

Getting there – on foot, by cycle

Report on Consultation

Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction.....	3
Section 1: Feedback themes - the Strategy overall	5
Section 2: Feedback themes - individual Strategy elements	9
Vision	9
Goals.....	10
Key Principles	11
Focus areas and Priorities	14
Section 3. Feedback themes - Strategy implementation.....	22
APPENDIX ONE : Overview of Consultation Process	26
APPENDIX TWO: <i>Getting there – on foot, by cycle</i> (Submission Booklet)	37

Executive Summary

In 2002, the government agreed to develop a national strategy for walking and cycling.

A draft Strategy, *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* (the Strategy), was released for consultation on 8 October 2003.

103 written submissions on the Strategy were received from a wide range of sectors, transport user groups, individuals, central government agencies, and local and regional government. In addition, around 200 people participated in seven regional consultation workshops.

Key messages from consultation

The introduction of a national strategy for walking and cycling was welcomed. It was viewed as timely within the context of the *New Zealand Transport Strategy* and important as a contributor toward a range of government strategies and objectives.

The Strategy's framework for action (vision, goals, key principles and priorities) was generally well regarded. In terms of revision, minor rather than major revision was seen as required.

Many of the issues and concerns raised during consultation centred on Strategy implementation. There was a strong desire for more information on implementation to be included in the Strategy.

Revising the Strategy - key messages

Clarify the scope of the Strategy - is it walking and cycling for transport, for recreation, or both. Which is the primary focus?

Use stronger language to signal intent – words such as 'ensure' rather than 'encourage'. Aim for a tone that is strongly pro-walking and cycling, but not 'anti-car'.

Position walking and cycling as modes of 'right' and 'necessity', not just 'choice'. Focus on improving environments for current users - especially those with fewer transport options - alongside promoting these modes to new users.

Be inclusive. Providing for pedestrians and cyclists means providing for a range of users - from people on skateboards to people on mobility scooters, from mums with prams to elite cyclists, from children riding to school in rural settings to city commuters catching a bus.

The Strategy skirts some hard issues. Acknowledge the role that traffic demand management measures can play in making these modes easier to choose over car use.

Link promotion with provision. If we are asking people to walk and cycle more, it is important to provide environments that support this – and that keep them safe.

Simplify, clarify and enliven Strategy presentation to increase its accessibility. Clarify its connections with other government policies and strategies, and highlight synergies.

Planning for implementation – key messages

Many sectors and agencies will have a role to play in implementing the strategy. It will require a whole of government approach that is co-ordinated and consistent.

It won't 'just happen'. Proactive leadership is required. Identify what will be done, who will do it, and when. Then monitor progress.

National strategy – local action. The Strategy's success will depend to a large degree on strengthening the commitment of local government to action for walking and cycling. Consider incentives and requirements to strengthen this commitment, while remaining responsive to community needs and aspirations.

Sustainable, well targeted resourcing will be critical to the Strategy's success. Current funding is unlikely to be sufficient.

Not just action – but effective action. An early focus on building workforce capability, both nationally and locally will pay dividends.

Show us you mean business. The Strategy is an excellent start – but the next steps will be the most important. We are looking for a clear signal from the government about its practical commitment to the Strategy.

Overall, the workshop consultation and written submission processes were considered well structured and very worthwhile. Significant feedback was received and will be well utilised by the project team to move into the next phase of work. Some difficulties, such as a need for more resources, were evident and these issues will need to be addressed before conducting similar projects in the future.

The workshop participant evaluation form and written submission booklet both received high rates of return which suggests that this strategy and its implementation is of strong interest in the public domain.

Introduction

In 2002, the government agreed to develop a national strategy for walking and cycling. This recognises the importance of these modes of transport within the sustainable transport framework set by the New Zealand Transport Strategy (NZTS), and the potential for walking and cycling to contribute to the five NZTS objectives:

- assisting economic development;
- assisting safety and personal security;
- improving access and mobility;
- protecting and promoting public health; and
- ensuring environmental sustainability.

The decision also recognises that walking and cycling for transport¹ is on the decline. More concerted and collective action is required to ensure these modes can flourish as modes of transport.

Consultation on *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*

From October to December 2003, consultation was undertaken on a draft strategy, *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* (the Strategy). Comment was invited through participation in seven regional workshops and through written submissions for consideration in:

- redrafting the Strategy document
- implementing a finalised Strategy.

A *Getting there – on foot, by cycle Submission Booklet* was provided to enable people to rate the extent to which the Strategy document needed revising and to provide supporting commentary on issues, concerns, and suggestions related to the Strategy and its implementation.

It was noted that in many cases, those who made a submission also attended a regional consultation workshop.

An overview of the consultation process is contained in Appendix One.

¹ *Transport walking and cycling refers to the use of walking and cycling to provide day-to-day mobility, enabling individuals to access communities, services, desired destinations and opportunities.*

Introduction to the findings

This report captures and illustrates the key themes arising during consultation on the Strategy.

It draws on comment from around 200 workshop participants and 103 written submissions. Comment was provided by representatives of a wide range of sectors, including stakeholder organisations and individuals with a responsibility for, or interest in, walking and/or cycling. Information on the workshop participants and those making submissions is contained in Appendix One.

The Strategy Project Team endeavoured to ensure this report captures the content, tone and flavour of workshop summaries and written submissions in a concise and accurate form.

The report is structured as follows:

Feedback themes - the Strategy overall. This identifies key themes related to the Strategy as a whole.

Feedback themes - individual Strategy elements. This identifies key themes related to the Strategy's vision, goals, principles, focus areas and priorities.

Feedback themes - Strategy implementation. This identifies key themes related to Strategy implementation, including comment on the implementation actions proposed in the Strategy.

While this is primarily a qualitative report, quantitative analysis of written submission responses against questions asked in the *Getting there – on foot, by cycle Submission Booklet* supports the thematic analysis. The quantitative findings are summarised in Table 6 in Appendix One.

The term 'people' used in this report refers to those who attended the workshops and/or made written submissions.

Section 1: Feedback themes - the Strategy overall

This section identifies key themes related to the Strategy as a whole.

Strong support for introduction of a national strategy

Written submissions showed strong support for the introduction of a national strategy for walking and cycling. Many viewed it as timely and important within the context of the New Zealand Transport Strategy, and to support achievement of government objectives in a range of sectors.

“We are pleased that the Ministry of Transport recognises the importance of cycling and walking and their benefits in terms of the community, health and the environment.” (Submission 37, Company).

“[We] welcome the opportunity to work collaboratively with the Ministry of Transport, and as stated, the implementation of this strategy can contribute to a variety of our policies and strategies.” (Submission 50, Central Government).

“[Our organisation] recognises cycling and walking as having important potential to reduce transport energy use and emissions by offering alternatives to car use and sees this strategy as an important contribution to this Government’s transport policy development.” (Submission 61, Support and Advocacy).

“[Our organisation] is fully supportive of the aims and intentions of the strategy and believe it is timely in consideration for future generations.” (Submission 82, Support Advocacy).

“[Our organisation] supports the vision and goals. Both walking and cycling contribute to the health and welfare of older people by enabling physical activity, increasing social connectedness, and providing opportunities for participation in groups – 3 factors that are keys for positive ageing.” (Submission 39, Support and Advocacy).

Support for the Strategy high – with some need for revision

Most submissions expressed overall support for the framework for action outlined in the Strategy, although many felt there was a need for some revision in order to address issues or concerns, further highlight aspects of the Strategy or improve document accessibility.

“A well thought through and timely document which I strongly support in its overall intent.” (Submission 80, Company).

“We have reviewed the Strategy and generally support the vision, principle, goals and priorities for action.” (Submission 37, Company).

“The solution is multidimensional” (workshop participant, Hamilton).

Provide more detail on implementation – and use stronger language to signal “intent”

There was a clear desire for more detail and a stronger focus on implementation in the Strategy. Many people thought that the Strategy should focus on what will occur rather than just what could occur. Linked to this, many considered that the Strategy should signal its intent through stronger language. For example, to preface lists of suggested actions to emphasise these actions *should* rather than *could* be undertaken, or to use words such as 'ensure' rather than 'encourage'.

“A strategy is normally a document that sets out how a particular objective will be achieved, but this one says how the objective could be achieved. Changing the wording of the action points to indicate firm intent would go some way to addressing this concern.” (Submission 83, Transport Sector/Support and Advocacy).

“It is worth considering a name change from “strategy” to “framework”, given the action plans are to be prepared later.” (Submission 36, Central Government).

More comment on implementation, including comment on the implementation actions proposed in the Strategy is contained in Section 3.

Clarify the scope of the Strategy

There were conflicting views about the desired focus of the Strategy. Some people wanted the focus to be foremost on transport. Others wanted more emphasis on health, physical activity, recreation or environmental sustainability.

“The focus areas and priorities are generally supported, but there is a need for the Strategy to be clearer on what type of pedestrian and cyclist activity it wishes to encourage and increase.” (Submission 90, Local Government).

“Our overarching comment is the need for the distinction between recreational and transport functions of walking and cycling to be taken through from the vision into all other aspects of the document.” (Submission 50, Central Government).

“Both the recreational and transport aspects of cycling and walking are important in order to realise the full benefits. The strategy currently focuses on the transport aspects, however, it does refer in places to the recreational aspects as well. In order to increase clarity for all readers, the boundaries for the strategy should be made clearer. To what extent are the recreational aspects of cycling and walking part of this strategy?” (Submission 45, Local Government).

Ensure an inclusive Strategy that recognises the broad mosaic of users

Many people considered that the Strategy could better recognise the broad ‘mosaic’ of walking and cycling users – children as well as adults, public transport users, those who may use the footpaths to move around by less conventional methods, and those with disabilities or special needs. It was commented that the current '*Getting there - on foot, by cycle*' title leaves out those who access the transport environment in, for example, wheelchairs or mobility scooters, and that the strategy should be ‘inclusive’ in its language.

“The strategy is silent on ‘alternative modes’ such as scooters, skateboards, roller blades, mobility scooters, power-assisted bicycles, etc. These modes are proliferating and since they share space with both pedestrians and cyclists, some attempt should be made to deal with the issues that they raise.” (Submission 83, Support and Advocacy).

“Please amend references to ‘walking’ to ‘pedestrian’. This is required throughout the document. Pedestrian need to be defined in a glossary of terms to include disability and elderly users. (Submission 43, Local Government).

“Design for the old/young/disabled, then it’s good for everyone!” (workshop participant, Christchurch).

Position walking and cycling as modes of “right” not just “choice”

Some people voiced the need for greater recognition of walking and cycling as modes of “right” not just “choice” - i.e. individuals should have the right to access their communities on foot or by cycle. This was sometimes linked with a desire for more explicit recognition of the need to address current inequities for walking and cycling in transport thinking, planning and execution.

“Cycling is a basic fundamental mode of transport that should not be viewed as alternative or recreational.” (Submission 54, Support and Advocacy).

“There are groups in our society where walking and cycling are not a choice. The challenge is to get the environment right so a choice can be made.” (Submission 94, Local Government).

“Many people don’t have the choice to choose therefore they must be given the same right as car users. Because of their vulnerability they must be given first priority in planning.” (Submission 70, Voluntary Organisation).

At the same time, it was also considered that the Strategy be perceived as “pro walking and cycling”, rather than “anti car”.

- **Further highlight synergies with other government strategies**

Many people commented on the importance of the Strategy for achieving a range of government objectives.

“Goal Four of the Positive Ageing Strategy is: “Affordable and accessible transport options for older people.” Options that include walking and cycling.” (Submission 15, Central Government).

There was a desire for the Strategy to highlight these synergies more specifically, particularly in areas such as health and the environment.

- **Focus on current users, not just new users**

Concerns were expressed that in focusing on encouraging more people to walk or cycle, the draft Strategy downplays the importance of improving pedestrian and cycling environments for those who walk and cycle now. In particular, the need to improve pedestrian environments for those with fewer transport options who may rely significantly on walking or cycling due to age, physical limitations, or because it may be their only affordable means of transportation.

“Although it does not detract from the aim to encourage more people to see walking and cycling as valid choices, it needs to be remembered that many people do not ‘choose’ to walk or cycle. For example, people may be unable to afford a car or be too young/too old to have a driver’s license. Similarly, many disabled people are very constrained in their transport choices, e.g. via the use of a wheelchair or scooter, and may not be able to easily use cars or public transport. (Submission 32, Support).

“The emphasis must be on creating safer environments that enable equity of access for all.” Submission 77, Support).

- ***Simplify, clarify and enliven strategy presentation to increase accessibility***

Suggestions were made to increase the strategy document’s accessibility, readability and clarity. The most common suggestions were:

Streamline the document to avoid repetition; provide a separate summary document;

Simplify connections between the goals, focus areas and priorities;

Include key principles in the strategy diagram;

Review and clarify or provide definitions for key terms used to ensure common understanding;

Include a diagram to clarify the relationship between this and other government transport sector strategies; and

Use examples of successful initiatives to ‘enliven’ the Strategy.

Section 2: Feedback themes - individual Strategy elements

This section identifies common feedback related to specific elements of the framework for action proposed in the draft Strategy – including its vision, goals, key principles, focus areas and priorities.

Vision

“A New Zealand where people from all sectors of the community choose to walk and cycle for transport and enjoyment – helping ensure a healthier population, more lively and connected communities, and a more affordable, integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable transport system.”

Many people were happy with the vision ‘as is’. Among those who suggested revisions, the following themes were most common:

As with the strategy as a whole:

There were conflicting views about the desired focus of the vision.

“Although they are important, health benefits need to be secondary to the transport-related goals set out in the New Zealand Transport Strategy, rather than foremost in the vision.” (Submission 90, Local Government).

“The vision links clearly to the five key objectives of the New Zealand Transport Strategy, however stronger links need to be made to environmental sustainability.” (Submission 92, Local Government).

There was concern that the vision’s focus on people choosing to walk and cycle, downplays the importance of walking and cycling to New Zealanders who may rely on these modes – such as people with a disability, older persons, children, or those in small communities without access to public transport.

The community “are able to choose” instead of “choose to”. (Submission 79, Health).

- The vision is too long and should be shortened. Many people wanted to shorten the vision to -

“A New Zealand where people from all sectors of the community choose to walk and cycle for transport and enjoyment.”

Others felt the wording of the second half could be simplified –

e.g. *“...promoting a healthier population, connected communities, and a more affordable, integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable transport system.”*

The vision could refer to communities that support or enable more walking and cycling.

- The state described in the vision could arguably be said to exist right now. A vision should be more active or outcome focused –

e.g. *“more/increasing numbers of people choosing...”; “moving toward a healthier population...”*.

Some thought this could be achieved by including targets.

Goals

The draft Strategy proposes three goals. The majority of people indicated support for the three goals 'as is'. Among those who suggested revisions, the following themes were most common:

Goal 1 – “Communities that are more walk and cycle friendly”

- The definition/scope of the word “communities” is vague and needs clarification.
- Use “*Communities and environments...*” to make the goal more ‘all-encompassing’.
- Aim for a high level of achievement. “*A community that is more walk friendly*” may still be far less than ideal -
e.g. “*Communities that are walk and cycle friendly*” is stronger and more ‘goal oriented’.
(Submission 92, Local Government).
- Make the goal more proactive – emphasise communities that promote rather than simply accommodate walking and cycling -
e.g. “*Communities that actively support/encourage/promote walking and cycling*” (Submission 42, Health).

Use ‘pedestrian rather than ‘walk’ –

e.g. “*Communities that are pedestrian and cycle friendly.*” (Submission 95, Local Government)

Goal 2 – “More people choosing to walk and cycle, more often”

Use of the word ‘choose’ does not acknowledge that some people do not choose to walk or cycle.

Temper the Goal to take into account walking and cycling are not suitable for all journeys – e.g. “*People choosing to walk and cycle for journeys where it is reasonable to do so.*” (Submission 3, Individual).

Link the Goal more closely to achieving modal shifts from private motor vehicles – e.g. “*More people changing journeys from private car to walking and cycling.*” (Submission 58, Support and Advocacy).

- Make the Goal stronger by removing the word “more” before ‘People’ –
i.e. “*People choosing to walking and cycle more often.*” (Submission 92, Local Government).

Goal 3 – “Improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists”

Consider joining this Goal with Goal 1? Alternatively, include “access” alongside “safety”?

Consider strengthening the Goal –

e.g. “A high degree of safety for pedestrians and cyclists.” (Submission 9, Company).

Emphasise that safety improvements should be gained for the full range of users of these modes and promote equity of access for all –

e.g. “Improved safety for all pedestrians and cyclists.” (Submission 45, Local Government).

Put more onus on the activity rather than the user (as users can change) –

e.g. “Improved safety for those walking and cycling.” (Submission 58, Support and Advocacy).

Put more onus on the safety of the environment –

e.g. “Safe environments for walking and cycling.” (Submission 89, Support and Advocacy).

Key Principles²

The draft Strategy proposes five key principles. A precis of each Principle is provided below.

Many people were happy with the principles ‘as is’. From the comments provided by those who felt some revision was required, the following common themes were identified:

Principle 1 – Increasing the use of walking and cycling requires more than simply promoting their use. A multi-faceted approach that works to maximise destinations within walking or cycling distance, improve the environment for walking and cycling, and show individuals how these modes can effectively meet their needs, will have the best chance of success.

Strong support was noted for a comprehensive, collaborative approach.

“Providing better facilities for walking and cycling to the general public will not result in optimal take-up if our urban communities continue to be largely designed for (long-distance) motor vehicle trips, or if other agencies initiatives continue to work against walking/cycling.” (Submission 32, Support and Advocacy).

Make reference to the importance of adequate resourcing and a collaborative, intersectoral approach in which stakeholders work together.

“Increasing the use of walking and cycling for transport will require a comprehensive and well-resourced approach.” (Submission 45, Local Government).

“Increasing the use of walking and cycling for transport will require a comprehensive approach that includes policy and funding at Central and Local Government level.” (Submission 47, Health).

² This section draws on analysis of responses to questions 10-11 of the Submission Booklet, “To what extent, if at all, do the principles outlined in Chapter 2 of Getting there – on foot, by cycle need revision?”, as well as other related comments made in submissions.

Principle 2 – Walking and cycling face similar issues, but they are different modes of transport. Each has particular strengths and limitations, and the facilities required by each are very different. Getting the best from both modes requires recognising their similarities but also ensuring that their differences are understood, considered and their specific needs catered for.

Comment on this principle was mostly supportive, agreeing that there are different issues faced by walkers as opposed to cyclists.

“In some priorities cycling and walking need to be separated.” (Submission 13, Support and Advocacy).

A common theme was:

- Consider delving deeper to look at the issues concerning subgroups within each mode.

Principle 3 – The benefits of walking and cycling cannot be fully realised simply by focusing on recreational use. Decreasing use of these modes for day to day transport is impacting on our health, the environment, and the sustainability of our transport system. Increasing walking and cycling for transport will help us achieve the widest range of benefits.

As with the Strategy overall, it was seen as necessary to clarify the primary focus/boundaries of the strategy – is it transport or leisure or both? While most comment supported the strategy’s primary focus on transportation/utility walking and cycling, others believed the strategy should focus more broadly and holistically and could build on a strong base of recreational use of the modes.

“May need re-wording to show that utilitarian transport is higher priority than leisure walkways.” (Submission 58, Support and Advocacy).

“This principle should read “recreational and utility walking and cycling will be integrated as much as possible to realise the full benefits of walking and cycling.” (Submission 92, Local Government).

“This section should be used to emphasise that the focus of this document is on transportation, whilst recognising linkages with recreational activities. In its present form this section does not make this clear.” (Submission 75, Local Government).

“...the strategy should recognise the importance of leisure cycling and walking as a catalyst to individuals using cycling and walking for more practical purposes.” (Submission 78, Local Government).

“There will be many occasions when walking or cycling for transport is also walking and cycling for enjoyment. This overlap needs to be made clearer...” (Submission 102, Central Government).

Principle 4 – All communities can gain benefits from increased walking and cycling, but urban areas provide significant opportunities to increase the use of these modes of transport. Our largest cities present particular challenges, but also opportunities for walking and cycling to help address traffic congestion and high levels of vehicle emissions.

A common theme was the need for the Strategy to remain responsive to local needs and aspirations, and acknowledge the differing issues, needs and aspirations of rural areas and smaller centres alongside those of major urban areas.

“Smaller communities also have challenges for cyclists and pedestrians – like crossing the major arterials that go through a town. Especially the people in these towns should be encouraged to walk and/or cycle, because distances are relatively short.” (Submission 98, Local Government).

Principle 5 – Increased walking and cycling must not be achieved at the expense of safety for those who use these modes. Safety must be considered and built into efforts to promote the modes, and initiatives to improve safety should also seek to facilitate increased use of walking and cycling.

Most comments emphasised the importance of ensuring that the transport environments in communities enable and are safe for cycling and walking as a precursor to encouraging greater use of the modes. Some also commented that safety may improve as more people walk and cycle.

“People’s safety must not be sacrificed in order to achieve the vision. The goals for making communities more walk and cycle friendly with improved safety must take precedence.” (Submission 96, Health).

“We would prefer if the key principle 5 were described as safety being integrated into promotion initiatives rather than being ‘hand in hand’. This would illustrate safety should sit under promotion activities rather than be the main focus. It is our understanding that cities like York in the UK have managed to both reduce pedestrian and cyclist deaths and injuries and increase the numbers of people walking and cycling by making the walking and cycling environment safer before promotion.” (Submission 101, Central Government).

- **Need for further principles**

A number of further principles were suggested for inclusion in the Strategy. These included:

“Key principles need to include the question of ‘access’.” (Submission 1, Support and Advocacy)

“Take on the development of a hierarchy of road users, giving priority to those modes which are sustainable and therefore are aligned with the goals of the NZTS and apply this to all decisions made about the transport system.” (Submission 14, Support and Advocacy).

“... the Strategy should make reference to the Treaty along the lines used on page 2 of the Transport Strategy.” (Submission 16, Individual).

“Inequities have developed in the transport system and need to be reversed.” (Submission 83, Support and Advocacy).

Focus areas and Priorities

The Strategy proposes 10 priorities under four focus areas.

Strong support was expressed both for the mix of focus areas and priorities and for each of the individual priorities. Most people indicated that these needed either minor or no revision.

Common themes from those who provided comment on individual priorities is identified under the appropriate priority. Feedback specific to the overall mix of priorities is provided at the end of this section.

Focus One:

Strengthen the foundations for effective action for walking and cycling.

Priority 1: “Encourage action for walking and cycling within an integrated approach to land transport.”

Much of the comment provided on this Priority focused on suggestions for new action points or changes to existing action points. A common suggestion was for regional and local transport plans to be audited from a walking and cycling perspective.

Other common themes were:

- Link the need for action for walking and cycling to other policy documents at central, regional and local government levels - such as the Local Government Act 2003, and the Resource Management Act.

Acknowledge the importance of walking and cycling in ‘multi-modal’ trips.

“The strategy does not seem to acknowledge the importance of linking walking and cycling with other modes, particularly public transport. Initiatives such as “bikes on buses” and “walk and ride” can greatly enhance the viability of alternatives to motor vehicles.” (Submission 32, Support and Advocacy).

- Emphasise the need to create a ‘normalcy’ about walking and cycling for transport, converting them from being considered as ‘add on’ components of transport planning to essential components of the planning process.

Recognise the importance of changing attitudes and perceptions of political and operational decision makers if this priority is to be successfully addressed.

“[There is] a perception among transport planners/engineers that only cars create ‘efficient’ roads.” (Submission 3, Individual).

Develop walking and cycling strategies under the ‘umbrella’ of a Sustainable Transport Plan.

A number of funding and other implementation issues were also raised. These are discussed in the Implementation section of this document.

Priority 2: “Expand our knowledge and skill base to address walking and cycling.”

Much of the comment provided on this priority was in support of the Priority or various of the action points suggested under it.

“Local bodies are going to need practical help to locate relevant information and skills.” (Submission 95, Support and Advocacy).

“We agree that it is essential that formative research is undertaken – this could provide a number of insights for future initiatives including perceptions and reasons behind choosing (or not choosing) cycling and walking as active transport options.” (Submission 71, Central Government).

“We also agree that evidence based pilot programmes need to be identified”. (Submission 57, Health).

Other common themes were:

Take education wider than just transport and roading professionals – extend it to councillors, council managers, stakeholders, and professionals in the education sector itself.

Emphasise the need to incorporate walking and cycling into general traffic/transport courses - and into ongoing professional development for those already working in the field.

“If education on cycle and walking issues/measures is offered as a stand alone subject, only the converted may end up attending.” (Submission 78, Local Government).

- Highlight the need for research to be practical and relevant to the needs of users.

“... any research should be done ‘on foot, by cycle’, not from behind a desk.” (Submission 96, Health).

Work toward a fully integrated set of design and planning guidelines that incorporate walk and cycle components, not just walk/cycle specific guidelines.

“The practical problem is that many projects are seen as ‘general roading projects’ and hence these documents [walk/cycle specific guidelines] would not be consulted.” (Submission 32, Support and Advocacy).

Priority 3: “Encourage collaboration and coordination of efforts for walking and cycling.”

Many people commented on the central importance of this Priority to the success of the Strategy, and offered suggestions as to who should or needs to be involved in its implementation.

“We strongly agree that collaboration and coordination is key to the success of implementation of this strategy. We need to see this demonstrated from Central Government through to local communities.” (Submission 57, Health).

“This is essential – agencies in central and local government, Local Government New Zealand, Living Streets Aotearoa, District Health Boards, Sport and Recreation Commission, FoE Coalition, TRAFINZ and many others could add value rather than re-inventing the wheel.” (Submission 58, Support and Advocacy).

“Planning, development and design that supports walking and cycling should have robust processes in place that enable community input. These processes should ensure that the voices of Maori, Pacific People and other high-need groups are heard.” (Submission 47, Health).

“In some cases support for cycling and walking groups may be required so they will be strong enough for real representation on regional transport committees, etc.” (Submission 95, Support and Advocacy).

“Mechanisms for meaningful engagement need to be used to consult with groups who are unable to advocate for themselves.” (Submission 57, Health).

Focus Two:

**Make our communities and transport networks
more friendly to pedestrians and cyclists.**

Priority 4: “Encouraging planning, development and design that supports walking and cycling.”

Common feedback on this Priority included:

The importance of this Priority to the long term success of this and other government strategies.

“...the strategy outlines well the importance of the integration between land use planning and urban design with transport.” (Submission 41, Local Government).

“We support the desired outcome... To promote social interaction and physical activity, we advocate for the need to build facilities for older people within walking distance of local shops and other local facilities. 27% of all journeys by people over the age of 80 are on foot.” (Submission 39, Support and Advocacy).

Concern that current policies and practices (including those of developers) do not always take walking and cycling adequately into account.

“The proposed Auckland University business school requires no planning for walking/cycling/disabled. It is not required to be linked to any such strategy. Yet it will be the destination of thousands of people. There is more concern for a ‘world class restaurant’.” (Submission 8, Tertiary Education).

Recognition of the importance of local government policies and plans in this area.

“We agree that District Plans and planning policy do provide a crucial framework for achieving an urban form which, through good layout and design, is supportive to cycling and walking.” (Submission 37, Company).

Priority 5: “Provide supportive environments for walking and cycling in existing communities.”

Of the comment provided, most either supported actions described in the Strategy document, or provided suggestions for further actions seen as important for pedestrians and cyclists. Actions that were mentioned most often included traffic calming and low speed zones, end use facilities for cyclists, pedestrian crossing facilities, light phasing to give greater priority to pedestrians, and intersection improvements for cyclists.

Other common feedback included:

Maintenance, including the maintenance of footpaths and cycleways, has not been emphasised strongly enough in this section.

“It is not just sufficient to plan and build them but they have to be maintained.” (Submission 8, Tertiary Education).

Pedestrians and cyclists need to be considered with the same degree of care as motorists.

“Just as motorists should not have to circumvent streets to get to their destination, so pedestrians and cyclists should not have to spend an extra 5 minutes to cross at a pedestrian crossing.” (Submission 14, Support and Advocacy).

There should be more focus on the provision of networks for walking and cycling within and between communities, and the need for collaboration across boundaries to ensure networks are continuous.

“Co-ordinate development to provide continuous networks of routes.” (Submission 44, Company).

More emphasis should be placed on the importance of facilities that are separate from the road environment.

Priority 6: “Improve networks for long distance cycling.”

Much of the comment provided on this Priority centred on whether work in this area should be considered a priority. The following comments illustrate the range of opinion:

“Rural communities can benefit financially by encouraging tourist cyclists.” (Submission 51, Health).

“This form of transport for overseas visitors is growing in [our region] and needs to be addressed.” (Submission 52, Local Government).

“We agree that networks need to be looked at for long distance cyclists, however feel that priority should be placed on encouraging more people to be active, rather than focusing on the needs of an already active, and perhaps elite group.” (Submission 57, Health).

“The priority’s emphasis on long distance cycling is at odds with the more pressing need to develop networks for cycling in NZ in general and in cities in particular... Long distance cycling is aimed at an extremely small number of cyclists and the improvements envisaged to primary networks throughout the country could be better undertaken on networks elsewhere...” (Submission 90, Local Government).

“Although NZ may not have an extensive network of country lanes, the opportunities for routes along rail/river corridors and conservation land need to be acknowledged.” (Submission 32, Support and Advocacy).

Focus Three:

Encourage the choice of walking and cycling for day to day transport.

Priority 7: “Build positive public perceptions of walking and cycling as transport modes.”

Much of the comment provided for this Priority either supported actions described in the Strategy document or asked that specific actions such as travel plans and walking school buses be featured more prominently.

Other common themes included:

- People's perceptions of walking and cycling can be influenced by the priority they see placed on them by decision makers.

"... perception is strengthened by robust operations programmes such as vegetation control and traffic signals." (Submission 78, Local Government).

While building positive perceptions we also need to be realistic.

"Rather than ignore these risks we would suggest that advice is publicised to communities and travellers about these risks, and attempts are made to address and minimise them." (Submission 57, Health).

Safety perceptions need to be better recognised under this Priority.

"While positive perceptions are desirable, it is equally important to convert those with positive perceptions but who do not cycle/walk because of safety concerns. Many already regard walking and cycling as desirable but are unwilling to risk their lives for health benefits." (Submission 96, Health).

The Priority is light on detail.

Priority 8: "Encourage and support individuals in changing their travel choices."

Common themes highlighted for this priority were:

Make children a priority - changing travel behaviour in children is of paramount importance.

"We're missing out on a generation. Educating the kids about walking and cycling will pay off in the future - the strategy should have an early focus on this issue." (Hamilton workshop).

"Child walkers and cyclists form attitudes and behaviours that will shape their transport choices as adults." (Submission 97, Support and Advocacy).

Success under this priority needs to be supported by work under other priorities

"For the strategy to succeed and people to make the choice to walk or cycle, everything possible must be done to make this an easy choice. If not, the behaviour won't be maintained." (Submission 93, Local Government).

"We strongly support Safe Routes to schools where enforcement, school policy, engineering and individual choice are connected in a complementary way." (Submission 58, Support and Advocacy).

Address the importance of providing disincentives for car use.

"There is nothing so far about encouraging motorists to reduce the extent of their car dependence through financial incentives." (Submission 58, Support and Advocacy).

Highlight the need for support and/or incentives for workplaces and other destinations to encourage 'active commuters'.

Several submissions expressed a preference for the discussion to be more far-fetching.

Focus Four:

Improve safety and security for those who walk and cycle.

Priority 9: “Improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists.”

Key themes for this Priority included:

The urgency of addressing safety.

“The success of the entire strategy will depend on how this priority is dealt with.” (Submission 52, Local Government).

- Support for a ‘danger reduction’ approach.

“We agree with the thrust of this priority. Reducing the actual number of crashes and injuries could be achieved by reducing the number of people participating in these modes of transport.” (Submission 71, Central Government/Central Government).

“Promote the fact that Road Danger Reduction for cyclists and walkers also helps to achieve overall safety for all other road users.” (Submission 14, General/Transport Sector).

Ensure the safety of those who are most vulnerable.

“The most vulnerable user needs to be the most protected.” (Submission 62, Company).

“Issues for groups such as children and elderly need to be advocated for. These groups are often at heightened risk as pedestrians and cyclists.” (Submission 57, Support and Advocacy).

Place a priority on building a ‘share the road’ mentality amongst road users.

“Ongoing and relevant cyclist education and driver awareness of walkers and cyclists should foster a spirit of sharing spaces rather than competing for them.” (Submission 99, Support and Advocacy).

“Although pedestrians and cyclists both have some common needs it is well worth noting that there are many potential conflicts between the two groups.” (Submission 80, Company).

Highlight the importance of consulting with users.

...there is a need to consult pedestrians and cyclists in new roading developments – if pedestrians will not use ‘improved’ facilities despite education, there is no point in them.” (Submission 66, Health).

- Merge this priority and the Pedestrian and Cyclist Road Safety Framework being developed by the Land Transport Safety Authority.

“We consider Focus 4, Priority 9 has a good fit with the current draft of the Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety Framework.” (Submission 101, Central Government).

In addition, a wide variety of comment was received detailing additional areas to consider in redrafting this Priority or designing the implementation plan for this priority, e.g. -

“Encourage schools to adopt walking schoolbus...” (Submission 59, Health Sector).

“All the obvious things such as more cycle lanes, good sidewalks or roadside verges, good maintenance of road and footpath surfaces and adequate lighting which is not masked by foliage were reiterated by our members.” (Submission 99, Support and Advocacy).

“Driving law changes may be required to bring NZ’s liberal laws regarding non-motorised (vulnerable) users into line with international practices.” (Submission 3, Individual).

“The focus on pedestrian, cyclist versus motor vehicle is very important, though the issue of long-term respiratory harm by vehicle emission is not addressed.” Submission 42, Health).

Priority 10: “Address crime and personal security concerns around walking and cycling.”

Common themes included:

Personal security fears are a significant obstacle – even if real risks may be low.

“Those most at risk, that is women, children, the elderly and disabled are usually those who are heard the least.” (Submission 94, Local Government).

“People will not venture out until they feel safe.” (Submission 89, Support Advocacy).

“The problem with crime is that the more you address it in the media, the more it is reinforced to the public as a real instead of perceived fear.” (Submission 74, Tertiary Education).

- Focus the Priority more on the crime issues of particular importance to cyclists and pedestrians.

“While the strategy needs to work in conjunction with strategies aimed at reducing crime generally, the focus should be on addressing crime experienced by pedestrians and cyclists when using the transport system. This would include provision of secure cycle-parking facilities as well as walking areas that are well-lit and well-maintained.” (Submission 90, Local Government/Local Government).

“Need more safe secure places where we can lock our bikes.” (Submission 8, Tertiary Education).

- Acknowledge the role walking and cycling can play in reducing crime.

“[Our local authority] acknowledges this priority as being an essential component but this might also be an opportunity to note that increased walking and cycling will increase general personal security e.g. eyes on the street.” (Submission 78, Local Government).

Highlight the potential role of Police enforcement in high risk areas.

“Make more reference to asking police to provide more assistance in problem areas. It has helped in [our City] and I am sure other local authorities will receive the same benefits if they work with the Police.” (Submission 43, Local Government).

Overall mix of focus areas and priorities

Many people believed the Strategy's mix of focus areas and priorities captured the range of activities that will be required to achieve the Strategy's goals and vision.

"This strategy provides very comprehensive coverage of the key priorities and issues for walking and cycling." (Submission 57, Health).

One area seen by many as requiring more emphasis was traffic demand management. Some considered that achieving significant increases in walking and cycling will require more than making walking and cycling safer, easier and more convenient - it will also require considering how to make these modes safer, easier and more convenient *in relation to motor vehicle use*.

"It is important to address why people choose to use cars in the first instance, and historically why the car has become the mode of choice. Specifically, financial incentives to use a car, hidden cost subsidisation; regulatory structures that favour car and detriment other transport modes... ." (Submission 3, Individual).

Other key messages related to the mix of priorities were:

Emphasise the need for taking a comprehensive approach

"Numbering of priorities can lead to people thinking 1 is more important than 10. For this strategy to be successful, all priorities need to be looked at together." (Submission 87, Support and Advocacy).

Highlight the importance of ensuring that local strategies for walking and cycling are linked effectively into broader territorial authority policies and activity - such as land use planning, development of District Plans and Asset Management Plans, and parks and recreation planning. In particular, highlight the key opportunity provided by new requirements on Councils to develop Long Term Council Community Plans.

"Within local Councils, walking is affected by decisions within Traffic and Transport, Recreation Planning, Urban Design, District Plan, Parks, City Safety, Parking Enforcement, Safer Community Councils, Disability Reference groups, and Road Safety Co-ordinators at least." (Submission 58, Support and Advocacy).

Identify priorities

"No priorities have been established." (Submission 5, Local Government).

"At this high level the focus areas looks satisfactory – the detail of the implementation plans will need careful consideration to ensure the strategy is workable." (Submission 89, Support and Advocacy).

Section 3. Feedback themes - Strategy implementation

This section identifies key feedback themes related to Strategy implementation.

Proposed implementation actions

Chapter 4 of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* proposes a set of actions to support successful delivery of the Strategy. These are:

strong national leadership and a central co-ordination process;

clarification of roles and responsibilities of national agencies;

action plans that identify specific action to be undertaken, by whom, and when, along with prioritisation of early action for best effect;

clear performance indicators/targets; and

ongoing monitoring and evaluation.

- **Strong support for proposed implementation actions...**

There was strong support expressed in the submissions for the above actions. Generally it was considered that without such actions, it would be difficult for the Strategy to have the 'traction' required to achieve its goals.

- **...but a need for more detail**

While support was high there was a general concern the actions did not go far enough. There was a strong desire by many for more implementation detail. Others acknowledged that action plans would be developed but stressed the need for early action on these.

“Without a completed implementation plan it is difficult to know what significant impacts there will be.” (Submission 41, Local Government).

“Overall the four focus areas and ten priorities are very broad and lack tangible meaning until the performance indicators are set along side them.” (Submission 42 Local Government).

“The proposed leadership by the MOT is applauded. However the biggest concern is the lack of detail about exactly what will be achieved, by whom and when.” (Submission 32, Support and Advocacy).

“We realise that work on outcome indicators is proposed, but consider this critical and urgent, in order that the strategy has real credibility.” (Submission 58, Support and Advocacy).

“Developing annual implementation plans is too short a timeframe. It is important to have a long term strategic direction for actions if effective networks are to be developed. Having annual implementation plans alone will almost certainly lead to insufficient forward planning and possible substandard, inadequate or piecemeal solutions.” (Submission 75, Local Government).

“A proactive rather than passive approach to leadership is required. There is a need for a body which will actively identify opportunities and needs, and persuade the implementation partners of the benefits of the action and the disbenefits of not acting.” (Submission 83, Support and Advocacy).

“The principle issue will be one of delivery and support to ensure it [the strategy] does not remain on the shelf.” (Submission 64, Local Government).

“While it is signalled in the document that one of the first tasks would be to develop this area further, if sufficient detail is not contained within the strategy it may not move forward. We consider that the specific roles and responsibilities of organisations and resources for implementation need to be identified and developed further.” (Submission 101, Central Government).

“It is most important that the responsibility for the implementation of the strategy is clearly outlined and that the timeframes are put on progress.” (Submission 62, Company).

Concerns around funding and resourcing

Particular concern was expressed about the lack of clarity around funding and resources available for strategy implementation. Concern was expressed that, both nationally and locally, current levels of funding directed toward walking and cycling would likely be insufficient to support achievement of strategy goals.

“At present while there is funding for pedestrian and cycle initiatives, there is a major difference between funding available and funding required.” (Submission 66, Health).

“Clearly funding will be a key hurdle, both from transport and other agencies. It is instructive to compare the amount of Transfund funding currently allocated to Public Transport (\$101.1m), modes that attract only half of the number of work trips as cycling and walking, and about 5% of all trips by these modes. Still it needs to be acknowledged that a lot of provision for walking and cycling should continue to be provided in general roading projects: the challenge is to have robust procedures in place to ensure that these modes are catered for adequately.” (Submission 32, Support and Advocacy).

“[Our local authority] will not fully endorse the Strategy until the level of “...ongoing investment by local government...” is revealed (Submission 78, Local Government).

“The English Cycling Strategy is an example of a strategy without dedicated resource that failed to meet its targets. Launched in 1996, the first central target was to double the number of trips by cycle by end 2002. After failing to meet this target a dedicated resource has been developed.” (Submission 101, Central Government).

Importance of capability building, collaboration and co-ordinated action recognised

Many people recognised that simply providing funding for infrastructure and promotion of walking and cycling would not, on its own, be enough to ensure a successful strategy. Capability building was seen as a key area requiring activity, as was an emphasis on partnership development, co-ordination and collaboration - between agencies, inter-sectorally and between central and local/regional government.

“Whilst it is understandable that this [the walking and cycling output class] fund is started small because of authorities’ inexperience in formulating proposals to spend it, the need for increased funding is considerable, and in order to make best use of this, the competency levels in the walking and cycling provision area of local practitioners, regional, local and roading authority staff needs to be raised...” (Submission 27, Individual).

“The English Regional Cycling Development Team (ERCDT) roles and responsibilities should be reviewed in relation to further development of ‘Getting There’.” (Submission 101, Central Government).

“It is appropriate for central government to drive the project while acknowledging that other government departments need to be committed to active roles also.... We highlight the value of local bodies taking responsibility for action addressing the needs of their communities. While resourcing and funding is a central government role, we would like to see a wider vision rather than just a top down approach.” (Submission 57, Health Sector).

Organisational implementation issues

As part of their submission, organisations were asked to identify the most important issues that could impact on their ability to help implement the Strategy. The most common issues identified were:

Lack of funding, staff resources and time;

Lack of public and political support/will at the local level and buy-in from stakeholders;

Access to guidance, advice and tools (e.g. research, standards, guidelines, resources);

The need for a mandate from a parent organisation and clear links to sector strategies;

Clarity surrounding roles and responsibilities for implementation and strategy objectives;

Establishment of a coordinated and collaborative framework for action; and

Safety concerns.

Of these, funding and resources were identified as the most important issues.

Priorities for central government and its agencies to support effective local action

The Strategy proposes that early focus be placed on supporting effective action for walking and cycling at a local level. There was strong support for this approach, and for the Strategy to remain responsive to local needs and aspirations.

Many recognised the key role local government would need to play in Strategy implementation – while at the same time expressing concerns about the current commitment and capability of local government to undertake the action required.

Local and regional organisations asked to identify the most important actions that central government and its agencies should be considering to support effective local action. The most important actions identified were:

- Identify adequate and sustainable funding and people resources to support Councils in providing effectively for walking and cycling;
- Identify incentives/put into place requirements or legislation to support Strategy implementation;
- Clarify government's expectations of agencies and others (e.g. local and regional government);
- Ensure communication and a co-ordinated approach among agencies;
- Provide tools (e.g. guidelines, research, practical resources) and training;

- Develop clear outcomes and monitor action toward these; and
- Undertake activity to educate decisionmakers, gain political 'buy in' and promote walking and cycling to the public.

Organisational priorities for change

All organisations were asked what they considered to be the three most important actions or changes their own organisation could undertake to increase the effectiveness of its action for walking and cycling. The most common actions identified were:

Promote and raise awareness of the finalised national Strategy;

Adopt, finish or update their own organisational or local walking and cycling strategies to ensure alignment with *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*; provide appropriate budgets and staffing for their implementation;

Strengthen integration of walking and cycling into Regional Land Transport Strategies and land use planning;

- Assist with national Strategy co-ordination or become involved in collaborative work to implement aspects of it;
- Increase advocacy with local government, central government and others;
- Work to change attitudes (including member education);
- Work to up-skill knowledge and skills within their workforce;
- Act as a role model – encourage staff to change to walking or cycling; and
- Undertake research or encourage information exchange.

APPENDIX ONE : Overview of Consultation Process

Consultation process

The draft Strategy, *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*, was released on 8 October 2003.

800 submission packs were printed, containing copies of the draft Strategy and its submission booklet and information on the regional consultation workshops.

Approximately half of the packs were distributed in a mail out to a range of key stakeholders such as territorial authorities, government agencies, national walking, cycling and other transport user groups; to Members of Parliament; and to the media.

In addition, the *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* project team advertised the consultation process, the regional consultation workshops, and how to obtain a copy of the draft Strategy and its submission booklet through a range of national stakeholder email networks at the beginning and during the consultation process. These networks enabled information to be sent to those with an interest in urban planning, active living for health and fitness, transport planning and engineering, injury prevention, child safety, road safety, and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), as well as to cyclist and pedestrian networks throughout New Zealand.

People could also request a consultation pack by:

- Phoning the Ministry of Transport
- Sending an email to the project team
- Visiting the Ministry of Transport website, following *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* links, and downloading copies of the Strategy and submission booklet.

About 120 hard copies of consultation packs were sent to people upon request (more were sent electronically), and around 200 packs were distributed to participants at regional consultation workshops.

Regional Consultation Workshops

Seven regional consultation workshops were conducted throughout the country from 11 November to 5 December 2003.

The primary purpose of the workshops was to:

listen and identify key feedback to government about the draft Strategy, and Strategy implementation

Other purposes were to:

provide information on *Getting there - on foot, by cycle*, and answer any questions

enable the Strategy's development team to learn about local and regional activity and issues related to walking and cycling.

Table 1 lists workshop locations, dates and approximate numbers of attendees.

Table 1: Workshop dates, locations and approximate numbers attending

Centre	Date	Number attending
Christchurch	13 November	25
Auckland	14 November	40
Dunedin	19 November	23
Nelson	24 November	24
Palmerston North	3 December	28
Hamilton	8 December	27
Wellington	5 December	33

Profile of participants

Overall, around 200 people attended the workshops, representing:

- regional and local government (officers and political leaders);
- cyclist, pedestrian and motorist road user groups;
- disabled people, older people, Maori, and people interested in environmental issues;
- local community groups;
- health, recreation/sport, injury prevention and child safety organisations;
- the road safety community;
- tertiary education providers;
- consultancies; and
- central government agencies.

Participants also included Members of Parliament and private individuals with an interest in walking or cycling.

Process and format

Workshops were organised and managed by the Ministry of Transport walking and cycling strategy project team in association with the appropriate regional or local council.

Information on the regional consultation workshops was included in eight hundred *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* submission packs and promoted to national stakeholder networks (see 'Consultation process' above). Information on the workshops was also available on the Ministry of Transport website, and each workshop was promoted through electronic mailouts to regional stakeholders identified by a regional or local council officer.

People could register for the workshops by phoning the Ministry of Transport, or sending an email to the project team.

Workshop facilitation was provided by the Ministry of Transport walking and cycling strategy project leader, an experienced group facilitator.

Workshops ran for approximately four and a half hours, using the following format:

Morning tea provided as participants arrived.

Formal start to the workshop, beginning with introductions and an overview of the purpose and suggested format for the day.

As not all people were able to read the document in depth before attending the workshop, a presentation on the draft Strategy was provided, followed by time for questions and initial discussion.

First workshop session. In small 'break out' groups of generally between five and eight people, participants were asked to discuss the draft Strategy and provide comment. This comment was recorded by a nominated group member. Four questions were provided as suggestions to aid discussion:

How much revision does the draft Strategy require – *none, some, or a lot?*

What is your *most important* feedback regarding the *strategic framework for action* presented in the draft Strategy?

What *key suggestions* do you have for improving the *strategy document* (e.g. to improve its structure, feel or clarity)?

What *other key feedback or issues* would you like to see considered as the strategy is redrafted?

Groups were also asked to identify their *most important* feedback about the Strategy for report back to the full group.

Lunch break (provided)

Continuation of first workshop session, and report back to full group.

Summary by workshop facilitator of key session feedback to enable further clarification.

Full group workshop session, led by the workshop facilitator. Participants were asked to focus more specifically on Strategy implementation. The following questions were used to aid discussion:

What are the most important messages or feedback you want to give related to *strategy implementation*:

about local or regional implementation issues?

about *initial* priority actions you would like to see central government and its agencies take to support effective local action?

What other important feedback or messages about implementation would you like to see taken into account as the government considers a final strategy?

Key messages were summarised by the facilitator and fed back to the full group to enable any further clarification.

Wrap up. Participants were thanked for their time and contribution and the process for Strategy finalisation was briefly outlined.

Workshop summaries

Notes were taken at each workshop by the project team, and by 'breakout group' facilitators. After the workshops, the project team:

incorporated 'breakout group' notes into the overall workshop notes;

for each workshop, and across the seven workshops, identified common themes, views, messages, concerns and suggested revisions; and

summarised specific data, for example, number and profile of people who attended, and evaluation feedback on the workshops.

The Strategy Project Team endeavoured to ensure this report captures the content, tone and flavour of the workshops in a concise and accurate form.

Workshop evaluation

At the end of each workshop, participants were asked to provide feedback on the workshops by filling in a one page evaluation form. This was requested to evaluate whether people were satisfied with the workshop, and enable the project team to make adjustments to the delivery of the workshops based on feedback.

The evaluation form allowed participants to rate the workshop overall, plus five aspects of the workshop (see below), as 'very poor', 'poor', 'fair', 'good', or 'very good'. Space was provided under each question for comments.

Of the approximately 200 participants attending the seven workshops, just over half (104) filled in an evaluation form.

Key evaluation results:

94% rated the **workshop overall** as either 'good' (62%) or 'very good' (32%)

90% rated the **format/structure** of the workshop as either 'good' (67%) or 'very good' (23%)

93% rated the **facilitation** of the workshop as either 'good' (45%) or 'very good' (48%)

86% rated the **presentation provided on *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*** as either 'good' (64%) or 'very good' (22%)

90% rated the **opportunities for discussion and feedback** provided in the workshop as either 'good' (40%) or 'very good' (50%)

95% rated the ability of the consultation team to **listen and capture key views and feedback** of participants as either 'good' (29%) or 'very good' (66%)

Table 2 overleaf provides quantitative evaluation of regional consultation workshops by centre and question.

Some participants also provided verbal feedback. Most commonly this related to:
appreciation of the fact that Government was undertaking consultation, and Ministry of Transport representatives had come to their region;
the calibre of workshop facilitation and/or summarisation of key themes and messages, given the diversity of the groups; and
the usefulness of discussing views from a variety of sectors and perspectives.

Table 2: Quantitative evaluation of regional consultation workshops by centre and question

CENTRE	Q1 Format/Structure					Q2 Facilitation					Q3 Presentation					Q4 Discussion/Feedback					Q5 Listen/Capture					Q6 Rating Overall					
	VP	P	F	G	VG	VP	P	F	G	VG	VP	P	F	G	VG	VP	P	F	G	VG	VP	P	F	G	VG	VP	P	F	G	VG	
Auckland			2	10	9			1	10	10			2	13	6			2	3	15			1	1	4	14			1	7	11
Christchurch				7	1				7	1			4	3				1	4	3				4	4			5	2		
Dunedin			1	11	1				5	8			9	3				1	6	6			1	1	11			11	2		
Nelson			1	5	1			1	3	3			1	4	2				6	1				3	3		1	5	1		
Palmerston North													11	4																	
Wellington			1	12	5				8	10			1					2	9	7				4	14		1	11	6		
			2	12	1			5	5	6			3	10	3			2	8	6				10	6		3	10	2		
Hamilton			2	13	6				9	12			3	16	2			1	6	14				4	17			13	8		
TOTAL³ All Centres			10	70	24			2	42	44			6	57	20			7	34	46			1	2	30	53		3	55	30	
% Percent⁴ (All Centres)			10	67	23			7	45	48			10	64	22			9	40	50			1	2	29	66		6	62	32	

³ In five cases, ratings provided fell between two categories. During totalling, these ratings were added to the lower category (e.g. a rating falling between 'good' and 'very good' was added to the 'good' category).

⁴ Not all questions were answered by all respondents (e.g. while 104 answered question 2, only 96 answered question 3). Percentages were based on the total number of responses per question.

Written Submissions

A total of 103 submissions were received from people representing a range of agencies, organisations and groups, as well as individuals with an interest in walking or cycling. Respondents were invited to provide information about their affiliations and their key areas of interest. Quantitative analysis of this information is contained in Tables 3, 4 and 5.

A submission booklet enabled people to rate, using a simple tick box system, the extent to which the draft Strategy document needed revising and provided opportunity to give supporting commentary on issues, concerns, and suggestions related to the draft Strategy and its implementation. Use of the submission booklet was voluntary. While the booklet was widely used, submissions were also received in other forms.

The project team registered submission responses in a database, and sent an email or letter acknowledging receipt to those who made a submission.

Submissions formally closed 19 December 2003, however, a few submissions were received after this date and were included in the analysis.

Quantitative analysis of submission responses against submission booklet questions about the Strategy and its individual elements is contained in Table 6.

Table 3: Affiliation of those who made a submission

(NB rounding to the nearest whole number has occurred)

Base: All organisations and individuals who made a submission	n=103
Central government organisation	10%
Local/regional government organisation	23%
Individual/not responding as part of an organisation	15%
Support/advocacy/special interest group	19%
Private company	9%
University/polytechnic/other tertiary education provider	1%
School	-
Voluntary/Not for profit organisation	8%
Health service provider	12%
Other	3%

The largest submission response came from local government (23%) followed by support/advocacy groups (19%), individuals (15%) and health service providers (12%).

Table 4: Mode of most interest

Base: All organisations and individuals who made a submission and answered the question	n=103
Walking	3
Cycling	19
Walking and cycling equally	81

Nearly 80% of respondents expressed an interest in both walking and cycling modes..

Table 5: Key areas of interest

Base: All organisations and individuals who made a submission and answered the question. Respondents were permitted more than one choice.	n=395
Transport planning/traffic engineering	47
Urban planning and design	44
Road safety / injury prevention	62
Liveable communities	44
Health / active living	52
Environment	44
Sport / recreation	33
Tourism	19
Needs of cyclists, pedestrians or another road user group	29
Needs of a specific population group (e.g. Maori, children, older adults, people with disabilities)	18
Other	3

When invited to identify their key areas of interest from the list of options presented in Table 5, many of those making submissions identified multiple areas of interest. Road safety/injury prevention, health/active living and transport planning/traffic engineering were the most commonly identified interest areas.

Table 6: Quantitative analysis of written submissions

(NB rounding to the nearest whole number has occurred)

Base: All those who made a submission and responded to questions		Fine as is %	Need/s some revision %	Need/s a lot of revision %
Vision	n=78	49	45	6
Goal 1	n=71	65	28	7
Goal 2	n=72	72	22	6
Goal 3	n=71	70	24	6
Key Principles	n=68	51	47	1
Priority 1	n=71	77	21	1
Supportive actions for Priority 1	n=61	59	41	0
Priority 2	n=67	78	21	1
Supportive actions for Priority 2	n=56	59	38	4
Priority 3	n=67	85	13	1
Supportive actions for Priority 3	n=57	65	32	4
Priority 4	n=72	67	32	1
Supportive actions for Priority 4	n=59	54	42	3
Priority 5	n=67	79	21	0
Supportive actions for Priority 5	n=57	63	32	5
Priority 6	n=66	80	18	2
Supportive actions for Priority 6	n=58	66	29	5
Priority 7	n=70	76	21	3
Supportive actions for Priority 7	n=59	66	29	5
Priority 8	n=68	81	18	1
Supportive actions for Priority 8	n=58	57	36	7
Priority 9	n=64	69	30	2
Supportive actions for Priority 9	n=60	55	37	8
Priority 10	n=65	80	18	2
Supportive actions for Priority 10	n=54	74	20	6
Overall mix of Strategy focus areas and priorities	n=67	52	43	4
Set of Strategy implementation Actions	n=64	52	39	9

Analysis Framework

The consultation process produced some comprehensive responses from which to draw analytical information.

Each workshop summary and written submission was thoroughly read and given due consideration. A thematic analysis of workshop summaries and written submissions was then undertaken.

A theme is defined as an issue or concern of relevance to either the drafting of the strategy, or the implementation of the strategy, either explicitly or implicitly referred to in a workshop summary or written submission.

This report captures the key themes arising from the workshop summaries and written submissions that were raised and supported by a number of people. It does not capture the one-off comments people made, although it provides examples of indicative comments. While it is primarily a qualitative report, the quantitative data supports the thematic analysis. The quantitative findings related to the Strategy and its individual elements are summarised in Table 6.

The Strategy project team endeavoured to ensure this report captures the content, tone and flavour of workshop summaries and written submissions in a concise and accurate form. Should further detail be required this can be obtained by contacting the project manager.

Positive aspects and difficulties of the workshop consultation process:

Positives:

A high return rate on completed evaluation forms (+50%).

Data obtained from the completed evaluation forms indicate that the workshops were received very positively across all areas of evaluation.

Difficulties:

- Communicating changes in venue, dates etc to workshop participants.
- Lack of Ministry of Transport staff at workshops to lead small groups led to some inconsistencies in the quality of 'breakout group' facilitation.

Positive aspects and difficulties of the written submission process:

Positives:

- Good rate of return considering workshops were held as well.
- Significant use of the submission booklet suggesting the booklet was designed well.
- Electronic submission by email was high which made it easy to import comments

Difficulties:

- Time consuming nature of entering and collating the data – could be reduced significantly if a web interface was made available whereby people entered their comments on-line and the data is downloaded from our end.
- Submissions received in other forms (i.e. not using the submission booklet) were difficult to analyse and created statistical bias as it had to be determined what questions were being addressed and in some cases what the view being expressed was.
- Duplication of information ie. large number of the same people (organisations) attending workshops also submitted a booklet. If those people/organisations were removed from the data, the results may be quite different.
- Some submissions were noted to be more promotional literature for the particular organisation rather than responses to the Strategy text.

Strategy Project team

The members of the Ministry of Transport walking and cycling strategy project team are as follows:

- Elizabeth Anderson (project sponsor)
- Reena Kokotailo (project manager)
- Shelley Harrison
- Michelle Barnes
- Alex Scott
- Andrea Sharrock

APPENDIX TWO: *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* (Submission Booklet)

Getting there *on foot, by cycle*

SUBMISSION BOOKLET

October 2003

Submissions close in Wellington at **5.00 pm on 19 December 2003**

Introduction and Instructions for Completion

This submission booklet has been developed to guide individuals and organisations who want to make a written submission on *Getting There – on foot, by cycle*, a draft strategy to increase walking and cycling in New Zealand transport.

The submission booklet follows the flow of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*. We suggest reading the draft Strategy document through before starting to complete the submission booklet. You may need to refer back to the draft Strategy document when completing the booklet.

Each section of the submission booklet is designed to:

- Get your overall rating on the extent to which each component of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* may need to be revised.
- Get your comments on any issues, suggested improvements, or concerns you have regarding the draft Strategy, and to receive any positive feedback.

Please answer as many sections as you can. You are also welcome to comment on any other issues relevant to *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*, or to use another format to make a submission.

The Ministry of Transport is subject to the Official Information Act 1982, which means that your submission may be made available following a request under that Act.

Two options for completing this submission booklet

1. Complete this booklet and post it to:

Getting there - on foot, by cycle
Strategy Submissions
PO Box 3175
WELLINGTON

Where possible, please make your comments in the appropriate spaces provided. If you need to make further comments, please type or write them separately, and include with the submission booklet.

2. Complete and return this booklet via the internet. Got to **www.transport.govt.nz**, click on “Current” and follow the *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* links and instructions provided.

For more information or copies

For more copies of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*, or this submission booklet, please telephone **(04) 498 0649**, email **walkcyclestrategy@transport.govt.nz**, or you can download copies from the www.transport.govt.nz website.

Submission Details

This submission was made by:

Name:

Postal Address:

Organisation (if applicable):

Role/position (if applicable):

1. Which of the following best describes you or your organisation?

Tick one only.

- Central government organisation
- Local government organisation
- Individual/not responding as part of an organisation
- Support/advocacy/special interest/community group
- Private company
- University/polytechnic/other tertiary education provider
- School
- Voluntary/Not for profit organisation
- Health service provider
- Other, please specify

2. *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* focuses on walking *and* cycling. Which of these two modes of transport is of most interest to you or your organisation?

- Walking
- Cycling
- Walking and cycling equally

3. Which of the following best describes your or your organisation's key areas of interest?

You may tick more than one.

- Transport planning / traffic engineering
- Urban planning and design
- Road safety / injury prevention
- Liveable communities
- Health / active living
- The environment
- Sport / Recreation
- Tourism
- The needs of cyclists, pedestrians or another road user group, please specify:
- The needs of a specific population group (e.g. Maori, children, older adults, people with disabilities), please specify:
- Other, please specify:

Vision, Goals and Key principles for *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*

Vision

The vision for *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* is

“A New Zealand where people from all sectors of the community choose to walk and cycle for transport and enjoyment – helping ensure a healthier population, more lively and connected communities, and a more affordable, integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable transport system.”

4. To what extent, if at all, does the vision statement need revision?

Tick one only:

Fine as is

Needs some revision

Needs a lot of revision

5. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

Goals

To realise the vision, three important goals have been identified:

- Goal 1 **“Communities that are more walk and cycle friendly.”**
- Goal 2 **“More people choosing to walk and cycle, more often.”**
- Goal 3 **“Improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists.”**

6. To what extent, if at all, do **goals 1, 2 and 3** need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision

7. Please detail what needs revision for **Goal 1** (or any other relevant comments).

8. Please detail what needs revision for **Goal 2** (or any other relevant comments).

9. Please detail what needs revision for **Goal 3** (or any other relevant comments).

Key Principles

Getting there – on foot, by cycle is based on five key principles (see Chapter 2 of the strategy document). The principles underpin the Strategy.

10. To what extent, if at all, do the principles outlined in Chapter 2 of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* need revision?

Tick one only:

Fine as is

Need some revision

Need a lot of revision

Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

Focus Areas and Priorities for *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*

To achieve its goals, *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* identifies a total of 10 inter-linked priorities for action, under four broad focus areas:

Focus One: “Strengthen the foundations for effective action for walking and cycling.”

- Priority 1 “Encourage action for walking and cycling within an integrated approach to land transport.”
- Priority 2 “Expand our knowledge and skill base to address walking and cycling.”
- Priority 3 “Encourage collaboration and co-ordination of efforts for walking and cycling.”

Focus Two: “Make our communities and transport networks more friendly to pedestrians and cyclists.”

- Priority 4 “Encourage planning, development and design that supports walking and cycling.”
- Priority 5 “Provide supportive environments for walking and cycling in existing communities.”
- Priority 6 “Improve networks for long distance cycling.”

Focus Three: “Encourage the choice of walking and cycling for day to day transport.”

- Priority 7 “Encourage positive public perceptions of walking and cycling as transport modes.”
- Priority 8 “Support individuals in changing their travel choices.”

Focus Four: “Improve safety and security for those who walk and cycle.”

- Priority 9 “Improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists.”
- Priority 10 “Address crime and personal security concerns around walking and cycling.”

For each priority, examples of actions are identified to highlight the types⁵ of actions that could be expected to contribute toward progress on each priority.

Priorities

12. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 1: “Encourage action for walking and cycling within an integrated approach to land transport”** and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Priority 1	Supportive actions for Priority 1
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

⁵ The specific actions that national agencies and organisations will undertake on the strategy’s priorities are expected to be detailed in the strategy’s annual implementation plans.

13. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments).

14. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 2: “Expand our knowledge and skill base to address walking and cycling”** and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Priority 2	Supportive actions for Priority 2
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

15. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

16. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 3: “Encourage collaboration and co-ordination of efforts for walking and cycling”** and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Priority 3	Supportive actions for Priority 3
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

17. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments).

18. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 4: “Encourage planning, development and design that supports walking and cycling”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Priority 4	Supportive actions for Priority 4
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

19. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

20. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 5: “Provide supportive environments for walking and cycling in existing communities”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Priority 5	Supportive actions for Priority 5
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

21. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments).

22. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 6: “Improve networks for long distance cycling”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Priority 6	Supportive actions for Priority 6
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

23. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 7: “Build positive public perceptions of walking and cycling as transport modes”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Priority 7	Supportive actions for Priority 7
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments).

To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 8: “Encourage and support individuals in changing their travel choices”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Priority 8	Supportive actions for Priority 8
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 9: “Improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Priority 9	Supportive actions for Priority 9
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

29. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments).

30. To what extent, if at all, does **Priority 10: “Address crime and personal security concerns around walking and cycling”**, and its examples of supportive actions need revision?

For each column tick one only:

Priority 10	Supportive actions for Priority 10
<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine as is
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs some revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need some revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Need a lot of revision

31. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

Strategy focus areas and priorities

32. Looking **overall** at the four focus areas and 10 priorities for action identified in Getting there – on foot, by cycle, how well do these capture the mix of activities that will be required to achieve the Strategy’s goals and vision?

Tick one only:

- Fine as is
- Needs some revision
- Needs a lot of revision

33. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

Implementation of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*

Chapter 4 of *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* proposes a set of actions to support successful delivery of the Strategy. These include:

- Establishing a central co-ordination process, led by Ministry of Transport
- Developing annual implementation plans identifying the work programmes of national agencies
- Establishing performance indicators
- Undertaking regular monitoring and evaluation
- Ensuring government investment in the strategy is informed by monitoring and evaluation, national implementation plans, and regional/local strategies.

34. To what extent, if at all, does this set of actions need revision?

Tick one only:

Fine as is

Needs some revision

Needs a lot of revision

35. Please detail what needs revision (or any other relevant comments):

36. What are the three most important issues that could impact on your or your organisation's ability to help implement the Strategy?

(1)

(2)

(3)

37. **(For organisations operating regionally or locally)** *Getting there – on foot, by cycle* proposes that early focus be placed on supporting effective action on the strategy at local level. What are the three most important actions that central government and its agencies should be considering for this?

(1)

(2)

(3)

38. **(For all organisations)** Based on the priorities and types of actions identified in Getting There – on foot, by cycle, what do you consider to be the three most important actions or changes your organisation could undertake in order to increase the effectiveness of its action for walking and cycling?

(1)

(2)

(3)

General or additional comments on *Getting there – on foot, by cycle*

39. Reviewing Getting There – on foot, by cycle as a whole, are there other aspects of the document you wish to comment on, or any general comments you would like to make?

**Thank you for taking the time to make a written submission.
Your contribution is important and will be given due consideration.**