

Living Streets Aotearoa



www.livingstreets.org.nz

Living Streets Dunedin submission on Dunedin City Council draft 2009-2019 Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP)

Name of Submitting Organisation	Submitted by Judy Martin (Living Streets Dunedin Co-ordinator) on behalf of Living Streets Dunedin
Postal Address	Living Streets Dunedin C/O of Judy Martin 207 Forfar St DUNEDIN 9011
Phone	453 4619
Email	jmartins@ihug.co.nz

15 April 2009

Introducing Living Streets Dunedin

Living Streets Dunedin is a pedestrian advocacy group established in 2007 as a branch of Living Streets Aotearoa. Its objective is to support Dunedin walkers and make our city a great walking environment for all.

Living Streets Aotearoa's vision is "More people walking more often".

For more information about Living Streets Aotearoa see www.livingstreets.org.nz

We wish to speak to our submission. Please can we have the Officers Report sent to us as soon as it is available to enable our group of volunteers to make an efficient and more useful oral submission. Preferred date for submission, Tuesday 5th May, pm or Wednesday 6th May, am

Submission layout

We have followed the format suggested by Council in the draft LTCCP document, and added page references in some instances. Many of the points refer to the same pages, at least where the financial forecasting tables are concerned:

- **Issue(s) for Council to consider**
- **Specific Action(s) we suggest Council should take**
- **Why Council should take that/these action(s)**

Submission Point 1. New footpaths beside primary interconnecting routes

Re: Accessible city (plus Forecast financial statements for Transport network, 10 year and 2009/10; Group activities transport network)
Page , v1, pp. 43-44 (v2, pp. 171-172 and 185-186; v2, p.41)

Issue(s) for Council to consider: It is good to see the Council promote a vision for an accessible city that includes pedestrian access and mobility as a high priority. The high level of funding for footpath resurfacing is noted, but it is also noted that there is no line item for the creation of new footpaths. We think new footpaths are essential along busy roads that link adjacent communities, in particular where there is no other convenient way of traveling by foot between the two.

Specific Action(s) we suggest Council should take: Please give urgent attention to creating separate footpaths along the following roads:

- a) Brighton road, between Friendship Drive, Waldronville, and Allen Road South
- b) Waikouaiti-Waitati Road (SH1) between Waitati and Evansdale (in conjunction with NZTA)

Why Council should take that /these action(s): These two stretches of road are reasonably short, well within what is considered a manageable walk for most people. and they each provide the only practical pedestrian link between two adjacent communities – Waldronville and Green Island, and Waitati and Warrington. In effect, neighbours in these communities have to drive, brave an unpleasant environment on bicycle or foot, or not visit. This violates the principles of accessible city, safe and healthy people, sustainable city and supportive community, and could be remedied for a reasonably small outlay. Living Streets Dunedin would be happy to see funding for these projects taken from the seal extension programme (see Submission point 3). State Highways such as the stretch of road between Waitati and Evansdale are often considered the responsibility of NZTA, but where these roads fall within city boundaries, councils have an obligation to advocate for the safety of their citizens.

Please see Appendix One for emails and photos regarding the Brighton Road.

Submission Point 2. Lookout Point Safety work

Re: Otago Regional Land Transport Programme (plus Forecast financial statements for Transport network, 10 year and 2009/10; Group activities transport network)
Page , v1, p. 42 (v2, pp. 171-172 and 185-186; v2, p.41)

Issue(s) for Council to consider: It is important that the Council and its transport planners acknowledge that some measures to improve accessibility for motor transport, such as seal extension, road and bridge widening and straightening, make the situation much worse for pedestrians and often deter them from walking, even when this is important for their health, social support and mobility. The first example of this issue is, Lookout Point safety work for Caversham upgrade

Specific Action(s) we suggest Council should take: Council Staff and Councillors and Council representatives on the Otago Regional Transport Committee (ORTC) must ensure that the upgrade of Caversham Valley road to Lookout Point with its plans for improved foot and cycle access across State Highway One at Lookout Point is undertaken before the widening of the Highway between Barnes Drive and Anderson's Bay Road. This is the order planned, and is the correct order for this project.

Why Council should take that /these action(s): In the Otago Daily Times on March 26, an article quoted the Chairman of the ORTC, Steven Woodhead, musing whether they should not carry out the widening of the lower part of the Highway before the Lookout Point upgrades, in his words, putting efficiency before safety.

<http://www.odt.co.nz/news/dunedin/48978/headache-over-bypass-options>

He asked the public to submit on the Regional Land Transport Programme, which we shall also do, but we wanted to make clear to the DCC as well, our absolute opposition to Woodhead's proposal. If the purpose of widening the lower road in increasing the flow of traffic is successful, this will place even more pressure on an extremely difficult active transport crossing, and destroy the connectivity between the Hills suburbs and southern suburbs even more than is currently the case.

Submission Point 3. Halt to seal extension and bridge widening, particularly Leith Valley Road and Wingatui bridge

Re: Safe and healthy people ; Group activities Transport network; Forecast financial statements for Transport network, 10 year and 2009-10

Page: v1, p.45; v2, pp. 171-172 and 185-186

Issue(s) for Council to consider: We repeat, it is important that the Council and its transport planners acknowledge that some measures to improve accessibility for motorised transport, such as seal extension, road and bridge widening, and road straightening, make the situation much worse for pedestrians and often deter them from walking, even when this is important for their health, social support, and mobility. The second example of this issue we wish to draw attention to is proposals for seal extension and bridge upgrades

Specific Action(s) we suggest Council should take: Consider all potential projects for seal extension, road and bridge widening, and road straightening for the impact that increased traffic volume and velocity might have on the community and non-motorised road users, and reject those where road "improvements" make the road more dangerous and less attractive to pedestrians.

Why Council should take that /these action(s) There is a budget line regarding the Leith Valley Road seal extension in the Regional Land Transport Programme that shows how discounting active transport needs reaches inaccurate conclusions (RLTP, p. 54-55).. Though no detail is given in the LTCCP, it is possibly included in the Seal Extension Programme line on page 171, volume 2. We strongly oppose this seal extension, especially for the full length of the road to the motorway junction, because rather than improve safety (the ostensible reason for the seal) it will decrease it, both for the motorists whose speed and number will increase, and for walkers and cyclists, who are currently high users of this pleasant, low traffic volume road. The last section of sealing that was done catered very poorly for walkers, with the seal margin ending sharply over steep slopes into ditches, and it is only the relatively low traffic volume that allows walkers to walk on the tarmac and avoid this hazard.

If the road were sealed, the thousands of cyclists, runners and walkers who use this road for recreational purposes, thus improving their own health and reducing the total health budget would reduce sharply. Any perceived increase in safety objectives would only be at the expense of these vanished active transport users, who would lose one of their most valued roads. (see email in Appendix 3)

Submission pt 4. Modification of footpaths in “parking on footpath” streets

Re: Forecast financial statements for Transport network, 10 year and 2009-10
Page v2, pp171-2

Issue(s) for Council to consider: When the “parking on footpaths” proposal was heard in 2007 Living Streets Dunedin and other submitters recommended that if parking on footpaths absolutely had to take place because of the narrowness of roads, affected streets be modified to change the profile and status of the streets, by changes to footpath, carriageway or utility placement. We were assured that such measures would be considered when road improvements came up for renewal, and incorporated if feasible. The trial was to be reviewed in one year, though this was later unilaterally lengthened to a five year period.

One of these streets in the Mornington area (Ventnor St) has just had its footpath and vertical kerbing renewed on the side on which footpath parking is permitted. This has perpetuated what was originally presented as a temporary solution.

Specific Action(s) we suggest Council should take: Living Streets Dunedin would ideally like the category of “parking on footpath” streets removed completely, as this is sending the wrong message to motorists and likely to increase parking infringements in neighbouring areas and throughout the city. At the time the “parking on footpaths” was undertaken in 2007 the New Zealand Transport Agency was writing the Pedestrian Planning Guide (2008). The Planning Guide is now available and provides useful recommendations and best practice on how to better deal with narrow streets.

Living Streets Dunedin recommends the following steps in relation to the streets currently designated as “parking on footpaths” streets.

- 1. A physical check of the width of the carriageway - some are wider than the width on the DCC database, eg. Appold St, Maryhill. These streets therefore do not need the categorization, “parking on footpath”.**
- 2. Check parking volume and local feeling to see if it is appropriate to restrict parking to one side of the street, thus increasing the virtual width of the carriageway.**
- 3. Consider underground wiring of phone and electricity services so that emergency vehicles can straddle the footpath for access to the street properties. Emergency Service access was the stated reason for allowing cars to park on footpaths.**

If the street is too narrow after all the above considerations then:

- 1. Consider designation of the street to “Shared Zone” category as per New Zealand Transport Agency (Pedestrian Planning Guide, 2008, section, 5.5.3)**

We request an immediate monitoring and evaluation report of the current streets designated for “parking on footpaths”. It is not appropriate to wait five years for the results of a trial, as the evidence should be available now (these have been in place for more than a year), and especially in light of the above new direction for best practice provided by NZ Transport Agency.

Why Council should take that /these action(s): A footpath that habitually has cars parked upon it is useless as a footpath, and therefore does not need expensive refurbishment, though it is possible that the underlying surface may need strengthening to support the weight of cars. It is essential that motorists are not given mixed messages that it is alright to park on footpaths in some situations, because it will increase their tendency to do so at other times. Replacing the same footpath on a street that has been identified as being too narrow is a shoddy solution that confuses motorists and sends the wrong signals about the purpose of footpaths.

Please see Appendix 2 for photos and a discussion of the footpath situation in Ventnor Street

Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide (2008)

This guide sets out ways to improve New Zealand's walking environment. It outlines a process for deciding on the type of provision that should be made for pedestrians and provides design advice and standards.

<http://www.ltsa.govt.nz/road-user-safety/walking-and-cycling/pedestrian-planning-design-guide/index.html>

Submission pt 5. Support for pedestrian initiatives

Issue(s) for Council to consider: There are several DCC pedestrian friendly initiatives, past, present, and future, - from the South Dunedin Neighbourhood Accessibility Plan (formerly Safer Streets) through to the upcoming revised Walking Strategy, to the proposed North Dunedin Neighbourhood Accessibility Plan.

The current DCC Pedestrian Strategy was adopted in February 2001. It has been long overdue for a review. We believe it did not have the resourcing and prioritisation it warranted in relation to ensuring its timely implementation. Therefore we believe the Council should be prioritising the implementation of the soon to be adopted Strategy including ensuring the new LTCCP has adequate funding to support the revised Strategy timely implementation.

The Dunedin Walking Strategy currently being revised, also supports completing the South Dunedin NAP, in its recommendation that DCC, "Implement physical works arising from travel plans and Neighbourhood Accessibility Plans including completion of the South Dunedin Safer Routes recommendations" (working draft DCC Pedestrian Strategy, 2009).

Specific Action(s) we suggest Council should take: We warmly support the continued use of DCC staff and resources to plan, implement, and monitor these strategies and Plans, for example the continued implementation of the South Dunedin Neighbourhood Accessibility Plan.

We consider the South Dunedin NAP needs to have priority over the North Dunedin planned NAP, as the South Dunedin NAP project was undertaken in January 2004, and therefore the actions need to be completed as soon as possible, to fulfill and respect the Community expectations and efforts in undertaking the project.

We applaud the DCC also funding the investigation stage of the North Dunedin NAP and look forward as a User Group to being part of this investigation.

The current revision of the Pedestrian Strategy is critical to finish in a timely way, and in particular there needs to be a detailed Implementation/Action Plan. Unfortunately, the

Pedestrian Strategy is still under review and the LTCCP process, which secures funding for three years, is now underway. We request that the Council ensures that there is sufficient funding to begin implementing the Action Plan in the 09/10 year. We do not believe the current level of funding for pedestrian facilities (Capex) and promotion is sufficient to enable this to happen, and so request further funding is secured to ensure the walking Strategy is implemented over the next three years.

Why Council should take that /these action(s): Strategies without objectives, targets and follow up to ensure that these have been met, are expensive pieces of paper that achieve little. These strategies, followed through towards their conclusion, contribute strongly to all the community outcomes listed in the LTCCP.

Submission pt 6. Adaptation of Community Street Review tool.

Issue(s) for Council to consider: The DCC needs to measure resident satisfaction with footpath quality in a more detailed manner than the single subjective measure of satisfaction of v2, p.40. One way of doing this including using a comprehensive tool supported by the NZ Transport Agency (NZTA), the Community Street Review. (see <http://www.levelofservice.com/>).

The DCC Walking Strategy under review has as one of its targets:

“

Specific Action(s) we suggest Council should take: Living Streets Aotearoa as a National Organisation is keen to offer their services to Dunedin City Council in the form of providing Community Street Reviews to enable the detailed assessment and ongoing monitoring of resident satisfaction with footpaths Living Streets Aotearoa was the organisation contracted by NZ Transport Agency to undertake this tool so we feel we are in the best position to talk with Council about this. Living Streets Aotearoa have piloted part of this tool with Wellington City Council in November 2007 <http://www.livingstreets.org.nz/pdf/Brooklyn2007.pdf>

Submission pt 7. Support for an Otago Regional Active Transport Forum

Issue(s) for Council to consider: Living Streets Dunedin supports the formation of an Otago Regional Active Transport Forum (possibly to also include Southland) to better co-ordinate Active Transport activities in Otago. Such a forum increases intersectoral and interregional support, networking, and information sharing so ensuring better Active Transport outcomes for Otago.

Several such Forums exist in many regions throughout New Zealand. The Canterbury Active Transport Forum established late in 2007 has contributed to better regional co-ordination and understanding and of best practice in Canterbury including through presentations on new Active Transport developments and Government initiatives and requirements.

In February this year the DCC held a Forum amongst largely Dunedin City Active Stakeholders that attendees were positive about. There is some support from DCC Staff to extend this to the Region and to a wider group, with a broader agenda.

The Dunedin Walking Strategy currently being drafted, upon whose working group one of the Living Streets members is on, recommends the formation of a Sustainable/Active Transport Forum.

Specific Action(s) we suggest Council should take: We request that DCC shows leadership and support through resourcing its staff to enable the setting up an Active Transport Forum in Otago in the current or early next financial year, with assistance to be sought from other Councils in the Region, including the Otago Regional Council,

Submission pt 8. Review of all Pedestrian Crossing facilities

Issue(s) for Council to consider: Pedestrian motor vehicle casualties are a major cause of death, injury, and disability in Dunedin. The number of pedestrians injured or killed through motor vehicle collisions in Dunedin between 2004 and 2008 was 266, and included 249 foot pedestrians, 12 skateboarders, and 5 “wheeled pedestrians” (wheelchair or mobility scooter users). Over the previous ten years the level of pedestrian casualties in Dunedin City has increased (from NZTA Crash Data).

The working draft of the revised Pedestrian Strategy (2008) has in its **Action Plan for Goal 2: A safe, convenient, and attractive walking environment to:**

“Review all pedestrian crossing facilities to ensure they are appropriate for the level of use and the adjacent land use environment and develop and implement a forward works improvement programme” (working draft DCC Pedestrian Strategy, 2009)

Specific Action(s) we suggest Council should take: Council prioritises reviewing pedestrian crossings in the next financial year due to increasing pedestrian casualty rate.

Submission pt 9. Best Practice Standards for all new and repairs of Footpath Facilities

Issue(s) for Council to consider: Dunedin pedestrian facilities need to be designed to the latest relevant guidelines and standards. Issues can occur at the design and planning stage and during implementation at the contractors stage.

Specific Action(s) we suggest Council should take: Council adopts the relevant guidelines and standards for the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of walking facilities. A list of relevant guidelines and standards is being undertaken in the currently being revised Walking Strategy.

Relevant Transport, Planning, and Design Council Staff attend and encourages DCC Contractors who design or build pedestrian facilities to attend , the Fundamentals of Planning and Design Course (NZ Transport Agency course).

Additional information

Please see Appendix 3 for an email from a member which puts all these issues in a larger perspective, emphasizing multimodal use and health benefits, and the slowness of current progress.

Thank you for your consideration of our submission. We look forward to working collaboratively with Council to help ensure Dunedin is walking friendly and the preferred city to live and work.

Regards

Judy Martin

Living Streets Dunedin Co-ordinator

Appendix one: Information relating to Brighton Road pedestrian access

From: Gail Arthur <gail.arthur@otago.ac.nz>**Date:** 18 March 2009 11:38:27 AM
To: "jmartins@ihug.co.nz" <jmartins@ihug.co.nz>**Subject:** Living Streets Dunedin

Dear Judy

My family and I live in Waldronville. I would love to be able to walk to Green Island with my children but feel the Brighton Road between Green Island and Waldronville is not safe for young children as there are no footpaths and the speed limit is 80 kmh. Having grown up in Green Island I am aware this stretch of road has always been an issue for pedestrians and am sure others have brought this to your attention.

Kind regards
Gail Arthur

And
Hi Judy

I am happy for you to use my email and can add in the six years I have lived in Friendship Drive, I have not walked the road to Green Island as having daughters, aged ten and five, I feel the road is not safe to negotiate with children. The last time I walked the Brighton Road stretch, I was in my teens (I am now 43) when traffic was much lighter than it is now. My daughters have friends (11 and 8 years of age) who also live in Waldronville who attend St Peter Chanel School in Green Island, their Mum has echoed my sentiments about the safety of the road and drives them to and from school each day as she is also conscious of the safety issues for pedestrians using this road.

Kind regards
Gail



Figure 1. Adult pedestrians braving the road verge on Brighton Road.



Figure 2. A closer view of the corner they were walking, showing narrow verge, uneven surface and steep unstable slope.

NB: This mature couple said they walked from Waldronville to Green island to see family members, but found the traffic very fast and close. Also, they had to walk on the same side of the road going in both directions. I met another mature couple on Allen Road South, who say they walk on the section of road between Brighton and Allen Road South (which has a much flatter slope from the road to ditch, and even a rudimentary gravel footpath) but have never ventured south of Allen Road South on foot. Even on the section they walk on, the closeness of cars and protruding truck mirrors makes the walk uncomfortable.



Figure 3: An example of the narrow verge and very steep unstable slope which face would be walkers between Waldronville and Green Island.

Appendix 2: Photos of the recently renewed “parking on footpaths” footpath in Ventnor Street.



Figure 4 Ventnor St. Footpath parking makes this footpath unusable, so why go to the trouble and expense of renewing it? A road of this type would be appropriate for consideration as a shared zone, which would involve the removal of all vertical kerbs.



Figure 5: Ventnor St, The “available” footpath. In current “Parking on footpath” streets, care must be taken to see that the remaining usable footpaths are kept clear of obstructions, with consideration given to putting electricity and phone wiring underground to increase the width of the footpath. (In practice, most people seem to walk on the road in this street, because of the obstructions on both footpaths.)

Appendix 3: Email from a member regarding the importance of multi-modal roads. Key points have been *bolded and italicized*

From: Gerrard Elizabeth Liddell <gliddell@xtra.co.nz>
Date: 10 April 2009 10:59:38 AM
To: Judy Martin <jmartins@ihug.co.nz>
Subject: **Comments on community plan**

The items I wished to raise in the community plan concerned the particular budget lines for pedestrian facilities, residential development, rural road seal extension (and to a related issue of budgeting and charging for city amenities like the swimming pools).

I cannot find any more information on the seal extension schedule (and have spent too much time looking for it already). Likewise I cannot find details of the pedestrian facility programme.

If these are not available online, then when you are talking to DCC you might point out that they need to be available if genuine consultation is to occur.

I cannot find reference in the community plan to development plans as they relate to residential development (see Economic Development and City Promotion).

The budget 'Transportation Operations' has items:

Seal Extension Programme 778 772 795 818 837 857 876 896 917 939 961Dunedin/Port Chalmers Walkway/Cycleway ‡ 250 1,030 636 764 1,117 1,198

Cycling Network Implementation ‡ 237 209 215 220 226 231Mobility Facilities Programme ‡ 309 593 610 610 624 639 654 669 684 701 717Pedestrian Facilities Programme ‡ 417 442 455 468 479 491 502 513 525 538 550

Facilitating walking as a transport option cannot be achieved under the current strategy for several generations. There is a list of some outstanding routes that need some pedestrian facility below, but a full map shows such problems are everywhere around the city region. Provision of full and formal footpaths in urban streets alone is estimated to be generations away:

See Report No. PM07/1387T B844403

NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY

SURVEY OF FOOTPATHS, CYCLEWAYS & RELATED COSTS

"At present rates of expenditure this would take some 24 years to achieve."

The only way to provide the option of walking as a means of transport is to use existing road corridors. They were created as multi-modal conduits. See the many analysis done of their varied use. Pedestrians criss cross the road in early photos, cyclists fill them and children play on them. The increasing presumption of the primacy of vehicules has generally increased the hazard to other users.

Where a road corridor remains the only pedestrian route, that corridor should be 'dressed' in such a way as to make the multimodal nature evident. The odd signs a few kilometers apart are

ineffective. Road markings to indicate the areas of the bitumen on which vehicles should expect pedestrians or to share with pedestrians is the only way of addressing Dunedins (and New Zealands) pedestrian challenges.

The community plan has a line for the harbour walkway, but no provision for this far more important and general pedestrian facility.

When the nature of a road is changed it is especially important to ensure its pedestrian facility is not lost.

The sealing of rural roads with no concomitant pedestrian facility usually downgrades the pedestrian amenity. The sealing leads to greater vehicle speeds. It usually extends the carriageway and delineates negligible space for pedestrians. It gives the impression that pedestrians who could previously share the gravel are not entitled to share the bitumen. It enhances the perception that the road is primarily for vehicles. It increases traffic volumes. I cite three examples.

The sealing of first section of the Leith valley road went right to the margins, leaving no pedestrian space. The road seal went right to the edge of steep dropoffs on one side and into the bank on the other. This is particularly slow on the section from the last and closest bus stop to the DCC attraction of the glowworms and Nichols falls and the tracks there. ***Within 10 days of sealing, there had been several incidents of conflict between accelerated vehicles and pedestrians, runners and cyclists.***

The sealing of roads without any other markings to emphasise the place of non-vehicular traffic leads to greater vehicle speeds, less tolerance, and enhances the presumption that the road is for vehicles and other users do so at their peril. The roads lose their multi modal character.

The same was observed after the sealing of Blueskin Rd. The resealing of Three Mile Hill road has increased vehicle speeds:

See: DCC to act after crashes on Three Mile Hill Rd. ODT Mon, 8 Dec 2008

At the moment the Leith Saddle route is the only route out of Dunedin that is multi modal. It is used by runners (the traditional Waitati circuit that Dunedin's outstanding runners train on). Any extension of the seal should be reconsidered on many grounds, not least of which is pedestrian and cyclist amenity.

The pools are well patronized, with resent letters to the ODT complaining about the lack of lanes at Moana in the morning. Indeed the pool is used from 5am and even at nearly 10pm I find the pool actively used by 20 or more people. This is one of the highest utilizations of any facility. It is accessible by foot from a large area of Dunedin. It has significant health benefits (swimming is the number one physical activity in NZ after walking, according to SPARC data). ***The economic value of the health benefits is not yet recognized in formal budgets, so this should be recognized by direct local government support.***