



6 May 2004

Christchurch City Council  
PO Box 237  
Christchurch

### **Re: Draft Long Term Council Community Plan 2004**

Spokes Canterbury, the local cycling advocacy group, is pleased to offer this submission regarding the Council's community plan. We would be happy to provide any further information if required.

We would like to present our submission in person.

### **General Comments**

**Spokes generally welcomes the direction that Christchurch City is taking for the next few years.** In terms of sustainable transport it feels like Christchurch is at the crossroads and could opt for either a traditional roading-dominated future with token acknowledgement of other modes, or a more equitable approach that truly embraces the potential of all modes. We trust that the Council will see the sense in choosing the latter course of action.

While we congratulate the council on its ongoing commitment to cycling promotion and provision in the city, we feel that significant uptake in cycling will only be achieved when parallel programmes such as **travel plans** and **traffic management/calming** are also extensively rolled out across the city.

We will comment on the draft Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Statement in a separate submission.

### **Specific Comments - Community Outcomes**

While we generally have no problems with the proposed community outcomes for Christchurch in broad terms, we suspect that our interpretation of what they mean and how they can be achieved differs from some other parties. For example:

- (1) Under "A Sustainable Natural Environment" (vol.1 p.24), we would expect to have mention of **the challenge faced by our growing motor vehicle population**, which threatens our natural environment through air and runoff emissions, and the land demand for roading-related infrastructure.
- (2) Under "A Prosperous City" (v1 p.25), we **don't feel that ongoing development in roading infrastructure is necessary for a vital economy**, if appropriate use of other modes can be encouraged instead, thus freeing up the existing network for essential commercial traffic. Similarly, a **CBD that promotes people over traffic** can produce a vibrant central city that is economically successful because of the desire for people to be there.

We suggest that the community outcomes be reviewed to more explicitly document some of these issues.

## Specific Comments - Council Activities

As with the Community Outcomes, we note some different interpretations of the performance indicators provided. There are also some notable omissions that should be rectified:

- (1) The section on Parks and Open Spaces (v2 pp.80-85) fails to acknowledge the vital role that these areas play for sustainable transport modes like walking and cycling. One of the listed sub-areas is “Landscaping the Transportation Network” (i.e. street network); yet it completely neglects the fact that **parks and other open spaces are themselves an important part of the transportation network** for a mode like cycling.
- (2) Meanwhile, when considering the Streets and Transport section (v2 pp.115-129), the emphasis appears to be on efficiency of traffic movement. This fails to recognise the fact that over **75% of Christchurch’s streets (by length) are local and collector roads**, where the emphasis is on accessibility, not traffic movement. It would seem logical therefore to have a performance indicator to the effect that “*x% of residents on non-arterial roads are satisfied with the nature of traffic and level of safety along their streets*”. This produces quite a different focus on what is needed to achieve this – see our discussion under item (2) of the Capital Expenditure Programme. Similar performance measures might assess the proportion of the local network with traffic management/calming treatments in place. Efficiency performance measures should also **consider the effects of delays on pedestrians and cyclists**; for example, lack of safe crossing facilities or adequate priority can significantly delay these modes.
- (3) We are intrigued by the proposed maintenance performance indicators for road cleaning (v2 p.120); our experience is that **existing maintenance regimes do not come even close to these standards**. As cyclists who are regularly travelling in areas of the road most prone to detritus, we certainly look forward to such an outcome as stated.
- (4) On the same page, we also take issue with the Service proposal that “*Sufficient roads are provided to contain congestion to acceptable levels*”. This implies that only roading capacity increases can control congestion; such supply-side thinking fails to **consider the alternative of reducing the traffic demand instead** (through pricing, encouragement of alternatives, etc). Indeed, there is no mention anywhere of specific tools such as introducing more cycleways, travel plans, and bus lanes.
- (5) It is difficult to identify from the Plan the current expenditure on cycling promotions. However, we request that increased funding for the next five years be allocated towards **marketing cycling** (to at least \$250,000 pa), if necessary by reducing the cycleways and general roading capital expenditure budgets.
- (6) In the Asset Information section (v2 pp.122-127), there is no mention of how many **cycle parks** the council has (yet the number of items such as signs and street furniture is known precisely), nor what plans are proposed for them in the future. This is a worrying oversight that should be corrected.

## Specific Comments – Capital Expenditure Programme

Spokes offers the following specific observations about the proposed project expenditures in the next 5 years:

- (1) For future reference, it would be very useful if it could be indicated **which “general” roading projects (i.e. street renewals, kerb & channel, etc) are likely to include specific cycle facilities**. While the information could be inferred from comparison with the city cycle network plan and roading hierarchy,

it would help us assess the overall provision for cycling and also the relative priorities.

- (2) It is also difficult to identify which street renewal (or other) projects will produce “Living Streets”-style solutions. We are concerned at the piecemeal implementation of such “people-friendly” streets across Christchurch; when an **area-wide treatment** is often far more effective at getting take-up of walking and cycling. For comparison we suggest that the Council consider Wellington City Council’s “Safer Roads” programme<sup>1</sup>, which proposes treating **all** residential areas around Wellington within seven years. A similar programme could be initiated within Christchurch over the next decade, focusing on treatments such as traffic calming features, area gateways, pedestrian/cycle crossing facilities, and 30 or 40 km/h speed limits. The likely cost to treat a whole neighbourhood in this manner would probably be the equivalent of completely reconstructing just a couple of streets in the area, yet the result would have a considerably greater coverage.
- (3) **We support all projects in the cycleways budget and specifically those in the 2004/05 year.** If any of these are unable to be completed, funding levels should be retained and projects brought forward from later years. We are particularly concerned to **maintain the programme on arterial roads**, where most cycling occurs and where cyclists feel the most stress, although we would also welcome investment in suitable alternative cycle corridors.
- (4) We would like to see the **Little River cycleway linkages** brought forward, to begin investigation and possibly construction in 2004/05. Development progress on the Little River trail is now reaching the point of actual construction, so Christchurch should ensure that connections to the city are in place at the same time.
- (5) We urge prompt progress on developing a solution along **Riccarton Road** for cycling and public transport; shared bus/cycle lanes may well be appropriate. As an important arterial route with considerable off-street parking, we encourage you to look beyond the inevitable complaints about loss of parking to provide a solution that is best for the whole city.
- (6) It is pleasing to see approximately \$50k pa allocated from 2005/06 towards **off-road cycle path resurfacing**. However, we request that similar funding be allocated in the coming financial year. We hope that funding also allows for suitable improvements in width and quality where necessary; for example, on many of the pathways in Hagley Park.
- (7) We would like to see some investment in **destination signage along major cycle routes** (at least \$20k pa over the next few years). In Hagley Park for example, it is not always clear to the unfamiliar traveller where each path goes. Likewise, for cycle tourists approaching the city, signage should indicate the safest and most direct way(s) to key city locations. For major future cycle route projects (e.g. Little River cycleway linkages, Railway Cycleway north), provision of destination signage should automatically form part of these projects.
- (8) We encourage a greater investment in new **40 km/h school speed zones**; the current plan would appear to suggest that the (relatively minimal) existing programme will peter out in 2006/07. We would like to see an extensive rollout of these speed zones across the city, and also accompanying street works to further persuade motorists to slow down in these areas. An alternative or

---

<sup>1</sup> See [www.wcc.govt.nz/news/projects/saferroads/](http://www.wcc.govt.nz/news/projects/saferroads/)

complementary activity would be extensive speed limit reductions on all local and collector roads, with supporting traffic calming where necessary.

- (9) We are disappointed that no work is currently identified to find an acceptable solution for **cyclists crossing the Waimakariri River**; your District Council neighbour bordering to the north has also shown similar reticence until at least 2011. As the only means for cyclists to connect to Christchurch from the north, this must be resolved sooner rather than later. We request an investigation during 2004/05 to identify physical a solution for construction during 2005/06.
- (10) We encourage an ongoing commitment to promptly funding projects that implement the goals of the **Council's Pedestrian Strategy, Central City Strategy, and Parking Strategy**, as well as the **Regional Council's Public Transport Strategy**. All of these policies have the potential to improve conditions for cyclists, as part of their traffic management outcomes. To date however we have yet to see much significant progress. An indication of this is the fact that the Programme still refers to generic projects such as "Central City Transport Projects" and "Public Transport Initiatives", rather than specific projects and locations. We strongly urge more commitment to mapping out a plan of action for these strategies.

Please consider modifying the programme to incorporate the issues raised above.

Yours sincerely,

**Richard Hayman and Glen Koorey**

Chairperson and Technical Advisor  
SPOKES Canterbury  
Email: [spokes\\_chch@hotmail.com](mailto:spokes_chch@hotmail.com)  
Phone: 021 772445

Spokes Canterbury (the former Canterbury Cyclists' Association) is a local cycling advocacy group dedicated to including cycling as an everyday form of transport within local and regional planning. The group is affiliated with the national Cycling Advocates Network (CAN) and includes a number of CAN's executive members.

Spokes provides significant cycling expertise through its many longstanding advocates, transportation professionals and (most importantly) regular cyclists. The group is represented on Christchurch City Council's cycling steering committee and Environment Canterbury's Regional Land Transport Committee and provides regular feedback on various council transportation and planning proposals.