



**Report**            **04.241**  
**Date**             30 April 2004  
**File**              TP03/07/03

**Committee**       **Regional Land Transport**  
**Author**           **Lesley McConnell Policy Advisor Access Planning**

## **Regional Pedestrian Strategy**

### **1. Purpose**

To provide the Committee with an analysis of the submissions received and to recommend to Council to adopt the Regional Pedestrian Strategy presented in **attachment 1**.

### **2. Background**

The draft Regional Pedestrian Strategy was released for public consultation by the Committee from 1 December 2003 to 31 March 2004. The strategy seeks more pedestrians in a convenient, safe and pleasant environment. When adopted it will form a chapter of the RLTS and as such it has a strategic transport perspective.

### **3. Comment**

#### **3.1 Submissions received**

Ten submissions were received from:

- Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)
- Kapiti Coast District Council (KCDC)
- Regional Public Health (RPH)
- Wellington City Council (WCC)
- Porirua City Council (PCC)
- Transit New Zealand (TNZ)
- Living Streets Aotearoa (LSA)
- New Zealand Automobile Association (NZAA); and
- two members of the public.

Submissions were collated and analysed, with necessary amendments made to the strategy in conjunction with the Pedestrian Technical Working Group. A

copy of the submissions is collated in a separate document and will be tabled at the meeting.

### **3.2 Analysis of submissions**

All submissions were generally very supportive of the strategy. Some of the submissions requested minor changes, sought clarification, suggested additions, or made suggestions regarding implementation of the pedestrian audits. Suggestions regarding implementation of the pedestrian audits have been noted for future use.

#### **3.2.1 Vision**

The vision is supported. No submissions requested changes or noted opposition.

#### **3.2.2 Objectives**

RPH believe the objectives read like strategies, and should be more directly measurable and directly incorporate targets within the objective statements.

*Comment*

*Objectives are to be delivered by the action programme. The action programme performance measures and targets will give an indication of how well the objectives are being achieved. System wide indicators will show how the outcomes and objectives are being met.*

PCC supports TA and LTSA roles in the safety objective, but not GWRC.

*Comment*

*GWRC has a clear role in facilitating road safety in planning the transport network. GWRC are responsible for facilitating Regional Road Safety Week and produce a Regional Road Safety Strategy. As regards the pedestrian strategy, there are no specific road safety actions listed for GWRC.*

Ms Diane Morris believes the vision and objectives fail to address the “basic obstacle to pedestrians” – that is, cars.

*Comment*

*This is the pedestrian strategy of the Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS). Any objectives that may relate to addressing car use are more appropriately dealt with in the context of the RLTS review currently underway, and not in a pedestrian strategy.*

#### **3.2.3 Action programme**

KCDC and WCC question what funding assistance GWRC will be able to provide to assist implementation. WCC request that GWRC fund all TA pedestrian actions arising out of the strategy. Both councils also note that GWRC’s support of TA’s Transfund funding applications is required if TAs are to achieve the pedestrian audits.

***Comment***

***This strategy forms a chapter of the RLTS. GWRC has a role in strategically planning the transport network. We do not own pedestrian infrastructure, and it is appropriate that TAs fund improvements to their own networks. The RLTS is a means of coordinating those improvements to attain regional benefits.***

***GWRC will fund those action points relating to them. GWRC will also support TA funding requests to Transfund for strategy implementation.***

KCDC claim the strategy does not mention advocating for more funding for pedestrian works at a national level.

***Comment***

***The strategy includes an action to actively participate in national level programmes/strategy development for pedestrians. This includes programmes around funding. This action has been amended to clarify this point.***

RPH request that parks and recreation services be involved in the development and implementation of the strategy to capture the “pleasant” aspect of the vision.

***Comment***

***This strategy forms a part of the RLTS. It is a transport strategy that concentrates on pedestrians using the transport network, not regional parks. However, if at an operational level an opportunity arises to coordinate with the Parks Division, it will be taken.***

RPH suggest there is anecdotal evidence that buses are responsible for a number of pedestrian casualties and would like an action related to this in the action plan.

***Comment***

***In the past five years, there have been 4 reported incidents of nominal injury to a pedestrian from being struck by a bus (Source: LTSA CAS database). Response to this is sufficiently covered in actions aimed at addressing pedestrian casualties as a whole. If at some point reporting statistics show this to be of a greater concern, it will be addressed.***

PCC supports GWRC public transport pedestrian audit, but does not support TAs being “told how to spend their scarce resources” in relation to pedestrian auditing of local street networks.

***Comment***

***The Pedestrian Strategy is a regional one developed collaboratively with TA officers, and aims at responding pedestrian needs at the regional level. TAs can respond to the pedestrian strategy as they would a RLTS.***

Does not support the GWRC role in locally directed advocacy, but does support GWRC advocating to central government for funding.

***Comment***

***A key to progressing pedestrian programmes is adequate funding. GWRC is in a position to add weight to funding requests by advocating to central and local government. There is support for this role from most territorial authorities.***

WCC request that the Walking School Bus (WSB) Interagency Group involves Transfund and advocacy groups.

***Comment***

***This will be communicated to those who facilitate the group.***

WCC Request that the strategy provide more direction on urban form and city “walkability”. LSA also request regional pedestrian signage standards, better LoS measures than merely surface roughness, and best practice guidance for TAs.

***Comment***

***Localised urban form should be led by TAs and supported by GWRC. However, the strategy has been amended to reference imminent LTSA guideline documents and the LSA street audit guidelines.***

TNZ notes that TAs should lead the pedestrian audits, given the majority of pedestrian access matters fall within TA jurisdiction. Transit are very willing to provide necessary input and consider agreed actions when state highway access, in the context of a TA review, needs to be addressed.

***Comment***

***TAs should engage Transit when necessary to ensure a coordinated approach, given state highway access is, particularly in urban areas, inextricably linked to the local network and urban amenity. The strategy has been amended slightly to reflect TAs lead role.***

The following submission points are made by LSA. Our comments follow in bold type.

Suggest an independent body lead the street audits.

***This is for each TA to determine.***

Public transport pedestrian review – wants to ensure the scope includes airports, ferry terminals, taxi stands, rail stations and interchanges, as well as bus stops.

***This is the intention of the pedestrian review.***

Local level programme implementation should be broader than just GWRC and should include also input on strategic planning (in addition to funding processes).

***All agencies can participate where appropriate in championing pedestrian needs.***

LSA website offered as central locality for information links around pedestrian issues.

*Noted.*

#### New Suggestions by LSA

TA free-for-mobile number to report vehicles blocking footpaths.

***Disagree: This is a decision for local authorities.***

Provision of a regional Walking/Pedestrian Forum.

***Disagree. Given the minimal incidence of cross boundary pedestrian issues, GWRC does not feel warranted to host a regional pedestrian forum at this point in time. This does not preclude another organisation forming a forum should they see a need.***

Fund promotional material to encourage walking. Large scale walking information maps for local schools. Host a Regional “Walk to Work Day”. Regional support of “Stepping Out” each year. Support LivingStreets Wellington’s “Train Walks”, “Cable Car Walks” and “Bus Walks” proposals to promote off-peak recreational activity in combination with public transport.

***It is not believed that this degree of intervention is warranted at a regional level, given walking numbers are relatively high: walking is the primary recreational activity. The current set of strategy interventions is comprehensive and should deliver the transport outcomes identified. This will be addressed again when the strategy is reviewed.***

Support WCC’s aim of reduced speed limits on certain routes & encourage other TAs to do the same

***GWRC is involved in the WCC SafeRoads steering groups. It is the decision of local authorities if they wish to reduce speed limits on local roads. This is a consideration broader than pedestrian issues.***

Support Shop Mobility schemes.

***Disagree. The need for this is as yet unsubstantiated.***

Fund research into barriers/motivators to more walking. Establish database of key walking statistics.

***Research into people’s perceptions as a pedestrian in the region is already undertaken by GWRC. Pedestrian data is also collated as an input to the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). These streams of data are available to those who wish to use them, and provide a good basis for evaluative activity across our system wide indicators.***

GWRC travel plan and encouragement of other large organisations in the region to do the same. Plan for increased housing density at transport nodes.

***Disagree. Addressing these matters is more suited to work streams that will develop when a Travel Demand Management strategy is produced in the context of the RLTS review.***

GWRC pay foot mileage allowance to employees and members and GWRC to remove car-focused elements from staff salary packages.

***Disagree. These are issues far outside the scope of a Regional Pedestrian Strategy.***

Ms Rachel Brown requested that maps be developed for pedestrians travelling around the Wellington CBD, to indicate shortcuts.

***Comment***

***This is a local issue and not of significance enough to be in the regional strategy.***

#### 3.2.4 General comments

KCDC and LSA wished to see greater clarity and the inclusion of a number of other agencies among the *Roles and Responsibilities* section of the strategy. KCDC requested local pedestrian advocacy groups and SPARC. While LSA extended this list to include: Capital & Coast DHB, the Police, EECA, NZ Planning Institute, Obesity Action Coalition, Chamber of Commerce, Age Concern, Cancer Society, Heart Foundation and Diabetes NZ.

***Comment***

***Local level advocacy groups do not play a role at a regional level and it is therefore inappropriate to include them in the strategy. However, this does not preclude TAs engaging with these groups in the course of their work.***

***While we agree with the importance of the other agencies listed in achieving greater levels of pedestrian activity among the community, it does not seem appropriate to list every possible agency in the region that is involved. Our approach has been to list and briefly describe the major agencies in the region that have a key role in facilitating strategy implementation. It is our expectation that those agencies will in turn collaborate with other organisations appropriate to their needs during the course of implementation. The strategy has been amended to include a paragraph to this effect.***

RPH would like the strategy to clearly enunciate the desire for reduced car use, and incorporate strategies for other pedestrian linked means of transport such as public transport use, car pooling and park & ride schemes.

***Comment***

***An objective as broad as “reduced car use” and the associated mechanisms outlined are system wide and are more appropriately dealt with in the context of the RLTS review currently underway, not within a pedestrian strategy.***

LSA request that the targets listed in the strategy need to be more specific, especially those related to the system wide indicators. A number of indicators and targets were recommended.

- Walking School Bus Targets should be set, ie “number of schools in the region with WSBs”.

***Comment***

***The current strategy action is for an investigation into how best to implement WSB. Explicit targets may follow with a possible programme of action stemming from the investigation.***

- Amount of walking undertaken on a weekly basis and proportion of trips made by walking.

***Comment***

***GWRC collects data on the proportion of trips walked and this will continue to be reported in the AMR.***

- Pedestrian audit targets for completing the street audits should be set.

***Comment***

***Progress on pedestrian audits will depend on adequate funds being allocated within each TAs, and on the timing of such allocation. Consequently, setting targets are the responsibility of TAs. Unnecessarily slow progress will be addressed in the strategy review.***

- Targets should be set for Lambton Quay/Waterfront pedestrian counts.

***Comment***

***These counts are conducted by Wellington City Council and are Wellington City specific and as such, target setting is WCC’s responsibility should they choose to do so.***

- A target for the number of public seats available.

***Comment***

***This is a local urban amenity issue, and unlikely to be significant regionally in achieving an increased proportion of walking trips.***

- Number of walkways in the region and percentage of walkways with maps.

***Comment***

***The Regional Pedestrian Strategy is transport driven and focuses on the street network, not on park walkways.***

- Percent of suburbs with a pedestrian map.

***Comment***

***Provision of suburban maps is a local measure. From a regional perspective, city street maps provide a high level of information regarding the roading network and pedestrian streets.***

Ms Morris and Ms Brown request that the strategy take more account of gender, age and poverty issues relating to pedestrian activities; and that it

recognise and take more account of pedestrians who are not “disabled”, but have mobility problems, or are elderly. WCC reiterate concern regarding the needs of disabled and elderly pedestrians.

*Comment*

*The strategy desires a high level of service for all pedestrians. By designing for the least able pedestrian, all pedestrians are well catered for. Any inadequacies should be addressed within the pedestrian audit programmes. It is also expected that these issues will be addressed in the LTSA guidelines currently being developed (see 4.).*

Ms Brown also requests that figures given in the pedestrian profile regarding casualties (pp 13 – 15) should be broken down by sex, disability and time of day.

*Comment*

*Breakdown by sex did not show any great differences; hence an aggregated total was sufficient. There is no reporting on disability breakdown. Time of day is captured by police reporting, but is at a level of detail more relevant to TA work.*

#### **4. Recommended changes to the Regional Pedestrian Strategy**

Given the general support of the strategy vision, objectives and actions the strategy does not need significant revision. The following changes are recommended and are incorporated to the strategy document (**attachment 1**):

- Mention of the role of pedestrian/government agencies other than those specifically listed.
- Clarification of TNZ’s role in the pedestrian audits.
- Reference made to forthcoming best practice document from the Land Transport Safety Authority (LTSA): *Pedestrian Facilities and Network Planning Guide* (due July 2004) and the *RTS 14 – Guideline for Installing Pedestrian Facilities for People with Visual Impairment*; and to Living Streets’ *DIY Community Street Audit*, as guides to road controlling authorities’ pedestrian audit programmes
- General editing of strategy text and minor rescheduling of some actions to better reflect current workstreams.
- Allocation of \$30,000pa for 3 years to public transport pedestrian audit to ensure a thorough review is undertaken. Previously, the review was allocated a one off sum of \$20,000 in the 2004/05 financial year. Note that all funding is subject to normal budgeting processes and is not committed by inclusion in this strategy.



## 5. Communication

A media release communicating key details of the adopted strategy and its general availability will be developed following Council's consideration of the strategy.

## 6. Recommendations

*That the Committee recommends Council adopt the amended Regional Pedestrian Strategy provided in **attachment 1**.*

Report prepared by:

Report approved by:

Report approved by:

**Lesley McConnell**  
Policy Advisor  
Access Planning

**Joe Hewitt**  
Manager  
Access Planning

**Dave Watson**  
Divisional Manager  
Transport

### **Attachment**

1 – Regional Pedestrian Strategy