



Cycling is being seen as part of the transport network by politicians at both local and national levels. The panel's report offers a watershed opportunity to capitalise on this.

Cycle Advocates Network (CAN) is the national umbrella organisation for all cyclists with an emphasis on advocating for everyday utility and commuting cycling, as well as cycle tourism. The vision of CAN is “more people on bikes more often”

We welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft report of the Cycle Safety Panel, *Safer Journeys for People who Cycle*. We believe the report offers a watershed opportunity to make cycling an integral part of the transport system of Aotearoa New Zealand.

What we expected to see in the report:

- Cycling seen as a legitimate transport mode, with provision for cycling networks that complement the overall transport system.
- Evidence based recommendations
- A recognition of the need for investment - this is likely to be large in comparison to existing expenditure, but small in comparison with the overall transport budget.
- investments will repay themselves by reduced health, congestion, pollution costs
- Specific support for separated cycle facilities: particularly through intersections, and when HT vehicles, multiple lanes, expressways are present.
- A statement on priority for parking on arterial routes: transport, for example cycle facilities, should have priority over parking.
- Wider shoulders on rural roads especially those popular with sport and touring riders, and on roads connecting to NZ Cycle Trails
- Education for people who drive cars, on why people who ride bikes do what they do - taking the lane for example.
- Expansion of CAN's successful bus/truck/bike training programme to include taxis drivers and driving instructors.
- Conversion of recreational riders to utility cycling.

CAN has three focus areas (<http://can.org.nz/focus-areas-2014>):

- funding linked to cycle uptake
- cycle training
- Complete Streets

These are largely reflected in the report, although the panel could consider including the “complete streets” concept.

By and large, the report has addressed the issues that we expect. However an overall comment is that the recommendations could be more forceful, and more clearly based on an objective of integrating cycling into the transport mainstream. A recognition that cycling is a transport mode that offers significant benefits (health, carbon emissions, congestion, etc) will engender initiatives that will lead to a safer environment for cyclists. For a comparison, the Danish Cycling Strategy (<http://www.trm.dk/~media/Files/Publication/2014/Engelsk%20cykelstrategi%20-%20Til%20web.pdf>) offers a clearer vision of cycling as part of the national transport system.

We offer these specific comments on the report:

- It is good that panel has recognised that there hasn't in fact been a significant upturn in cycling deaths, and that cycling is essentially a safe transport mode.
- Need to include targets and timeline for cycling modeshare
- We are pleased that the report highlights benefits as a rationale for increasing cycling mode share: e.g. congestion, health, emissions, urban environment, road maintenance, economic benefits. There is little sense in over investing in private motor vehicles, a mode of transport that contributes to climate change, congestion. We need to invest in active transport, which does not contribute to climate change. In the hierarchy of transport modes, bicycles (along with other forms of active transport, and public transport) need to rank above private cars.
- Need something for media to grab onto other than minimum passing distances. E.g. cycle provision at intersections - include examples in Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch of how intersections should change.
- Recognises "safety in numbers" effect. But the recommendations need to follow through on this: if we accept safety in numbers, we need to boost numbers. Logically, this means:
 - network of protected cycle ways starting in cities and towns
 - normalising cycling
 - establishment of public bike share schemes
- We welcome the recommendations to:
 - Establish connected cycle networks & provision for cycling at the point of road construction. But there could be stronger language, for example: "Provision for cycling should be mandatory if high speeds, multiple lanes, roundabouts, HT vehicles are part of the route. Cycling facilities should be designed to increase safety, based on research evidence"
 - To increase information gathering - this should be done as soon as possible to establish baselines.
 - Reduce speeds, but how will it happen?
 - Programmes to improve road user behaviour and awareness
 - KPIs based on outputs - also financial benefits (see CAN focus area 1)
 - Reconsider criteria for funding
 - Provide for a national cycle touring network based on the Nga Haerenga trails.
 - Expand Grade 2 training for school students (CAN focus area 2)
 - Improve children's access to cycling by funding Bikes in Schools programme
 - Establish mandatory minimum passing distances, however we suggest that
 - Evidence for the effectiveness of mandatory minimum passing distances should be evaluated. It may be worth waiting for the results of Queensland trial.
 - It is a concern that the mandatory distance at 60km/hr or under is less than current guidelines.
 - It is important to clarify rules for crossing centreline/medians if passing a cyclist - even if minimum passing distances are not implemented.
 - The minimum passing distances should not just apply to bikes, but also to other vulnerable road users: pedestrians, road workers, horses...

- Address problems with cyclists passing/being passed by HT vehicles, e.g. underrun protection, detectors, improved visibility, education of drivers and cyclists.
- We are pleased that NZTA is already acting on recommendation for leadership by appointing national cycling manager and recruiting staff
- In the recommendation “Safe provision for active modes is considered at all stages of road transport planning and investment and given higher priority status”. Safety should not be a sole consideration. Consider replacing “Safe” with “ “Safe, attractive and efficient” wherever appropriate.
- Peloton riding has particular safety issues. It would be desirable to emphasise the value of guidelines such as “Good Bunch”, and Ride Leader programmes should be expanded.
- To reduce the risk of inaction, include an implementation plan with regular reporting back to the sector and Minister

Typo:

p17 “including improving the ability to cycling net” not sure what this means “improve cycling networks”?

Prepared by

--

Alastair Smith

Cycling Advocates Network Committee

+64 21 036 4443 (M)

<http://www.can.org.nz/>

24 October 2014