

## Draft Regional Walking Plan – April 2008

### Summary of Submissions

| Sub No. | Name(s)                   | Organisation      | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response   |
|---------|---------------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1       | Ian Hunter<br>Dave Watson | Land Transport NZ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports draft plan and suggests some minor changes and additions:</li> <li>• Suggests that due to the name change it would be useful to indicate that draft plan will replace the Regional Pedestrian Plan</li> <li>• Suggests that the role of Land Transport NZ be added under the 'responsibilities' section of the plan</li> <li>• Suggests it would be useful to acknowledge work already done by some local authorities to develop and implement local walking and cycling plans</li> <li>• Suggest the action 'Improve Pedestrian Access to Railway Stations' is changed to 'Improve Access to Passenger Transport Hubs' and an additional action to cover hubs that are not railway stations.</li> <li>• Also notes the targets for walking and cycling in the Wellington RLTS 2007 – 2016 are comparable to those in the updated NZTS and will require some effort from all transport agencies to meet them. May require a step change in policy rather than business as usual.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Agree. Amend plan accordingly.</li> <li>• Agree. Amend plan accordingly.</li> <li>• This can be commented on in the covering committee report if appropriate – but the role of the plan itself is to signal the need for all TAs to have a local strategy and what elements these should include.</li> <li>• This action is focused on pedestrian access to railway stations to progress implementation of improvements identified through the pedestrian audit report on access to the region's railways stations - where the responsibility is shared between TAs, GW, and ONTRACK. Access to bus stops is expected to be addressed by TAs under the first action in the draft plan 'Improve the walking network'.</li> <li>• Agree that business as usual unlikely to achieve RLTS targets. Implementing agencies will have a vital role in ensuring that adequate resources are put into providing for active modes. Note that other external factors such as fuel prices may influence these targets.</li> </ul> |
| 2       | Pat van Berkel            |                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide drinking fountains at key high points – easier</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be addressed under TA local strategies and reviews – as</li> </ul>   |

| Sub No. | Name(s)      | Organisation | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response  |
|---------|--------------|--------------|---|---|
|         |              |              | <p>for joggers and walkers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide routes away from roads for pleasant walking and cycling.</li> <li>• Supports the action 'encourage walking to school'.</li> <li>• Would like to see walking maps that show all tracks, walkway and alleys – and drinking fountains identified. Maps should be available on paper and online.</li> <li>• The plan does not mention 'joggers' yet the needs of walkers and joggers are almost identical – suggests scope of the plan be extended to include joggers/runners.</li> </ul>  | <p>considered appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As above.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Addressed under the action 'Improve information for walking' to investigate an online journey planner for walking trips.</li> <li>• The definition of 'walking' in the draft plan – the act of self propelling along a route - would also cover jogging. It is not considered to require separate mention – as the submitter notes, the needs of walkers and joggers are almost identical.</li> </ul>  |
| 3       | Paula Warren |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walking is an important mode of transport with a wide range of associated benefits.</li> <li>• Progress in implementing the existing pedestrian plan has been slow.</li> <li>• While the new walking plan is an improvement on existing, doubts that it will achieve the sort of mode shift envisaged by the RLTS.</li> <li>• Seeks the inclusion of clear outcomes/targets that local authorities are expected to meet. For example: <i>At least 50% of households are within 20 min walk of major centres.</i></li> <li>• Suggests these outcomes then be given legal weight (through the RLTS and RPS) so that TA compliance is mandatory.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed.</li> <li>• Agreed.</li> <li>• The draft walking plan sets out a range of actions that are required to support walking as a mode of transport, the extent to which a mode shift is achieved will depend on the level of effort and resource put into the various action areas by implementing agencies.</li> <li>• While the draft walking plan signals the need for TAs to develop local strategies with objectives and targets, it is considered inappropriate for the region to set specific targets that TAs must meet – identifying local priorities and setting local targets should take account of good practice guidelines and be consistent with the RLTS, but is the role of TAs to respond to their local community needs.</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s)                            | Organisation                                    | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response   |
|---------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 4       | Derek Richardson                   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests creating more shared pedestrian/cyclist/car areas (eg. waterfront area near TSB Arena/Fergs kayaks).</li> <li>• Need to consider the long term benefits of investment decisions - including fuel savings, health and environmental benefits - not just short term gains.</li> <li>• Supports the actions 'Facilitate info sharing' and 'Improve information for walking' – also ensure walking is safe.</li> <li>• Suggests that pedestrians should not be looked at in isolation. The RLTS combines walking and cycling in its vision and a merged approach to their planning will ensure both modes can co-exist. Separate activities and planning according to separate requirements will cause conflicting strategies.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This may be appropriate in some locations, but will be considered at the local level as part of their network development.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• While the strategic policy approach in the RLTS often combines the 'active modes' of walking and cycling, it is considered appropriate to address these modes separately at the action plan level as their needs are often very different and shared facilities are only appropriate in a small number of circumstances. The two plans will complement and support each other where appropriate.</li> </ul> |
| 5       | Wayne MacKenzie                    | Korokoro Environmental Group                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Words are good but need actions. Requests support for retaining and improving walking/cycling network from Petone Beach to Korokoro Valley. Current access is proposed to be closed by Transit NZ and a 1.5km diversion provided.</li> <li>• Supports work done to provide free cycle access on trains and would like to see this continue.</li> <li>• Promote walking (and cycling) the Mill Stream in Korokoro Valley.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific walking routes/links are primarily a local issue covered under the action 'Improve the pedestrian network'.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• The plan includes an action 'Promote the wider benefits of walking' however promotion of specific facilities/locations is outside the scope of this plan.</li> </ul>  |
| 6       | Janice Simmons<br>Ken Whelan (CEO) | Capital and Coast District Health Board (CCDHB) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the plan as it provides a clear framework for territorial authorities and other key stakeholders to work together to improve pedestrian</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>   |

| Sub No. | Name(s) | Organisation | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response   |
|---------|---------|--------------|---|--|
|         |         |              | <p>infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsibilities section – would be useful to mention ‘Getting there’ implementation team here – likely to provide an important source of resources &amp; social marketing programmes for other agencies to use.</li> <li>• ‘Improve the pedestrian network’ – point 3 – in terms of best practice guides it would also be useful to mention ‘Universal Access’ design principles, as promoted by Barrier Free NZ Trust – encourages design solutions for all New Zealanders, including the disabled.</li> <li>• Supports GW advocacy for high standards of walking facilities in new land use development.</li> <li>• ‘Encourage walking to school’ action could also include walking to work – working adults are a large section of the population and equally important they maintain healthy levels of exercise.</li> <li>• Supports GW in its advocacy to central government for increased funding for walking.</li> <li>• ‘Promote the wider benefits of walking’ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Alongside RPH, the ‘Getting there’ implementation team are likely to be key stakeholder in developing a social marketing plan.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree – the role of Land Transport NZ, including their role to progress the ‘Getting there’ implementation plan, to be added to the final plan.</li> <li>• The best practice guide (Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide - Land Transport NZ 2008) referenced in the action plan includes design principles to meet the needs of disabled persons.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• We agree that encouraging adults to walk to work is equally important. The walk to work trip will be influenced by actions in the plan to improve local walking networks and land use development and urban form which support walkability. It is also provided for under the Regional Travel Demand Management Strategy through the workplace travel plan programme. However, the review process identified the need for some specific initiatives to be identified for the walk to school trip to address safety issues for children.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>– RPH is listed as the lead agency but other agencies are likely to be involved and regional/local campaigns may support/feed off any national campaign run by Land Transport NZ.</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s)     | Organisation                         | Summary of Submission  | Comments in response   |
|---------|-------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
|         |             |                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include mention of walking maps as example of useful resources to promote walking.</li> <li>- Opportunities exist to promote recreational walking as a tourism activity in the region.</li> <br/> <li>• 'Improve information for walking' – suggests investigating a standardised, high quality wayfinding and signage system for pedestrians – at the regional level to prevent TAs needing re-invent the wheel.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Calorie maps are one type of walking map identified as an example under this initiative.</li> <li>- The Regional Walking Plan sits alongside the Regional Land Transport Strategy and is therefore appropriately focused on interventions for walking as a mode of transport. Other strategy documents and plans (eg. At The Heart – Regional Physical Activity Strategy) take a greater health or recreational perspective in relation to walking.</li> <br/> <li>• On-street measures to guide and inform pedestrians are expected to be considered as part of local strategies and network reviews. Best practice guidance about pedestrian signage is provided in Chapter 16 of the Land Transport NZ design guide. The Regional Walking Forum could be used to share best practice examples and ideas for on-street signage between local authorities, however a regional 'standard' is not considered necessary.</li> </ul> |
| 7       | Sue Johnson | Kapiti Coast District Council (KCDC) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Regional Walking Plan.</li> <li>• Acknowledges important role of TAs in relation to walking.</li> <li>• Notes positive action by Kapiti Coast District Council (KCDC) to date to encourage walking – Cycleways, Walkways, Bridleways (CWB) Strategy and School Travel Planning.</li> <li>• 'Improve the Pedestrian Network' – initiatives identified under this action are consistent with the CWB Strategy and will be taken into account at its next review. Specific mention of need to implement improvements in conjunction with Transit NZ on the state highway is welcomed.</li> <li>• 'Improve Pedestrian Access to Railway Stations' –</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted – may need to clarify the coordination and liaison process.</li> </ul>  |

| Sub No. | Name(s) | Organisation | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response  |
|---------|---------|--------------|---|---|
|         |         |              | <p>welcomes the initiative to carry out the recommended pedestrian improvements identified by the audits in conjunction with the railway station upgrade programme. Notes the need for good liaison between TAs, GW and other stakeholders around this process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Provide for pedestrians in land development' – notes that KCDC's District Plan and subdivision guides include provision for pedestrian priority and high levels of walking accessibility. A design and review team ensure that CWB issues are taken into account with new applications.</li> <li>• 'Encourage walking to school' – notes that School Travel Planning is underway in Kapiti with two primary schools and one college. A School Travel Plan coordinator is to be employed. GW support to date is appreciated - but seeks more assistance with providing a coordinator.</li> <li>• Also stresses that road safety skills for children an important part of encouraging uptake of active modes – concern that Road Sense programme is not continuing in Kapiti - a facilitator may be needed back in the district to work with schools.</li> <li>• 'Influence Central Government policy' and 'Seek adequate funding' – Supports these initiatives.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Regional School Travel Plan support will continue to be available and GW will work with KCDC to address this issue. We note that TAs can apply directly to Land Transport NZ for a 75% subsidy for such a coordinator role.</li> <li>• Agree that road safety skills for children are vital alongside an increased use of walking. The RoadSense Strategy – Ata Haere is a partnership between Land Transport and NZ Police and is about developing a school-wide road safety culture. The Police Road Safe series forms an integral element of the strategy. We understand that Land Transport NZ funds RoadSense facilitators to help guide school communities to develop initiatives, but that these may be currently focussing in the high risk areas of NZ. Therefore, it may be appropriate for GW to advocate to Land Transport, and the Ministries of Education and Transport for increased intervention.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s)       | Organisation        | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response   |
|---------|---------------|---------------------|---|--|
|         |               |                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Facilitate information sharing' – Supports the facilitation of a Regional Walking Forum. Notes the background issues paper was very helpful with comparative statistics and info on each TA.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>   |
| 8       | Graham Taylor | Transit New Zealand | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General comments:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Measurability of some targets/actions will be challenging and monitoring not fully thought through</li> <li>– No mention of UNZTS and sustainable travel targets outside the RLTS</li> <li>– No mention of how to attract and develop use by new pedestrians rather than existing</li> <li>– Road safety not explicitly mentioned</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Improve the pedestrian network'               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Seeks more details about the needs of and types of pedestrians and how the reviews will reflect the different uses and users.</li> <li>– Seeks the addition of road safety as a review item</li> <li>– Would also like to see a review item around integration with other modes and disabled access</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The project related targets provide a measure to report progress against and are reported through the quarterly Agency Report to the RLTC</li> <li>– The final UNZTS is not yet published. However the targets for walking and cycling in the RLTS are comparable to those in the draft UNZTS at the regional level</li> <li>– The walking plan seeks to encourage more people to walk more often through a combination of improved facilities, promotion, awareness and education.</li> <li>– Road safety is addressed in the plan primarily through infrastructure improvements, but also under road safety skills for children. No additional regional interventions were identified through the workshop process. The Regional Road Safety Plan provides a greater focus on road safety initiatives and action planning specifically.</li> <li>– The Land Transport NZ <i>Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide 2008</i>, referenced in the plan, provides a comprehensive description of the various pedestrian types, uses and needs.</li> <li>– Agree. Amend plan accordingly</li> <li>– The review item 'Needs of different types of pedestrians' includes the needs of disabled users. Plan amended to</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s) | Organisation | Summary of Submission  | Comments in response   |
|---------|---------|--------------|--|--|
|         |         |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reference to Transit NZ in point 4 should perhaps reflect the new agency's name</li> <br/> <li>- No mention made of temporary pedestrian facilities when needed (eg. roadworks)</li> <br/> <li>- Feels an opportunity has been missed to establish a vision for improving the network.</li> <br/> <li>• 'Improve pedestrian access to railway stations'               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests widening remit to bus stations, ferry terminals and well used venues</li> <br/> <li>- No mention made of crossing railway lines and level crossings</li> </ul> </li> <br/> <li>• 'Provide for pedestrians in land development'               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Point 2 could be worded more robustly, at present no onus on developers to take heed of planning comments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>include 'integration with other modes'. Best practice guidance on the detailed design for integration with other modes and disabled access are covered in the Land Transport NZ <i>Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide</i>, referenced in the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The plans 'Responsibilities' section near the front includes a footnote regarding the upcoming merger of Transit NZ and Land Transport NZ. Will update to NZTA once the merger occurs.</li> <br/> <li>- Temporary facilities are not a regional intervention – they are part of standard RCA operating procedures beneath the scope of this plan.</li> <br/> <li>- The strategic regional vision for walking is provided by the RLTS and included in the walking plan. TAs will develop appropriate vision for their own communities and networks through their local strategies.</li> <br/> <li>- Access to bus stops/stations and ferry terminals are expected to be addressed as part of the previous action area. Access to rail is set apart due to more complex ownership and responsibility arrangements which need some additional effort to coordinate.</li> <br/> <li>- This issue is specifically covered in the Land Transport NZ <i>Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide</i>, 2008.</li> <br/> <li>- The walking plan itself cannot directly influence developers. However it seeks good provisions for pedestrians in those planning documents that do influence land use development decisions.</li> </ul> |



| Sub No. | Name(s) | Organisation | Summary of Submission  | Comments in response  |
|---------|---------|--------------|--|---|
|         |         |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Encourage walking to school'               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In addition to TAs, Transit may also have a limited role in relation to parking and speed restrictions around schools, particularly in rural areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Seek adequate funding'               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Queries whether they (Transit NZ) should have a pedestrian fund set aside within the Annual Plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Facilitate information sharing'               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests that a walking forum is a backwards step and that a combined 'sustainable transport forum' is best approach.</li> <li>- Notes that no mention made of exchanging and promoting best practice.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Improve information for walking'               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Online journey planner needs to take account of walking trips as part of bigger journeys and multi-modal trips.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agree. Amend line in plan to read RCAs rather than TAs</li> <li>- Yes. Amend line in plan to read <u>RCAs</u> and GW</li> <li>- It is likely that the new walking forum will be run in conjunction with the existing cycling forum in some way, and the plan notes this intention. However it is recommended that the exact details of how these forums will operate be determined outside of this action plan in consultation with the relevant stakeholders.</li> <li>- Amend plan to include this point.</li> <li>- The purpose of this new tool is to provide information for trips which are made by walking (and cycling) as the main mode for a trip. The Metlink journey planner will continue to be used for combined walk and PT journeys. A separate tool is proposed for trips where walking (or cycling) is the main mode as it allows for greater functionality and features specific to these types of trips. These online tools will be linked and integrated wherever possible to ensure they are easy to find and to use.</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s)       | Organisation               | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response  |
|---------|---------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 9       | Roger Blakely | Porirua City Council (PCC) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the plan, subject to the following comments:</li> <li>• 'Seek adequate funding' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports this action but re-iterates that funding should not fall on local ratepayers alone.</li> <li>- Large onus on TAs to fund projects but no indication of how they are to fund their local share. Funding suggested is over and above that identified in their LTCCP and it cannot be assumed that additional rates funding will be available or that local priorities will be the same as regional priorities. Projects with high regional priorities should be funded from regional or national sources.</li> <li>- Funding should also come from health authorities and central government.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Improve the pedestrian network' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Believes the suggested review is applicable to a mature pedestrian network, but networks in many parts of region are still being developed. Priority should be connectivity, with review of level of service later when core network in place.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Improve pedestrian access to railway stations' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports this action but suggests that funding for improvements should not be tied to the railway station upgrade programme as this is prioritised by the need for platform upgrades for new rolling stock, not pedestrian needs. Priority should be targeted to stations with high use.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- GW is not a RCA or funding agency and therefore does not fund walking infrastructure projects. For local walking improvement projects, local share may be supplemented by a subsidy from Land Transport NZ or by making a case for R or C1 funding during consideration and development of the Regional Transport Programme.</li> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>• This action area and the associated best practice guide cover both existing and potential new network facilities. It will be up to TAs through their local strategies to determine priorities for their community.</li> <li>• The funding element of this action area is a matter for the Greater Wellington Annual Plan process.</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s)         | Organisation | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response  |
|---------|-----------------|--------------|---|---|
|         |                 |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Facilitate information sharing' – supports the establishment of a Regional Walking Forum.</li> <li>• 'Improve information for walking' – supports in principle but feels that an online 'journey planner' will be expensive and have limited use. Suggests local walking maps (hard copies and online) would be more useful.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Recent technology advances mean that this type of application is relatively affordable compared with the existing Metlink journey planner. An online journey planning facility has many advantages over hard copy only maps, although we expect there will be a continued need for local hard copy maps produced by TAs.</li> </ul>  |
| 10      | Richard Herbert | (individual) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Improve the pedestrian network' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Would like to see additional actions with GW responsibility to: develop strategies for walking networks through Regional parks and adjacent crown owned land; provide a region wide walking network plan to integrate TA initiatives and continue cross-boundary walkways; and utilise existing river, rail and road corridors as walking routes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Improve pedestrian access to railway stations' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Unclear from the plan what the proposed improvements are. Seeks more park and ride (particularly at Takapu Road, level access between platforms and trains, and upgraded pedestrian overbridge walkway facilities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Provide for pedestrians in land development' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– supports the structure plan approach to land use development which ensures for example inclusion of local facilities and amenities within a 10 minute walk of new residences</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Encourage walking to school' – supports this action</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– This plan is an implementation plan of the regional land transport strategy and as such has a focus on walking for transport purposes. However, we recognise that regional parks can provide direct connections and alternative off road routes for walking trips. The region's parks and recreational strategies and plans are the appropriate place for these issues to be addressed. Improving integration of regional parks with walking routes and local open space will be addressed via the upcoming Regional Parks review.</li> <li>– The audit reports carried out on the region's railway stations include detailed description of the deficiencies and recommended improvements for each station. This action area seeks to progress implementation of the audit report recommendations.</li> <li>– Noted.</li> <li>– Walking school buses are included under this action area –</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s)                       | Organisation                      | Summary of Submission  | Comments in response  |
|---------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
|         |                               |                                   | <p>area. The 'walking bus' is another concept could be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Promote the wider benefits of walking' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests a regionally coordinated walking awareness programme and events</li> <li>- Suggests more flexibility in allowing higher density living in areas around public transport hubs and centres.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Improve information for walking' – the online 'journey planner' should also include recreational walk routes.</li> <li>• Other comments – suggests some project targets very general, unclear how they will be measured - seeks clarification about what 'adequate funding' means as there can never be enough funding allocated to walking projects.</li> </ul> | <p>see bullet point 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional coordination of any walking programmes or events is something that can be addressed at the Regional Walking Forum.</li> <li>- Agree. This concept is supported through policies in the Regional Policy Statement, Wellington Regional Strategy and the Wellington RLTS.</li> <li>• As mentioned earlier, the focus of this plan relates to walking as a mode of transport.</li> <li>- The project targets provide a measure against which to monitor progress in implementing the various interventions.</li> <li>- Noted, but would define this as a need for adequate funding to make reasonable progress in implementing the identified interventions.</li> </ul> |
| 11      | Andrew Wilks<br>Jenny Bentley | Victoria University of Wellington | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commends development of the walking plan – believes it correctly identified the key issues and recommends a suitable set of actions.</li> <li>• Suggests following areas for potential improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure an appropriate budget to deliver the proposed actions is set aside by the relevant authorities</li> <li>- Clearly designate the responsibility for delivering actions in the plan</li> <li>- Include workplaces which are part of the travel</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- Agree, this is the intention of the action area 'Seek adequate funding', but funding processes are subject to Annual Plan processes.</li> <li>- The lead responsibility for progressing each intervention is identified in the second column of the action programme.</li> <li>- This is carried out through the workplace travel plan programme under the Regional TDM Strategy.</li> </ul>   |

| Sub No. | Name(s)                            | Organisation                 | Summary of Submission  | Comments in response   |
|---------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|         |                                    |                              | plan programme as target audiences.  |  |
| 12      | Dr Stephen Palmer<br>Kristen Foley | Regional Public Health (RPH) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, the draft plan is very positive and demonstrates forward thinking and potential.</li> <li>• Submitter provides comprehensive discussion about the links between walking, transport and health, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Levels of physical activity</li> <li>- Injury from motor vehicles</li> <li>- Access to amenities and social relationships</li> <li>- Impacts of climate change</li> <li>- Independence and social development in children</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes that urban open spaces are often used for walking for leisure and to pass through en route to other destinations.</li> <li>• Notes that walking is not only a mode of transport but also a leisure activity significant to public health. Suggests the plan should recognise and incorporate the value of informal, unplanned walking during discretionary leisure time. Suggests an approach too focussed on walking for transport may place undue emphasis on use of footpaths alongside roads – need to look at opportunities through parks and reserves.</li> <li>• Agrees with the walking action programme but seeks links with various District Plans, local LTCCPs and other plans and strategies and commitment sought</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Agree.</li> <li>• We recognise the health and wellbeing benefits associated with walking and the opportunities for shortcuts and walking connections through recreational land. However, the Regional Walking Plan sits alongside the Regional Land Transport Strategy and is therefore focused on interventions for walking as a mode of transport. When walking with for a trip purpose, people will normally look for the shortest and most convenient route, and this often involves using footpaths along the existing road network. We agree that there may be opportunities to improve the pedestrian experience while using that network, or to provide alternative connections through recreational land where appropriate and this is covered under the action – ‘Improve the pedestrian network’.</li> <li>• This regional plan identifies a range of interventions with various lead responsibilities, including local authorities. In many cases the full details of each initiative, including funding, is subject to annual</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s)         | Organisation                   | Summary of Submission  | Comments in response   |
|---------|-----------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
|         |                 |                                | <p>from each to firm up timing, cost, funding and targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to have further involvement in the development of initiatives under the first 3 action areas in the plan.</li> <li>• Recommends a continued focus on walking for transport and to public transport, suggests focus also needed on priority areas such as poorly connected communities to reduce health inequalities. Suggests targeting initiatives towards inactive populations and ensuring provision is made for people with disabilities, the elderly and high deprivation areas.</li> </ul>  | <p>plan processes and development of local strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• The interventions in the draft plan generally do cover the priority areas suggested. However it will be a matter for local walking strategies to identify their own local priorities for their communities and we encourage health representatives to be involved in development of those strategies.</li> </ul>   |
| 13      | Patrick Hanaray | Upper Hutt City Council (UHCC) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that to date pedestrian works in Upper Hutt have been funded solely by local ratepayers. Many actions in the draft plan indicate funding from Land Transport NZ or GW. It has been UHCC's experience that in most cases Land Transport NZ will not subsidise most pedestrian improvements on TA roads. Under such a scenario priority will be given to maintenance and renewal of existing services.</li> <li>• Feels there is no clear link between the plan and the active mode share target for at least 15% of region wide JTW trips. Suggests shortcomings in using this performance measure from the census as only captures 'main means of travel to work' not PT trips with associated walking trip at either end.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land Transport NZ's latest advice is that pedestrian improvements in accordance with a local strategy will be eligible for funding.</li> <li>• JTW mode share is used as target and performance measure simply because it is the best regional measure available at present for active modes. We recognise that this type of journey is more relevant to some TAs than others and also that it may not capture an increase in walking as part of a PT journey or for other purposes such as walking to school. It is hoped that the MoT Household Travel Survey will soon be released with a regional breakdown which may provide more relevant data for active modes.</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s) | Organisation | Summary of Submission  | Comments in response  |
|---------|---------|--------------|--|---|
|         |         |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Also unclear how the plan will further the RLTS 2016 target in relation to pedestrians injured in the region. Plan has an emphasis on infrastructure works and network upgrades and does not specifically address issues of Wellington City CBD with its already high standard of pedestrian facilities yet high pedestrian injury statistics.</li> <li>• 'Improve the pedestrian network' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TAs already required to identify community needs and outcomes through the Long Term Council Community Plan process. This process includes proposed pedestrian works and budget. Developing a local strategy would require a significant financial and time input and fails to have any benefits not provided by the current system. Suggests walking strategies only be required in areas with high pedestrian densities.</li> <li>- Timing of any strategies would need to fit in with the 2009-10 funding cycle as the 2008 -09 round has now closed – therefore the June 2009 date needs to be amended.</li> <li>- The need for point 2 under this action unclear – why not included as part of point 1 or point 3.</li> <li>- In relation to point 3, notes that the Land Transport NZ <i>Pedestrian Planning and Design</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed local walking strategies identified under the first action area in the plan are expected to include safety improvements to the pedestrian network but should also consider initiatives such as reducing pedestrian wait times at signals and specific awareness/education campaigns and programmes to address local safety issues. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We acknowledge the differences between TAs and would expect each TA to develop a strategy appropriate for their particular characteristics taking into account local issues, existing infrastructure and pedestrian volumes. We note that having a local strategy should help support any funding applications to Land Transport NZ for new walking facilities.</li> <li>- Noted. Plan amended to take account of this timing issue.</li> <li>- This action in the plan attempts to set out each identified step as clearly as possible, as requested by the technical working group in the workshop sessions. Point 2 could be developed in conjunction with either points one or three, but the plan recognises that it is a significant step or component in its own right.</li> <li>- The draft plan does not seek the adoption of the Land Transport NZ document as part of TAs District Plans. It simply</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s) | Organisation | Summary of Submission  | Comments in response   |
|---------|---------|--------------|--|--|
|         |         |              | <p><i>Guide</i> has not been adopted by UHCC, its District Plan and associated planning documents. Before this document could be adopted it would need to be demonstrated that it has benefits over the UHCC existing code of practice and did not create significant additional financial obligations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In relation to point 4, asks why Transit NZ specifically mentioned as they are one of the smallest RCAs in terms of pedestrian network.</li> <li>• 'Improve pedestrian access to railway stations' – supports this initiative. Supports funding through the passenger transport funding agency. Where works are to be carried out on assets owned by TAs, would expect to retain control of those assets.</li> <li>• 'Provide for pedestrians in land development' – As noted earlier – does not necessarily support inclusion of the <i>Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide</i> in the planning procedure – suggests GW may advocate for it's inclusion in District Plan's or subdivision guides during future consultations on these documents.</li> <li>• 'Encourage walking to school'</li> <li>- Suggests amended wording under point 2 from infrastructure improvements <i>as appropriate to when appropriate</i>. Also queries funding responsibility allocated to Land Transport NZ</li> </ul> | <p>seeks that both the review of local pedestrian networks and the planning documents that guide land use development are consistent with the principles set out in this NZ best practice guide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The plan identifies TAs as having primary responsibility for this action - however there are instances where implementing improvements will need to be done in conjunction with other providers such as Transit NZ, ONTRACK, and DOC.</li> <li>• The funding of improvements on the stations themselves is likely to be primarily from GW as part of the station upgrade programme, but there will also be funding requirements for TAs where the identified improvements are part of the TA road network around and adjacent to the stations themselves. Amend walking plan to clarify this.</li> <li>• See comments above in relation to this issue.</li> <li>- Amend plan accordingly.</li> </ul> |



| Sub No. | Name(s)     | Organisation                  | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response  |
|---------|-------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
|         |             |                               | <p>here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Queries whether the Road Sense programme is to continue, as there have been reports to the contrary in Wellington region. Need more focus on human behaviour in relation to pedestrian crashes. Programmes need to look at road crossing behaviour irrespective of whether at a pedestrian crossing or not.</li> <li>• 'Seek adequate funding'</li> <li>- Funding for pedestrian projects is consulted on agreed through the local LTCCP process. Unless additional external funding made available, level of funding will be as determined by the local community.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The RoadSense Strategy – Ata Haere is a partnership between Land Transport and NZ Police and is about developing a school-wide road safety culture. The Police Road Safe series forms an integral element of the strategy. We understand that Land Transport NZ funds RoadSense facilitators to help guide school communities to develop initiatives, but that these may be currently focussing in the high risk areas of NZ. Therefore, it may be appropriate for GW to advocate to Land Transport, and the Ministries of Education and Transport for increased intervention.</li> <li>- For local walking improvement projects, local share may be supplemented by a subsidy from Land Transport NZ or by making a case for R or C1 funding during consideration and development of the Regional Transport Programme.</li> </ul> |
| 14      | Paul Barker | Wellington City Council (WCC) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supportive of the draft plan, however makes the following comments and suggestions:</li> <li>• WCC is currently developing its own walking plan for the city, expected to be adopted in June 08. This will respond to objectives of the WCC Transport Strategy and will form a key part of the actions arising from the Ngauranga –Airport Corridor Plan.</li> <li>• Suggests the draft regional walking plan is well aligned with the above WCC documents.</li> <li>• Strategic alignment – Notes the RLTS targets for pedestrians. Notes that while statistics show the journey to work (JTW) mode share trend in the</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- The draft Regional Walking Plan includes initiatives to improve pedestrian safety and will be supported by the road safety initiatives in the Regional Road Safety Plan.</li> </ul>  |

| Sub No. | Name(s) | Organisation | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response   |
|---------|---------|--------------|---|--|
|         |         |              | <p>region is on track, the trend relating to the pedestrian road safety target 'fewer than 100 pedestrians injured in the region per annum' does not look to be on track. Also notes that over 50% of pedestrian casualties in the region occur in Wellington City. Suggests that the focus of the draft plan seems to be on increasing walking mode share, although safety improvements are embedded in many initiatives. Suggests plan is misaligned with the strategic objectives of the RLTS and either emphasis of plan needs to be changed or RLTS targets for walking revisited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sub-regional targets – Notes that 2006 JTW figures show WCC is already exceeding the regional JTW target, while other TAs are some way from achieving it. Acknowledges that different land use and employment conditions in other TAs largely influence this. Suggests that it would be helpful to set sub-regional targets for walking (in consultation with the relevant TAs) to focus attention and set individual accountabilities for achieving the regional target.</li> <li>• 'Encourage walking to school' – notes that TAs contribute to all actions under heading and plan should be amended to reflect this. Also suggest that measuring the levels of walking to school will be important in understanding whether initiatives are succeeding.</li> <li>• Importance of urban form – notes that many strategic documents in Wellington Region rightly recognise the role of compact and planned urban</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed local walking strategies identified under the first action area in the plan are expected to include infrastructure improvements to the pedestrian network to improve safety but should also consider initiatives such as reducing pedestrian wait times at signals and specific awareness/education campaigns and programmes to address local safety issues. The draft plan also identifies road safety education in schools.</li> <li>- These initiatives are aimed at contributing towards the desired RLTS outcome of improved safety for pedestrians.</li> <li>- It is not considered appropriate for the regional walking plan to set specific walking targets for each TA in the region using a top down approach. These targets should be developed at the local community level as part of their local walking strategies. Local targets should respond to local issues and priorities. Greater Wellington would be happy to assist TAs in developing their local targets through provision of available data and trends where these are available.</li> <li>- We acknowledge that TAs may have a role to play in all initiatives under the action 'Encourage walking to school' however as stated in the plan, the responsibility column identifies the lead agency who had the primary role for progressing the initiative. Measuring levels of walking to school will occur through the school travel plan programme and through the MoT Household Travel Survey when regional data becomes available.</li> <li>- Agree. Plan amended accordingly.</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s)          | Organisation                  | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response  |
|---------|------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
|         |                  |                               | <p>form in achieving good transport outcomes. Recommends amending the second point under the action 'Provide for pedestrians in Land Development' to reflect this – by adding 'These measures should also recognise the importance of compact and well planned urban form in promoting walkability'</p>   |   |
| 15      | Celia Wade-Brown | Living Streets Aotearoa (LSA) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally supports the draft plan.</li> <li>- Pleased to have the role of walking advocates recognised as important.</li> <li>- Welcomes development of local walking strategies signalled in the draft plan.</li> <li>- Seeks liaison between Councils in relation to region wide issues and cross boundary connections.</li> <li>- Pleased to see Sport Wellington identified in the responsibility section and seek focus on active mode use in addition to recreational activities.</li> <li>- Notes that workplaces, schools, households and individuals also need to assume certain responsibilities in relation to walking.</li> <li>- If RLTS does not provide targets broken down by mode (walking and cycling) and geographically, then suggests this plan should set disaggregated targets –for journey to work, school and leisure.</li> <li>- Would like to see the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) also develop a regional walking</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- Agreed. The proposed regional walking forum will provide opportunity for this type of coordination.</li> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- Journey to work by active modes is currently the only regional statistic available from census data. Trips for education and other purposes are not captured and therefore setting mode share targets for these trips is problematic. TA targets are expected to be developed through local walking strategies.</li> <li>- NZTA will be a national agency. At the national level, policies and outcomes relating to walking are contained in the Getting</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s) | Organisation | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response   |
|---------|---------|--------------|---|--|
|         |         |              | <p>or active modes strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Improve the pedestrian network' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports the review of local pedestrian networks both in terms of key routes and across the network as a whole.</li> <li>- Reviewing and monitoring the network essential to identify the gaps and to highlight positive achievements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Improve pedestrian access to railway stations' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pleased that the pedestrian audits suggested under the existing regional pedestrian plan have been completed, but note that progress in implementing these has been slow.</li> <li>- Notes that access should include directional signage around the station.</li> <li>- Suggest opportunities exist for medium density apartments and office/commercial uses on land adjacent to stations to provide overlooking.</li> <li>- Suggest access to bus stops/exchanges be included.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Provide for pedestrians in land development' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the requirements for District Plans and therefore new development to include good provision for pedestrian, but notes that issues of location, distance to facilities, density and</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>There...On Foot By Cycle Strategy and the Updated New Zealand Transport Strategy. At the regional level they should be guided by RLTS and regional plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- Agreed.</li> <li>- Agreed.</li> <li>- Agreed. Signage issues are specifically addressed through the pedestrian audit reports.</li> <li>- Agree – this concept is promoted through policies in the Wellington RLTS and Regional Policy Statement.</li> <li>- Bus stops are captured as part of the first action area relating to review of the local pedestrian networks.</li> <li>- Agreed. Some wording change made to draft plan to capture this idea, but notes it is a wider land use issue and is appropriately addressed through the Wellington RPS and Wellington Regional Strategy.</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s) | Organisation | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response   |
|---------|---------|--------------|---|--|
|         |         |              | <p>connectedness are even more important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Encourage walking to school' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support this action.</li> <li>- Request some targets be developed around % students walking to school or % schools with travel plans (including secondary schools). Notes that sufficient research needs to be undertaken to provide stats to set targets.</li> <li>- Notes the use of the Walking Map toolkit as a valuable resource for schools.</li> <li>- Notes the many social, health, wellbeing and community benefits of walking as a habit.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Influence central government policy' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports involvement of regional councils and other walking stakeholders in transport and physical activity policy making and lament infrequency of National Advisory Group on <i>Getting there</i>.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Seek adequate funding' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests that at the national, regional and local level the re-allocation of funds may be sufficient rather than asking for more – eg. from road building to walking improvements.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- The school travel plan programme which sits under the Regional Travel Demand Management (TDM) Strategy includes targets over ten years on the numbers of school travel plans implemented and number of school children exposed to school travel plans. These cover all sustainable travel modes and sit most appropriately as part of this programme.</li> <li>- Agree this is a useful resource, but consider it is best promoted through community wide travel awareness initiatives as part of the TDM Strategy.</li> <li>- Agreed.</li> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- Noted as a matter for consideration during development of the Regional Transport Programme. Also note that the Government Policy Statement (to be released mid 2008) may address this issue.</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s) | Organisation | Summary of Submission   | Comments in response  |
|---------|---------|--------------|---|---|
|         |         |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Facilitate information sharing'               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the Regional Walking Forum action and look forward to participating.</li> <li>- Suggests all stakeholders ensure information easily available on their own websites in addition to the Information Centre.</li> <li>- Recommends all agencies attend the biennial Walking Conference and that Land Transport NZ run seminars for staff on the new Pedestrian Planning Guide.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Promotion of walking'               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unsure why RPH identified as only one responsible for this action – SportWellington should also have a role.</li> <li>- Sees a role for LSA to expand walk2work day in coming years and seeks funding support.</li> <li>- Expects each partner agency to have a staff and customer/visitor travel plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Improve information for walking'               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports the action to investigate an online journey planner for walking trips but suggests it should not be a separate one as integration with PT is useful. Seeks a range of functionalities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- Agreed.</li> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- RPH are identified as the lead agency to progress this initiative, however, other agencies likely to have a role. This could be coordinated through the proposed Regional Walking Forum or the 'At the Heart' forum.</li> <li>- GW will consider the merits of future support and partnerships to expand this initiative alongside other potential walking initiatives in due course.</li> <li>- This is an existing action in the Regional Travel Demand Management Strategy.</li> <li>- The Metlink journey planner will continue to be used for combined walk and PT journeys. A separate tool is proposed for trips where walking (or cycling) is the main mode of transport as it allows for greater functionality and features specific to these types of trips. The two online tools will be linked and integrated wherever possible to ensure they are easy to find and use.</li> </ul> |

| Sub No. | Name(s) | Organisation | Summary of Submission  | Comments in response   |
|---------|---------|--------------|--|--|
|         |         |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests GW and all other agencies could ensure that any meetings and events include link to online map with walking routes.</li> <li>• Other matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Submitter also provides comment on climate change, surveys/measures, motivation, running, cycling, public transport, private vehicles, and land use planning.</li> <li>- Submitter also seeks GW advocacy in support of walking/pedestrians to all levels of policy making and funding. Also seeks advocacy for more regular meeting of the Getting there National Advisory Group.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted. This sort of initiative could be developed as part of workplace travel plans.</li> <li>- Noted.</li> <li>- GW will continue to advocate for pedestrian provisions at all levels. Comments relating to the frequency of the Getting there group are noted and will be referred to the GW representative on that group.</li> </ul> |

## Abbreviations

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| GW                | Greater Wellington                            |
| Land Transport NZ | Land Transport New Zealand                    |
| LSA               | Living Streets Aotearoa                       |
| NZTA              | New Zealand Transport Agency (from 1 July 08) |
| RCA               | Road Controlling Authority                    |
| RLTC              | Regional Land Transport Committee             |
| RLTS              | Regional Land Transport Strategy              |
| RPH               | Regional Public Health                        |
| TA                | Territorial authority                         |

Transit NZ  
UNZTS

Transit New Zealand  
Updated New Zealand Transport Strategy