

MINUTES: SHARED FOOTPATHS WORKING GROUP MEETING

Thursday 26 October 2017 – 9.30 am

Boardroom, Wellington Museum, Queen’s Wharf, 3 Jervois Quay

Present

Wayne Newman	RCA Forum Research & Guidelines Steering Group
Amy Evanson	Office for Disability Issues (retired from group)
Gerry Dance	System Design & Delivery, NZTA
Trish Rudolph	NZ Transport Agency
Anna Blomquist	Wellington City Council, SASTA
Carina Duke	Blind Foundation
Claire Pascoe	System Design & Delivery, NZTA

Apologies

Michael Harrison	Independent Chair
Amanda Banks	CCS Disability Issues, Waikato
Simon Kennett	System Design & Delivery, NZTA
Gerri Pomeroy	CCS Disability Action Waikato
Philippa Fletcher	Alzheimers NZ
Kirsty Horridge	Hamilton City Council
Dr Lynley Hood	Visual Impairment Charitable Trust Aotearoa
Sarah Eames	Office for Seniors, MSD
Kate Bevin	Greater Wellington Regional Council
Ellen Blake	Living Streets Aotearoa
Sue McAuley	Nelson City Council (SASTA)
Patrick Morgan	Cycling Action Network
Michael Voss	Waitaki District Council
Paul Dickey	Office for Disability Issues

A g e n d a

1. Welcome, introductions, apologies and H&S briefing
2. Minutes of 17 August 2017 and actions arising
3. Dissolution of the Shared Footpaths Working Group and distribution of its differing roles to ensure broad strategic policy input is separated from technical reference group activities and delivered to the appropriate forum
4. Identification of issues to be referred to AMIG for consideration within the scope of the technical reference group
5. Mechanisms for future communications

NOTES

1. Welcome, introductions, apologies and H&S briefing

W. Newman opened the meeting and welcomed Claire Pascoe. The apologies were noted. Late apologies were recorded from Michael Harrison.

2. Minutes of meeting on 17 August 2017 and actions arising

The minutes of the meeting on 17 August 2017 were taken as a true record without further discussion.

3. Dissolution of the Working Group

W. Newman explained the need to change the present structure of the working group in order to remedy the impasse that has developed that appears to prevent the group progressing its terms of reference any further. Discussions between the Chair, NZTA and MoT have identified a division between strategic policy input and practical implementation as probably offering the best means to deliver a more satisfactory mechanism.

C. Pascoe explained that the transformation of NZTA from an essentially modal focus to a multi-modal focus on integrated transport provides an opportunity to begin to think about an integrated public transport-walking-cycling transport model. This recognises that NZTA has failed to participate fully in discussions around these issues previously, such as by joining the Disability Action Group.

4. Identification of issues for AMIG

C. Duke noted that there has been no effective integration of walking into plans. In almost every case in Christchurch the planning has resulted in a significant decrease in levels of service for pedestrians, especially pedestrians with any form of sensory impairment. Missing connections mean pedestrians step into the path of cyclists. New suburbs are being designed to have only shared paths and no PT plans. The reliance on hubs for PT makes PT a very slow and more expensive option; a need for two changes on PT can transform a ¼ hour car journey into a 2 ½ hour journey on PT. Efforts to increase the distances needed to walk to bus stops do not appear to have considered accessibility or the needs of an aging population.

A. Evanson commented on the apparent need to exert stronger influence on the designers. A simple KPI for accessibility for any facility is: Can you get there and can you use it? There seems to be an inadequate awareness of accessibility and multiple guidelines being inconsistently used across the country.

G. Dance suggested that the change of government provided an opportunity to go back to the work that was done a decade ago on accessibility, including the Neighbourhood Accessibility Plans, and build on that foundation.

A. Blomquist noted that, too often, officials are being asked to seek to change behaviour in response to implemented designs that fail to address established and recognised behaviours. Organisational silos shift responsibility for bits of the problem to someone else, completely negating any concept of integrated transport planning.

T. Rudolf commented on the need to justify expenditure on delivering not just safety, but mobility - mobility perceived to be safe, i.e. accessibility. It is a priority to see business cases for expenditure on this. This requires a willingness to invest resources in overcoming silos, encouraging conversations and having meaningful consultation with the advocacy groups.

New Zealand has a long way to catch up in addressing pedestrian priority, white cane priority or a hierarchy of road users that does effectively place the most vulnerable at the apex, compared to the situation in many overseas jurisdictions.

C. Pascoe noted the NZTA restructure means its business plan now includes goals to provide genuine transport choice for customers, particularly in high growth urban areas. NZTA has committed to deliver three recommendations from the Cross Agency Government Disability Action Plan 2014 -2018.

A multimodal focus will require NZTA to understand the current context for walking to better understand how to support the development and improvement of networks where walking is a safe and accessible transport choice, so it intends undertaking three pieces of related research.

The first two are closely related. The first step is to better understand how effective the uptake and use of the pedestrian design guidance, RTS 14 and other accessibility related guidance is, with the other guidelines and tools that RCA's are using. The second step is discovering what impact a change in NLTF policy to invest in footpath maintenance would have on RCA's behaviour in maintaining and improving footpaths. The third piece of research focuses on current and desired customer experience.

Taken together these projects will touch on design, delivery, maintenance, policy and customer experience and enable NZTA to focus its efforts for pedestrians across the value chain.

A review of the Pedestrian Planning Guide and a programme of training courses to increase industry awareness are also being planned.

5. Mechanisms for future communications

C. Pascoe queried the level of awareness of accessibility within the RCA Forum.

A. Blomquist noted that both she and Kirsty Horridge were presenting work on shared footpaths at the Trafinz Conference in Nelson.

It seems likely that Trafinz and SASTA will be more prominent in this area than the RCA Forum.

6. Other business

A. Blomquist noted the continuing lack of public understanding of new devices being installed on roads without adequate publicity and public education. The use of ASBs and sharrows extensively and almost indiscriminately has caused widespread confusion. What exactly a sharrow marking means was asked at the Asia Pacific Cycling Conference, with no clear answer being available.

Meeting closed 1.00pm