



6 May 2004

Christchurch City Council  
PO Box 237  
Christchurch

**Re: Draft Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Statement (MCTS)**

Spokes Canterbury, the local cycling advocacy group, is pleased to offer this submission regarding the Council's MCTS. We would be happy to provide any further information if required. We also plan to make a submission in person regarding the draft LTCCP, and would be willing to discuss these MCTS issues further there.

We also strongly endorse the submissions of the **Sustainable Cities Trust** and **Living Streets Aotearoa**.

**General Comments**

**Spokes generally welcomes the draft MCTS** as a step in the right direction. The increase in proposed funding for walking, cycling, public transport, and demand management is a tangible statement of the commitment that the Council plans to make in these areas. While Spokes obviously has a particular interest in cycling, we tend to find that concerted investment in all "alternative" modes of travel (and demand management) greatly benefits the cycling environment overall.

Our concern is whether this will be enough, given that a "business as usual" approach seems to be proposed for roading expenditure (where no change in previously planned spending is envisaged). It is arguably difficult for the alternative modes to compete, even with additional funding, when at the same time facilities for motorists are continuing to be improved. The fact that over 65% of funding will still be allocated to "roading" (albeit acknowledging that some of this also benefits other modes) would appear to **do little to redress the past inequities and significantly change the status quo**.

The forecasts for motor vehicle growth (such as on page 11) are not challenged on how we can slow them down, and indeed turn them around. Instead they seem to be used to justify further investment in roading. The MCTS envisions in 20 years time (Goal 7, page 15) that *"By reducing the need to travel there is less need for expenditure on transport infrastructure and services, allowing more money to be available for productive investment elsewhere"*. Yet virtually the **same** roading investment is still forecast over the next 20 years, with or without this strategy.

An innovative approach is required. We would suggest that **some major roading projects be delayed by a few years** to allow new alternative initiatives, implemented first, to compete fairly with the existing roading network. Some of the deferred road funding could also be used to speed up the rollout of other initiatives, whilst still allowing an overall saving to ratepayers. We could envisage that the success of the alternatives may reduce the need to provide the roading options, deferring them even further and allowing further alternative investment to be provided instead. Ultimately this "virtuous cycle" is far more productive (and cost-effective) than the traditional one where road building feeds further traffic growth and vice versa.

We feel that it would be useful to explicitly define in the MCTS a **hierarchy of transport users**. For comparison, the Local Transport Plan for York (UK)<sup>1</sup> provides the following order:

1. Pedestrians
2. People with mobility problems
3. Cyclists
4. Public transport users
5. Powered two-wheelers
6. Commercial/business users (including deliveries, HCVs)
7. Car-borne shoppers
8. Car-borne commuters

This then translates into appropriate themes and priorities for projects. For example, York's planned 5-year expenditure on traditional "roading" construction and maintenance was only about 40% of their total budget.

### Specific Comments – Planned Programme

Spokes offers the following specific observations about the proposed MCTS and planned expenditures:

- We support the intention to involve the surrounding Councils as part of the MCTS planning process; clearly developments in their areas significantly affect traffic demand in Christchurch. We urge stronger consideration of the role that **rail and busways** can play in providing long-distance transport needs to these districts (particularly in conjunction with cycling to provide door-to-door links).
- The MCTS is notably lacking in discussion of the role that **traffic management / calming** can play in promoting safer streets and encouraging more walking and cycling. With over 75% of Christchurch's streets (by length) being local and collector roads (where the emphasis should be on accessibility, not traffic movement), this is a not-insignificant factor. Residents along such non-arterial roads should be satisfied with the nature of traffic (volumes, speeds) and level of safety (walking/cycling, security, children) along their streets. We suggest that the Roding element of the MCTS programme be separated into "Arterial movement" and "Local accessibility and safety", to clearly distinguish the relative emphasis on each. The latter would identify the level of investment in treatments such as "Living Streets", school speed zones, neighbourhood area plans, safe routes to schools and low-speed zones. For an example of similar area-wide treatments, we suggest that the Council consider Wellington City Council's "Safer Roads" programme<sup>2</sup> as an appropriate model.
- It seems to be symptomatic of the traditional road-based thinking that, while a number of specific roading projects are costed and programmed (there is even a map showing major roading projects), other expenditure categories list just generic items like "New Assets (inc Cycleways)" and "Bus Priority Measures". We hope that this apparent willingness to do detailed work on roading projects ahead of other projects does not manifest itself in terms of which projects get developed and constructed first. We suggest that the final MCTS provide a more detailed implementation plan for **all** transportation categories.
- Following on from this discussion about specific projects, we note that it's not unusual for a specific roading project to cost in the order of many millions of

<sup>1</sup> City of York Council 2001. *Policies into Action: Local Transport Plan 2001/02-2005/06 - Executive Summary*. York, UK.

<sup>2</sup> See [www.wcc.govt.nz/news/projects/saferroads/](http://www.wcc.govt.nz/news/projects/saferroads/)

dollars. We wonder therefore whether we can't propose similar multi-million dollar **"package projects" for walking & cycling**. Such projects would enable (say) a lot of cycling initiatives to be constructed all at once, rather than stretched out over a long timeframe. This would enable continuous complete cycle routes to be developed in one stage, which usually provides more benefits than via incremental stages. Similarly, it would allow for area-based treatments, to make an entire neighbourhood friendlier for walking and cycling.

- We are concerned that Travel Planning is not seen as requiring significant expenditure until considerably further along the 20-year timeline. While some demand management initiatives such as congestion pricing might not need to be considered until later, travel behaviour programmes (such as business and school travel plans) are a vital tool that should be strongly implemented right from the start. Overseas evidence would suggest that, in comparison to other transportation activities, they have the potential to provide the greatest level of benefits relative to their cost. Therefore we recommend **increasing the initial allocation to the Travel Planning category**.
- Although significant funding is directed towards **"Central City Amenity"**, it is totally unclear what this is meant to encompass. We would like to think that it would include more investment in on-street parking management, shuttle bus services, traffic calming, street closures, and motor vehicle access restrictions. Such measures would enhance the viability of the central city for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport and counter the unproductive "parking outside my shop" mentality. More detailed discussion of these aspects is required in the MCTS.

Please consider modifying the MCTS 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.

