



National Highway Manager
Transit NZ
PO Box 5084
Wellington

2002/3 State Highway Programme Submission

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this document.

Because of the size of the project list and our late involvement, we have not had the time or resources to examine individual projects for their cycle-worthiness or get feedback from our member groups about priorities, so we will just be commenting on the general framework for consultation and priority-setting.

Process for Preparing Draft SH Programme

Step 1 (Classification of Projects) does not reflect the Government's recently-announced funding priority of "promoting cycling and walking". We suggest that that could be rectified by amending the 'examples/definitions' in the first two categories as follows:

A. Statutory Responsibility - Projects that correct a serious breach of legislative responsibility, including the non-consideration of the needs of cyclists and pedestrians.

[We note that there is a common law 'right to pass and repass' for all road users. Roadway layouts which are so uncongenial that they effectively exclude cyclists and pedestrians are potentially in breach of that.]

B. Congestion Relief - Projects that reduce severe congestion, that is, congestion which occurs regularly during the week, causes long time delays, and has significant economic, social or environmental impacts, giving greater emphasis to projects which encourage the use of passenger transport, cycling or walking for journeys currently undertaken by private motor vehicle.

Step 3b (Transit Consultation) should be more explicit about who is being consulted as 'representatives of road users', so that everyone (Transit NZ, the public and stakeholders) is clear about the breadth of the consultation, and can highlight any gaps. We have noted in the past that consultation with 'road user groups' has been limited to dialogue with the AA and RTF, and we do not consider that an acceptable level of consultation since neither group can or does represent the interests of cyclists and pedestrians.

Programme Priorities

As mentioned above, we are not able to comment on specific projects, but we would like to make the following points in relation to the prioritisation process.

1. The replacement or modification (via 'clip-ons') of narrow bridges should be a priority on both safety grounds and 'promoting cycling' grounds. Within that, first priority should be given to those bridges on routes most used by cyclists, including training cyclists, tourists and recreational cyclists.

We have attached at the end of this submission a list which includes bridges that have been identified as problems (>4000vpd and W<6m or [W<7.5m and L>100m]). We also note that many of the longer bridges that cause the biggest problems are not listed in the draft programme, and we are concerned that they have been put in the "too hard" basket. We would like to point out that bridge widening also has considerable safety benefits for motorists too.

Similar priority should be given to seal widening projects (also included in the list at the end of this submission) and a review made of links deemed to require target widths of 7.0m or 8.5m (neither of which provide an adequate cycling shoulder). As well as seal widening projects over long lengths, which we accept can be costly in some places, more consideration needs to be given to treating isolated "pinch points" and sight-restricted locations (curves, dips) as these are often the most dangerous locations for cyclists.

2. 'Congestion relief' projects should be deferred until it is established that implementing other measures (e.g. encouraging the use of cycling, walking and public transport for journeys currently undertaken by private motor vehicle, or implementing 'Safe Routes to School' programmes) will not relieve the problem. Given the considerable expense involved in some of the major congestion relief projects and their debatable long-term benefits, we suggest that expenditure on other measures be undertaken first. While this is work often outside the scope of Transit NZ's functions, Transit should make suitable representations to the appropriate agencies.

3. Consideration of projects which assist regional development should include consideration of the value brought to local communities by the increasing number of cycle tourists in this country.

4. Priority should be given to (or taken away from) projects depending on their contribution to local patterns of transport (particularly in the priority areas of cycling and walking) in urban areas, having regard to journeys which cross the State Highway network as much as those which travel along it.

In conclusion

With cycling, often the devil is in the detail. Many of the roading projects listed have the potential to also provide improved facilities for cyclists (e.g. wide shoulders, off-road paths, crossings). Whether they do so is the challenge for Transit NZ: a number of projects in the past have been notable for missed opportunities. We hope that consultation with local cycling groups and/or CAN will assist this process in the future. To that end, we would suggest that some generic design strategies are put in place for new projects to ensure that they will provide at least a minimum level of service for cyclists, e.g.

- bridge replacement/upgrade: must have adequate shoulders or separate crossing/path
- rural realignment: must have sufficient shoulders, especially at "pinch points"
- urban intersection improvement: provide cycle lanes
- new urban arterial corridor: provide off-road cycleway etc...

While the idea of supporting cycling projects that are part of a local/regional strategy is good in principle, in practice few areas have a strategy in place or with sufficient project detail. We would like to see Transit NZ complete their own cycling strategy, particularly in relation to national cycling routes, and to identify and promote their desired projects with local/regional government, particularly where the SH provides the only reasonably direct link.

In terms of dominant benefits, it would appear that most cycling projects fall under either Statutory Responsibility (i.e. providing the right to road access by cyclists, especially for

limited access roads and roundabouts) or Safety. However many cycling projects also provide Congestion Relief, Travel Route Quality and Environment benefits.

We attach below a list of some significant cycling projects, many of them not listed in the draft programme. Many of these were derived from road and bridge data that CAN has collected over time, and one or two may have already been dealt with. While some of them do not directly affect an existing SH, they are required because the SH route does not currently provide adequate/any cyclist access.

Northland

- SH11 Kawakawa-Paihia seal widening

Auckland

- SH1 Auckland Harbour Bridge access
- SH20 Mangere Bridge improvements
- SH20A Auckland Airport access improvements

Waikato

- Hamilton Waikato R. crossings
- SH1 Waikato R. bridge Ngaruawahia (134m x 7.3m)

Bay of Plenty

- SH29 Tauranga Harbour bridge
- SH2 Tauranga inner harbour bridge (310m x 7.9m)
- SH1 Taupo Control Gates bridge cycle access
- SH30 Whakatane R. bridge (242m x 7.3m)

Hawkes Bay

- Napier-Hastings cycleway
- SH2 Tutaekuri R. bridge Clive (243m x 7.3m)
- SH2 Ngaruroro R. bridge Clive (297m x 7.3m)
- SH2 Tukituki R. bridge Waipukurau (276m x 6.7m)
- SH2 Waipawa R. bridge Waipawa (303m x 7.3m)

Wanganui

- SH3 Wanganui R. cycleway Wanganui (adequate width)
- Palmerston Nth Fitzherbert R. crossing
- SH1 Rangitikei R. bridge Bulls (420m x 7.3m)
- SH1 Ohau R. bridge Levin (135m x 7.3m)
- SH3 Whangaehu R. bridge (110m x 7.3m)
- SH4 Wanganui R. bridge Taumarunui (140m x 7.3m)

Wellington

- SH1 Otaki R. bridge (206m x 7.3m)
- SH1 Paremata Harbour bridge (136m x 6.7m)
- SH1 Waikanae R. bridge (80m x 7.3m)

- SH2 Petone-Melling-Haywards cycle facility (rail/river corridor?)
- SH2 Petone-Ngauranga-Wellington cycleway
- SH1 Ngauranga Gorge cyclepaths
- SH1 Pukerua Bay-Paekakariki cycleway
- SH1 Wellington Airport access improvements
- SH2 Rimutaka Saddle hill seal widening
- SH58 Pauatahunui-Paremata seal widening
- SH53 Ruamahanga R. bridge (232m x 5.5m)

Nelson/Marlborough

- SH1 Wairau R. bridge Tuamarina (292m x 7.3m)

- SH1 Opawa R. bridge Blenheim (170m x 5.5m)
- SH1 Awatere road/rail bridge (258m x 3.7m)
- SH6 Wairoa R. bridge Brightwater (128m x 5.9m)
- SH6 Wairau R. bridge Renwick (707m x 7.3m)
- SH60 Appleby bridge (207m x 7.3m)
- SH6 Nelson-Stoke-Richmond cycleway
- SH60 Motueka-Riwaka seal widening

Canterbury

- SH1 Ashley R. bridge (363m x 6.7m)
- Waimakariri R. bridge - old main road (354m x 6.1m)
- SH1 Rakaia R. bridge (1757m x 7.3m)
- SH75 Akaroa summit hill seal widening
- SH74 Lyttelton tunnel access
- SH1 Rangitata Nth R. bridge (646m x 7.3m)
- SH1 Rangitata Sth R. bridge (317m x 7.3m)
- SH1 Selwyn R. bridge (320m x 7.5m)
- SH1 Temuka R. bridge (163m x 7.3m)
- SH1 Kekerengu-Kaikoura seal widening
- SH73 Waimakariri R. bridge Bealey (268m x 3.0m)
- SH1 Hurunui R. bridge (147m x 3.6m)

West Coast

- SH6 Taramakau road/rail bridge Kumara Jn (222m x 3.3m)
- SH6 Arahura road/rail bridge Hokitika (205m x 3.2m)
- SH6 Runanga-Greymouth-Hokitika seal widening
- SH6 Stillwater-Greymouth seal widening

Otago

- SH88 (Port Chalmers-Dunedin) cycle facilities (7.0m)
- SH1 Dunedin northern outlet cycle access
- SH1 Clutha R. bridge Balclutha (226m x 6.7m)
- SH1 Waitaki R. bridge (906m x 7.3m)
- SH6 Cromwell-Frankton seal widening

Cycling Advocates' Network

PO Box 6491

Auckland

phone/fax: 04 - 385 2557

email: can@actrix.gen.nz