

# Living Streets Aotearoa



www.livingstreets.org.nz

## Living Streets Canterbury submission on draft Canterbury Regional Land Transport Programme 2009-2019

27 April 2009

<b>Name of Submitter and Submitting Organisation</b>	Living Streets Canterbury Co-ordinator, Wendy Everingham, on behalf of Living Streets Canterbury
<b>Postal Address</b>	Living Streets Canterbury C/O of Wendy Everingham Living Streets Canterbury Co-ordinator 1/4 Harmans Road Lyttelton
<b>Phone</b>	328 9093 or 328 8359
<b>Email</b>	wendy.everingham at xtra.co.nz

### Introducing Living Streets Canterbury

Living Streets Canterbury is a Christchurch based pedestrian advocacy group established in 2004 as a branch of Living Streets Aotearoa. Everyone walks and uses the footpaths, some with an aid or support. Living Streets represents the interests of all types of walkers, many of whom also use public transport.

The Living Streets Aotearoa vision is “More people walking more often”.  
For more information about Living Streets Aotearoa see [www.livingstreets.org.nz](http://www.livingstreets.org.nz)

The International Walking Charter and its objectives is promoted by Living Streets Aotearoa  
<http://www.livingstreets.org.nz/ICharter.htm>

We wish to speak to our submission. Please send Living Streets Canterbury at the above address, a copy of the Officers' Report as soon as it is available, to enable our group of volunteers to make a more efficient and useful oral submission.

For our submission we have ordered our comments using the Key Consultation Questions in the draft RLTP document as headings.

## Draft RLTP Question 1

### Do you agree with the transport priorities identified for Canterbury in this Programme (Table 2)?

We support the walking, cycling, and bus Activities [e.g. Activities # 22, 38, 39, 103, 104, 105, 110, 138, 139]; and also the Travel Demand Activities [e.g. Neighbourhood Accessibility Plans (Selwyn District Council, # 92) and Travel Demand Management (Selwyn District Council, # 93)] in this priority list, as these will improve conditions for Active Transport users. We believe these type of Activities should be the highest priority. In particular Walking projects that help implement Local and Regional Councils Walking or Active Transport Strategies should be high priority.

We also support any Active Transport Strategy Reviews such as, Timaru District Active Transport Strategy Review (#22). We query why there is nothing in the priority list for Canterbury Councils that do not have Pedestrian or Active Transport Strategies e.g. MacKenzie District Council and Waimate District Council. It is our understanding these are the only Canterbury Region Councils without such Strategies. These Councils need to be supported and encouraged to undertake developing Strategies. Councils who should have reviewed their Strategies a long time ago, and developed detailed implementation plans, need to be supported and encouraged to do so, e.g. Christchurch City Council Pedestrian Strategy (2001). The draft Banks Peninsula Strategy (2005) needs to be considered in relation to incorporation into the existing CCC Walking and Cycling, or adopted as a Strategy in its own right for the Banks Peninsula area. Hurunui District Council recently put out their Active Transport Strategy for public consultation and we are concerned there does not appear to be a budget for implementation of this strategy in relation to walking and cycling Activities. We consider developing, reviewing, monitoring, and implementing Active Transport or Walking Strategies are critical, and should be high priority line items.

We do not support a number of Activities listed (see the list of these activities below)\* as priorities, as these are too expensive and physically expansive roading projects involving the building of new roads or adding lanes (to become four lanes). These Activities are not supportive of a sustainable transport system, and are in conflict with the vision of the NZ Transport Strategy and The Canterbury Regional Transport Strategy. The current situation economically (e.g. Peak Oil and the World Wide Recession) and environmentally (e.g. Climate Change) mean Canterbury can not continue to *“build its way out of congestion”*. These types of activities (building new roads and expanding road widths) are *“business as usual”*. We want to grab the opportunities Canterbury has to become a regional leader in New Zealand, by prioritising sustainable transport options such as walking and cycling for shorter trips. By shorter trips we mean within 2-3 km for walking and within 10 km for cycling. For longer trips excellent Public Transport options are important. If we need to *“build our way of the recession”* then let’s do it with huge walking, cycling, and Public Transport projects, in that order.

Building the Southern Motorway and the Northern Arterial and four-laning existing two-lane roads means that the opportunities and commitments of the Greater Christchurch Urban Design Strategy are undermined, as these types of roading projects create and support Greenfields opportunities.

Any four-laning or road widening that occurs must always ensure that community severance is not an outcome, and that people who walk and cycle are provided for, in particular that intersections and crossing points are best practice and proactive towards encouraging Active Transport.

**\*Specific Activities in Table 2 we do not support**

Activity 25 (Christchurch Southern Motorway Extension - C) (NZTA)

Activity 26 (Christchurch Southern Motorway Extension - C) (NZTA)

Activity 26 (Christchurch Southern Motorway Extension - Property purchase) (NZTA)

**Total of 25, 26, & 27: \$175M**

Activity 37 ( Christchurch Northern Arterial Rural) (NZTA) **Total: \$6M**

Activity 50 (QE2 Four-Laning Northern Arterial to Hills Rd 4L) (NZTA) **Total: \$2M**

Activity 66 (Memorial Ave to Yaldhurst Rd 4L – C)

Activity 67 (Memorial Ave to Yaldhurst Rd 4L – Property purchase)

**Total of 66 & 67 = \$28M**

Activity 68 (Sawyers Arms to Memorial Ave 4L) **Total: \$0.4M**

Activity 69 (Yaldhurst Rd to Waterloo Rd 4L) **Total: \$0.5M**

**TOTAL of all these activities = \$212 Million!**

Imagine what \$212 million dollars could be spent on. The infrastructure, monitoring, promotion, education opportunities for Active Transport would be a new paradigm that means Canterbury would become a better place, to live, work, visit, do business, and travel.

A very important Research paper undertaken by the University of Auckland that was commissioned by the NZ Transport Agency has been recently made available to the public. The paper called “Valuing the health benefits of active transport modes”, can be found at <http://www.landtransport.govt.nz/research/reports/359.pdf>

The Executive Summary notes:

*“There is a growing awareness that traditional economic evaluation methods tend to undervalue the wider public health benefits provided by active transport modes, which include walking, cycling, and their variants, such as skates and scooters. The objective of this project is to determine the monetary value of the health benefits of active transport modes, in order to include it in cost-benefit analyses for transport and other government sectors.”*

The funding for significant transport projects is subject to a Benefit Cost analysis. The health benefits from the new Research found these were around \$4/km for walking and around \$2/km for cycling (Table 10, Page13, NZTA Research Report # 359).

When the draft RLTP was prepared for NZTA in November 2008 the revised figure for the health benefits were not yet available. The health benefits were previously valued in NZTA's Economic Evaluation Manual (Volume 2) at 16 c/km for cycling and 40 c/km for walking. The NZTA Economic Evaluation Manual was updated in January 09 to take account of the new findings, and NZTA decided on taking a pragmatic approach to implementing the research findings by gradually introducing higher health benefits for walking and cycling, hence the Total health benefits of

walking have been assessed as \$2.70/km and of cycling \$1.45/km.

<http://www.landtransport.govt.nz/funding/manuals.html#eem2>

These revised health benefits are more than ten times higher than previously. The next step is to ensure these health benefits that can be factored into improved cost/benefit ratios result in more walking and cycling infrastructure being funded. Walking and cycling projects that may not previously have qualified may now do so. The RLTP should take account of this new information and allow Councils to put up new projects on this basis. This may require a further process of Public Consultation.

The new Government's Policy Statement on Transport Funding is expected to be released early May, but it has been out for consultation with Local Government and other targeted organisations and it is known to have an emphasis on “economic efficiency” and “value for money”. When the revised health benefits figure is taken into account then Walking and Cycling Facilities are much more economically viable.

The Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide (2007) notes that what is preferred in relation to making places more walking friendly is less traffic volume and lower speeds.

Bus priority programmes need to be prioritised over other roading projects, by bringing these forward where possible. E.g. Cranford bus priority is budgeted for (2017-2018) and with the congestion on the Main North Road and Cranford Street this should be addressed sooner. Bus Priority programmes like all roading projects must improve things for pedestrians (and cyclists), as pedestrians are the people who use bus services.

### **Why the Canterbury Region should take these actions?**

Taking these actions creates sustainable, safer, accessible communities, where more people are encouraged to use Active and Public Transport, there is community ownership of problems and solutions, and a well designed Transport system that meets the current and future needs for all pedestrians.

Some Activities need naming should also be changed to reflect that these are “shared paths” between pedestrians and cyclists. E.g. Line items:

- 31 (**Cycle** Railway-South (Kilmarnock-Blenheim Rd);
- 38, 39 (Railway **Cycleway** North-D & C (CCC), Railway Cycleway
- 28 (Southern Motorway **Cycleway** and Auxiliaries) (NZTA)

These line items need to be renamed and the design budget and implementation needs to ensure that it does not cause conflict between these two modes of transport.

### **Draft RLTP Question 2**

**Do you agree with the emphasis given to one type of activity compared to others in the Programme (Table 1, Figure 1, and Table 4)?**

We consider that some Activity Classes have too much emphasis in relation to funding, and others have insufficient emphasis and funding.

Activity Classes which need less emphasis (i.e. less funding)

- New and Improved Infrastructure for State Highways (currently 19%)

Activity Classes that need more emphasis (i.e. funding)

- Walking and Cycling Facilities (currently only 2% and needs to be increased significantly)
- Demand Management & Community Programmes (currently only 1% and should be increased significantly)
- Rail and Sea Freight (currently <1% and should be increased significantly to take unnecessary road freight off the road, so enhancing the environment for those walking and using Public Transport through less noise and pollution etc, and making it safer for pedestrians.)

The RLTP should include mention of the draft Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Strategy (GCTDM) as an important/integral document to achieving the aims of the RLTS, and the aims of the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) which include smart growth location (urban intensification) and supporting increasing the numbers walking, cycling, and using public transport.

Although these are sub-regional strategies they involve a significant amount of Canterbury population. Environment Canterbury has its own Regional Travel Demand Strategy which should be mentioned too.

**The RLTP should ensure the Travel Demand Management budget is sufficient to implement the Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management Strategy, including School and Work Place Travel Plans, and thus effectively contribute to cost savings in relation to transport infrastructure in the future.**

### Draft RLTP Question 3

**Do you agree with the forecast expenditure and funding given to transport activities in this Programme (Table 4)?**

There should be much more spent on the following two Activity Classes: “Walking and Cycling Facilities” (currently only 2% and needs to be increased significantly) and “Demand Management & Community Programmes (currently only 1% and should be increased significantly). More should also be spent on Rail and Sea Freight.

Councils in the Region need to prioritise the investment in renewals (not widening) and repairs of existing roads over building new roads. When roads are renewed better facilities for walking, cycling, and Public Transport must be included. There are opportunities for looking at interconnections and continuity for walkers in every roading project. Sometimes these are very small low cost additions that have huge benefits for walking.

The two Activity Classes, “Renewal of State Highways” (currently 7%) and “Renewal of Local Roads” (currently 16%) may have programmes that help walking but it is unknown what these are, so it is difficult to comment on. However all roading projects are walking and cycling projects, and every opportunity must be taken to ensure that roading projects follow best practice for walking .

Design for all roading and footpath projects must include using best practice which includes using Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles as well as NZ Standard 4121, the NZTA Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide (2007), and Road and Traffic Standard 14: Guidelines for facilities for blind and vision-impaired pedestrians 2003 (currently under revision). Intersections and crossing points are of particular concern for pedestrians in the urban situation, and adequate footpaths on both sides of the roads is of particular concern for rural residents.

There needs to be enforcement to keep public footpaths clear of blockages (such as sandwich boards) and use of public spaces bylaws throughout the Region. This is a low cost measure that all Councils can take to help improve significantly the footpath environment for pedestrians.

#### **Draft RLTP Question 4**

**Are there any state highway activities you think should be removed or any additional state highway activities you would like to see included to address the region's transport priorities?**

*Re Activity 28 (Southern Motorway Cycleway and Auxiliaries) (NZTA)*

We noted in our submission to the draft Christchurch City Council LTCCP, and wish to reiterate it here, and as a request to both the Regional Council and NZTA.

This Activity is incorrectly referred to as the “Southern motorway **and cycleway & auxiliaries**”, as it is a path proposed for both cycling and walking.

We believe that this project will be increasingly important in the future for the communities in that area, and as such it needs to be implemented.

We understand that there was a document signed between the then Transit (now part of NZ Transport Agency and called Highways and Network Operations and) and Christchurch City Council (CCC) that meant CCC is to pay the costs for this shared pathway.

#### **Specific Actions we suggest Council should take**

- 1) Council change the wording to say “Southern motorway and shared path, & auxiliaries” or “Southern motorway and shared walking and cycling path, & auxiliaries”
- 2) Christchurch City Council requests (and the request to CCC to undertake this is also made to CCC by the Regional Council) that NZTA reconsider the commitment to not fully fund the pathway, as we believe it meets the requirements of a facility that NZTA should fully fund, thus freeing up CCC money for other city walking and cycling projects. This is especially in light of the new Central Government priority of this State highway as a “Strategically Important Route”, and with that special Central Government prioritisation of funding for the Southern Motorway extension which should include the shared pathway.
- 3) NZTA fully funds the “Southern motorway shared pathway”.
- 4) Given the budget constraints for walking and cycling NZTA needs to ensure that the essential infrastructure (such as underpasses, bridges etc), that is best included at the time of the Southern Motorway construction are built. The rest of the pathway may need to be funded over a longer period of time, to enable other walking projects of greater priority to proceed earlier. But given



new NZTA funding for the Southern Motorway this may not need to be the case.

All new bridges or renewals for bridges in rural areas should have a minimum carriageway of 8 metres with 2.5 metre shared paths (or clip-ons) including smooth ramps to allow prams and mobility scooters easy access, and walkers and cyclists to share these facilities. In urban areas, bridges should be wider.

### **ECan Draft RLTP Question 5)**

**Are there any other comments you wish to make?**

1) We request the Regional Council, [just as it has recently supported the Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) proposed legislation change of lowering the legally allowable blood alcohol level from 80mg alcohol/100ml blood to 50mg alcohol/100 ml blood, and zero for under 20 year olds] to show its support for the following initiatives:

- I. Lobby Central Government to fund Footpath Maintenance. And to set the Financial Assistance Rate (FAR) to at least the same rate it funds local road maintenance (typically around 50%). Currently Central Government does not fund Footpath Maintenance, this maintenance is solely funded through rates. We believe that there is some sympathy by Central Government, the Ministry of Transport, and the NZ Transport Agency. If we want to spend our way out of the recession by building transport infrastructure, what a great opportunity to improve the quality of footpaths! If Central Government funded footpaths this would make it easier for Local Authorities to commit to new footpaths, and in particular rural Councils with lower rating bases to put footpaths in on both sides of roads and to build more footpaths.
  
- II. Lobby Central Government to Review the Driver Licensing Age (to look at raising the age for when people can get a licence) and Driver Licensing programme (to ensure the knowledge about driving around pedestrians, including those with impairments is significantly improved).
  
- III. Lobby Central Government to make it easier for both urban and rural communities to introduce lower speed limits reduction.

2) Environment Canterbury to sign the International Walking Charter by Council Resolution.

[The International Walking Charter and its objectives is promoted by Living Streets Aotearoa  
http://www.livingstreets.org.nz/ICharter.htm](http://www.livingstreets.org.nz/ICharter.htm)

The International Walking Charter encourages signatories to:

Recognise the benefits of walking as a key indicator of healthy, efficient, socially inclusive and sustainable communities and acknowledge the universal rights of people to be able to walk safely and to enjoy high quality public spaces anywhere and at anytime. Signatories are committed to reducing the physical, social and institutional barriers that limit walking activity and to work with others to help create a culture where people choose to walk through their commitment to this charter and its strategic principles:

1. Increased inclusive mobility
2. Well-designed and managed spaces and places for people
3. Improved integration of networks
4. Supportive land-use and spatial planning
5. Reduced road danger
6. Less crime and fear of crime
7. More supportive authorities
8. A culture of walking

Several organisations and Territorial Authorities (including Christchurch City Council) have signed the International Walking Charter by resolution.

The Region by showing its support for the principles of the Charter supports the Regional Land Transport Strategy vision and goals. It also helps with promoting and educating Regional Council Staff and Councillors about good environments for walking. By signing the Walking Charter Canterbury helps shows support for walking.

Thank you for your consideration of our submission. We look forward to working collaboratively with Council to help ensure that Canterbury is the preferred region to live, work, play, visit, and do business.

Regards

Wendy Everingham

Living Streets Canterbury Coordinator