



5 May 2006

Christchurch City Council
PO Box 237
Christchurch

Re: Draft Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) 2006-16 - SUBMISSION

Spokes Canterbury, the local cycling advocacy group, is pleased to offer this submission to you regarding the Christchurch City LTCCP. We would be happy to provide any further information or clarification if required. In making this submission, Spokes has based its feedback on the public consultation document received, and feedback from our members.

Spokes currently has over 800 direct members. However we also represent the **approximately 100,000 people** who cycle each year in this city¹.

We would like to speak to our submission at the relevant hearing meeting.

General

It has been a rather frustrating exercise to try to assess the merits of this LTCCP. Admittedly the complexity of an operation as large as Christchurch City does not make for a simple task, but the way that the information has been presented certainly does not help.

For example, the broad-brush groupings of the LTCCP's capital works programme (p.82) make it very hard to identify the relative merits of all individual projects (e.g. safety projects versus road capacity projects). Only belatedly was it noted that more detailed capital works information was available on CCC's website, albeit in separate documents for each ward. Similarly it was only found by chance that, hidden under the Council's Development Contributions Policy, was more detailed information about major transport projects proposed; projects that were all lumped together as "*MCTS Funding*" in the LTCCP's capital works programme.

This is quite important when one considers the magnitude of expenditure involved here. Council has been "fluffing" around the edges looking to trim small amounts off the budget by closing libraries, etc when the biggest item still remains the Streets and Transport budget (\$140-180 million p.a.). This contains some large-cost road capacity projects of dubious long-term value (e.g. Northern Arterial). But it is difficult to consider removal or deferment of any of these items when they are so well hidden from view in the current Plan.

There appears to be only relatively minor mention of the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy in this Plan. This seems strange given the obvious importance of this exercise to a sustainable city in the long-term. We encourage a speedy completion of this Strategy so that future city planning can be made with more clarity and certainty.

There's even less mention of the impacts of peak oil and fuel prices on transport patterns in the LTCCP. Given the growing awareness of the issues, even in the media, a Plan looking to provide for the city in over a decade's time should be looking to promote far less dependence on motor vehicles.

¹ Based on 2005 CCC Cycling Monitor Survey, www.ccc.govt.nz/Recreation/Cycling/StrategyMonitoring/

Needless to say, we strongly support planned cycleway (and pedestrian) works in the Plan. As proposed in the Metropolitan Chch Transport Statement (MCTS), these need to be accelerated from their current rate of progress if we are to halt the current motor traffic trends. In some locations, the best solutions may need to be achieved by removing roadspace or traffic priority from motor vehicles; Council will need to stand firm against the inevitable grumbles from short-term thinkers.

In essence, we would like to see the **identification, development and promotion** of key cycling routes into the central city and elsewhere, to provide safe and convenient "routes to town" for both commuting and recreational cyclists, and as a basis for encouraging more people to take up cycling. At present, it is not clear whether the Plan truly supports such a vision for cycling in Christchurch.

Specific Comments

Spokes offers the following specific observations about the draft Plan:

- We have some concern with the stated Vision (p.9) and its reference to a "first-world lifestyle". At present, such a lifestyle seems to include an unhealthy addiction to motor vehicles. Elsewhere we are seeing growing problems as developing countries try to emulate their "first world" counterparts by discouraging non-motorised transportation in favour of motor vehicles. If anything, we should be following their approach with a more village-like urban scale and more reliance on active transport.
- It is rather confusing when, on one hand, p.73 indicates that cycleways have been included in the Plan, but then p.75-76 suggests that they have been left out. We would appreciate the final Plan document (and future Plans) being much clearer in this regard.
- The amount of cycleways work programmed for 2006/07 (p.84) seems woefully low (\$410k) in comparison with both previous expenditure levels and future plans. Whilst appreciating that the Council is currently undergoing somewhat of a strategic review of its approach to cycleways, there should still be plenty of non-strategic items that it could be continuing to do to support cycling in the meantime. For example, much of the existing network is in need of improvements to its condition or safety e.g.
 - Railway Cycleway north of Papanui Rd
 - Linwood Drain cycleway
 - Numerous pathways in Hagley park
 - Removal of various pathway barriers
 - Introduction of kerb ramps at appropriate locations

We request that additional relevant funding be included in the 2006/07 budget to provide for these actions.

- We remind you of our "Top 10 Initiatives" presented to Council in October 2005². We would like to see specific items in the Plan for some of these, namely:
 - 30 km/h "home zones"
 - Development of a CBD "Bikestation" for cycle commuters (possibly as part of the bus exchange expansion?)
 - Support for or development of travel behaviour plans for major organisations
 - Expansion of city cycling events and promotions
 - Auditing and upgrading of existing cycle facilities
- The proposed priorities for cycleway capital works (as outlined in the separate ward summaries) do not seem to make much sense to us, in terms of key areas of need.

² See www.can.org.nz/spokes_chch/moratorium/spokes-top10.htm.

For example, we see the following projects as having a more urgent priority than that proposed:

- Ilam Rd (Riccarton – Aorangi), esp. the University section³
- New Brighton Rd (Golf Links – Lake Tce)
- Waltham Rd (Brougham – Moorhouse)
- Rutland – Grassmere pathway
- Waimakariri Bridge
- Barrington St (Studholme – Lincoln)
- Sockburn Roundabout

Conversely, the following projects are not considered as urgent from a city-wide perspective:

- Curletts Rd pathway
- Waterloo Rd (Carmen – Racecourse)
- Riccarton High “Bubble”
- Fitzgerald Ave (Moorhouse – Armagh)

We also note that a 2008-11 cycleway project is proposed for “*Centaurus Rd – Cashmere Rd*” when this already appears to have been completed. Please readjust the cycleways programme in light of our comments above.

- Despite the recent development of a strategic walking & cycling plan for Banks Peninsula, we note no expenditure allocated in the future to implement any likely recommendations from this.
- We do not support the removal of local services such as libraries, halls and pools (p.86). Cutting down the number of facilities increases the average distances travelled by residents, thus increasing their likelihood of relying on motor vehicles to get there. Our aim should be to create relatively self-contained suburban “villages” instead.
- We support increases to on/off-street car parking charges (p.87).
- We strongly support the following proposed capital works (p.71-75):
 - Expanding the Bus Exchange
 - Strategic land purchases
 - Central City Transport projects
 - More 40km/h school zones (although more traffic management works to go with them may be appropriate)
 - Developing the Avon River central corridor
 - Introducing bus priority corridors.
- We would like see acceleration of “Living Streets” traffic management to local streets (p.78), including the introduction of 30 km/h zones.
- We strongly support an increase in developer contributions with new subdivisions, particularly for outlying locations. The huge increases in rates (currently and in the future) are largely due to a lot of additional infrastructure development or refurbishment required to address the demands of these new subdivisions and therefore they should help to pay for the consequences.

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

³ We note that 2004 University surveys established that the number of cyclists and pedestrians using Ilam Rd between Rountree St and Montana Ave during the day-time (~7000 movements) *equalled* the number of motor vehicles travelling along it during the same period.

Yours sincerely,

Glen Koorey

Chairperson, SPOKES Canterbury

Email: spokes_chch@can.org.nz

Phone: 331-7504 (hm) 364-2951 (wk)

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. We currently directly represent over 800 people.

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.

Website: http://www.can.org.nz/spokes_chch