

# **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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:walkcyclestrategy@transport.govt.nz), or you can download copies from the [www.transport.govt.nz](http://www.transport.govt.nz) website.

## Submission Details

This submission was made by:

Name: Jane Dawson

Postal Address: PO Box 6491, Auckland

Organisation (if applicable): Cycling Advocates Network Inc.

Role/position (if applicable):

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: cyclists
- 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):

It is good to see the vision statement making the link to the health of both people and communities. However, the wording of the statement does not set a scene to work towards. Arguably, we already have "people from all sectors of the community choosing to walk and cycle". The vision is presumably indicating that more people (or maybe all people) choose to walk or cycle, so it should say that.

We suggest rewording it to add the idea of growth in numbers:

'A New Zealand where increasing numbers of people from all sectors of the community choose to walk and cycle ...'

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input 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). Should be strengthened to 'Communities that encourage more cycling and walking'. This would make it more obviously connected with the priority area of 'promoting cycling and walking'. The current wording suggests that walking/cycling should be accommodated but 'promoting cycling and walking' goes further than that and signals a more proactive approach. The 'priorities for action' in the NWCS pick up the idea of actively encouraging change, and should be reflected in the wording of the goals.

The word 'communities' is rather vague, and should either be clarified or replaced. Perhaps say "Communities and an environment that encourage more cycling and walking".

8. Please detail what needs revision for **Goal 2** (or any other relevant comments). The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and this is an absolutely crucial long-term goal. It is only likely to be achieved, however, after the other two goals have been substantially achieved, so setting measurable targets for this goal should be done with a longer time-frame in mind.

9. Please detail what needs revision for **Goal 3** (or any other relevant comments). The current wording is too tentative to be a serious goal - it could be achieved by just a minimal improvement in safety, which is unlikely to encourage more people to walk and cycle. We also have concerns that it signals that pedestrians and cyclists should be 'protected from danger', which has in the past translated into those modes being segregated from motor vehicles in a way that makes travel by bike or on foot less direct and convenient. We would like to see that turned around, so that the goal is to create an environment where the (safety) needs of pedestrians and cyclists are included in decision-making at the most fundamental stage, and in a way that ensures that any compromises in levels of service do not inevitably lead to less convenient travel for pedestrians and cyclists. We suggest the wording is changed to 'a safe environment for people to walk and cycle in'. For this goal (as for all goals) it will be essential to have well-designed performance indicators to ensure that the desired improvements are achieved.

## 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):

Under the fifth principle, it is not clear whether we are allowed to do safety and promotion

separately. There is a danger that no promotion will get done in some cases, because no funding is available at the time to address the perceived safety issues. The last paragraph needs to be highlighted more - evidence overseas doesn't show anywhere where cyclist and pedestrian crashes have gone up significantly with higher use of those modes.

We suggest adding two further principles, as follows.

1. An effective promotion of cycling and walking requires an all-of-government approach.

Cycling and walking are not just transport issues, so require support from other sectors such as environment (urban form, emissions control), health (injury prevention, positive ageing, benefits of activity as a means of controlling conditions such as cardiovascular disease, obesity and some cancers), tourism promotion, climate change and energy efficiency programmes, and recreation provision. Many of these sectors do not see themselves as having a role in promoting cycling and walking, but are developing policies and programmes which could usefully include cycling and walking as one of the tools that will help them achieve their goals, often at little or no extra cost.

An all-of-government approach requires the collaboration and co-operation of a range of central government agencies as well as local government and non-government organisations. Transport is a key area for more joined-up working by central government, and also by local government at the local level.

2. Inequities have developed in the transport system and need to be reversed. It needs to be publicly recognised that current and past policy, planning and engineering have not adequately provided for walking and cycling. In particular, motor vehicles have been given special treatment, often at the expense of pedestrians and cyclists (though not usually deliberately). Because of this historic pattern of neglect, and because these are sustainable modes, particular efforts must be made to redress the secondary status that they have in planning, policy and provision.

Many people see the current set-up as inevitable, and do not understand why pedestrians and cyclists now need "special treatment". Unless the general public (which includes transport professionals and decision-makers) is made aware of the changes that have happened over time and their consequences, there is unlikely to be public support or understanding for the need to change from the status quo.

We suggest the adoption in this section of a hierarchy of road users, giving priority to those modes that best achieve the goals of the NZTS, and that such a hierarchy is applied to all decisions made about the transport system. A local example of this in action can be seen in the Living Streets programme run by Christchurch City Council.

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input checked="" 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).

The priorities and desired outcomes are generally fine, but the 'supportive actions' need a lot of revision.

For all actions, the wording under 'How?' should be changed to:

'This outcome will be achieved by the following actions'

and the grammar of each action point should be given a positive focus, rather than the current tentative one. For example, the first of the Priority 1 action points should read[deleted words in brackets]: 'Transport policy and practice will be [is] based on the premise that the road corridor is shared by all travel modes, and well designed and managed transport systems will [should] accommodate all users.'

The actions that have been identified are comprehensive, and are all things that have to happen in order to achieve the vision. We realise that they won't all happen at once, but there should be an intention to do them all at some stage. Obviously, the annual implementation plans will set out which action points will be progressed in any given year, though we note that some of them are extremely easy to put in place immediately.

It would also be helpful to add a comment to the effect that the numbering of the priorities does not imply any ordering according to importance.

There are additional action points that we believe are needed, as follows:

Priority 1

- Best practice standards and guidelines will be developed and regularly reviewed to ensure that they reflect current international and local research, developments and best practice.
- Resources detailing the contribution that walking and cycling can make towards addressing issues such as congestion, health problems etc will be produced and promoted to decision-makers.
- An audit process will be established to ensure that the plans and practices of Road Controlling Authorities and Regional Authorities with regard to the transport system are consistent with the aims of the NWCS, with assistance available to those authorities that have difficulty understanding their role in implementing the Strategy.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

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

Comments about actions as per Priority 1.

Additional action points needed:

- Manuals used by those designing and managing roads are updated to include cycle-friendly and walk-friendly standards and guidelines for general roading projects, so that cyclists and pedestrians are not just included when project managers remember to think about them.
- Government agencies actively promote trials of new initiatives to support cycling and walking in the NZ context.

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 type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

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

Comments about actions as per Priority 1.

It would be useful in the discussion section to identify as many policy areas and agencies as possible, so that the potential relationships between the NWCS and other work programmes are signalled to all parties. This would give the links that are less obvious (for example the Department of Conservation in relation to longer-distance paths through the conservation estate) a chance to be developed.

Additional action points needed:

- Relevant government policies and programmes (such as health strategies, 'green prescriptions', tourism promotions, and climate change responses) will use cycling and walking as one of the tools by which they achieve their goals.
- The existence of the National Walking & Cycling Strategy, and its implementation plans, will be publicised.
- An organisation will be established to actively promote and report on the implementation of the NWCS.
- Systems to enable and encourage information sharing among both providers and users of the transport system will be established, e.g. regular conferences on pedestrian and cyclist issues, best practice updates, email networks for practitioners, registers of high quality facility designers.

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 type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

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

Comments about actions as per Priority 1.

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 type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

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

Comments about actions as per Priority 1.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

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

Comments about actions as per Priority 1.

The third action point needs to change to 'National roading technical standards and service guidelines address open road cycling ...' (from 'National cycling technical standards'). Most cycling on the open road is done on roads that were designed (and are maintained) without cyclists in mind, so it is the 'normal' roading manuals that need to be brought up to speed with the needs of cyclists.

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

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

This priority could be reworded to say 'Encourage and promote positive perceptions ...', and it would be useful in the text to signal what agency (or agencies) will have the job of promoting walking and cycling in marketing campaigns and the media generally. We note that in the LTSA's TV advertising to date, no cyclists have been visible, and the only pedestrians visible have been hit by cars.

Comments about actions as per Priority 1.

Additional action point needed:

- The disbenefits of private motor vehicle usage are widely promoted along with the consequences of increased use of that mode, so that people can rely on more than just car advertisements to make a judgement about which mode of transport they wish to use.

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 type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

27. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):  
Comments about actions as per Priority 1.

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 type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

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

Comments about actions as per Priority 1.

Additional action points needed:

- Traffic rules and regulations will be reviewed and opportunities taken wherever possible to reduce the potential for risks to be imposed on pedestrians and cyclists by other road users and to improve the levels of service for those modes.
- Improvements will be made to driver education and licensing to support safe sharing of the road space.
- The fact that safety for all road users is improved when traffic is calmed and speeds reduced below 50km/h will be publicised.

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"/> Needs some revision <input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is <input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

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

Comments about actions as per Priority 1.

## 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):

Targets need to be built into the strategy to give some meaning to the action points, particularly the ones concerned with monitoring. Those targets must be for an increase in the proportion of trips done by walking or cycling, not for an increase in absolute numbers of trips by those modes, otherwise a doubling of cycling and walking trips alongside a quadrupling of motor vehicle trips could leave us further back than when we started in terms of the conditions experienced by cyclists and pedestrians.

It will be critical to the success of the Strategy to get the implementation plans right, and to continue to review the strategy and its priorities to ensure that they are still comprehensive enough and relevant. We believe that that element of the Strategy needs to become stronger.

Another essential element in the Strategy, which is largely absent at the moment, is to build in 'sticks' as well as 'carrots' for those implementing it. We are regularly getting feedback from members around the country who tell us that their local authority has chosen not to go ahead with a cycle facility project, sometimes after considerable consultation and design work, because of the political difficulty (or perceived difficulty) of making trade-offs, e.g. between a cycle facility and parking provision. Until there is some requirement for local authorities to actively promote cycling and walking, the situation is unlikely to improve. Funding processes are an easy way to achieve a culture change, and we would favour a system where general funding assistance was dependent on a certain proportion of the local authority's transport budget being used for cycling and walking projects. The proportion could be initially quite low, so that most local authorities would easily meet the target but inactive ones would not. Over time, the 'bar' should be raised, so that the increased development of cycle and walk-friendly environments becomes noticeable to the public.

### **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):

The implementation actions proposed are fine as far as they go, but it is clear from overseas experiences that a proactive rather than passive approach to implementation is needed. This was highlighted during the recent national cycling conference by the keynote speaker, Steven Norris, who described current efforts to ensure more consistent implementation of the UK Cycling Strategy. The point is equally well illustrated by the lack of progress on the Australian Cycling Strategy, which has had little effort and resource applied to its implementation at a national level.

In England, investment in the UK Cycling Strategy has included:

- the establishment of a Board that meets every 2 months to co-ordinate and press forward with key actions to deliver the Strategy and that reports annually to a meeting of stakeholders
- a Cycling Forum
- a Regional Cycling Development Team that is a group of independent, contracted consultants responsible for auditing how well local authorities are providing for cyclists currently and highlighting where improvements could be made; ensuring that advice on cycling is getting through to key people at local and regional levels; and establishing new channels for sharing information and best practice.

The NZ Cycling and Pedestrian Advisory Groups are well positioned to help with Strategy monitoring, though their membership may need to be reviewed. If they are to play a key role in overseeing this strategy, then the entire mandate and resourcing of the Advisory Groups need to be looked at. At the very least, major agencies (such as the Ministries of Transport and Health, Transfund, Transit and LTSA) need dedicated staff resources with sufficient status to influence policy and planning, otherwise NWCS work will not get done due to other perceived priorities. The LTSA has taken the lead in demonstrating how this can work productively.

But there is also a need for a body which will actively identify opportunities and needs, and persuade the implementation partners of the benefits of action and the disbenefits of not acting. This may be a Project Team led by the Ministry of Transport and charged with bringing the NWCS to life, identifying monitoring and evaluation needs, identifying synergies and overlaps between the work of different agencies, and maintaining an overview of the Strategy's progress.

With the proliferation of regional and local strategies in NZ, there is a growing need to focus on auditing implementation efforts. This must be independent (in addition to self-audits), and involve cycling and pedestrian advocates.

We suggest that a fifth 'early task in the central co-ordination process' is - establishment of an organisation that will have primary responsibility for ensuring that the national implementation plans are actioned.

Our main concern with this section, though, is that there is so little information about how the implementation will be managed. A strategy is normally a document that sets out how a particular objective will be achieved, but this one merely says how the objective could be achieved (with the potential proviso "if one wanted to"). Changing the wording of the action points to indicate firm intent, as described above, would go some way to addressing this concern, but it would also be helpful to pull all of the action points together into a long-term implementation plan. This should include performance indicators, to assist with the monitoring process.

The names of lead agencies which will carry each action point forwards are also needed to give some clarity and to provide a starting point for discussion of responsibilities.

An indication should also be given of whether each action point is of high, higher or highest priority in terms of implementation, and those action points that are currently being worked on noted.

Clearly, any long-term implementation plan will be subject to regular review and is likely to change over time. There is therefore no good reason not to include an initial overall implementation plan in the strategy. The annual implementation plans would obviously then fall out of the overall plan, picking the highest priorities to target at that time.

An overall implementation plan, even if it just a list of the action points already identified, would provide a structure for further debate on implementation, and help to signal the scope of the task.

The list of 'milestones' should include a date for the finalisation of the initial national implementation plan, so that work can be planned for the August 2004 - June 2005 period. That date is likely to be April or May 2004, so that funding can be sorted out prior to the start of the financial year on 1 July.

We also suggest that the Minister of Transport should be required to report annually to parliament on progress made on the implementation of the NWCS, as the Minister in charge of ACC does for the Injury Prevention Strategy, for example. As with the NZ Disability Strategy, all relevant government departments should be required to develop implementation plans that specify the steps they will take to implement the NWCS.

An implementation status report should be published every 2 years, and a review of the Strategy should be scheduled in 5 or 6 years from the date it is finalised. Ongoing information about implementation and monitoring needs to be publicly accessible for general public (and advocates!), for example via a dedicated website like the UK Cycling Strategy one ([www.nationalcyclingstrategy.org.uk](http://www.nationalcyclingstrategy.org.uk)).

Resources for implementation are clearly going to be a perennial problem. We suggest that more funding for walking and cycling projects should come from new road construction funding - there is still too much going there, given that most of it does little to advance the goals of the NZTS.

In addition, other government agencies (such as health, sport and recreation, environment, tourism) should make funding available for appropriate cycling and walking projects. Funding for organisations other than road controlling authorities is very important in order to get a lot of the supporting tools in place (like cycle parking, training, promotion). This would also allow local groups like advocates or community groups to get minor facilities built when the local council has a low level of commitment.

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

- (1) - having resources and financial assistance available to enable us to participate fully in the process
- (2) - having a very clear mandate (via the Strategy, but also via the LTSA's Pedestrian & Cyclist Safety Framework, Transfund's Funding Allocation Framework, NZTS etc) which we can use to work with other agencies to highlight those areas that need more work, and how they can best be altered
- (3) - a requirement for road controlling authorities to include provision for cyclists in their transport plans (as opposed to the current situation where they can do nothing), with a mechanism for dealing with those who ignore the requirement
- (4) - ensuring that both decision-makers and transport professionals have a genuine understanding of how to include cyclists in the transport system
- (5) - a public education campaign that builds understanding and support for measures to support cyclists and pedestrians, addressing both 'why' and 'how'
- (6) - creating a requirement that cycling and pedestrian interests are consulted by decision-makers when the views of road users are to be taken into account, in all roading and other transport system decisions, not just those that are obviously about walking and cycling

(2)

(3)

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) - having a legislative and regulatory framework that requires local authorities and Transit NZ to actively promote cycling

(2) - providing financial incentives to local and regional authorities to provide programmes and infrastructure which promote the use of bikes

(3) - providing resources (e.g. Cycle-Friendly Employer Guide) that can be easily applied locally by both private and public sector organisations, including financial support (perhaps via a contestable fund)

(4) - leading by example, e.g. ensuring that central government agencies are cycle-friendly employers, providing bike parking at agency offices, supporting national promotional activities such as Bike To Work Day

(5) - assist with data collection: setting standards and undertaking nation-wide surveys, so that local and regional authorities don't have to fund it all

(2)

(3)

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) - step up our monitoring of progress and increase pressure in those areas where we see little progress

(2)

(3)

## 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?

CAN sincerely welcomes the NWCS, and thanks the Minister and Ministry officials for the effort they have put into making it such a comprehensive document.

The publication of the NWCS is a much-needed step in the promotion of these economically and environmentally sustainable and healthy modes of transport. As modes of transport, they have community-wide benefits, not just benefits for those who use those modes. This strategy is an important complement to a number of other key government strategies and should be similarly resourced for successful implementation, with similar involvement of all key stakeholders including community-based advocacy groups

We do, however, have some comments on general issues that we feel are not adequately addressed.

'Alternative modes'

The Strategy focuses on walking and cycling, but is silent on 'alternative modes' such as scooters, skateboards, roller blades, mobility scooters, power-assisted bicycles etc etc. These modes are proliferating, and since they share space with both pedestrians and cyclists, some attempt should be made to deal with the issues that they raise.

Disabilities

We note that the NWCS may not fully encompass the needs of those who have particular impairments which mean that they cannot walk or cycle as easily as those without such impairments. However, we consider that the draft Strategy has the potential to significantly improve the opportunities for those who use wheelchairs or mobility scooters, who are visually or hearing impaired, or who can walk or cycle but with more difficulty than the average person, or with intellectual or cognitive impairments. For example, if high quality traffic calming becomes widely used, and the 'give way' rule is amended so that vehicular traffic turning into a side street is expected to give way to pedestrians crossing that side street, those people with disabilities would have a better chance of crossing safely. We believe that the NWCS can work in conjunction with the NZTS and other strategies to promote access in its broadest sense.

Speed reduction

We are disappointed at the lack of emphasis on reducing traffic speeds, particularly in urban areas. There are well-established benefits to all road users (motorists as well as pedestrians and cyclists) from speed limits less than 50 km/hr, and we would like to see those promoted strongly in this Strategy.

Trade-offs

We are equally disappointed at the lack of a clear signal that priorities have changed and that decisions will need to be made differently about transport projects. Promoting a 'road user hierarchy' as a decision-making tool would be a useful addition to the strategy. The level of understanding by many people involved in making decisions about the transport system is relatively low, and having an easily understood tool like that would be helpful.

Research strategy

It would be useful to have a walking and cycling research strategy as an appendix to the NWCS. We have raised this issue in the past with LTSA/Transfund, and would be happy to contribute to the development of it.

Comments on specific pages of the Strategy document:

Foreword

The use of current trip numbers is interesting, and presumably meant to demonstrate how important walking and cycling really are. But they should be put in perspective: 1 billion walking trips is less than one trip per day per NZer (and a return journey somewhere is, of course, two trips). And 100 million cycle trips is only 25 per year per NZer - and a regular cycle commuter does that many in a fortnight. We would like to see these statistics used to give the strategy an optimistic slant: if just a quarter of all NZers made just one extra return cycle trip each week, the number of cycle trips in the country would double.

Page 2 (diagram)

'Focus One' and its block of Priorities could perhaps be placed under the other three Focus areas. It addresses issues that are very much at the foundation level, whereas the others relate more directly to the three Goals.

Page 6

We agree that "the development of walking and cycling is integral to achieving the objectives of the NZ Transport Strategy". It would be a useful strengthening of the importance of the NWCS to add a comment to the effect that walking & cycling are the only two modes that can truly achieve all five objectives of the NZTS.

We note that the fourth bullet point in the side panel highlights the gross inequity between funding for public transport and cycling, when they have similar shares of trips. Walking and cycling are at least as important as public transport in combating high motor vehicle use.

Pages 7 and 8

The economic benefits of investing in cycling and walking should be highlighted much more strongly here, especially as often seen as a 'weakness' for walking and cycling. For example, the benefits to businesses such as cycle couriers delivering documents quickly in congestion, reduced sickness levels of employees, lower parking and vehicle fleet costs. Also, more people switching to walking and cycling trips frees up roads for those who do need to travel by motor vehicle (e.g. local freight deliveries, repair and maintenance services).

Page 8

It should also be pointed out that good urban design forms that support walking and cycling also tend to be more safe and secure by nature.

Page 10

Under 'Existing Strengths', we would like to point out that it is debatable whether the high helmet wearing rate has been useful for the safety of cyclists, given that the mandatory legislation to achieve this has tended to divert attention (and funding) away from real means of improving cyclists' safety (i.e. reducing danger and crashes, not just injuries), and that it may have also put off potential cyclists.

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