
12. Our submissions as summarised in the table below are focused on safety and the perception of safety as well as the need to provide necessary amenities for active transport users.

Decisions Requested

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
1	Transport	Whole chapter	Support with amendment	Overall we commend the council for recognising the importance of mode shift, and the impact of our built environment choices on mode shift.	As below
2		TR Chapter Introduction	Support	We applaud that high generating activities are to encourage the uptake of active and public transport modes.	Keep provision
3	Transport	TR-P1 Required Transport Facilities	Support	We agree with the provision of Cycle parking and end of trip facilities to facilitate access to activities via active transport modes.	Keep provision
4		TR-P7 Positive effects	Support	We commend that Cycle parking or end-of-trip facilities are recognised as positive effects, as are connections to or integration with public transport. We commend that High trip generating activities are located in a way which facilitates the minimisation of transport demand and increased uptake of active and public transport modes.	Keep provision

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
5		TR-S2 Provision of cycle parking and end of trip facilities	Support with amendment	<p>We commend the inclusion of these facilities in new buildings.</p> <p>We recommend that any redevelopment of existing buildings be subject to these requirements.</p>	<p>For all activities in new buildings and redevelopment of existing buildings which increases GFA by 10% or more</p> <p>Matters of discretion if the standard is not met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The availability of alternative, <u>functional</u>, accessible, safe, and secure <u>cycle</u> parking that meets the needs of the intended users. 2. <u>If minimum rates cannot be met on site, cash developer contributions to council to fund public provisioning should be considered in the order of \$500 – \$1000 per bicycle parking space.</u>

		TR-S3 Design requirements for cycle parking	Support with amendment	<p>Requirements for long-stay cycle parking should include security measures to avoid theft and ebike charging. Ebikes are heavy and some do not have removable batteries, thus some need to be charged in-situ.</p> <p>We recommend that the matters for discretion be limited to pedestrian safety considerations only, and that every effort must be made to adjust the design to satisfy the requirements safely.</p> <p>If minimum rates cannot be met on site, cash developer contributions to council to fund public provisioning should be considered in the order of \$500 – \$1000 per bicycle parking space. This would help offset councils costs of providing additional public bike parking which is in higher demand if developments do not include onsite end of trip facilities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cycle parking required by TR-S2: Provision of cycle parking and end of trip facilities must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Be sized and spaced to accommodate cycle dimensions of 1200mm height, 1800mm length, and 600mm width, b. Be securely anchored to an immovable object, c. Be able to support the bicycle frame and front wheel, and d. Allow the cycle frame to be secured. e. <u>Include signage that indicates the area is reserved for bicycle parking.</u> f. <u>Be kept clear of obstructions and rubbish.</u> g. <u>Be well lit.</u> 2. Short-stay cycle parking required by TR-S2: Provision of cycle parking and end of trip facilities must be in a location: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. That is accessible for users of short-stay cycle parking for the duration of the activity's hours of operation, b. Within 20m of the primary entrance, c. That does not impede pedestrian thoroughfares, d. Clear of motor vehicle parking or manoeuvring areas, and e. Clear of any structure, storage of goods, landscape planting, or other use. 3. Long-stay cycle parking required by TR-S2: Provision of cycle parking and end of trip facilities must be in a location that is: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Secure and separate from any short-stay cycle parking facility,
--	--	---	------------------------	--	--

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
				<p>Cycle parking signage should be provided and that cycle parking areas be kept clear of obstructions and rubbish. This ensures the areas included and developed for cycle parking remain available for their intended purpose. We observe that cycle parking can become a dumping ground for bins, trolleys, dogs etc. In order to encourage participation in active transport by women and minorities it is essential that cycle parking is well lit and secure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Accessible to long-stay users related to the activity (such as staff or residents), and c. Covered either within the building for the activity or within its own structure. d. <u>Protected via security measures such as a locked enclosure, CCTV or inclusion in security patrols.</u> e. <u>Inclusive of provision for e-bike charging in Residential situations.</u>

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought												
		Table 1: Minimum requirements for cycle parking	Support with amendment	<p>Soon we will have two of the best cycle routes in the country passing through lower Hutt - the Remutaka cycle trail and the Great Harbour way. We know that such routes attract tourists and visitors who will want to visit our businesses, stay in the area and explore beyond the trails.</p> <p>By not adequately providing for cycle parking facilities at Visitor Accommodation we reduce the level of service we, as a city, are offering our visitors. In short they will feel less welcome and is that what we want?</p> <p>Additionally, excluding the City Centre, Metropolitan and Local Centre Zones from Short Stay parking requirements puts the onus for the provision of these facilities purely upon the council. We question whether the council have both the budget and the human resources to provide adequate cycle parking facilities in these zones.</p>	<table><tr><th>Activity</th><th>Min Number of on-site cycle parking spaces Short Stay</th><th>Min Number of on-site cycle parking spaces Long Stay</th></tr><tr><td>Any activity in City Centre Zone, Metropolitan Zone or Local Centre Zone</td><td>Nil <u>1 per 750m² of Net Leasable Area.</u></td><td>In accordance with rest of table</td></tr><tr><td>Visitor accommodation</td><td colspan="2">Up to 405 units: Nil required</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Greater than 405 units: 1 per additional 10 20 units</td><td>Greater than 405 units: 1 per <u>2 units</u> 10 FTE employees</td></tr></table>	Activity	Min Number of on-site cycle parking spaces Short Stay	Min Number of on-site cycle parking spaces Long Stay	Any activity in City Centre Zone, Metropolitan Zone or Local Centre Zone	Nil <u>1 per 750m² of Net Leasable Area.</u>	In accordance with rest of table	Visitor accommodation	Up to 405 units: Nil required			Greater than 405 units: 1 per additional 10 20 units	Greater than 405 units: 1 per <u>2 units</u> 10 FTE employees
Activity	Min Number of on-site cycle parking spaces Short Stay	Min Number of on-site cycle parking spaces Long Stay															
Any activity in City Centre Zone, Metropolitan Zone or Local Centre Zone	Nil <u>1 per 750m² of Net Leasable Area.</u>	In accordance with rest of table															
Visitor accommodation	Up to 405 units: Nil required																
	Greater than 405 units: 1 per additional 10 20 units	Greater than 405 units: 1 per <u>2 units</u> 10 FTE employees															

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought						
		Table 4: Design requirements for driveways	Support with amendment	Separate cycle access will reduce conflict with vehicles and improve safety for people on bikes and pedestrians.	<table><tr><td></td><td>Vehicle Access Level 2</td><td>Vehicle Access Level 3 and Level 4</td></tr><tr><td>Cycle Lane</td><td colspan="2">Shared in vehicle lane <u>A separate 1.6m wide cycle lane should be provided for each direction, or a 2.8 m wide bidirectional path.</u></td></tr></table>		Vehicle Access Level 2	Vehicle Access Level 3 and Level 4	Cycle Lane	Shared in vehicle lane <u>A separate 1.6m wide cycle lane should be provided for each direction, or a 2.8 m wide bidirectional path.</u>	
	Vehicle Access Level 2	Vehicle Access Level 3 and Level 4									
Cycle Lane	Shared in vehicle lane <u>A separate 1.6m wide cycle lane should be provided for each direction, or a 2.8 m wide bidirectional path.</u>										

		TR-S6 Vehicle crossings - Separation distances and design	Support with amendment	<p>We strongly support that visibility splays are applied to the pedestrian or micro mobility path / driveway intersection.</p> <p>In support of this requirement we refer to Section 4.4 Figure 5 in the <u>NZTA RTS6 Guidelines for visibility at driveways</u> which states “For all driveways crossing a footpath there should be a line of clear sight between pedestrians on the footpath and vehicles using the driveway so that collisions are avoided. The area occupied by the driveway should also be well defined so that pedestrians can anticipate vehicle paths across the footpath.” and provides the Building Industry Authority DI Access routes figure as an example. RTS 06 was “intended to give guidelines which could be incorporated into district plans”.</p> <p>An increased visibility splay of 2.0m by 5.0 metres is recommended in areas with higher numbers of vehicle movements, per NZTA's <u>pedestrian network guidance</u>.</p>	<p>5. For pedestrian <u>the safety of pedestrians, people on bikes and micro mobility users</u>, vehicle crossings must have clear visibility splays from 1.0m above ground level, as shown in Figure 2: Visibility splays and safe stopping distances.</p> <p><u>5a For Vehicle Access Level 1 (based on the classification in Table 2: Driveway and vehicle crossing classification), where providing the visibility splay is not practicable, then it is not required if a 75mm high speed hump is installed 1.0m from the road boundary or if convex mirrors or other monitoring and visibility devices are installed.</u></p> <p><u>5b For Vehicle Access Level 3 and 4 (based on the classification in Table 2: Driveway and vehicle crossing classification), a visibility splay of 2.0 m by 5.0 metres is required.</u></p>
--	--	---	------------------------	--	--

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
				<p>“The Guidelines for visibility at driveways (RTS 6) recommends a five metre by two metre ‘visibility splay’ (see figure below) for areas with high pedestrian flows and more than 200 expected daily vehicle access manoeuvres”.</p> <p>Therefore we recommend that an increased visibility splay should be applied to driveways with more than 200 movements.</p> <p>We should prioritise keeping every pedestrian, cyclist and micro mobility user safe. Improved driveway visibility splays also enable drivers to give practical effect to Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004 where it is made clear that a driver “must give way to a road user on a footpath” (clause 4.4). Noting that this requirement is not restricted to High Volume situations.</p> <p>Where visibility splays cannot be applied we recommend that use of convex mirrors or camera assisted technologies be considered as an alternative.</p>	

On behalf of the Hutt Cycle Network

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jo Clendon', with a stylized, flowing script.

Jo Clendon

jo@clendon.org.nz