

Kōrero mai | Let's talk

Share your feedback results - Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing 12-month review

May 20, 2026 - Jun 8, 2026

Response No:
1

Contribution ID: 44339

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

good to not have speed bumps at Western side of the crossing.
low volume crossing so leave it as is now. no need for speed humps that causes havoc

Response No:
2

Contribution ID: 44208

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

See attached pdf.

Consolidated Feedback on The impact of the new crossing, and design changes to mitigate that impact

Deans Avenue Precinct Society

June 2026

Overview

1. This note is not a final or definitive “position statement”, but consolidates feedback from our committee members, and broader community. It is complemented by two other documents:
 - a. One summarising our feedback on the process by which decisions were made about the design applied to the southbound lanes of Deans Avenue at the mosque crossing; and
 - b. The other detailing several minor upgrades that would make it easier for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the road at adjacent crossing points on the avenue, and help mitigate the negative impacts of recent developments identified in this note.
2. To be clear, our committee fully supports the intent to provide better access to the Mosque from the park side of Deans Avenue, and hopes that that community is benefiting from it.
3. We understand that some local residents also use the crossing. But local residents did not seek to have a crossing at that location, and we do not think they use it much although some may be forced to, because the crossing design has made it harder to cross the Avenue anywhere else.
4. By way of background, we remind the Council that it voted to target this area for High Density development, even though virtually none of it meets the stated criteria in terms of distance from the centre of Riccarton, or the CBD, citing the rationale that more and more future residents would cross Deans Avenue to access the CBD, on foot, cycle etc.
5. We would also like to remind the Council that we were possibly the only neighbourhood association to express broad support for the Council’s agenda, including the intensification of our own area, and to work constructively with it on those issues.
6. In that process, though, we stressed the need for a consistent and comprehensive transport plan to deal with the fact that the railway and park combine to make the whole area south of Bartlett St probably the least accessible in the entire city. Properties in that area are largely inaccessible, by residents or emergency vehicles, or by foot, cycle, scooter etc, without either using or crossing Deans Avenue.

7. Even the planned extension to the “Northern Line” cycleway will not improve access, because it is planned to go down the other side of the railway, where it will be inaccessible to resident in our area, or indeed anywhere else, except at Riccarton Road.
8. Accordingly, we believe that all proposals affecting access across and/or along Deans Avenue (or indeed in the cycle network) should be considered in the context of a comprehensive framework that accounts for their overall impact on access to the whole block south of Riccarton Road, paying careful attention to input from the local community who deal with these issues daily.
9. With respect to the specifics, the feedback we have received indicates overwhelming support for removing the speed hump, which is seen as having negative impacts on vehicle flows, accident rates, and overall pedestrian/cycle access along the length of the Avenue, not to mention vehicle noise endured by the nearby residents. We were promised that the hump could be removed quickly, easily and cheaply, if it proved to be problematic. So, we propose that it now be removed ASAP.
10. Support for re-instating two southbound lanes, was more muted, and that support would probably weaken if the speed hump were to be removed. So, we suggest that that situation could be re-assessed after removing the hump.
11. Beyond that, we will provide a separate document, suggesting some minor changes to adjacent crossings that would help to mitigate the negative impact of recent developments, and improve pedestrian and cycling access across the Avenue, along the whole section south of Riccarton Road.

Introduction

We understand that Christchurch City Council staff (CCC henceforth) are merely looking for “feedback” at this stage of the review process, rather than a formal submission. Accordingly, this document largely summarises the feedback we have heard from local residents, along with some from our own committee members.

This document should not be interpreted as a definitive position statement from the DAPS committee. Some firm positions will be stated below, but we will not be taking firm positions on other topics until we have seen the full range of feedback, and had the opportunity to discuss the issues as a committee, and with CCC.

The issues are complex, though, and different groups are affected differently by the changes, with many individuals affected differently on different occasions, depending on the transport mode chosen. So, we will start by laying out the issues facing those trying to cross or use Deans Ave, which is the only entry/exit route for almost all residents south of Riccarton Road.¹

In summary, our impression is that residents have a predominantly negative view of the crossing development, and especially of the process by which that decision was made.

We recognise that this impression may be biased, because residents are more likely to share negative views with us than positive. For the record, though neither the committee nor any of its members has actively campaigned to collect or incite negative feedback. We have merely ensured that your consultation materials have been circulated to the affected residents. We understand that some have provided their own feedback directly to you, and that feedback may well include more positive views than those represented here. We hope, at least, that the Mosque community, with whom we have had no discussions, see nett positive value in the new crossing.

¹ The main exception being that residents in Bartlett Street can directly access Riccarton Road. The only other alternative is that residents in Brockworth Place can access Riccarton Road via a very narrow single file one-way-at-a-time, walk/cycle way from the north end of Brockworth to the railway line. Even if the council does proceed with plans to extend the North-South cycleway down to meet the East West cycleway crossing the southern end of Deans Avenue, that extension will be inaccessible if it proceeds as planned down the other side of the railway.

Meanwhile, potential access to the cycleway network from Mayfair and the south end of Brockworth via the railway corridor has been blocked off. So, the entire cycling network will remain largely inaccessible to residents in this high-density development area, except via Deans Avenue. And that leaves us all very much dependent on regular and emergency access across the Avenue, and along the Avenue via the heavily congested Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Road intersections at either end.

Situation summary

Deans Avenue is perhaps unusual in that the traffic situation, and hence the crossing situation, for north and south bound lanes is quite different, and varies widely across the day and week, and even by the season, depending on the extent to which the varying times of prayer at the Mosque overlap with more regular flows of local, business, commuter and school pick-up traffic. By and large, though:

- The most critical time was, and is, Friday afternoon, when the northbound lane, in particular, is very heavily congested;
- There has been a longstanding issue with “boy-racers” on Friday and Saturday evenings; but
- Much of the time, both sides of the road were (until now) actually quite easy to cross, with a little patience, even where there were no crossing points.

In order to understand the feedback, we need to distinguish between several groups who regularly use, or cross, the Avenue, including:

Vehicular traffic

- Motorists from the Mosque, parkers on Deans Avenue, and residents on the Avenue itself, and lanes off it, for whom the critical requirement is actually being able to do U turns at intersections, since that is the only way they can access their properties /vehicles when travelling from the north, or exit when travelling to the south.
- Motorists from Mayfair, Bartlett, Freyberg and Brockworth, for whom the critical requirement is being able to do right turns at intersections, since that is the only way they can access their streets when travelling from the north, or exit them when travelling to the south.
- Through traffic, for whom the critical requirement is just passing through as quickly and safely as possible.

Pedestrian traffic

- Able-bodied adult walkers from the Mosque, or resident and/or parked on Deans Avenue itself, and lanes off it, for whom the critical issue is the duration of gaps between traffic pulses released by the lights at either end of Deans Ave and, more recently and erratically, the cycleway crossing from the old saleyards area:
 - Given that pulsing, many traditionally found it easiest, and arguably safest (see discussion of safety at existing crossing points below) to either cross directly from their properties: Waiting on the footpath, and then again on the median, for traffic gaps, which were traditionally frequent and easily long enough to allow safe crossing at a relaxed pace, at most times of day and night; or

- When walking North or South, to walk along the Ave/park in that direction until a gap appeared.
- At peak times, though, the gaps effectively disappeared in the northbound traffic, lane making it easier and safer to cross at recognised crossing points, where motorists rolling forward in slow moving queues were more inclined to stop for pedestrians and/or turning traffic.
- Able-bodied adult walkers, resident and/or parked in Mayfair, Bartlett, Freyberg and Brockworth, who naturally tend to use the recognised crossing points, because that is where they must arrive at, or depart from, Deans Ave.
- Less able walkers and family groups, who tend to use the recognised crossing points because they are less able to step up onto the median strip, and/or slower to organise and cross the road, and so more reliant on motorists to recognise and accommodate their situation.
- Able-bodied adult park users, some crossing to parked cars, but others on walking or running circuits, e,g via the Brockworth walkway to the railway line, and who thus also tending to use the recognised crossing points.

Non-vehicular wheeled transportation devices

This includes cycles, scooters, skateboards, skates, wheelchairs, mobility scooters and so on. There is no reason for such devices to be travelling along Deans Avenue because the footpath is adequate on the residential side, and there is a very nice shared pathway on the park side. It should be recognised, though, that Deans Avenue must be crossed to access that pathway, or the park, or the CBD, with CCC's zoning of this area for High Density development resting heavily on the assumption that this will become increasingly important over the years to come.

- Such devices can only use the recognised crossing points (or roadways), because those are the only places where:
 - Those devices do not need to be lifted over curbs to get on/off the footpaths and median strip; and
 - There is an opening through the fencing on the park side, and guaranteed gaps between parked cars. particularly on that side.
- There are challenges, though, because those existing crossing points feature:
 - Problematic “staple” style access barriers on the park side; and
 - Woefully inadequate “refuges” on the median strip, with the lowered areas being only just sufficient for a rider to wait with a single bicycle, with one wheel protruding slightly into the traffic lanes at one or both ends.

Feedback

We recognise the likelihood that we would tend to hear more negative than positive feedback in this kind of situation. Given the above diversity, though, we would expect to hear diverse feedback, with positive feedback from some affected groups on some aspects offsetting negative feedback from other groups on other aspects. In this case, though, feedback is overwhelmingly negative, from all of the groups we have heard from.

Feedback from motorists

Unsurprisingly, feedback from all groups of motorists has been uniformly negative, with at least some out of town visitors making “that absolutely **** crazy speed bump” their first topic of conversation on arrival. It obviously slows, impedes, and limits traffic flow, thus presumably increasing journey times across the city.

It increases journey times for local drivers, too. But it also exacerbates existing local problems, in that the congestion caused by the crossing often now extends back at least to the Freyberg intersection, where many residents and Mosque users, who could formerly make right or U turns into lengthy gaps between traffic pulses, must now make those turns into a much more continuous stream of traffic that is slowing, and jostling for position, but typically not yet stationary. Meanwhile, the more turning traffic has to wait, the greater the obstacle to other traffic moving forward, even in the northbound lane.

All that is as should be expected, though, from a development which did nothing to alleviate the existing problems, and apparently had the explicit goal of “forcing mode change”, in the words of some key decision-makers. As a committee, we hold a variety of views on the ethics, wisdom, acceptability and ultimate viability of that “forced mode change agenda”, as it has been practiced by CCC staff and decision-makers to date. We do appreciate, though, that “negative feedback” from motorists will probably be seen as a positive outcome by the advocates of that philosophy.

On the other hand, we should record that we are not aware of any negative feedback with respect to the crossing configuration on the northbound lane, which does not seem to have significantly exacerbated pre-existing congestion problems in that lane. One view would be that peak time traffic must stop several times anyway, so may as well stop there as anywhere else. Doing so also creates more gaps to allow crossing at other points, further north.

We also note that, while there has been negative comment about narrowing the roadway to a single lane, the committee itself has mixed views on the desirability of that change. It clearly reduces traffic flow, and increases journey times. But some motorist may value a “calmer” traffic flow, though, along with a possibly improved parking experience (although see below).

Feedback from pedestrians, cyclists, etc.

Unsurprisingly, it has been said that the new crossing was an unjustifiable impediment to traffic flow, and a waste of money, because it is seldom used. We are not monitoring usage ourselves, but look forward to seeing the result of whatever monitoring CCC has been doing, or will be doing.

- As a committee, though, we would like to express our appreciation and support of the Mosque community, and hope that they do enjoy significant use of the new crossing, even though that may only occur at particular times.
- On the other hand, we never did expect residents to use it much, because they did not seek, or particularly welcome, a crossing at that point, because it does not align with any through routes they would use on either side.
- We expect that, now that the crossing is there, some pedestrians will deviate from the routes they might otherwise have taken, to take advantage of it.
- But we also expect that some of those using the crossing are only doing so because the changes there have made it more difficult to cross at the more convenient points where they would have crossed in the past.
- The situation is a little different for cyclists etc. Previously, they could only cross at designated crossing points that were not well designed for their use, and deviating to use the new crossing costs them less time and energy. So, we would logically expect them to be using this new crossing more than pedestrians would.
- We have not heard any feedback to that effect, though, and we wonder how much wheeled traffic this crossing actually services, because there are no through routes aligned with it:
 - We expect that cyclists using the excellent new paths in the southern part of the park would mainly use the light-controlled crossing installed for their use down there.
 - Conversely, cyclists using the more northerly through route aligned with the Brockworth walkway are certainly not going to deviate all the way down to the Mosque, and then back along the footpath, just to use a marginally better crossing.
- For pedestrians, cyclists and other crossing users, the major concerns must be that:
 - There seem to be no plans to deal with the real problems faced by pedestrians and cyclists at the more heavily used crossing points elsewhere on Deans Avenue, now exacerbated by the spillover effects from creating the new crossing; and
 - For reasons discussed below, narrowing the road and placing a speed hump on the new crossing has made it more difficult to cross the southbound lane(s), both there, and everywhere else along the Avenue.

- On the first point, we are not aware of significant negativity around the substantial pedestrian refuge created in the median strip for this crossing:
 - Some may regard it as overkill, when compared with the absolutely minimal “refuges” provided for older crossings, but the cage-like design is probably suitable for situations involving groups of people crossing, particularly where there are potentially children involved.
 - Some would probably support upgrading the refuges at the existing crossing points, which are actually much slimmer than the rest of the median strip, with similar constructions, and that suggestion is discussed in the final section of this note.
- On the second point, there was arguably never any real problem crossing the southbound lanes, because the pulsing of traffic left regular gaps long enough to safely cross a two-lane roadway. The real problems were crossing the single northbound lane, at peak times, and providing adequate access, and median strip refuge, for groups, and cycles etc at existing crossing points.
- The reasons why the recent changes should have been expected to make road crossing more difficult were carefully laid out by one of our committee members in a submission and presentation during the decision-making process. But they are basically obvious:
 - The reduction in roadway width only reduces crossing time by about 3 seconds.
 - Condensing two lanes of traffic will obviously increase the duration of each traffic pulse, and hence reduce the duration of inter-pulse gaps. At least at the peak times when crossing might potentially be difficult, the gaps will typically reduce by more than 3 seconds, thus more than offsetting any gain from narrowing the roadway.
 - Then, adding a speed hump reduces traffic speed by about half, thus doubling the duration of each traffic pulse, and further reducing the duration of inter-pulse gaps, to the extent of potentially eliminating any usable gap, at peak times. ;
 - The regularity of the total lights cycle means that, once gaps reduce below a critical threshold, maybe around 6-7 seconds at the mosque, waiting times start to rise very rapidly, because the remaining gaps are too short to allow safe passage, particularly for less able pedestrians and family groups, so the pulses effectively coalesce into one long uncrossable stream.
- We will not detail any evidence, because we understand that one of our committee will be submitting separately on that topic. We have appended a letter presenting the personal perspective of an elderly pedestrian in the neighbourhood who makes exactly the same point. But these predicted effects are now readily observable by anyone, with:
 - Peak-time traffic now regularly forming a more or less continuous slow moving procession on the new single southbound lane, as far back as the Freyberg crossing point; and

- Slowing/merging traffic making crossing more difficult on the two-lane section, as far back as the Northern Brockworth crossing point.
- Against this, we should note one piece of positive feedback for the CCC. A Press letter-writer, who may have been a resident, wrote that adding speed humps was a “no-brainer”, because southbound traffic stopped to let them cross (on at least one occasion), whereas northbound traffic did not. We don’t doubt the experience of that writer, who obviously enjoyed being able to induce traffic to stop. But we think that, if anything, the letter just illustrates some of the negative points made above:
 - Presumably, the writer does not care that every second shaved off their journey time has added multiple seconds to the collective journey times of the stalled drivers and their passengers.
 - Understandably, the writer has focussed solely on their own experience, ignoring the fact that, if they were crossing at a time of significant traffic flow, any car stopping for them would be causing traffic to back up in ways that reduced crossing opportunities for other pedestrians, further up the Avenue.
 - The writer had apparently not thought about the fact that, while some obliging motorist saved them a few seconds on that occasion, the hump is there 24/7, holding up traffic flow and reducing crossing opportunities for pedestrians, cyclist and so on, up and down the Avenue all day, every day.
 - Perhaps most disturbingly, the presence of a speed hump seems to have given the writer the impression that they had the right-of-way, and could perhaps expect the traffic to stop if they stepped out. And that is exactly the scenario most likely to cause the kind of head to tail pile-up noted above, because some motorists will not be expecting pedestrians to do that when they do not have the right of way.
 - Thus, we would suggest taking this kind of positive feedback, based on one-off personal experiences, should be weighed against more careful observations and modelling within a broader space and time framework.

Feedback on side effects for other parties

First, concern was apparently expressed about the reduction in parking spaces on Deans Ave, and we were told, very late in the process, that a two laned crossing of the southbound lanes could not be considered because “national standards” would require removing many more parking spaces, and thus require a new round of consultation.

- As a committee, we may have varied views about the appropriateness of applying such a standard to this situation where, if the status quo had been retained, crossable gaps would have still been clearly identifiable all the way back to the lights that control them.
- Many would argue that there is no real need to provide any more clear space, or visibility, than that currently provided for established crossing points.

- But we were somewhat bemused by the claim about consultation, because we were not aware that the total number of parking spaces available to non-residents in the area had been highlighted as an issue in any consultation we were aware of.
- Residents seldom if ever park on there, and those in the relevant zone, between Freyberg and the crossing, would probably be little affected, because all kerbside parking on both sides of the Avenue fills up anyway, from an early hour each weekday.
- In any case, while immediate neighbours may have been affected, we are not aware of any feedback, positive or negative, about the overall reduction in parking opportunities for the wider public.

Second, it was argued that restricting southbound traffic to one lane would reduce “damage” to the park verge, because motorists would no longer feel the need to get their left side wheels up onto it. We do observe that fewer motorists now do that, but have seen no change to the verge, and heard of no plans to ‘improve’ it.

Third, narrowing the roadway obviously makes parking manoeuvres more disruptive and difficult. Under the old configuration some motorists may have been reluctant to stop and reverse into a parking space, but they did so in a lane carrying comparatively little traffic, while leaving a lane free for others to flow on past. And there were long gaps in the traffic, anyway. Now, though, it would only a very bold driver would dare to hold up the near constant stream of traffic in the new single-lane section, during busy periods. Doing so would see traffic backed up for some time, creating a long gap at the crossing, but then an even longer steady stream across the crossing while it cleared.

On the other hand, we do expect that, once parked, passengers (if any) must find it a little easier to exit vehicles on the left-hand side. The impact on drivers is less clear, though:

- Previously, it was obviously unsafe to open a door when two lanes of fast traffic was passing by, in a concentrated pulse. So, drivers utilised their side mirrors to identify upcoming gaps, and those were easily long enough to allow safe exit and entry.
- Now, there is more room to open a door in the newly created single lane section, but seldom any long gaps at peak times. So, drivers must either wait much longer or enter and exit their vehicles while the traffic is still moving in the adjacent lane, albeit more slowly.
- Opinions probably differ as to whether that activity is actually safer than it was previously.

Fourth, some comments were made to the effect that the changes made to the southbound lanes might reduce “boy racer” activity. We have not noticed any such reduction, but would be interested to hear of any evidence of reduction emerging from CCC’s monitoring.

- Clearly, the speed hump does reduce speeds, but speed is really not the key issue for residents, who do not typically cross the road into the park late at night.

- The key issue is really noise, and that is more related to acceleration and deceleration than it is to speed. Other things being equal many would prefer a noisy car to pass quickly than slowly....with the worst nuisance arguably being a stationary vehicle with a high-powered audio system.
- Unfortunately, residents close to the crossing itself are reporting VERY significant problems with noise, and even fumes, from racers using the speed hump as a “launching pad, then accelerating noisily away from it. Such behaviour is regularly visible and audible, even in the middle of the day.

Fifth, the crash rate is also an issue:

- We are aware of the argument that narrowing roadways and slowing traffic with speed humps will “calm” traffic. In many cases it may induce vehicles to avoid a route, thus probably shifting problems to other areas, but we can readily believe that it will reduce the severity of impacts.
- However, common sense suggests that, for the same traffic flow, those measures will also increase the likelihood of impacts where cars jostle for position where the road narrows, and where they slow and/or stop to negotiate speed humps.
- We can not constantly monitor the Avenue, and do not have records of all crashes, so would greatly appreciate CCC making their records available. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that the crash rate has probably increased from the, perhaps surprisingly low, historical rate reported during the consultation.
- We realise that minor incidents involving broken mirrors etc may not be reported, but we are aware of at least two significant incidents in the section north of the speed hump over the last few months.
 - One involved a car parked around the area where the roadway narrows being hit by a passing car, and partly shoved through the fence into the park, but that may have been coincidental because it did not occur when traffic was heavy.
 - The other was a classic rush hour three car nose to tail pile up, though, probably caused by a car braking unexpectedly at, or just before, the speed hump.

Finally, there is the related issue of access for emergency vehicles, not just to our neighbourhood, but to the city as a whole. This applies particularly to ambulances, and also to hospital patients/visitors/staff, who are heavy users of Deans Avenue. We suggest that CCC seek feedback from the drivers of ambulances and hospital shuttles, but note that:

- The second incident above, in particular, completely blocked the southbound lane(s) of Deans Avenue at a peak time. That caused major congestion at the Riccarton Road intersection, and presumably on all other routes to and from that intersection. It also trapped many vehicles, including a truck/trailer unit. Being unable to cross the median strip, they all eventually had to do U turns at the Freyberg intersection, further exacerbating the congestion in the northbound lane, and far beyond.

- More generally, though, narrowing the roadway between Freyberg and the crossing means that the roadway can now be completely blocked by even very minor “incidents”, such as a car trying to park, that, in the past, would have left traffic able to proceed, albeit cautiously, on one lane.

Suggestions for improvement

We will comment elsewhere on improvements to the decision-making process, and to adjacent crossings. With respect to the design of this crossing itself, though

- We believe that residents very strongly support removing the speed hump, which is seen as having negative impacts on vehicle flows, accident rates and overall pedestrian/cycle access along the length of the Avenue, not to mention the vehicle noise now endured by nearby residents. We expect that the vast majority of the city’s ratepayers would be of the same opinion, albeit for different reasons.
 - We can imagine that some might consider the hump makes it safer for pedestrians to cross, by protecting them from vehicles approaching at speed, particularly when trying to cross through short gaps. But the reality is that it is the hump itself creating most of the problem it purports to mitigate. Pedestrians would have ample time to cross, with much larger safety margins, if the traffic pulses were simply allowed to flow on through, as they did before.
 - You may recall that, when we called for a trial to be done before committing to this design feature, we were assured that there was no need for a trial, because it would be quick, easy and cheap to remove the hump if it proved to be problematic. Since it clearly is problematic, we now call for that to be done ASAP.
- By the same token, re-instating a two-lane configuration, would allow traffic flows to revert fully to their earlier pattern, making it easier to cross, because the reduction in gap duration would exceed the increase in crossing time.
 - We were told that such a configuration could not be considered because it would force removal of more carpark, implying that the real trade-off was between the ease and/or safety of crossing the road and the city’s need for more commuter parking. car parking
 - We were not particularly convinced by any aspect of that argument. But it would be fair to say that the call to re-instate two southbound lanes seems less strongly supported, and some residents and/or drivers may actually prefer the single lane configuration. That proposal might also be less strongly supported, if the hump were to be removed. So, we should perhaps put that option forward more as an alternative to be seriously considered if removing the hump does not create enough gaps in the southbound traffic stream to allow cyclists and pedestrians to once more cross with reasonable ease.

APPENDIX: Unsolicited letter from a locally resident crossing user

We append this letter, in slightly redacted form, because it aptly illustrates exactly the points we have emphasised with respect to the negative impact of the speed hump on pedestrians.²

It reads:

I use the new Deans Avenue crossing by the Mosque to take my dog (-----) for walks in the park, normally mid to late afternoon on weekdays.

The hump on the eastern side of the crossing has made it more difficult to cross that side of the road. The traffic comes in pulses from the lights at the Deans Avenue/Riccarton Road/Riccarton Avenue intersection. The hump slows the traffic down, so that one pulse of traffic slows down allowing the next pulse of traffic to catch up. That leaves little or no gap between pulses to cross that lane, particularly late in the afternoon when there is a lot of traffic. So, I have to wait a while for a suitable gap or until a vehicle stops and waves me across that lane.

There is no problem getting across the western side of the crossing as the traffic comes in pulses from the lights at the Deans Avenue/Moorhouse Avenue intersection and there are always sufficient gaps between pulses to cross.

Removing the hump on the eastern side of the crossing would make it easier and safer (larger gaps) for pedestrians to cross that lane.

Regards,

P.S. ----- should have consulted with local people who actually cross Deans Avenue, before they made a stupid decision to put a hump on ----- the avenue.

² This letter was sent to the Committee in October 2025, then re-sent in response to your recent call for feedback, with the apparent intent that we submit it on the writer's behalf. We know the writer (a former committee member) but have been unable to ascertain whether he has subsequently submitted himself.

Response No:
3

Contribution ID: 44207

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

See attached pdf.

Personal Feedback on the Mosque crossing design and performance

Edmund Grant Read, June 8, 2026

During earlier consultations, and in the final decision-making meeting, I submitted separately from the Deans Avenue Precinct Society. As the current acting chair, I largely compiled the summary of feedback from that Society, and will not repeat the points made in that document, which I obviously endorse. Accordingly, this note simply follows up on the main thrust of my original submission, with some observations on how the slowing of traffic in the southbound lanes has changed traffic conditions, and hence also changed the conditions faced by pedestrians, cyclist and so on, at the crossing itself, and the Freyberg crossing immediately to the north.

In my submission, I argued that the proposed design of confining two lanes of southbound traffic to a single lane, then slowing it with a speed hump, would actually make crossing the southbound lane(s) harder, not easier, at all points along the Avenue, including the crossing itself.

That argument was partly based on extensive everyday experience of crossing the Avenue, often with young children and their bikes etc, supplemented by three afternoons of intensive observation of traffic flows up and down the Avenue. My experience and observations came to the same clear conclusion:

- Unlike the northbound lane, which can be difficult to cross at peak times, the southbound lanes were easy to cross, at all points, because the largely unimpeded flow of each traffic pulse released by the lights at Riccarton Road almost always left a gap during which it was safe to cross two lanes for each cycle of the lights, and almost always left two such gaps, in my observations.
- The conventional wisdom that pedestrians would have more difficulty judging gaps across two lanes of traffic than one is almost irrelevant when traffic in both lanes is synchronised, so that they both arrive at the same time, and then are both clear at the same time.
- The design of existing crossing points was not ideal, especially for cycles and other wheeled mobility devices but, while residents, parkers, and park users often had to wait for a gap, they regularly crossed both lanes, without any difficulty or incident that I ever saw.

As it happens, though, I am also a semi-retired university professor with 40 years experience of teaching and research on the art of mathematical modelling for decision-making. While traffic models, as such, are not my particular speciality, the mathematics of this particular situation seemed both obvious and unequivocal. The key point made by my submission was that:

- It only takes about 3-4 seconds more to cross two lanes than one;

- So, any changes that increased the duration of traffic pulses by more than 3-4 seconds were obviously going to reduce the gaps between pulses, and hence the safety margins on crossing times; and
- There was a danger that many of the gaps could become too short to allow safe crossing at all, thus creating extended non-crossable periods.

Traffic conditions are highly variable on Deans Avenue. Much of the time, traffic is modest and, while a raised median forces cycles and other wheeled devices to use the crossing points where the curb has been lowered, pedestrians can easily cross, even where there is no recognised crossing. (And some definitely consider it safer to stand on a reasonably wide raised median than on the sections that have been narrowed and lowered to create unprotected “refuges”, at the recognised crossing points.)

Be that as it may, the observations I made before the crossing was installed suggested that, on Friday afternoons, which I believe to be the times when road crossing is most difficult:

- The Riccarton Road traffic light cycle varied with the time of day, but typically lasted something like 80 seconds on a Friday afternoon/evening.
- The main pulse released in each cycle was quite solid in the centre lane, and somewhat less so in the outer lane, typically lasting around 20-30 seconds.
- The following gap was then typically about 20 seconds, allowing ample time to cross two lanes..... and even back again for anyone so inclined.
- The secondary pulse, consisting mainly of traffic turning into Deans Avenue at the intersection, was more ragged, but often spread over a similar period.
- But that was almost always (in my observations) followed by another clear crossable gap
- So, in each cycle there were generally two clear crossable gaps, but
- In a few cases, the gap between two pulses filled in, perhaps due to traffic turning in from side streets, effectively creating a combined pulse. Of up to 41 seconds in my observations.
- Importantly, that pattern was very much the same, whether observed at the Brockworth North crossing, or down by the Mosque.

As a resident of the block just north of the Freyberg crossing, my anecdotal observation has been that the traffic now regularly forms a slow moving queue reaching back to that crossing. Even if the queue does not “block” the crossing, the queue is still moving, and the traffic slowing to join the back of queue clearly takes longer to pass, substantially reducing the gaps available for pedestrians and cyclists to cross.

That effect feeds back all the way through the zone where traffic is starting to merge and slow, as it prepares to join the queue ahead. The crossing at Brockworth north is critical for pedestrians, cycles, scooters and skateboards heading for Brockworth Place and the Brockworth Walkway. Because it remains unchanged, any slowing at all must decrease

the duration of crossing gaps available. Not surprisingly, then I believe there is a noticeable increase in risky behaviour, as frustrated would-be crossers are tempted to try crossing in those shorter gaps. And the situation is made more risky by the fact that drivers focussed on merging must surely be paying less attention to pedestrians.

This time, I did not systematically measure the situation at the Brockworth crossing, but I did spend an afternoon timing the gaps available at the Freyberg and Mosque crossings, in an attempt to compare the situation before and after the crossing was inserted. To be exact, I measured pulses and gaps over periods of approximately 5 minutes, at about half-hour intervals from 2pm to 5pm on a Friday afternoon.

In summer, the early part of Friday afternoon is a critical time, because the flow of pedestrians from the Mosque, and of motorists needing to do U turns at the Freyberg intersection, coincides with the buildup of other traffic, perhaps heading (like me) to pick children up from school.¹

At this time of year, though, the mosque traffic clears by 2pm, and there were no pedestrians or motorists leaving the mosque during the hours of observation. In fact, I only saw 4 pedestrians use the new crossing in that whole 3 hour period, along with maybe twice that number of very noisy vehicles accelerated away from the hump, as reported by nearby residents, and of course hundreds of motorists being significantly delayed.²

I observed conditions at the Freyberg crossing, where the roadway still takes 9 seconds to cross curb to curb, at a moderate pace, so maybe 10 seconds with a safety margin. Definitely shorter if you consider yourself safe when standing on paintwork, but maybe longer if you are herding young children across. Unsurprisingly, the crossable gap between the 1st and 2nd pulses is often missing now, and the remaining gaps would probably have been filled by turning vehicles if there had been many leaving the Mosque in this period. The roadway between there, which was easily crossable before, is now uncrossable for significant periods, due to a slowly moving queue... although, to be fair, you might well be able to catch the eye of an obliging motorist who realises they will have a long wait anyway. In my experience, it is much harder to cross at the point where vehicles are still moving at some speed in an effort to catch up with the queue.. and that point is often around the Freyberg crossing.

¹ To be clear, I have no problem with U turning traffic. It is the only sensible way residents or mosque worshippers alike can actually get where they need to go. You definitely would not want to see that traffic added to the stream heading north to the Riccarton Road intersection!

² There was also one senior citizen who rode their mobility scooter down the road, beside the moving traffic lane, and then into the park via the new entry point at the crossing. I guess that may be seen as an endorsement of the new design, or an indictment of the fact that they had to use the road because they could not enter the park at any point further north. Which begs the question: How did they ever get into that lane? If they were a local resident they would have to across the Avenue to get there. So why did they not ride down the footpath and use the crossing? If they were not a resident, where did they come from,? And why could they not enter the park at the Riccarton Road intersection, for example?

However, I ended up focussing mainly on the new crossing, because, although it can be crossed more quickly, in maybe 6 seconds, or 7 seconds with a safety margin, that is also where the lack of crossable gaps in the traffic problem is most obvious.

Some raw data is shown below. It will be observed that there are still crossable gaps, some of which can stretch for up to a minute... perhaps due to grid lock at the lights? But there are also now much longer periods during which there is a constant stream of traffic.

Watching the traffic stream, it seems that there are still crossable gaps, albeit much shorter than they once were, so long as the lane is only used by regular cars. But this route is also used by heavier vehicles, tradies towing trailers, and hospital vehicles wanting to ease their sensitive passengers over the hump. These must all slow to a crawling speed, backing traffic up to the point where gaps just disappear. Traffic turning from side streets tends to fill up the gaps, too,

As a result, the data shows that uncrossable periods exceeding one minute are now quite common, with two to three such periods, ranging from around 54 seconds to 1 minute 23 seconds, observed in each 5 minute interval. In some cases, the remaining gaps are quite short, so that even a minor disturbance in the flow can lead to rapidly increasing wait times, as pulses concatenate. While these observations were made on a Friday afternoon, they were taken when no pedestrians or vehicles were leaving the Mosque. Even so, I recorded a case where, if the minimum safe crossing time were deemed to be 7 seconds, the wait time would blow out to nearly 3 minutes, followed by an easily crossable 30 second gap, but then another pulse approaching 1½ minutes, leaving only 2 gaps, totalling less than a minute of crossable time, in a 5 minute interval.

In reality, I expect that motorists might stop to let pedestrians cross, if they saw them waiting so long. But that would just exacerbate problems further up the Avenue, for both motorists and pedestrians.

In summary, I am not in a position to judge how this situation compares with situations elsewhere in the city, or what the CCC may consider “acceptable”. But:

- The observation below confirm my contention that the design chosen for the crossing over the southbound lane(s) of Deans Avenue would not only cause a great deal of inconvenience to motorists, but make it much more difficult than it was, or could have been, for pedestrians to cross there, and significantly more difficult to cross elsewhere along the Avenue.
- The situation for cyclists, who could not previously have crossed at that point, may seem a little better. But that is really a false comparison, because almost any design would have allowed them to cross at that point. The special feature of THIS particular design is to close up the gaps they could easily have crossed in, if two lanes had been retained and no hump added, while also making it more difficult for other cyclists to cross at other points along the Avenue.

Some observations:

My observations are very rough, alternating between two crossings and transferring data from the stopwatch to a spreadsheet, on my phone. And I've left some out that I believe to have been improperly recorded. The uncoloured cells are gaps, the grey cells are short pulses of traffic (sometimes a single vehicle), and the highlights are discussed below. The righthand column shows accumulated time, while the middle column shows the time of each gap or traffic pulse.

The first observation here starts with nearly a minute of crossable time, but there are then two uncrossable periods of nearly a minute in the following 5 minutes.

2:25 pm		
1	00:56.84	00:56.84
2	00:53.57	01:50.41
3	00:07.33	01:57.74
4	00:18.65	02:16.39
5	00:28.24	02:44.63
6	00:54.70	03:39.33
7	00:09.28	03:48.61
8	00:04.24	03:52.85
9	00:14.45	04:07.30
10	00:03.21	04:10.51
11	00:27.54	04:38.05
12	00:31.51	05:09.56

The next has two uncrossable periods of around a minute, in 5 minutes\

2:45 pm		
1	00:06.26	00:06.26
2	00:05.15	00:11.41
3	00:51.29	01:02.70
4	00:25.01	01:27.71
5	00:11.96	01:39.67
6	00:09.63	01:49.30
7	00:14.44	02:03.74
8	00:02.94	02:06.68
9	00:49.43	02:56.11
10	01:06.04	04:02.15
11	00:39.89	04:42.04
12	00:58.23	05:40.27
13	00:18.47	05:58.74

The next case is probably the worst. There are 3 uncrossable periods of more than 1 minute, but the gaps between them are also small. Some would consider the 1st gap to be crossable, but if you think that 7 seconds should be allowed, the first 3 pulses join into a single uncrossable period of 174 seconds... or nearly 3 minutes. And there are only two crossable gaps, totalling

less than a minute, in this 5 minute period. (If 6.7 seconds is OK for crossing, the longest pulse is only 1½ minutes, but this is a system close to being in serious trouble.)

3:15pm					stream	gap
1	01:21.22	01:21.22	N	81	81	
2	00:06.74	01:27.96	Y	7	88	
3	01:11.71	02:39.67	N	72	160	
4	00:04.92	02:44.59	Y	5	165	
5	00:08.58	02:53.17	N	9	174	
6	00:28.32	03:21.49	Y	29		29
7	01:23.13	04:44.62	N	83	83	
8	00:17.34	05:01.96	Y	18		18

he next observation also has three uncrossable periods of over a minute, albeit in the 5 minutes starting from 1:56.54. with decent gaps in between

4:15pm		
2	00:24.28	01:03.27
3	00:04.77	01:08.04
4	00:48.50	01:56.54
5	01:15.07	03:11.61
6	00:28.85	03:40.46
7	00:07.47	03:47.93
8	00:17.96	04:05.89
9	01:03.24	05:09.13
10	00:50.25	05:59.38
11	01:02.70	07:02.08

And this final 5 minute observation again shows three uncrossable periods of over a minute³

4:45pm		
1	01:07.01	01:07.01
2	00:24.45	01:31.46
3	01:23.27	02:54.73
4	00:30.75	03:25.48
5	01:03.12	04:28.60
6	00:15.30	04:43.90
7	00:04.53	04:48.43
8	00:17.95	05:06.38

³ There was 1 pulse of nearly 1 minute at 5pm, but traffic flow fell off after that. I omitted the 3:45 observation, which purported to show an uncrossable period of around 2 minutes, because I'm not sure it was correctly recorded.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

Reduction to 2 lanes on east side approaching the pedestrian crossing is causing considerable interruption to southbound traffic and confusion. While ok perhaps for the very infrequent pedestrian traffic improvements, a return to 2 lanes would be, I think better.
For occasions when the mosque is busy, perhaps a school type crossing assistance could be provided? By the mosque congregation?

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

Spokes is happy overall with the Deans Ave pedestrian crossing that has made it easier for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Deans Ave. Drivers are more aware of people crossing the road at this point because they can see the fencing. Vehicles are travelling slower when they approach the crossing on the side with the speed hump. There are still some reported concerns crossing at peak traffic times in low or dappled light conditions before the street lights come on where people worry they have not been seen.

Spokes would like to see a speed hump on both sides of the road to reduce traffic speeds. CCC could consider if adding some reflective tape to the central fence would help traffic in low light conditions look for people who are crossing.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

It has slowed traffic on the Parkside considerably and now often takes a lot longer to cross , waiting for a single lane of traffic to pass. There's more horn blasting from 'road rage' as cars converge. Very seldom see anyone use the crossing within the cage frame (it's full of leaves that never get cleared). People tend to cross to the middle island either side of the framework unless they have a pram. I've seen 2 cyclists use the crossing. I'm in and around the park constantly so view this multiple times daily. The speed bump has impacted boy racers but now the noise of their acceleration is much worse. Very few mosque attendees use it as they can't get carparking on Parkside and Saturday sports families just cross from wherever they park. I consider this another great waste of taxpayer money with an over engineered roading construction.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I work not too far away from Deans Avenue, attend sport at South Hagley Park, and regularly donate plasma at New Zealand Blood so I know this area well. I also walk every day in an urban environment (totalling just over 200 km per month), so as a pedestrian I well understand the risks around roads. It is very noticeable many drivers travel at a speed greater than the speed limit or travel at a speed too fast for the environment or conditions.

Further to this I often see traffic lights, barriers, signs, and pedestrian handrails hit by drivers. Another thing that should be noted is often drivers mistakenly drive without their headlights on at night or have motor vehicles with failed lights*. Impairment and distraction are also common. These are all behaviours that can put pedestrian's lives at risk. It should also be noted that when a collision occurs, for whatever reason some drivers continue on without rendering assistance. This could worsen the outcome for a victim.

The fact is people make mistakes on the roads, they may not have the experience or education to prevent incidents, and/or they may not provide the best response should a collision occur. This is something everyone involved in the decision-making process should understand. Sure, individually we are likely to have behaviour better than this, but we must understand in our community we have behaviours that shouldn't be happening and we have pedestrians that have varying age and ability.

It is well identified, that when it comes to road safety designing a safe transport system is the best way to save lives and reduce harm on the roads.

Therefore, I strongly encourage decision-makers to add a speed hump to the northbound lane at the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing. This will result in the same safety improvements already seen on the southbound lane as well as providing a consistent treatment on each side.

A marked pedestrian crossing would also be a great benefit here.

* You might wonder what the relevance of motor vehicle lights is in relation to curtesy crossings? - after all a vehicle driver is often assumed to have priority anyway. The thing is, a vehicle without their lights on may not be seen by a pedestrian, and as a result the pedestrian could step out into the path of a moving vehicle. A speed hump reduces the speed of a vehicle down to 30 km/h or less, which results in a much more favourable outcome should a collision occur. (BTW, yes pedestrians do walk and use crossings at night and in the early morning.)

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

We are writing to request the removal of the speed hump that was installed on the east side of Deans Avenue by the crossing. While to Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board decided to install this item there have been horrendous noise pollution created by this hump. The noise impacts on the health and well being of nearby residents, causing sleep deprivation and enjoyment of our properties.

Another problem is it causes traffic to lump up and slow together (with a 3 car collision recently), then roar off down the road. It has been interolable day and night since installed. This was predicted by residents. Boy racers love it, so weekends and public holidays are dreadful. The crossing itself appears to be used very little with the majority of people crossing the road where they have parked their vehicles. We understand the Traffic dept. has conducted a count of numbers using this, on 28/4/26 but are having difficulty finding those numbers.

Fortunately the Waipapa Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board decided NOT to install a similar hump on the west side. It is also noted that lights were not installed, but infastructure for them was -this would be totally unnecessary and terrible for residents living next to this.

Thank you

[REDACTED]

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

Thank you for this opportunity to give feedback.

I live at [REDACTED] Deans Ave and have done so for the last 10 years. I was in favour of the crossing and still am after the 12 months it has been in place. It has achieved the desired outcome of making a safe place to cross over the the park for sports, events and walking in the park. I particularly appreciate it myself when walking in the park and taking my grand children across to the park.

The hump, however, has had a more difficult effect for us. Whilst it has slowed the traffic near the crossing, it has also given the cruisers, who disrupt our evenings on Friday and Saturday nights, the opportunity to slow for the hump and then roar off on the other side in their modified cars, some times backfiring all way down the stretch of road past the hump. While the cruising has always been annoying for us it has now intensified so much that it is almost unbearable. This noise goes from 9.30pm to after midnight every Friday and Saturday night.

My husband and I feel that this situation could be rectified by making the speed limit 30 or 40 between the area where the road goes down to one lane to the lights on the crossing further down towards Moorhouse Ave or even all the way to Moorhouse if possible.
This would achieve the desired out come of making this whole stretch safer for children and adults crossing as was set out in the original plan.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I can't say much about the mosque crossing as we are not using it at all being four of the many residents living on the densely populated Brockworth Place. We like many, many others cross at the north or south end of Brockworth Place. These highly used crossings urgently need an upgrade though. I am in support of flattening and fattening of the central refuge islands and dropping kerbs on all existing crossings of Deans Ave as I can't even use them crossing by bike in particular with kids on bikes in tow. They are too narrow for bikes and not wide enough for several people. Even more annoying are the type of barriers on the park side which make us stop and with several cyclists crossing some end up waiting on the car lane to get their turn to feed through the hole in the barriers. This is a safety issue. Simple little posts like at the mosque crossing would solve this problem. 'Please keep clear' signs would be very helpful too to avoid people parking too close to the crossings.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I have used this Deans Avenue at least once a week for the past year. Although cars do need to slow down because of the bumps, I do not believe there is any significant hold-up to traffic because there are greater holdups at the Moorhouse Ave/Deans Ave/Blenheim Rd junction lights. I'm sure the crossing is now safer for pedestrians.

Response No:
12

Contribution ID: 44114

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

We have no issues with the crossing.

Q5 Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I believe the current crossing design is flawed and may not achieve its intended safety outcomes.

One concern is that pedestrians and other users can still travel across the paved area that has not been physically blocked off, reducing the effectiveness of the crossing design and potentially creating confusion about the intended route.

I am also concerned about the decision to install a speed hump on only one side of the road. Given that this is effectively a shared corridor involving two road authorities or communities, the treatment appears inconsistent and may limit its effectiveness in reducing vehicle speeds through the entire crossing area.

Of greater concern is the transition from two traffic lanes into a single lane on what is a very busy road. This lane reduction has the potential to create congestion, sudden merging movements, driver frustration, and an increased risk of vehicle conflicts, particularly during peak traffic periods. Any safety benefits gained from the crossing treatment may be offset by the hazards created by the lane narrowing.

I also question whether the crossing is being used at the level originally predicted. While I appreciate that my observations are anecdotal rather than formal traffic data, I regularly travel through this area and have not observed a high level of pedestrian use. Given the significant investment involved in the project and the changes made to traffic flow, it would be valuable to compare actual usage data with the forecasts that supported the crossing's installation. If pedestrian numbers are significantly lower than anticipated, this should be considered as part of the review process.

I recommend that the crossing be reviewed to assess whether the current design is achieving its intended safety objectives and whether additional measures are required to better manage pedestrian movements, vehicle speeds, and traffic flow through the area.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

Putting a speed bump in here was a very poor decision in the first place, due to one person having their child run onto the road (this is not a traffic safety thing, that comes down to parenting), i have crossed deans ave thousand of times with children, friends, dogs etc and had issue. The speedbump and crossing has made NO change to people crossing the road. I have lived in this area for over 20years, and there have never been any issues with people crossing Safely. If anything the speed bump directly after a merge is creating more risk. Happy for the mid crossing area to stay, even though I have only seen it used once, but the speed bump should be removed, the people who attend the Mosque do not use the crossing.

This council needs to rethink speed bumps and actually listen to the locals who live in the areas.
Best outcome, remove the bump.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I walk along the pathway in Hagley Park past this crossing just about every day and I seldom see anyone using it. Yet the crossing at the north end of Brockworth is often used, but it has no refuge area and it is very narrow, making it dangerous for bikes or prams.

How come you accommodated the Mosque people who hardly use the facility and mostly don't live locally, but have not provided a similar amenity for the residents who live nearby?

This has been a shocking waste of ratepayers' money to advantage a few, who mostly only use it on a Friday lunchtime. Many of them dash across at other places to avoid the extra time it takes to negotiate the refuge.

The speed bump is totally over the top. It badly disrupts traffic, causes vibration noise for neighbours, and is actually dangerous for people trying to cross. It should be removed.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

We live in LeCascina Lane. So use Deans Ave everyday.
The traffic flow on Deans Ave is constant all day. The pedestrian crossing and the speed hump are TOTALLY disruptive to traffic flows.
We believe to reduce the lanes to a single lane has had a really negative impact on traffic flow.
Our request is you remove the speed bump and return the road to dual lanes.
Thank you.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

The crossing itself is fine - though largely un-used, however the speed bump has proven to a significant issue.

I drive down Deans Ave at least twice every day, sometimes I can drive it up to 8 times a day. Since its establishment, I have seen the crossing used approximately 3 times in total. I have even witnessed people crossing, but 2-3 metres either side of the crossing itself (ie. still just using the grassed berm), including on Fridays when the Mosque is used and there are a lot more people around. I therefore wouldn't say that the crossing has had overwhelming positive outcomes, however it hasn't necessarily had negative impacts (I am referring to the crossing alone, not the road changes).

The speed bump and merging of lanes have caused considerably more issues. Namely, they have caused congestion, and many close collisions. Almost daily, I witness near-misses from cars merging or slowing for the speed bump. The merge itself would probably be less of an issue if the speed bump wasn't there - it is the sudden slowing of traffic that is problematic, and the merging just adds to that. If the speed bump wasn't there, and the merging remained, it would probably be ok. The speed bump achieves nothing and only gives rise to negative impacts - it would be sensible to remove it. This wouldn't have any bearing on the safety of the crossing, which as I said, is very under-used and has its own safety methods (railing etc).

It is unfortunate that the actions of a few (those that couldn't sensibly cross Deans Ave) has led to negative impacts on many (with the road changes). I have lived on Mayfair Street for over 16 years, and crossing Deans Ave (including with small children and dogs) has never been problematic, even at peak hour.

The best outcome would be for the crossing to remain and for speed bump to be removed.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

The Deans Ave pedestrian crossing does not work and is totally unnecessary. If it was constructed for the mosque worshippers then we have video footage showing they do not use it. Its placement in front of the mosque does not assist the hundreds of people coming out of Brockworth Place and trying to cross Deans Ave. As to why the speed hump was put in on the park side, it has only slowed the traffic wrongly, increased the noise more and in the weekend the boy racers just use the speed hump as a starting point for another race!! Why not just put in a speed camera? This would be a good deterrent for the speeding and noise.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

1. Loss of carpark on the street - the development of the Deans Ave pedestrian crossing meant that two car parking spaces were lost outside my place. [REDACTED]. The results of the yellow no parking lines means that every day someone is parking illegally outside [REDACTED], this is especially a problem on the Friday lunchtime mosque.
2. Boy racers accelerating noisily and fast after going over the speed hump on east side - on most Friday and Saturday nights, boy racers with low slung cars go very carefully over the hump so their car is not damaged, then "floor" the accelerator and speed well in excess of the speed limit of 50km/h and creating a noise so loud it wakes me up.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I have previously had a letter published in the Press newspaper regarding the ridiculous situation of the speed bump(s) at this very fine crossing, read it below.

Can anything be dumber than the Mosque road crossing to Deans Ave with its speed hump on the Hagley Park side & zero hump on the Mosque side? Why is a speed hump considered necessary on one side but not the other? The humpless side is plain dangerous because most cars just speed past as if the crossing & waiting pedestrians do not exist, whereas most stop for pedestrians on the hump side. Well done to the Central Zone Community Board Councillors for their hump. This is the safe side. This stupidity of, let alone danger of no hump on the Mosque side is a memorial to a very poor decision by the Riccarton Community Board Councillors. Why not simply admit a bad decision & retro-install a hump here (same as the park side)?

Mike Stockwell

The crossing works very well apart from the above (yes angry comment at the time) comment.

My recommendation is this. Leave it in place but install the missing bump on the Mosque side of Deans Ave.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I have a list of improvements that I would like to see for the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing and the surrounding area.

- There must be more speed bumps, to improve safety infrastructure to reduce danger for residents.
- The already existing speed bump could be larger for similar reasons.
- I think that the crossing is an improvement, and hasn't made boy-racers noise levels worse. But, they are the same as before. There should be a speed bump before and after the crossing for northbound traffic to discourage boy-racers from driving down the wrong side of Deans Avenue to avoid the current singular speed bump for southbound traffic.
- The crossing should be signaled to increase resident safety and reduce the dangerous threat posed by boy-racers and SUV drivers.
- There should be more crossings in the surrounding area to allow free, unrestricted safe access to and from Hagley Park South.
- The crossings should be wider to improve ease and accessibility.
- There should be pedestrian rest-rails on the Hagley Park side.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

The crossing is excellent and I use it regularly. It is ridiculous however that there is a speed bump on just one side however, it is hard to comprehend how such a decision could ever be made. In my opinion there should be speed bumps on both sides.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I am pleased with the crossing. I ride an E- bike, so use it to cross the road into the park. If there was no halfway stopping place I would find it more difficult, due to the high density of traffic at all times on Deans Ave.

It would be excellent to have traffic lights at the crossing, like the one at the walk/cycle way through to Tower Junction.

This would also make gaps in the traffic for residents to get out of their driveways.

I find getting in and out of my driveway difficult at all times and this includes turning due to the median strip.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I think it has been a very positive change as it has resulted in safer crossing for pedestrians between a Parkside and mosque side of the roads. I also noticed a reduction in noise from vehicles speeding up Dean's Ave towards Moorhouse Ave as they have to slow down.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

The new crossing is great, but can be unsafe due to different traffic speeds. The single sided bump is ridiculous. Northbound traffic doesn't slow down, and southbound boy racers treat it as a loud exhaust challenge. The original proposal talked about a low speed zone and I assumed there would be a reduced speed limit. The right way to fix this mess is by a 30 km/hr speed limit on the single lane stretch between Freyberg and the cycle crossing (together with either no bumps or two bumps!) The limit could either be continuous, or targetted to Friday prayers, Saturday sport, and overnight at the weekends.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I live at [REDACTED] and it is extremely noisy as cars slow and then accelerate away. This is terrible at night when the modified cars do this until all hours of the night. It also blocks up traffic and does not make things any safer than having an island in the middle without a speed hump.

Response No:
27

Contribution ID: 43833

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

You should probably put a speed bump on both sides of the crossing.

Response No:
28

Contribution ID: 43828

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I think it is working well, once everyone has got used to it. Often use it when out walking my dog.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

The crossing, as a whole, is a positive addition to Deans Avenue. However, while the eastern side includes traffic calming, the western side does not, resulting in an inconsistent interaction with traffic. The space created in the median is effective in accommodating bikes, scooters, and pedestrians. Although the hump achieves its aim of slowing traffic on the eastern side and benefits people crossing, vehicle behaviour around it creates issues. These include excessive acceleration away from the traffic calming and noise from loaded trucks clattering over the feature.

That said, the primary concern is not the crossing itself. Looking at it in isolation highlights may identify isolated benefits, but those may be creating greater negative impacts at other crossings along Deans Avenue. As a frequent user of the crossing at Brockworth Place into Hagley Park, I believe there has been an increase in drivers jockeying for position before the merge that now occurs ahead of the speed hump. As a result, driver attention appears to be focused more on the merge and speed hump than on the nearby crossing points (which were already receiving limited attention previously).

Several years ago, I experienced a near-miss when a child ran out at the Hagley Park exit near Brockworth Place. I was fortunate that the driver at the time was not manoeuvring for position and was able to stop. I am not confident that, in high-traffic situations now, the same outcome would occur.

This and other crossings along Deans Ave require appropriate improvements. For example, the median refuge should adequately accommodate a bicycle without it extending beyond either side. At the same time, access to and from adjacent roads, as well as safe U-turn opportunities, should continue to be supported.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

There is a noticeable difference with traffic congestion increasing due to the slowing down of traffic approaching the crossing. This combined with the cycle/pedestrian lights further along Deans Ave has made it very much harder to exit and enter our property. I would guess the number of people using the crossing every day does not substantiate the increase in traffic congestion. It does not seem very progressive to create congestion when the city is not coping with traffic congestion currently. Especially at peak times it can take 15 minutes to get to our home from Moorhouse Ave which would normally be a 2 minute drive.

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

People cross anywhere on Deans Avenue, the crossing doesn't directly encourage people to cross at that point. The speed humps slow cars but has created more vehicle noise because of the acceleration off the speed bump. Some cars appear confused as there is a crossing but no white lines. It's confusing.

Response No:
32

Contribution ID: 43769

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

The traffic congestion caused by the installation of the speed hump on one side has caused me to change my daily commuting route.

Response No:
33

Contribution ID: 43749

Q5

Please share any feedback about the Deans Avenue pedestrian crossing.

Long Text

I really like the new crossing and speed bump. As a pedestrian it is much safer and easier to cross deans Ave with a protected island and I hope that there will be more crossings in future. As a driver I like the speed bump for the southward bound traffic, it makes it much easier to get a gap to onto Deans Ave and i think it would make sense to put a speed bump on both sides of the road.