

# **Getting there** *on foot, by cycle*

**SUBMISSION BOOKLET**

October 2003

Submissions close in Wellington at **5.00 pm on 19 December 2003**

## Introduction and Instructions for Completion

This submission booklet has been developed to guide individuals and organisations who want to make a written submission on *Getting There – on foot, by cycle*, a draft strategy to increase walking and cycling in New Zealand transport.

The submission booklet follows the flow of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*. We suggest reading the draft Strategy document through before starting to complete the submission booklet. You may need to refer back to the draft Strategy document when completing the booklet.

Each section of the submission booklet is designed to:

- Get your overall rating on the extent to which each component of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* may need to be revised.
- Get your comments on any issues, suggested improvements, or concerns you have regarding the draft Strategy, and to receive any positive feedback.

Please answer as many sections as you can. You are also welcome to comment on any other issues relevant to *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*, or to use another format to make a submission.

The Ministry of Transport is subject to the Official Information Act 1982, which means that your submission may be made available following a request under that Act.

## Two options for completing this submission booklet

1. Save this document to your computer, complete it electronically, then email to **walkcyclestrategy@transport.govt.nz** (or post a hard copy to the address below).
  2. Print a copy of this document and complete by hand. Where possible, please make your comments in the appropriate spaces provided. If you need to make further comments, please write them separately, and include with the submission booklet.
- Post to:

**Getting there - on foot, by cycle  
Strategy Submissions  
PO Box 3175  
WELLINGTON**

## For more information or copies

If you have any questions regarding *Getting there - on foot, by cycle*, about how to complete this submission booklet, or about the submission process, please telephone **(04) 498 0649**, or email **walkcyclestrategy@transport.govt.nz**.

For more copies of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*, or this submission booklet, please telephone **(04) 498 0649**, email **walkcyclestrategy@transport.govt.nz**, or you can download copies from the **www.transport.govt.nz** website.

## Submission Details

This submission was made by:

Name: Celia Wade-Brown & Ralph Chapman

Postal Address: P O Box 11-663, Wellington

Organisation (if applicable): Living Streets Aotearoa

Role/position (if applicable): President & Committee member

1. Which of the following best describes you or your organisation?

**Tick one only.**

- ☐ Central government organisation
- ☐ Local government organisation
- ☐ Individual/not responding as part of an organisation
- ☒ Support/advocacy/special interest/community group
- ☐ Private company
- ☐ University/polytechnic/other tertiary education provider
- ☐ School
- ☒ Voluntary/Not for profit organisation
- ☐ Health service provider
- ☐ Other, please specify

2. *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* focuses on walking *and* cycling. Which of these two modes of transport is of most interest to you or your organisation?

- ☒ Walking
- ☐ Cycling
- ☐ Walking and cycling equally

3. Which of the following best describes your or your organisation's key areas of interest?

**You may tick more than one.**

- ☒ Transport planning / traffic engineering
- ☒ Urban planning and design
- ☒ Road safety / injury prevention
- ☒ Liveable communities
- ☒ Health / active living
- ☐ The environment
- ☐ Sport / Recreation
- ☐ Tourism
- ☒ The needs of cyclists, pedestrians or another road user group, please specify: Pedestrians
- ☐ The needs of a specific population group (e.g. Maori, children, older adults, people with disabilities), please specify:
- ☐ Other, please specify:

## Vision, Goals and Key principles for *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*

### Vision

The vision for *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* is

**“A New Zealand where people from all sectors of the community choose to walk and cycle for transport and enjoyment – helping ensure a healthier population, more lively and connected communities, and a more affordable, integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable transport system.”**

4. To what extent, if at all, does the vision statement need revision?

**Tick one only:**

☒ Fine as is                      ☐ Needs some revision                      ☐ Needs a lot of revision

5. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

We like it because it:

- is inclusive (all sectors)
- is positive and suggests active choice (choose to walk and cycle)
- covers both functional and recreational walking
- mentions the various benefits from walking (and cycling) - health, connectedness, affordability, safety, responsiveness and sustainability.

A possible improvement would be to markedly shorten the vision and put the detail into description of supporting goals. In that case, the vision could read: "More people choose to walk and cycle more often, for transport and enjoyment."

## Goals

To realise the vision, three important goals have been identified:

- Goal 1 “**Communities that are more walk and cycle friendly.**”  
 Goal 2 “**More people choosing to walk and cycle, more often.**”  
 Goal 3 “**Improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists.**”

6. To what extent, if at all, do **goals 1, 2 and 3** need revision?

**For each column tick one only:**

Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision

7. Please detail what needs revision for **Goal 1** (or any other relevant comments).

Goals 1 - 3 are ok but need some extra points explicitly covered:

Alter Goal 1 so it reads "Healthier communities that are more walk and cycle friendly and accessible."

Health is a key reason in wishing to improve walking numbers. Some people consider 'friendly' includes 'accessible' but we want to make that explicit.

Improvements for the least mobile, such as people using wheelchairs or infants in prams, generally improve matters for all pedestrians.

8. Please detail what needs revision for **Goal 2** (or any other relevant comments).

Unless modal share is addressed, change will be ineffective. Given how rapidly fuel use is increasing, mere walking trip increase may mask a decline in modal share. This could either be addressed by a change to goal "More people changing journeys from private car to walking and cycling. " or in the underpinning principles.

9. Please detail what needs revision for **Goal 3** (or any other relevant comments). Suggest a subtle reformulation as "Improved safety for those walking and cycling" to focus on the activity rather than the people (who may change their activity frequently).

## Key Principles

*Getting there – on foot, by cycle* is based on five key principles (see Chapter 2 of the strategy document). The principles underpin the Strategy.

10. To what extent, if at all, do the principles outlined in Chapter 2 of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* need revision?

**Tick one only:**

☐ Fine as is

☒ Need some revision

☐ Need a lot of revision

11. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

Some of these principles are barely principles as such but, more importantly, they tend to be a bit too bland. A principle is needed which sets out the need for active encouragement of walking and cycling. We suggest a first principle which conveys the government's (and the community's) commitment to get people walking and cycling:

"Increased walking and cycling is vital for the health of New Zealanders and their communities, and requires active promotion and encouragement".

We believe it is also necessary to be explicit in the strategy about walkers and cyclists having as much 'right' to be on the roads as vehicles. We believe it is time to redress the implicit presumption that vehicles have precedence, and we consider that the principles section in this document is the best place to state this. (Note that Priority 1's Action suggestions pick up this idea, but we believe it needs greater prominence.) Hence we suggest another principle: "Our streets and road corridors, except for motorways, are for walking and cycling as much as for vehicles".

Principle 1 is fine as long as it includes a wide range of agencies e.g. hospitals having travel plans, bus companies working with pedestrian advocacy organisations, councillors attending Walking conferences and the disabled community having input into District Plan design guides are a few of diverse interactions required. Comprehensive must refer to the people involved as well as the breadth of actions required.

We strongly support Principle 2 and suggest that indicators, encouragement and engineering treat the two important active modes separately in many cases. However, street audits and 'safe & active routes' programmes may work

with both modes equally. Issues of consultation in both cases are important - recreational walkers, runners, young children, frail elderly, wheelchair users, the deaf and people with limited vision all are best served by their specific involvement in an audit rather than an "umbrella person" trying to deal with all of these issues. However, over time, both advocacy groups and engineers can expect to become more familiar with mobility requirements of different groups.

Principle 3 is supported but may need rewording to show that utilitarian transport is a higher priority than leisure walkways. "Realising the full benefits of walking and cycling requires consideration of commuting modes, activity trips e.g. shopping and leisure trips." All four aspects that Rodney Tolley refers to as 'access mode', 'access sub-mode', recreation/leisure' and 'circulation/exchange' are important to measure, plan for and nurture. See In the supporting text under current principle 4, there is reference to significant challenges to walking and cycling in larger cities. We believe this underplays the significant problem that many city areas are now becoming hostile to or unsupportive of walking and cycling (e.g. when arterials dominate communities). We consider that the text needs to acknowledge this and point to the need to redress this problem, in language that is less bland and emollient.

We contend also that towns of a size such as Carterton have considerable room for improvement for pedestrians. Many tourist destinations don't qualify as cities but could be safer to walk around. Secondly, schools in small towns can certainly benefit from Safe Routes to Schools programmes for the children's activity and independence. Transit NZ may well need to be more involved in taming state highways through rural communities.

Principle 5 - we refer to evidence (as well as commonsense) that increasing numbers of pedestrians and cyclists reduces risk per km travelled (appended). The current wording seems to suggest that authorities may accept that promotion of walking should not occur since current situation is too dangerous. We disagree with this since it becomes an excuse to maintain status quo.



## Focus Areas and Priorities for *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*

To achieve its goals, *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* identifies a total of 10 inter-linked priorities for action, under four broad focus areas:

*Focus One: “Strengthen the foundations for effective action for walking and cycling.”*

- Priority 1 “Encourage action for walking and cycling within an integrated approach to land transport.”
- Priority 2 “Expand our knowledge and skill base to address walking and cycling.”
- Priority 3 “Encourage collaboration and co-ordination of efforts for walking and cycling.”

*Focus Two: “Make our communities and transport networks more friendly to pedestrians and cyclists.”*

- Priority 4 “Encourage planning, development and design that supports walking and cycling.”
- Priority 5 “Provide supportive environments for walking and cycling in existing communities.”
- Priority 6 “Improve networks for long distance cycling.”

*Focus Three: “Encourage the choice of walking and cycling for day to day transport.”*

- Priority 7 “Encourage positive public perceptions of walking and cycling as transport modes.”
- Priority 8 “Support individuals in changing their travel choices.”

*Focus Four: “Improve safety and security for those who walk and cycle.”*

- Priority 9 “Improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists.”
- Priority 10 “Address crime and personal security concerns around walking and cycling.”

For each priority, examples of actions are identified to highlight the types<sup>1</sup> of actions that could be expected to contribute toward progress on each priority.

### Priorities

12. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 1: “Encourage action for walking and cycling within an integrated approach to land transport”** and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Priority 1	Supportive actions for Priority 1
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

<sup>1</sup> The specific actions that national agencies and organisations will undertake on the strategy’s priorities are expected to be detailed in the strategy’s annual implementation plans.

13. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments).

Action suggestion 1 should become a principle in its own right.

Action suggestion 4 ("Regional land transport strategies seek to integrate walking and cycling into regional planning, and address strategic issues related to local as well as longer distance travel") is weak and needs strengthening to "...strategies integrate walking and cycling into regional planning, and address strategic issues in ways which encourage active local as well as longer distance travel.". (Note that we favour use of the term 'active travel' to denote walking and cycling, consistent with the comment on p36 of the draft strategy. It would be helpful if the Strategy were to pick up and use this term more often).

14. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 2: "Expand our knowledge and skill base to address walking and cycling"** and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

**For each column tick one only:**

<b>Priority 2</b>	<b>Supportive actions for Priority 2</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

15. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

An important part of the research picture which this Priority should seek to encourage is research which links walking and cycling with urban design and sustainability. An alternative placement of this idea might possibly be under Priority 4, but we given that we are talking about research, we consider it most appropriate to add this idea into Priority 2's 4th suggested action, as follows:- "An active programme of research for

walking and cycling is undertaken, including on linkages to urban design and sustainability, within a coordinated framework...."

Another area to improve is the co-ordination of injury data between hospitals, ACC and police sources. We believe that pedestrian and cyclist injury are both under-reported and mis-represented in that the phrase "pedestrian heedless of traffic" is used in police reports where that may only be view of driver, protecting their own interests, while pedestrian (or cyclist) is more likely to be injured and not able to speak or remember sufficiently to offer an alternative view. The issue of pedestrian injury caused by potholes and other deficiencies in pedestrian infrastructure be collected by local government. Use of comparative studies such as Quality of Life in Eight Cities is both motivating and furnishes a standard methodology.

Data about subjective matters is as important to modal shift as data about objective matters and both may be qualitative or quantitative (see [www.gpiatlantic.org](http://www.gpiatlantic.org)).

Research to document best practice that is applicable to NZ is useful and this will require considerable dissemination across a range of organisations.

Trainee and experienced engineers, planners, health professionals and recreation advisors, inter alia, need more information and examples of why walking is important and how to cater for and encourage it. Involvement of tertiary institutes, IPENZ, LGNZ and the New Zealand Institute of Highway Technology in upgrading the theoretical and practical education of practitioners and decision-makers is vital.

Living Streets is happy to offer our website as a repository of pedestrian-related links.

16. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 3: "Encourage collaboration and co-ordination of efforts for walking and cycling"** and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

**For each column tick one only:**

<b>Priority 3</b>	<b>Supportive actions for Priority 3</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

17. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments).

This is essential - agencies in central and local government, LGNZ, Living Streets Aotearoa, District health boards, SPARC, FoE Coalition, TRAFINZ and many others could add value rather than re-inventing the wheel (or shoe?).

Ministries that affect walking include Education (siting of schools, curriculum, support for travel plans at primary, secondary & tertiary levels), Health, Transport and Culture & Heritage.

Collaboration within local government is necessary. Within the city councils, walking is affected by decisions within Traffic & Transport, Recreation Planning, Urban Design, District Plan (land-use, parking and subdivision rules and resource consents), Parks, City Safety, Parking Enforcement, Safer Community Councils, Disability Reference groups and Road Safety Co-ordinators, at least.

Then there is the relationship between central, regional and local government - is it sufficient, for example, to have a regional pedestrian strategy to get funding for pedestrian projects?

We urge your support for some administrative function for the advocacy groups as information gatherers, pressure groups for local authorities and catalysts for action. Our aim is to provide exemplary advice in form of research, run community street audits with locals and external people, organise conferences, promote walking to a range of agencies and authorities, promote the benefits of walking to the general public and be an initial point of contact for walking matters in New Zealand. Our objects are appended to this submission. Some of this activity can be self-funding and we have a number of expert members. We have begun process of initiating or supporting advocacy groups in a number of centres but this work would proceed much more rapidly with adequate funding.

If Transfund uses effective performance measures for its pedestrian funding AND for its other projects, collaboration will be increased. For example, funding for area-based traffic calming could require community street audits to be done.

18. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 4: “Encourage planning, development and design that supports walking and cycling”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

**For each column tick one only:**

<b>Priority 4</b>	<b>Supportive actions for Priority 4</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

19. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

The encouragement of early action to 'design in' support for walking and cycling, as new developments take shape, is very important. At present, many local authorities seem to be largely overlooking the need to reduce car-dependence in their whole design approach, through means such as favouring higher density and mixed use development. This is particularly important for new subdivisions.

We suggest the following change to Action suggestion 4: "New subdivision standards and codes encourage street design that supports walking and cycling and encourage a reduction in car dependence."

20. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 5: “Provide supportive environments for walking and cycling in existing communities”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

**For each column tick one only:**

<b>Priority 5</b>	<b>Supportive actions for Priority 5</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

21. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments).

Add consideration of enhancing off-street paths and access-ways. Emphasis on best practice for engineering design great for new infrastructure but some access ways are steep or dark and need steps or lights rather than closure.

Funding to extend and maintain footpaths in good condition is essential. Local authorities have a backlog of streets without footpaths or crossings, low quality handrails and dangerous steps. Most of our cities already have the key streets upon which to create better walking environments but the condition is unsatisfactory.

It's good to see the issue of supporting street furniture raised such as seats. Please include water fountains and effective bus shelters too. Kerb cut-out improvements and installation of rest benches could be implemented as part of a Safe Routes programme that includes thought for the frail and elderly as well as routes to school for children. We agree the supremacy of the 'green wave' currently limits signal responsiveness to pedestrians rather than vehicles. Pedestrian needs include more frequent phase changes as well as longer phases for slower pedestrians. Maximum use of phase could be achieved by having a "seconds left" countdown rather than a red flashing man that drivers ignore.

We also welcome attention given to enforcement. For pedestrians with limited mobility, a poorly parked vehicle renders a footpath unusable for rest of its length. Many wheelchairs and scooters just cannot descend and ascend kerbs without cut-outs. Higher levels of fines and stricter enforcement for inconsiderate parking is an action to add.

We strongly support the thrust of this priority to attract new "users" of walking and cycling, although we prefer to say "new walkers and cyclists" rather than "new users" (p29). We also see parking charges and reduction in availability of parking spaces as better illustrations of a travel demand management policy than 'parking provision' (although reductions in parking provision may have been intended).

"Local walking and cycling strategies are developed in all communities within 3 years, with strategies identifying a systematic, proactive and financially supported programme to improve walking and cycling conditions, including improving behaviour of other road users."

(Note deletion of "in priority communities", since the implication should be that all communities should develop and can benefit from such strategies, even though some with a limited number of destinations within walking and cycling distance may not gain great benefit; and we would not support local authorities unduly restricting the resourcing of initiatives to provide more walking and cycling friendly environments).

Speed reduction is important for ambience as well as safety. We support 40kmh maximum speed limits in urban areas, most urgently near schools. We also support 20kmh home zones in appropriate residential streets.

22. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 6: "Improve networks for long distance cycling"**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

**For each column tick one only:**

<b>Priority 6</b>	<b>Supportive actions for Priority 6</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

23. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

Please include long-distance walking - it's an important tourist activity and although utilitarian transport may be a higher priority, we believe larger scale trails such as Te Araroa has significant economic and social benefits.

Replace with "Improve networks for long distance cyclong and walking."

We note that the extensive Sustrans routes in the UK cater for cycling, walking, running and wheelchairs.

24. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 7: “Build positive public perceptions of walking and cycling as transport modes”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

**For each column tick one only:**

<b>Priority 7</b>	<b>Supportive actions for Priority 7</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

25. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments).

Suggest rephrase slightly as "Promote positive perceptions...." or "The social, environmental, and economic benefits of walking and cycling, including the benefits of physical activity for personal health, are widely promoted...."

26. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 8: “Encourage and support individuals in changing their travel choices”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

**For each column tick one only:**

<b>Priority 8</b>	<b>Supportive actions for Priority 8</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

27. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

We note that the formulation "Encourage and support...." is used above, whereas the printed document just uses "Support...". We prefer the former, as it is more active.

An important additional suggested action should be added to the list under this priority. There is nothing so far about encouraging motorists to reduce the extent of their car dependence, through financial incentives. We believe this is important, since people need both a positive incentive to walk or cycle (or use public transport) and a disincentive to take the easy option of a car (with its attendant negative effects on



others). There is thus an economic case and a behavioural case for a financial incentive not to use a car, and this should be picked up in the strategy.

"Travel behaviour change initiatives are linked to and supported by financial and other incentives to discourage car use, such as increased car parking charges, reduction of car parking provision and introduction of congestion charging in central areas of main cities."

Furthermore, mileage allowance should be payable for walkers, cyclists and public transport use, on same mileage basis as car - this is simpler, costs no more than if people had used their car and provides a daily incentive. A discouraging tax on company car parks, (whether owned or leased - there is currently anomaly in taxation treatment of two situations) that went towards funding travel plans would be excellent.

Curriculum activity in considering their own transport in terms of energy, cost and health would be fruitful for different levels of education.

We strongly support Safe Routes to schools where enforcement, school policy, engineering and individual choice are connected in a complementary way. We suggest that the routes be checked with the local Age Concern and/or Health representatives in a community audit to discover opportunities to simultaneously help other parts of local community.

28. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 9: "Improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists"**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

**For each column tick one only:**

<b>Priority 9</b>	<b>Supportive actions for Priority 9</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

29. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments).

There are two critical elements which appear to be missing under this priority. One is changing the mindset of the driver so that he or she sees the walker and cyclist as, with few exceptions, having the priority. The second is raising the legal age for driving to 18 years.

The first issue goes beyond educating motorists on the needs and rights of pedestrians and cyclists. Changing driver attitudes and behaviours is vital given the physical circumstances: the driver, as the controller of a lethal weapon, must see "sharing" the road as involving the active demonstration of their willingness to accept and defer to the needs and rights of pedestrians and cyclists, who are not well protected in a physical sense. We suggest adding the words, perhaps added to suggested action 6: "Drivers understand that safe sharing of the road with those walking and cycling involves actively demonstrating their willingness to accept and defer to the needs and rights of pedestrians and cyclists, through courteous and careful driving."

Raising the legal minimum age for driving is important given the safety record and behaviours of young drivers. A low minimum age may have been justified when New Zealand was still essentially a rural country, but for an urban society is an anachronism.

In respect of suggested action 7, on enforcement, we suggest that the following be added: "Penalties for dangerous driving, or driving which intimidates those walking or cycling, be reviewed and, if necessary, strengthened."

Cellphone use while driving seems to particularly disadvantage walkers and cyclists since we are even less likely to be seen and drivers do not take evasive action - or even signal - no hand free to do so! Even with hands free sets, the concentration lapses - see TRL research for an UK insurance company on this point.

A possibility to improve safety for cyclists would be to encourage more young drivers to take a cycle proficiency test could contribute to the achievement of their full driving license more rapidly, as other achievements under the admirable Alchemy project do.

Physical safety is also about condition of the footpath, grates, manhole covers, slippery utility covers and so forth.

Finally, the most important issue missing here is that more people walking and cycling make streets, parks, squares and short-cuts safer in terms of road safety. This is presumably due to changed motorist expectations.

30. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 10: “Address crime and personal security concerns around walking and cycling”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

**For each column tick one only:**

<b>Priority 10</b>	<b>Supportive actions for Priority 10</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

31. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

Collaboration with Police beyond traffic units, and relationships with CPTED trained professionals will assist here.

It is crucial that accessways are upgraded (with steps, handrails, lights and even CCTV) rather than using this issue to force closure of shortcuts.

Funding for comprehensive network signage and provision of pedestrian maps would be useful.

The most important issue is under-emphasised here - more people walking (more than cycling, for personal safety issues) make streets, parks, squares and short-cuts safer. The promotion of a "virtuous circle" may be more encouraging than reference to a "vicious circle" of decline. We feel the point needs to be more strongly made - with the support of decades of evidence going back to Jane Jacobs' work on American cities - that more people walking will improve public safety: It is a central theme for Living Streets Aotearoa that "More feet on the streets represent more friendly eyes." Another way of putting that is "Pedestrians are guardians of the public realm."

## Strategy focus areas and priorities

32. Looking **overall** at the four focus areas and 10 priorities for action identified in *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*, how well do these capture the mix of activities that will be required to achieve the Strategy's goals and vision?

**Tick one only:**

☐ Fine as is

☒ Needs some revision

☐ Needs a lot of revision

33. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

We would like to see some specific targets in the strategy before it is finalised, to give it a longer-term sense of tangible direction and stretch. Our comments on indicators are provided below. However, we do not see major risks in setting some provisional target such as doubling the number of short trips by foot rather than car over the next five years.

## Implementation of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*

Chapter 4 of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* proposes a set of actions to support successful delivery of the Strategy. These include:

- Establishing a central co-ordination process, led by Ministry of Transport
- Developing annual implementation plans identifying the work programmes of national agencies
- Establishing performance indicators
- Undertaking regular monitoring and evaluation
- Ensuring government investment in the strategy is informed by monitoring and evaluation, national implementation plans, and regional/local strategies.

34. To what extent, if at all, does this set of actions need revision?

**Tick one only:**

☐ Fine as is                      ☒ Needs some revision                      ☐ Needs a lot of revision

35. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

We realise that work on outcome indicators is proposed (p47), but consider this critical and urgent, in order that the strategy have real credibility. If the target date for strategy performance indicators cannot be brought closer than January 2005, it is critical that MOT allocate adequate resourcing to ensure that this target is met with a high quality analysis of indicators and target options. We would appreciate early support for role of Living Streets Aotearoa in bringing together professionals and activists to share best practice, indicators and progress in a Walking Conference 2004.

Physical implementation will happen at a local level so ensuring local communities and councils have agreed targets, possibly through the LTCCP as well as RLTS, would be most effective.

Policy implementation such as tax changes is important and can be very rapidly implemented.

36. What are the three most important issues that could impact on your or your organisation's ability to help implement the Strategy?

(1) Resourcing (i.e. time/money) to draw on expertise within and outside New Zealand and co-ordinate activity across different centres in New Zealand.

(2) Government agencies lacking co-ordination and commitment .

(3) Local government decision-makers that choose to see walking and cycling as marginal activities by "the car-deprived".

37. **(For organisations operating regionally or locally)** *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* proposes that early focus be placed on supporting effective action on the strategy at local level. What are the three most important actions that central government and its agencies should be considering for this?

(1) Please note that branches of Living Streets operate locally at either regional, city or district levels. We suggest that pedestrian performance measures for local government be a prerequisite for any transport funding available for general projects.

(2) Requiring composition of RLTC's to include explicit pedestrian representation.

(3) Require public agencies at local levels (e.g. Councils, DHBs, schools, colleges, WINZ ) to prepare travel plans.

**38. (For all organisations)** Based on the priorities and types of actions identified in *Getting There – on foot, by cycle*, what do you consider to be the three most important actions or changes your organisation could undertake in order to increase the effectiveness of its action for walking and cycling?

(1) Publicise our existence to all local and regional government agencies.

(2) Offer and run comprehensive street audits as an independent organisation.

(3) Organise a biennial or annual Walk21 conference to bring New Zealanders together to share, learn and enjoy walking promotion, research and experiences.

and a (4) Build up and support branches across New Zealand to advocate for better conditions for pedestrians.

**General or additional comments on *Getting there – on foot, by cycle***

**38. Reviewing *Getting There – on foot, by cycle* as a whole, are there other aspects of the document you wish to comment on, or any general comments you would like to make?**

We welcome the draft strategy and feel it will make a major contribution to advancing walking and cycling in New Zealand, and to the wider goal of enhancing New Zealanders' quality of life, and sustainable development.

Overall, it is a highly professional and high quality document, which canvasses most of the relevant issues, and does so extremely clearly and helpfully. However, we feel that it lacks a sufficient sense of urgency about the need to reverse the drop seen in recent years in walking and cycling in New Zealand. There is a range of reasons to reverse this drop, such as health considerations, which are both compelling and, we understand, accepted by the Government.. We also feel that the implementation section, Chapter 4, needs strengthening, including clarification of specific contributions by government agencies such as those in the health, leisure and environment areas.

We would like to see rapid progress made in these areas, preferably in the final strategy, but at the minimum in the follow-up documents (such as the first national implementation plan)- which should be produced to a clear and demanding timetable. This strategy is not something that agencies such as Health can afford to place on the back burner, although because of the public health implications of the strategy we presume they will have no wish to do so. We would expect to see the Ministry of Health make a major effort to analyse and report publicly on the implications both at a strategic level (we note that the current Health Strategy does not give adequate attention to walking and cycling) and at the operational level. We would also expect the Ministry for the Environment and the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet to give the strategy support in terms of the objective of making our cities more sustainable. The draft strategy is positive in reflecting a recognition that the walking environment is a key factor in how liveable our towns and cities are, but that fostering such environments needs positive action. The major focus on collaboration and co-ordination between sectors and across agencies to advance this is important and laudable, but will require a tangible commitment from those agencies at all levels.



**Thank you for taking the time to make a written submission.  
Your contribution is important and will be given due consideration.**