

February 2003

1. Submission on Land Transport Management Bill

We welcome the opportunity to comment on this bill and would like to appear before select committee members with an oral submission. This submission focuses on what's good for people who walk. Improvements to public transport and cycling are also likely to help pedestrians but we have not concentrated on these areas.

2. What is Living Streets Aotearoa?

We are a society which incorporated in 2002, after an informal existence since 1998, to advocate for pedestrians. Our objectives are attached as Appendix A. We have members in Auckland, Hamilton, Palmerston North, Wellington, Lower Hutt and Christchurch.

3. General points about walking & pedestrians

3.1. Why walking is part of the solution.

Walking is the most natural, cheapest, democratic, healthy, friendly, environmentally sound mode of transport. It is the glue that creates community. Living Streets Aotearoa believes that walking contributes significantly to the five main objectives of the Bill.

- Walking
- connects people in public places
 - turns residents into neighbours
 - develops networks of support
 - forms social capital
 - allows observation of the wellbeing of others.

- Pedestrians
- provide natural surveillance of the built environment
 - provide witnesses to crimes
 - reduce fear of crime
 - act as potential guardians of targets
 - add to vibrancy of urban centres
 - shop, go to theatres, cinemas, stadia and
 - .

- Walking reduces risk of
- coronary heart disease & stroke
 - obesity
 - osteoporosis
 - diabetes
 - high blood pressure
 - cancer of the colon
 - depression & anxiety
 - loss of mobility & independence.

Walking short distances is still helpful for health and fitness – three walks of ten minutes every day are as good for fitness and better for losing weight than one thirty minute walk a day.

- Walking provides psychological & social benefits
- relaxation
 - stress reduction
 - enhanced self esteem

- thinking time
- independence, especially for young and old.

Walking reduces congestion for other road users and offers minimal danger to other road users.

Environmental benefits, assuming reasonable numbers walk rather than drive, consequently reducing kilometres driven and need to accommodate so many cars include local and global effects:

- fewer particulate emissions;
- less NO_x and CO_x emissions;
- less land hard-paved for roads, on & off ramps, parking spaces, parking buildings and garages downtown and in suburbs so less liability to flooding
- more room for urban dwellings
- more room for vegetation which absorbs CO₂ and provides native habitats;
- less oil into drains, streams and oceans.

3.2. Who are pedestrians?

Please note that pedestrians include:

- people walking for utility (i.e. to get from A to B) ;
- people walking for pleasure;
- people on footpaths, walkways, parks and crossings
- people with disabilities who may travel by wheelchair or are partially sighted, for example;
- toddlers and the elderly;
- pram-pushers;
- visitors and residents;
- people in a hurry and people relaxing in the streets;
- people who have just got out of a car, bus, coach, train or off a bicycle;
- people who have walked their whole journey.

3.3. Barriers & problems for pedestrians

3.3.1. Pedestrians are often not formally consulted, perhaps since we are all pedestrians some of the time, we are overlooked. There is also a lack of technical expertise about best practice provision for pedestrians.

We are affected by decisions made by Ministers, MoT, Police, LTSA, Transfund, Transit. and local government. Only recently have any of these organisations begun to consult with pedestrians explicitly. Often staff, board members and councillors assume that they know all there is to know about pedestrian risk, preferences, behaviour and appropriate engineering, promotion and enforcement. Sadly there is ignorance about the statistics and indifference to declines in walking and unwillingness to learn about successful interventions from other areas in New Zealand e.g. Christchurch's use of Safe Routes to Schools programme or elsewhere e.g. mileage allowances for employees walking to work at a UK health authority . The following are matters both of subjective and objective reality.

3.3.2. Speed of traffic – the faster the speed at which a pedestrian is hit, the more severe their injuries. At 30 kph, they have a 5% chance of death, at 50 kph it's 40% and at 70kph, 90% of pedestrians will die.

3.3.3. Volume of traffic

3.3.4. Pollutant emissions

3.3.5. Personal crime

3.3.6. Stranger danger

3.3.7. Poor footpaths

3.3.8. Lack of footpaths

3.3.9. Lack of consideration of access for people with impaired mobility

3.3.10. Difficulty in crossing roads, especially multi-lane ones

- 3.3.11. Lack of signage
- 3.3.12. Overgrown shortcuts
- 3.3.13. Illegally blocked right-of-way
- 3.3.14. Obstructions to the footpath – signs, vegetation, parked vehicles
- 3.3.15. Phasing of traffic signals
- 3.3.16. Separate consideration from cycling required by all agencies

These issues affect children and the elderly disproportionately. Far more children die on the roads than from violence, abuse or neglect. Given the decline in walking without significant reduction in child pedestrian deaths and injuries, child pedestrian safety is actually deteriorating. Unless pedestrian deaths and injuries are also reported in terms of numbers injured for distance covered, reductions in the road toll disguise the problem.

3.4. Success stories – many examples of programmes, promotion and engineering have contributed to improvements for pedestrians and the benefits noted above. However they are implemented in an ad hoc and piecemeal approach.

- 3.4.1. Traffic calming of individual roads
- 3.4.2. Area-wide Traffic calming and management plans
- 3.4.3. Safe Routes to School
- 3.4.4. Mileage allowances
- 3.4.5. Street furniture
- 3.4.6. Sustrans
- 3.4.7. Travel plans
- 3.4.8. Walking School Buses
- 3.4.9. Urban and rural walkways
- 3.4.10. Selective pedestrianisation of streets
- 3.4.11. Quality urban environments to shelter and attract people to walk there
- 3.4.12. Heritage and Art trails

4. General comment on scope and objectives of Land Transport Management Bill (LTMB)

Living Streets Aotearoa supports broad aims and five objectives of the New Zealand Transport Strategy (NZTS) as reiterated in the Bill's objectives. This is a good beginning to the implementation of NZTS although funding allocations have continued to favour roading solutions and there is still undue emphasis on roading for vehicular traffic. We wonder whether processes to generate effective non-roading projects have been effective.

The broader view of transport is welcome though until there is a public transport equivalence, roading projects will receive the lion's share of funding. Not all pedestrian issues are related to funding by any means. Some are design issues that would have cost no more upon construction but add-on costs are unacceptable. Achievement of the objectives requires broad action by a number of organisations and different choices by individuals.

Although the Bill emphasises acceptable land transport programmes and evaluation of alternatives, it seems that individual projects are assessed one by one. We urge the consideration of funding of packages rather than individual items, possibly over a three-year time frame.

We consider there is value in noting the adverse effect of motor vehicles as in the Road Traffic Reduction Bill and agree that targets should be established at national, regional and local levels and this requirement added either to the LTMB or the Land Transport Act be amended. Targets could usefully include emissions as well as number of vehicles. Future project funding could be dependent on the achievement of those targets by approved organisations. Decoupling transport energy consumption from economic growth is both possible and important.

The relationship of the LTMB with the Land Transport Act 1998 is complex and the separation of requirements for strategies and programmes potentially confusing.

Is it possible by ministerial directive or legislation to require all public institutions to produce their own travel plan? Funding should be minor for most organisations since increased walking could lower organisational costs. Schools may need assistance in developing travel plans since they won't be able to realise benefits financially.

We support Transfund and Transit having social and environmental responsibilities.

5. Detailed comment on Part 1 (Preliminary provisions)

- 5.1. Change definition of land transport users to explicitly include pedestrians.
- 5.2. Change definition of land transport infrastructure to explicitly include footpaths.
- 5.3. We query whether incorporated societies and trusts could become approved organisations e.g. so LSA could apply for Transfund funding to complete Te Araroa or CAN apply for completion of cycle networks – both cases where regional transport strategy may be inadequate, or can they apply to Transfund to make this happen in some other way?

5.4. Revenue – not clear why fines from e.g. bus lane infringements or parking on footpaths or from red light cameras could not be considered as income to local authorities to be used to improve pedestrian and public transport infrastructure and service levels.

6. Detailed comment on Part 2 (Funding)

6.1. Ministerial interventions must be consistent with NZTS.

6.2. Consultation – the breadth is agreed but consider that evidence of adequate community consultation in a Council's preparation of LTCCP may be sufficient in some cases, rather than repeating same consultation if the project is exactly the same as consulted on previously. However, consultation, if done early on rather than only once a project is in a detailed stage, can produce better ideas and win-win outcomes. Living Streets Aotearoa views consultation as a collaborative process rather than an adversarial burden.

6.3. We support inclusion of "affected communities" in the consultation requirements in general and particularly since the more local the group, the more important walking as a transport mode will be in regard to the proposed project.

6.4. LTSA to have similar consultation requirements in production of SAP.

6.5. LTSA's advisory groups (National Road Safety Advisory Group and Industry groups) need updating in reflection of broader thrust of transport objectives, specifically to include pedestrian advocates/representatives.

6.6. Add the Police to the list of parties to consult with.

6.7. We request consultation and subsequent funding decisions be on overall package/strategies rather than individual projects taken in isolation.

6.8. Clause 19 to require statement of how each activity or activity class contributes to overall purpose as in Clause 3 as well as criteria in section 23 .

6.9. Clause 21 to include promotion of walking and also production of organisational travel plans, either explicitly or in some broader category.

6.10. Tolling issues

6.10.1. Allow congestion charging on existing roads if there is broad support.

6.10.2. Avoid entering into any compensatory agreements for revenue lost due to effective alternatives such as a new light rail.

6.10.3. Procurement – is it intention to avoid any 'buy local' procurement of goods and services? Local businesses may be more sympathetic to the local situation and pedestrian needs.

6.10.4. We have reservations as to whether private sector objectives including required funding streams are likely to encourage sufficient consideration of pedestrian needs.

6.10.5. Clause 36 and 37 –LTSA – it is not clear why there is no onus on the LTSA to consult fully on its Safety Administration Programme rather than just publish it. We request that the Authority consult a similar list to those required by Transit, Transfund and local authorities. The Land Transport Safety Authority's objectives must be also amended to include consistency with the

NZTS, rather than just assessing how each output assists the implementation of the NZTS, although that's a useful start. Otherwise it becomes acceptable to achieve death and injury statistics reductions by reducing the number of people walking rather than contributing to a safer environment.

7. Comment on Part 3 (admin regarding Transit, Transfund)

Why are board sizes so different?

Ensure points made in parts 1 & 2 are all embedded in Transfund, Transit & LTSA's objectives e.g. 71 (i) to include promotion of walking.

8. Bibliography – many links from our website to relevant organisations and publications. Special mention must be made of the following:-

New Zealand Pedestrian Profile 2000 – The National Pedestrian Project

Children: A critical link for changing driving behaviour, Catherine O'Brien, National Center for Bicycling & Walking, Washington DC

Proceedings of London Walking Conference 'The Way Ahead' September 2002

'New Opportunities to Promote Walking' Philip Connolly, Living Streets UK

'Bringing London to its Feet' Peter McBride TfL Street Management

'The Walking and Health Connection' Neil Cavill

9. Appendix A – objects of LSA.