

## Jim Jefferies #245 presented 28 March 2019, submission notes as requested by Ms Pomare

### What I want

A condition to the NOR that a separated, sealed, shared cycling and walking pathway be commissioned at the same time as the new road.

### Who am I and submission made personally

Current PNCC Councillor, past member of RLTC, experienced cyclist. Made as personal submission and not in any representative capacity.

### Overall view

Today I will make a few specific points in respect to the outcome I seek. I have read many of the submissions and my views are well captured and articulated in these submissions in better ways than I could. Also, I support the submission of the Build the Path Group.

### My comments

1. Safety and the health benefits of cycling and their relevance to having a separated path. The importance of actual and perceived safety as a means of getting people on bikes and keeping them there is well known. Safety actual and perceived is critical to people getting on a bike. There are significant social and economic benefits to having an active and healthy community. Building a safe cycleway is key. The following matters concern me in this respect:
  - a. Cyclists and pedestrians are vulnerable road users. Safe System Principles for 100kph roads are to separate vulnerable users from high speed vehicles. This is contrary to the current plan for the new road.
  - b. Travelling alongside vehicles on such a high-speed national road is a disincentive to cycling and walking. Heavy vehicles in particular in close proximity to a vulnerable user are concerning.
  - c. My perception of the planned strip is that it provides vehicles with a safe place to pull over to the side of the road when needed. When this happens cyclists will have to pull out into a 100kph vehicle lanes to pass the stationary vehicles. A very unsafe maneuver.
2. The population demographic is for a greater proportion of the population over 65. The importance of keeping them healthy and saving on the health budget is sometimes overlooked. Whole of Govt costs relevant here. Health care costs associated with inactivity are significant. 8 years on the MidCentral DHB and 15 years as chair of our local private surgical hospital have given me an insight into these costs.
3. There is currently a safe separated cycleway from PN City to Ashhurst bridge. It seems logical to continue this over the Ruahine Range.
4. Electric bikes are a key enabler for increased use of cycleways. We can expect an increase in the number of people cycling because of this. Consequently, greater use of a safe cycleway.
5. This decision seems inconsistent with the direction I have perceived towards safe cycling and walking following the new Government's Land Transport Policy Statement. My perception arises from:
  - a. NZTA Partnerships. PN City is investing significantly in shared pathways in partnership with NZTA and the Government Cycle fund. An example is the almost completed bridge and pathway to Linton and Massey. \$13m partnership project.
  - b. Attending many Cycling and Walking Conferences over the many years I have followed the direction of successive governments through their National Policy Statements (GPS). Strong message received from NZTA following the new GPS has been their commitment to investing in cycling and walking, both commuter and recreational. Seems out of line with that direction.