

**Before the Christchurch Replacement
District Plan Independent Hearings Panel**

In the Matter of the Resource Management
Act 1991 and the Canterbury
Earthquake Christchurch
Replacement District Plan) Order
2014

And

In the Matter of the Transport of the
Christchurch Replacement
District Plan

**Written Statement of Jane Murray for the Canterbury District
Health Board**

Submission Number: 648 / FS-1443

Written Statement on behalf of the Canterbury District Health Board

Introduction

1. My full name is Jane Elizabeth Murray. I am a Health in All Policies Advisor employed by the Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB).

I have a post-graduate diploma in Planning from Massey University and I have worked in my current role since May 2012.

Submission

2. This submission is an overview of the CDHB's key issues with the proposed Transport chapter.
3. The CDHB welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch City Council (CCC) proposed Replacement District Plan (pRDP). The CDHB is making this submission to promote the reduction of adverse environmental effects on the health of people and communities and to improve, promote and protect their health pursuant to the New Zealand Public Health and Disabilities Act 2000 and the Health Act 1956.
4. Our submission focuses on key health issues, building on input already provided through CDHB engagement in the pDRP review process. The links between transport and health are numerous. The design of cities can result in motor vehicle dependence. This in turn leads to low levels of physical activity in the population, resulting in higher levels of chronic illness including obesity, cardiovascular disease, and diabetes, with associated high health costs. Those economically disadvantaged may find owning a motor vehicle prohibitively expensive and therefore rely on alternative modes of transport. The provision of effective alternative transport modes can reduce the amount households spend on transport. There is a wide range of health literature that supports this, including Community and Public Health's publication on "*Review of studies that have quantified the economic benefits of interventions to increase walking and cycling for transport*".
5. We support the development of an effective transport system that includes provision for active and public transport modes. This will encourage physical activity, improve air quality through reduced vehicle emissions and provide better connectivity and access to health services, employment, education, other essential services and key activity centres. Investment in an efficient multi-modal transport system will lead to more choice for all transport users and a transition away from motor dependency.

6. The submission identifies a range of recommendations for consideration and incorporation into the pRDP.

Key Issues with the Transport

7. This written statement highlights the key issues for the CDHB
 - a) Objective 1 – Integrated Transport System (7.1.1)
 - b) Policy 2 – High trip generating activities 7.1.1.2
 - c) Policy 4 – Requirement for car parking and loading 7.1.1.4
 - d) Policy 5 – Design of car parking and loading areas 7.1.1.5
 - e) Policy 6 – Promote public transport and active transport 7.1.1.6
 - f) 7.2.3.1 Appendix 7.1 Table 2
 - g) 7.2.3.2 Minimum number of cycle parking facilities
 - h) 7.14 Table 7.19. Clauses m & o
 - i) Appendix 7.7 (1) to address this issue

Objective 1 – Integrated Transport System (7.1.1)

8. The CDHB supports the CCC's revised version of Objective 1 as written by Mr. David Falconer
9. The CDHB does not support any requests to remove clauses (iv) from Objective 1. This clause aligns with the objectives of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (Objective 6.2.4). Provision for active and public transport modes encourages physical activity and promotes healthy lifestyles, improves air quality through reduced vehicle emissions and provides better connectivity and access to health services, employment, education and other essential services. Investment in active and public transport will provide people with more transport choices.
10. The CDHB has concerns with other submitters requests to include the phrase "where practical/ where practicable" to this clause. This objective covers the transport system in its entirety and therefore should encompass all modes of transport. The wording "where practical/where practicable" does not add any clarity to the Objective and therefore makes this clause open for interpretation. Mr Falconer has also addressed this matter in his evidence.
11. CDHB encourages the CCC to aim towards Sweden's Vision Zero Initiative - <http://www.visionzeroinitiative.com/en/> . Vision Zero aims to have zero serious injuries and zero deaths caused by inadequacies in the transport network. Whilst this goal is

ambitious and unlikely to be achieved, it is a laudable goal to work towards and would send a signal to the community that no injury or death is acceptable. The CDHB's view is that this goal would sit well within Objective 1 to help create a safe, effective and efficient transport network.

Policy 2 – High trip generating activities 7.1.1.2

12. We attended the informal mediation sessions held by the Council in April and my division has had a series of conversations around the wording in the policy.
13. The CDHB supports the wording in the Council's revised policy on high trip generating activities especially in regards to using parking management measures and travel plans that will promote active and public transport and make sites easily accessible. This will result in more people in the community being able to use a range of modes to access the sites.
14. The CDHB has concerns with other submitters requests to include the phrase "where practical/ where practicable" to these clauses because once again this may dilute the strength of the policy.
15. The CDHB has worked with Mr Falconer regarding the wording around disability and mobility. The revised version of the Chapter reflects our wording change that any reference to "people with disabilities" be amended to "people with limited mobility", and "disability parking" be altered to "mobility parking" as this aligns with CCS Disability Action and is more accurate.

Policy 4 – Requirement for car parking and loading 7.1.1.4

16. CDHB supports the Council's revised wording in this clause A
*"Require car parking **(including car parking for people whose mobility is restricted)** and loading spaces which provide for the expected needs of an activity in a way ..."*
17. The needs of users, especially those with limited mobility should be taken into account in transport planning. The more accessible the location is, the more patronage the location will receive. New Zealand has an aging population and in the future more elderly people will be unable to drive and therefore will need to use alternative modes. By making locations easily accessible, future population needs will be well catered for.
18. We recommend that the clauses relating to active and public transport are retained as notified. There are health and economic benefits to providing public and active transport infrastructure into car parks. By catering to multiple transport modes, this makes places more accessible to a wider range of patrons. This would also reduce the demand for the number of car parks.

Policy 5 – Design of car parking and loading areas 7.1.1.5

19. For the reasons set out in paragraph 17 of my evidence, we recommend that an additional clause is added to this policy as follows:

“vii. be accessible for those whose mobility is restricted”.

20. The CDHB supports the inclusion of CPTED principles into this policy. Safety is a concern for the CDHB, the creation of unsafe and dangerous areas can result in injury and harm and that puts an additional burden on the health system. When an area is considered dangerous, this can have a negative impact on people’s mental wellbeing if they need to frequent this area often. We endorse applying CPTED and universal design principles in the design of car parks to ensure that car parks are safe and accessible for all.

Policy 6 – Promote public transport and active transport 7.1.1.6

21. The CDHB supports the revised wording in this policy. Referring to the road classification system as outlined in NZTA’s ‘One Network – Road Classification’ will help create clear and consistent transport networks for people travelling by all modes of transport. Specific and clearly defined road classifications help to establish the levels of service for each mode of transport on particular roads. This reduces ambiguity and increases clarity about priority of use, which will help reduce the potential for transport mode conflict and potential collisions. This additional clarity is also consistent with the Statement of Expectations (particularly Clause i) for the pRDP.

Rule 7.2.3.1 Appendix 7.1 Table 2

22. The CDHB supports the floor area based parking requirements for hospital and health facilities as notified. This is a change in approach from the Operative Plan which considered staff and bed numbers, which fluctuated and were more difficult to measure. We note that the revised version has no reference to mobility parking for residential activities. We recommend that a provision is added to ensure that mobility parking is included for larger residential developments that are required to provide visitor parking. This would ensure that the site is more accessible.

7.2.3.2 Minimum number of cycle parking facilities

23. The CDHB does not support any reduction in the minimum number of cycle parks required as fewer parks would discourage people cycling and this could potentially lead to poorer health outcomes. The provision of good quality cycle infrastructure encourages people to cycle. This is supported in Mr Nunn's evidence as well as Ms Ward's evidence. There is a causal relationship between more cycle parks and more cyclists. It is important that cycle parks for commuters are secure i.e. within an enclosed area accessible by swipe card or padlock. This was also considered at mediation.
24. For a long time in Christchurch, car-parking has been seen as an essential part of any development. Whilst car-parking is an integral part of any development, cycle parking should be seen in the same way. Providing both cycle and car parking provides greater transport choice for people. In the past, many developments have provided many carparks but very few cycle parks. The installation of more cycle parks that are highly visible, easily accessible and part of good quality infrastructure will encourage more people to cycle thus promoting a modal shift.
25. The CDHB supports the provisions for cycle lockers to be included in the plan as this will also encourage cycling.

Appendix 7.14 Table 7.19. Clauses m & o

26. The CDHB supports clauses m & o because they support a modal shift away from private vehicles to other forms of transport including active transport. This supports the objectives of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (Objective 6.2.4 and Policy 6.3.4). Provision for active and public transport encourages physical activity and promotes healthier lifestyles.

Appendix 7.7 (1) to address this issue:

27. The CDHB recommends that the District Plan set minimum vertical height clearance provisions of 2.5m for car parking buildings, to apply at the building entry and along the route to all covered Mobility Car Parks, as recommended by New Zealand Standard 4121; a 2.5m height clearance will enable access by a much wider range of vehicles.
28. The current Building Code requires only 2.1m minimum height clearance. This is not adequate for all tall wheelchair carrying vehicles (vans), and also roof-mounted wheelchair carriers in use in New Zealand.

29. Car parking buildings will continue to be required as part of the parking options for a successful Christchurch. It is important that any facilities are accessible to all citizens. Car parking buildings must meet needs now and into the future, as the population ages and the number of people with limited mobility increases. These facilities can play an important role in the 'accessible journey', which enables people to travel from home to their destination and return safely. For people with health conditions or disabilities, the shelter and safety provided by a car parking building may be a key that enables an accessible journey.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jane Murray', with a stylized, cursive script.

Jane Murray

10 June 2015