

Living Streets Aotearoa



www.livingstreets.org.nz

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

14 April 2009

James Ryan
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 237
CHRISTCHURCH 8140
ccc-plan@ccc.govt.nz

Name of Submitter and Submitting Organisation	Living Streets Canterbury Coordinator, Wendy Everingham, on behalf of Living Streets Canterbury
Postal Address	Living Streets Canterbury C/O of Wendy Everingham Living Streets Canterbury Coordinator 1/4 Harmans Road Lyttelton
Phone	328 9093 or 328 8359
Email	wendy.everingham@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, whether it is with an aid/support or not. Living Streets represents the interests of all types of walkers, many of whom also use public transportation.

Living Streets Aotearoa vision is “More people walking more often”.
For more information about Living Streets Aotearoa see www.livingstreets.org.nz

Christchurch City Council is a signatory to the International Walking Charter and its objectives, a Charter 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.

General Comments about our submissions layout and content

For this Living Streets submission we have mostly ordered our comments in the order found in the draft document, with page references (relating to Volume 1), and following the format suggested by Council in the draft LTCCP document of:

- **Issues for Council to consider**
- **Specific Actions we suggest Council should take (in bold)**
- **Why Council should take that/these action(s)**

We think this LTCCP is much clearer than the previous edition, however it is still difficult to make useful comments particularly on the monetary figures, but also on some of the line items that do not provide detail (see specific actions requested below for an explanation). We have appreciated the support of Council Transport Officers in answering some of our questions.

Comparisons of past spending on walking and Active Transport is further complicated by changes in category names and the items included in different categories between the years.

Specific Actions we suggest Council should take:

1) It would be helpful to include in future LTCCPs:

- a) **what budgets are being cut or increased in the proposal, and by how much**
- b) **actual figures for income and expenses plus projected budgets**
- c) **information on what specific projects listed under Capital Expenditure (Capex) and non-Capex (e.g. Operational) line items mean. There are no details of specific projects to improve walking/cycling. For example we have been unable to get information on what “pedestrian priority” projects mean (page 261)**
- d) **information showing a comparison between Canterbury Transport Regional Implementation Plan (2008-2038) (CTRIP) and what funding has and has not been applied for in the LTCCP.**

This submission comments on a variety of issues including:

- The tram route extension - too far and too costly
- Need for greater investment in travel demand management and travel plans
- Implications of cluttered pavements for an ageing population
- Contributions to economic development
- Need for increasing the walking budget to ensure that real gains in relation to increasing the walking modal share are made
- Need to increase the walking target including ongoing increasing over the ten year period

Extension of the Central City Tram Route through City Mall South to Barbadoes Street

Pages 14, 211-213

Issues for Council to consider

The existing tram tracks are dangerous for people crossing the tracks due to the potential for slipping or tripping. There is extensive evidence that injuries and near misses for cyclists are occurring at an alarming rate (see Spokes Canterbury website - <http://spokes.org.nz/webform/bike-crashes-on-tram-tracks>). This is a particular issue in Armagh Street near Hagley Park. We are especially concerned to ensure that the tram does not affect the safe movement of people's everyday

commuting or shopping.

We are also concerned about the amount the tram extension is costing and that it has been wrongly itemised under the Transport budget rather than tourism amenity promotion, where it belongs.

The Mayor at a recent Public Meeting (held March 25, 2009 in Council Chambers) acknowledged the tram as a tourist asset rather than a light rail public transport system. The Christchurch Tram publicity brochure lists ticket options of \$15/ticket for the tram or combination pricing options with other tourist ventures - the gondola and punting on the Avon. All these options are for-profit tourist operations run by a private operator, not public transport.

The historic tram can not be considered an accessible or viable public transport option due to high pricing, its limited route (even if extended to High Street and beyond), its gauge incompatibility with a genuine light rail network and also the problem of boarding and alighting using high steps for older people and people with impairments. The Shuttle bus service provides excellent inner city transport, and could possibly have its route extended to include other areas. The tram extension by contrast is not a valid public transport service - which is why it does not qualify for a NZ Transport Agency subsidy.

To promote economic development and inner city revitalisation, tourists should be offered the experience of a different lifestyle to what they may have at home, so they need to feel part of a City's normal life including everyday people's movement around the city centre. If we build for the locals, tourists will come and stay, if we build extensive infrastructure solely for tourists and leave the locals in cars, visitors experience the city with other visitors and not locals, and consequently will not stay long.

The only explanation we can find about funding arrangements is:

“As described in the LTCCP, this project is proposed to be funded from the Grants and Subsidies and borrowing and not from either rates or by a direct levy on businesses.” (page 212).

There are many issues with the tram project that remain unclear.

1. What are the financial arrangements and is there a profit share scheme with the council?
2. If the tram isn't self funding shouldn't the costs be shared with the retailers (through a direct levy) who stand to benefit most from the project?
3. What about maintenance costs?

In summary, Living Streets Canterbury asserts that the proposed \$11.5 million Grants and Subsidies under the Transport budget could be better spent improving walking and cycling facilities, safety and signposting in the central city and some traffic calming of streets to make them more pleasant for inner city residents, visitors, and commuters.

Specific Actions we suggest Council should take

We would like clarification on how the Tram is funded, see our questions above.

1) If the decision after Public consultation through this LTCCP process is still to extend the tracks:

a) It is important to ensure the tracks do not compound issues for pedestrians and cyclists, including those crossing the tram tracks, and people entering and alighting the tram. It is essential that the tracks and platforms are installed in a manner that does not impact negatively on those with mobility impairments, walkers, and cyclists. We suggest the (new) tram tracks are kept to the centre of the road, minimising the amount of criss-crossing required, and with accessible, pedestrian-prioritised waiting platforms immediately adjacent,

i.e. along the centre line. This means cars are secondary to the tram in these roads, rather than the tram being subservient to cars. This is the case in Melbourne where there is a very successful tram transport system into central city from the suburbs, covering sufficient distance to help local travel as well as tourists.

b) Only Stage 1 (\$5.9 million) should be implemented after which an assessment should be done of its benefits. Stage Two (\$5.6 million) is less obvious in terms of real benefits for tourists, with only the Music Centre and Cathedral as 'visitor' destinations, both easily achievable by a short walk with a good map and signposting, without the need to extend the tram tracks. The capital saving on tram track laying could easily pay for signposting and map displays at several points around the tram route.

c) We believe it is not necessary to construct new tram tracks before the 2011 Rugby World Cup events in Christchurch, as there is already an adequate route in Central Christchurch for tourists to experience the Tram. We suggest the existing tram route is promoted in advertising for the World Cup and that the additional number of tourists are provided with attractive central city walking maps showing locations of features which can be seen by walking from that route. Extending the shuttle bus service in addition during the World Cup to cater for the crowds attending AMI Stadium would help address congestion during this time and notices about the tram on these buses would give another opportunity to advertise the Tram. A free bus service caters more for tourists to come into the city rather than the limited capacity of the proposed tram extension.

We request the timing of the proposed spending of the \$11.5 on the Tram Track extensions, including the \$5.9 million proposed for Stage 1, be delayed to enable other priority sustainable transport and community needs to be funded. These include remedial work in relation to the tram tracks currently endangering pedestrians and cyclists at the Hagley Park end of Armagh Street and by Victoria Square, and will enable more essential local work on footpaths and public spaces to occur. The Council notes an assumption of 40% drop in growth of new ratepayers in 09/10, 25% in 20/11, with a return to normal new ratepayer growth from 11/12. And Council also notes, *“To accommodate this slowing of growth, the Draft Plan proposes some alterations to the timing of big projects”* (page 8). This should be just such a project.

Some of the \$11.5 million “redirected” money (through timing changes, not undertaking Stage 2, or not undertaking the tram extensions at all) needs to be spent on the well designed revamp of the Hagley Park Armagh Street entrance (we support Spokes Canterbury 2004 Hagley Park Submission), including roading considerations that prevent the “rat run” of cars avoiding peak Durham Street South traffic by using Rolleston Ave and Park Terrace, and ensuring safer access to Armagh Street for pedestrians, cyclists, and the tram.

d) Council needs to pro actively look at opportunities to improve walking facilities that are connected with the existing (and if it goes ahead the future) tramway stops. For example, “Stop 8 The Casino” on the Tram company's pamphlet notes that this is also where the bus to the Christchurch Gondola leaves. A quality/accessible walking environment including good footpaths and signage is important to enhance and complement the tram travel experience.

Strategic Conversations; investment in Travel Demand Management (TDM), including School and Work Place Travel Plans

Pages 19-20, 25, 84, 85

Issues for Council to consider

The Council has five other Council Strategies that deserve mention in the LTCCP, the Pedestrian

Strategy (2001), the Cycling Strategy (2004), the draft Banks Peninsula District Council Walking and Cycling Strategy (2005), the Parking Strategy (2003), and the draft Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Strategy (2009). There is no mention of any of these Strategies in the draft LTCCP.

The Walking and Cycling Strategies involved considerable public consultation and are as valid now as ever before. At this stage we believe these strategies are best kept separate, as although these have some strategic level common elements, at the implementation, monitoring, and target levels, these two modes are very different.

The overview of “*strategic conversations with the community on key issues facing the city*” does not mention the draft Greater Christchurch Travel Demand (GCTDM) Strategy, which was out for Public consultation in February 2009. Council however mentions in the draft LTCCP, the draft Water Supply Strategy another recent public consultation, held after the consultation about the GCTDM. The lack of inclusion of the draft GCTDM misses an opportunity to reflect the Council's stated commitment to the aims in the GCTDM Strategy. Like the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (GCUDS), Travel Demand Management has huge implications for collaborative action between the partners to the Strategy, and to how we might reduce Christchurch's dependence on the motor vehicle, and in particular single occupant vehicles.

The GCTDM Strategy points out that if just one trip per week per person was changed from single occupancy to shared then the expected growth rate of congestion would not occur. The GCTDM is supportive of what the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (GCUDS) is trying to achieve in terms of making walking, cycling, and public transport the easy choices. This is hugely significant for the City Council in terms of savings in building new roads and for the health of the community (through less air pollution, noise, & community severance), as it better enables the essential car and freight traffic to flow on the road.

There does not appear to be a Capex budget for Travel Demand Management, apart from “safe routes to schools” (\$76,000) (page 25 and in Capex section). We understand there is a small amount in the Operational budget for Travel Demand Management. The implementation of GCTDM Strategy will save the Council a considerable amount of money in the future, by avoiding road building, due to the modal shift towards the active modes, Public Transport, car ride share, School Travel Plans, and Work Place Travel Plan type initiatives.

One area where the Council needs to show leadership is sustainable transport planning for its own events. For example, major events such as the Ellerslie International Flower Show and Christmas in the Park need to encourage and prioritise attendees who use public or active transport.

Linwood College being “prescribed” pedestrian fences/barriers along the centre of Aldwins Road while maintaining a 60km/h zone right through the school zone, and inadequate provisions for cyclists and walkers, is an example of unsuitable road infrastructure without planning to get the best outcome. A Neighbourhood Accessibility Plan (NAP) and School Travel Plans are urgently needed for the Linwood Avenue, Linwood Intermediate, and Linwood College area and schools

Neighbourhood Accessibility Plans (NAPs) are a good investment for the Council. One of the key priorities for action under the Government's *Safety to 2010 Strategy* is to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists. This includes developing Neighbourhood Accessibility Plans (NAPs) in targeted geographical areas, with priority given to low income areas where there are safety issues. NAPs are developed by partnership between local authorities and local communities to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists in areas where they are at high risk of injury or death. Wellington is implementing one, as is Otara in Auckland (due to start in July 09).

Council needs to develop an action plan (possibly best fits within the Travel Demand Management Strategy Action Plan) for implementing NAPs, with priority given to those areas with a high vulnerable user injury rate and low socio-economic index.

There does not appear to be any information about NAPs in the LTCCP.

School Travel Plans are also great for Council to support. School Travel Plans rely on support from and engagement with the school community, community boards, and the Council. School Travel Plans focus on: school journeys and encourage alternatives to car travel, reducing traffic at the school gate, and improving pedestrian and cyclist safety.

Types of actions from School Travel Plans include: establishing 'walking or cycling school buses' for primary school aged children (Nelson has cycling school buses and some Christchurch schools have walking school buses); improving the safety of pedestrian and cycling road-crossings; signposted safe walking and cycling routes and facilities; engineering to reduce vehicle speed and increase driver awareness so that they expect high numbers of young people walking and cycling (Local area traffic management and traffic calming); road safety training; parking restrictions; promotional activities that encourage car pooling, walking, and cycling; and walking and cycling school route maps.

The Council only plans to roll out **four** School Travel Plans per year. Given there are **151 schools** (primary, intermediate, secondary, and composite schools) in the CCC area this is tokenism. It will not result in the much needed modal shift to active transport so desperately needed for travel to school, to reduce the “chaos at the school gate”. Auckland has several School Travel Planners working, and any new infrastructure around schools first requires a School Travel Plan. Christchurch should emulate this.

Workplace Travel Plans are ways that businesses can encourage reduced individual car travel for commuter and business journeys. Types of initiatives include: car pooling schemes; provision of cycle facilities, provision of showers and lockers for people walking, running, or cycling to work; improved passenger transport services; flexible working practices; and car parking schemes. Although Work Place Travel Plans are mentioned in the draft GCTDM Strategy there appears to be no budget in the draft LTCCP (or no specific line item for these, so it is unknown if there is any budget for these).

Workplace Travel Plans are great for Council to support as an important part of helping to increase the active and public transport modal share to take the pressure off the existing road system thus allowing essential traffic including essential road freight to move efficiently.

Specific Actions we suggest Council should take

1) In the discussion about Strategic conversations, Council should include mention of the draft Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Strategy as an important/integral document to achieving the aims of the LTCCP, 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.

2) The Council should ensure its 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.

3) The Council should increase the number of School Travel Plans it proposes to undertake annually and ensure there is a both an operational and capital expenditure budget for these. If more schools sign up than predicted, then Council staff should be able to raise the minimum in subsequent years. We suggest that the Council works in with the Enviroschools programme to increase school staff and parental interest and participation in these.

4) The Council should make School Travel Plans mandatory preparation to getting new roading infrastructure around schools.

5) The Council should hire staff or contractors to audit and undertake travel plans for existing Council public 'crowd-attracting' events, to demonstrate environmentally sustainable practice in relation to both transport and recycling at such events.

6) Council needs to commit to reviewing its own Pedestrian Strategy, including a detailed implementation plan, and budget to implement the existing Strategy and any changes from a review.

Strategic Issues - Ageing

Pages 20-21

Issues for Council to consider

The ageing Christchurch population, which by 2031 will see nearly a quarter of the city population over 65 years old, as the Council notes in its draft LTCCP, means we need to start planning for this older population now. Good quality footpaths, lighting, freedom from obstacles and more frequently available seating are all important to ensure older people are able to fully and safely enjoy public spaces; and participate in economic, social, and cultural activities in their city.

Street furniture (e.g. signage, seating, and gas heaters) and shop promotional displays are increasingly cluttering footpaths, impeding pedestrian flow, and making it especially difficult for members of the community who have mobility impairments such as physical impairment and vision loss. Living Streets Canterbury is supportive of the “Cafe Culture” for the life it can bring to the streets, but this needs to be managed so the balance between people using the footpaths to walk and those sitting and enjoying the ambiance of street life is appropriate. Space for cafes should be taken from motor vehicles (parking or active traffic lanes), rather than from footpaths. Nelson City has good examples of parking spaces being used for cafe life. Design 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). There needs to be appropriate enforcement of clear public footpaths and use of public spaces bylaws.

Examples of areas where there are issues include:

- along Oxford Terrace, the area known as “The Strip”, where increasingly high “walls” are being installed, and menu boards on stands creep ever-further onto the footpath, impeding pedestrians' passage and preventing passersby and patrons from having visual interaction (see CPTED). This appears to be anathema to the intended purpose of outside seating, which was to bring the cafe culture into the street while designing to meet principles of NZ Standard 4121. The footpaths are also public space that now appears to be claimed by the cafe owners as if their own property, some with barriers to prevent usage by the general public.
- the west corner of Peterborough and Colombo Street where it appears the restaurant owner

has put up large white picket fences, cemented in large stones, and placed planters on the street corner impedes natural desire lines of pedestrians - thus the design of the street appears to have been captured by one retailer's style. All along the stretch of Colombo Street from Peterborough to Kilmore Street especially on the west side there is a lot of street signage and seating clutter, especially in the shop frontage zone.

- New Regent Street, where the great public open space has been consumed by illegal car parking every evening.
- Cathedral Square appears to be increasingly encroached upon by cars driving and parking.

Specific Actions we suggest Council should take

1) The LTCCP needs to reflect the Council's stated commitment to provide for an ageing population by increasing the amount of funding available to be spent on the design, implementation, and enforcement, of quality accessible pedestrian facilities, including footpaths, seating, safety from hazards and better lighting.

2) Some relatively low cost initiatives would be for Council to:

a) Enforce where shops and cafes put their street furniture. Signs and street furniture should be at the curbside rather than next to shop frontages (Reference: Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide, 2007) This needs a specific enforcement campaign, and ongoing work to educate business.

b) Initiate dialogue with Cafe and Bar owners about what constitutes acceptable and good use of Public Spaces.

c) Ensure no extension beyond permitted boundaries (and removal where appropriate of the existing "creepage") by Cafe Owners installing permanent fixtures on Public Space and cars parking or driving in pedestrian areas.

d) Enforce all bylaws relating to use of public spaces.

Why Council should take that/these action(s)

To ensure that footpaths are high quality environments for all people walking and enjoying public spaces but especially the increasing older age group and those with impairments.

Strategic Issues - Economic Development

Page22

Issues for Council to consider

Consider our vision of a future Christchurch:

"Christchurch as *the* place to do business and for tourists to visit. A movement back from Auckland of Head Offices to Christchurch, due to the relative ease of transport around, and in and from the City Centre. Christchurch as a centre of excellence in which to live, visit, and do business, due to high quality roading and footpath infrastructure, which provides for multi-modal choice. People who live close to the City centre (less than 2km) will choose to walk, cycle, or take Public Transport. People who choose to bus will do so due to the close proximity of high quality Council-funded infrastructure, such as well lit and serviced bus stops, with good seating and bus proximity information displays. Cars and freight that need to be on the road can move freely, as people who don't need to drive a car have access to affordable and enjoyable active modes (walking, cycling), taxis, and public transport."

Specific Actions we suggest Council should take

1) The Council budgets in the LTCCP for considerably more walking infrastructure investment in the following three years. It is not accepted that walking will remain at the same low share of transport modes, both in the shorter term during a financial recession, when second car ownership will cease in some households; and in the longer term when the cost of fuel will rise in response to international competition for a scarce oil resource (“peak oil”).

Why Council should take that/these action(s)

Council can help significantly in making Christchurch a better place to live, work, and play by investing in quality walking environments. The Christchurch economy will benefit as people choose to locate and do business in Christchurch due to its great infrastructure and ease of doing business.

Community Support

Page 176

Issues for Council to consider Strengthening Communities – The Council has indicated a commitment to providing community support activities to enhance opportunities for meeting and socialising, and to develop strong and inclusive communities in Christchurch. As part of this community development projects are listed - one of which is the “Accessible Christchurch Project”. We understand this was an initiative between the Council, Humanware, the University of Canterbury, and other Disability Agencies but to date there has been no results. The aim was for Christchurch to be the most accessible city in the world – to be able to be proud of achievements around accessibility. We have an ageing population as well as those needing the community to be designed to be inclusive.

Specific Actions we suggest Council should take

1) We request information on what has happened to the Accessible Christchurch Project, and a recommitment by Council to this Project.

Strategic Issues-Transport, and Streets and Transport

Pages 25, 82, 84, 257

Issues for Council to consider

Better Urban Design that incorporates Public Transport and active modes of transportation in the design stage – so design work is not an 'add on'.

Better coordinated public transport route planning (ECan leads) and infrastructure provision (CCC leads).

We congratulate the Council on its programme of Bus Priority routes (e.g. Cranford, Central City, Sumner, New Brighton, Orbiter, Metrostar, Halswell) this is vital to “advantage” public transport users so to further encourage people out of their cars. We ask that the bus priority lanes include excellent improvements for pedestrians and cyclists as part of this programme (Council is required to currently provide for these modes). Please consider prioritising over other roading projects.

Specific Actions we suggest Council should take

1) Limit private car access in the central city area – do not increase the number of on street car parks available (in some Dutch cities the number of parking spaces is being systematically

reduced each year) and increase the price of existing parking provision to encourage other modes of transport.

2) Ensure Public Transport and Active Transport modes are included in all planning – private and commercial.

3) Consult more with the public about Public Transport routes and facilities.

4) Ensure Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are in all planning applications.

5) Prioritise bus priority programme 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.

Why Council should take that/these action(s)

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

Strategic Issues - Urban growth and central city revitalisation

Page 24

Issues for Council to consider

Living Streets supports the aim of the GC Urban Development Strategy to look at mixed-use city developments, so more people can work and play close to where they live. This means less need for commuting large distances and means that many amenities will be within walking distance.

It is important to ensure that planning of improvements to public spaces and transport networks has close involvement with communities directly affected, including user groups such as our own that advocate for quality walking environments and public spaces. We consider that the Inner City Revitalisation programme has not had adequate involvement of non-Council Staff and those other than business people.

Specific Actions we suggest Council should take

1) A more concerted effort to ongoing consultation, beyond obvious statutory consultation periods (such as this LTCCP process).

2) Living Streets Canterbury be consulted regularly as a User Group on the City Revitalisation Project, on an ongoing basis. Currently such consultation is erratic and sometimes occurs informally through other networks.

Why Council should take that/these action(s)

Living Streets Canterbury has a membership with a passion for more walkable urban communities, that ranges from those with professional knowledge and practice (Engineers, Disability Sector, Community Development, and Sustainability expertise) to everyday users of active modes and Public Transport. Inclusion of Living Streets Canterbury at the early planning stages of inner city revitalisation projects could ensure plans for consultation had incorporated best practice and promoted sustainable, accessible, and walkable urban environments.

Community Outcomes, Recreation, Safety, Proposed Capital Programme

Pages 21, 25, 56-60, 82-87, 255, 257

Issues for Council to consider

Of the nine Community identified goals in the Council LTCCP, at least seven of these goals (Security, Community, Environment, Prosperous, Healthy, Recreation, and Development) are significantly advanced by investing in quality walking infrastructure. But the draft LTCCP has insufficient funds allocated to significantly improve the walking environment. For example “Street signage” is in the unfunded budget, and the budget for seats and bus shelters for Public Transport stops needs to be increased. Quality signage is really important for locals and tourists alike; and seats are required to encourage people to use Public Transport as an attractive viable option (especially as they age - see our comments above).

Environment Canterbury has invested significantly in Public Transport including integrated ticketing and a fairly robust ongoing public consultation about Metro Reviews of existing services. The City Council needs to complement and support these improvements in service with adequate quality bus infrastructure, including quality seating and lighting at many more bus stops. If a person's experience of using the bus is not satisfactory when they use it for the first time they are less likely to continue to use that mode of transport, and the modal shift towards Public Transport so desperately needed to prevent congestion will not occur. Bus users are also pedestrians.

The Council notes in the Strategic Issues section under “Supporting Communities” that recreation patterns are changing with an increasing demand for more flexible, less formal recreation opportunities. By investing in quality walking infrastructure including footpaths this enables people to walk and run as part of leisure or commuting to work or recreation. Walking is the most egalitarian form of transport and recreation. Walking does not require any special equipment but it does require quality, accessible footpaths to ensure it is a safe and enjoyable activity.

Spending more on footpaths enables people to enjoy using these for fitness, leisure, and commuting. Incidental exercise is important way of people achieving the World Health Organisation's recommended thirty minutes a day of exercise.

The Council claims to be following the direction of the Regional Land Transport Strategy including to make it easier to walk, cycle, and use Public Transport. However, the financial investment by Council in these modes pales compared to the spending on roading infrastructure itself. We support the investment in renewals and repairs of existing roads over building new roads. When roads are renewed better facilities for walking, cycling, and Public Transport must be the result.

Greater investment in walking and cycling facilities and programmes will pay dividends in making the Central City a great place to walk and cycle. It is amazing how so many Council Strategies, Plans and documents have a photo of a cyclist and/or pedestrians yet numbers are declining. The romanticism of Christchurch as being the Walking and Cycling City in New Zealand is much as we like to think of Christchurch as the Garden City. Christchurch has recently revamped and revitalised its much loved image of Christchurch the Garden City, with the hugely successful attendance of crowds at the Ellerslie International Flower Show. What is needed now is to make this also happen for walking and cycling too. Basic improvements like walking and cycling paths through Hagley Park have been neglected. Spokes Canterbury 2004 submission to Council outlines what needs to be done for the paths in Hagley Park and all suggestions are still relevant. The iconic route for commuting through Hagley Park has become dilapidated and run down over the years. The pleas of Christchurch pedestrians and cyclists for urgent safety issues around the Hagley Park and Armagh Street entrance in relation to the traffic, parked cars on Armagh Street, and the tram tracks criss crossing over the road have gone ignored. An opportunity for reasonable value for money remedial work has not been taken up.

The council is supposed to be supporting a more sustainable city. To state that the council believes walking, cycling, and public transport patronage will remain roughly constant for the life of the ten year plan sums up the attitude to making a real difference to transport patterns in Christchurch. All other modes still appear to be sidelined as “fringe” and most of the transport budget is going towards improving conditions for cars and road freight.

Council's proposed capital expenditure for transport over the next ten years is \$663 million on the maintaining and improving the roading network, and \$68 million* on Active Transport which is an insignificant amount when compared to the total budget. *Of which \$50 million is for footpaths mainly re-surfacing and \$10.5 million is for the Southern Motorway extension Shared walking & cycling path. Currently footpath renewals are driven by roading needs including curb and channel replacement. This means that the needs of pedestrians are often driven by the needs of motorised traffic.

The Council states that walking, cycling, and public transport rates are expected to remain static over the next ten years (pages 83-84) while claiming the Council is doing everything to make sure that these modes are more accessible. There appears to be a contradiction in terms or a real need to rethink what the Council is doing that the active and public transport modal share is not expected to increase and by default it is saying that single occupant vehicle use is set to increase.

Clearly the Council firstly needs to look at accurately measuring the current rates for walking, cycling, and Public Transport. Using the 2006 Census figures does not give enough detail to measure any changes - especially in the intervening years between the Census. While Household Travel Survey data is useful this also needs to be backed up by physical counting of pedestrian trips. It is really disappointing that the council actually predicts walking to decline from 9.4% of trips to 9.3% of trips and remain constant for the 10 year plan.

The Canterbury Regional Land Transport Strategy encourages a modal shift towards the active modes including setting a public transport target of 6% of trips by public transport by 2011. The draft LTCCP Council's target is 3.4% for 2009/2010, and expects to maintain this through the remaining 9 years which is in conflict with the Regional Land Transport Strategy - a Statutory document that is supposed to guide Canterbury's Transport Programme.

We are concerned that work for pedestrian facilities is not always to best practice standard both during work and on completion. There are a number of examples around Christchurch where the pedestrian facilities do not cater for all pedestrians, with narrow crossings that do not allow more than one walking frame or mobility scooter on high use crossings, tactile tile installations are not completed or to the best practice design and may be misleading, missed or overused, block pavers are not level with surrounding surfaces and temporary blockages require crossing very busy roads independently to continue the journey.

As part of measuring progress with the Road Network Christchurch City Council is proposing to measure “Resident satisfaction with road and footpath quality”. But there is no method proposed for how this might be done, and determining the measure is to be deferred until 2010/11 (**Page 84**).

We need to measure resident satisfaction properly to know whether the footpath infrastructure is quality or not and the Council needs to set higher targets for active travel.

The proposed new bus exchange has not gone out for consultation with major stake holders – surely this should be happening early to ensure we have an accessible, usable facility.

Under Significant forecasting assumptions it makes no mention of peak oil problems. There is a general lack of seriousness taken with the plan in terms of climate change. The plan seems to be a “Business as Usual” forecast.

Under “Supporting Communities” the Council notes that “Community Safety is a major focus for the Council at present.” and their “commitment to a collaborative, community-wide approach to improving safety” “recognised in October 2008 when Christchurch was accredited as a Safe City, using criteria established by the World Health Organisation.” (**Page 21**). The obligations of being a signatory include a lot of attention towards Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

The recently released Quality of Life Survey (2008) provided a comprehensive assessment of the quality of life in twelve NZ Cities, as part of a multi-council and Ministry of Social Development initiative (CHCH Star, page A2, 8 April, 2009). It was noted that Christchurch had the lowest percentage of the twelve cities studied of residents who felt safe in their city after dark. This is an important issue to address whether it is perceived or real, with a variety of currently proposed measures, and also adding good lighting and walking environments, and more attention to ensuring CPTED principals are followed in design and planning of public spaces.

The Pedestrian Strategy (2001) notes under “Appropriate funding levels”.

“Present funding for pedestrians is relatively limited. While the only figures available are that 5% of commuter trips solely by walking, it is thought that most commuter trips involve some walking. Also a large number of short trips are walked and an important form of recreation is walking. The encouragement of pedestrians (in conjunction with the promotion of other sustainable modes eg. Cycling) may help to reduce the pressure for new roading projects. This in turn would make available funding from roading works, for other modes.

In current years the provision of funding specifically for pedestrian related projects makes up around 1% of the City Streets Unit budget and around 2.5% of the Parks Unit budget, however large amounts of the City Streets Unit budget go to projects that have some benefit to pedestrians (see above). While there is strong indication that a significant increase in the funding for pedestrians would greatly increase the numbers of people walking, the proportion of the available budgets that should be spent on pedestrians is uncertain. Research is required into appropriate funding levels particularly as relative to other transport modes.”
(Pedestrian Strategy, 2001, Page 21)

Specific Actions we suggest Council should take

1) Council needs to ensure there is sufficient budget in the draft LTCCP, especially over the next three years to ensure quality, accessible walking environments including quality footpaths and footpath amenities.

2) The Council invests in improving the Public Transport system by adequately funding seating and suitable lighting at bus stops especially in the suburbs. There appears to be some budget but insufficient for this task. The Walking routes to and from bus stops are an ideal place for Council to prioritise footpath work.

3) Council makes a more concerted effort to ongoing consultation with User Groups, outside obvious consultation periods such as the LTCCP.

4) A reprioritisation and commitment towards the implementation of the Council's walking and cycling strategies, especially ensuring these have detailed implementation plans and a budget to enable implementation to proceed in a timely way.

- 5) Council investigates the high turnover of Transport Staff especially the position of Transport Team Leader (position has been vacant since November 2008) to ensure issues previous Team Leaders have struggled with in that position are addressed and to make Council the work place of choice for talented staff. Council prioritises getting the position of new Transport Team Leader position filled. Council commits to ongoing support of the Transport Team Leader position**
- 6) Council supports Living Streets Canterbury as a valuable User Group to consult early in relation to proposed urban design and pedestrian facilities.**
- 7) Council ensures that the layout in the new Council building and Council Staff hierarchy is conducive to the different Council sections such as Transport Planning, Transport Engineering, and Urban Design work collaboratively in a more consultative and integrated way.**
- 8) The new Council building has meeting rooms available for the Public during and after office hours. Such meeting rooms would have access to water, coffee, and tea making facilities, adequate bathrooms, secure bike lock up, and good mobility access. We would like these facilities to be free, using a booking system for User groups registered with the Council.**
- 9) Clearly to meet the LTCCP goals, walking, cycling and public transport need to be much higher in both the Councils' expectations through setting ambitious and realistic targets, and monitoring these targets and providing appropriate funding to achieve these targets.**
- 10) Council immediately determines how it will count Pedestrians especially in the CBD in order to monitor targets and help with prioritisation of pedestrian improvements.**
- 11) The CCC needs to measure resident satisfaction with footpath quality in 2009/2010 rather than 2010/2011. One way of doing this is by running Community Street Reviews, a tool developed by Living Streets Aotearoa, and further developed and supported by the NZ Transport Agency (NZTA), see www.levelofservice.com Living Streets Aotearoa as a national organisation is keen to offer their services to Council for running Community Street Reviews. Living Streets piloted part of this tool with Wellington City Council in November 2007, see <http://www.livingstreets.org.nz/pdf/Brooklyn2007.pdf> Living Streets Aotearoa as a National Organisation is keen to offer their services to Christchurch City**
- 12) Ensure the plans for the new Bus Interchange are circulated amongst key stakeholders and users, early before the concept plans are too far down the track. It is our understanding a Health Impact Assessment is to happen of the proposed Bus Exchange but this does not involved the infrastructure itself.**
- 13) The money set aside for parking renewal (Project 116) increases at a faster rate than the money for providing the new footpaths programme (172). Council should reprioritise funding so that car parking is a reducing budget and the new footpaths programme budget is increasing.**
- 14) Living Streets Canterbury would like to be put on the Council list for early notification of street renewals, and Neighbourhood Improvement Programmes.**
- 15) Linwood College, Linwood Avenue, and Linwood Intermediate school areas are**

prioritised for a Neighbourhood Accessibility Plan. Ensure the budget for NAPs is adequate.

16) The Bealy Avenue & Colombo Staged Crossing budget currently in the unfunded budget is funded [The Canterbury Active Transport Forum has a presentation where this type of crossing is shown

<http://www.ecan.govt.nz/NR/rdonlyres/649E8775-4F36-4D68-A7E1-84244107E978/0/StagedPedestrianCrossings.pdf>

17) A Road User Hierarchy is undertaken in order to make Council Staff decisions more streamlined, and facilitate consistent decision making that is consistent with all Council Strategies, rather than having each Transport project subject to the current staff or loudest lobby group.

18) Monitoring and Auditing of contractors work is reviewed to ensure best practice and quality projects.

19) Council prioritises investment in renewals and repairs of existing roads over building new roads. When roads are renewed better facilities for walking, cycling, and Public Transport are included. Opportunities for looking at interconnections and continuity for walkers in every roading project. Sometimes there are very small low cost additions that have huge benefits for walking.

20) Council to look at existing guidelines to ensure CPTED principals are incorporated.

Why Council should take that/these action(s)

Investing in quality walking facilities makes good economic sense, as it helps to stem the need to build our way out of congestion with new roads, lowers health costs, and makes attractive environments for locals and tourists.

To ensure that the pedestrian facilities the City Council is installing to encourage the modal shift towards walking are appropriate to support such a modal shift.

If the Council does not aim for increased use of Active and Public Transport modes then the congestion problems in our greater Christchurch area will continue and all of the associated costs with this (economic, health and wellbeing, and social costs). Planning for this now is essential for our future sustainability and all of the above.

The new Bus Interchange must meet all needs of current and potential/future users and stakeholders. Lack of timely and adequate consultation with the previous site is now showing the consequences.

Southern motorway and cycleway & auxiliaries

Page 255

Issues for Council to consider

This section incorrectly refers to the “Southern motorway **and cycleway & auxiliaries**”, as it is a path proposed for both walking and cycling, not just cycling.

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 the Christchurch City Council that meant CCC was to pay part of the costs for the shared pathway.

Specific Actions we suggest Council should take

- 1) Council change the wording to say “Southern motorway and shared path & Auxiliaries”**
- 2) Council requests 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) Given the budget constraints for walking and cycling Council needs to ensure that the essential infrastructure that is best included at the time of the Southern Motorway construction such as underpasses, bridges etc, are built and the rest of the pathway is funded over a significantly longer period of time, to enable other projects of greater priority to proceed earlier.**

We reiterate we want this facility but that it needs to be undertaken over a longer period of time and funded fully by NZTA.

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

Regards

Wendy Everingham
Living Streets Canterbury Coordinator