

Submissions received on Way Safer Streets, June/July 2023

Would like to speak to the hearings panel

ID	Do you think this proposal will improve safety for tamariki travelling to school?	Is there anything else we could do to improve school travel safety in this area?	Is there anything else we need to know?	Name - Organisation
10003	Yes	When the 30km/hr speed limits past schools are approved, please make the signs HUGE, and perhaps even install flashing warning signs during school hours.		Sarah Elicker - Te Huarahi Linwood Ave School Board (Presiding Member / Chair)

Organisations / Businesses

ID	Do you think this proposal will improve safety for tamariki travelling to school?	Is there anything else we could do to improve school travel safety in this area?	Is there anything else we need to know?	Name - Organisation
10016	N/A - manual submission	N/A - manual submission	<i>See submission attachment 10016</i>	Chris Ford – Disabled Persons Assembly, Kaituhotuho Kaupapa Here ā Rohe - Regional Policy Advisor (Local Government)

Individuals

ID	Do you think this proposal will improve safety for tamariki travelling to school?	Is there anything else we could do to improve school travel safety in this area?	Is there anything else we need to know?	Name
10001	Yes			Cody Cooper
10002	Don't know / Not sure	Cameras to stop cars running the red lights at the pedestrian/bike crossings on Linwood Ave and Aldwins Rd., i.e. the crossings adjacent Chelsea St. and Marlborough St. Cars speed through fully red lights there all the time.		Adriel Kind
10004	Yes	My concern is that people will still double park even in slip lane. A lot of people don't care to the road rules ie will continue to park on the no stopping lines.	Fencing ideas are great along the verge area. My daughter has nearly been hit by a few cars who continue to park there. Even where there are no stopping lines alongside the footpath, the cars are half on road half on path. This then narrows the path even more so when car doors are open.	Nicola Mackie
10005	Yes	I don't use the school, I drive past every day at 0830. The majority of drop off cars leave safely, the odd few don't. I have never seen, in 15 years, any instances of children's safety being threatened. I cant speak for after school traffic behaviour. I put a large amount of kudos on the school for good communication and procedures.		Neville Brensell

Submissions received on Way Safer Streets, June/July 2023

ID	Do you think this proposal will improve safety for tamariki travelling to school?	Is there anything else we could do to improve school travel safety in this area?	Is there anything else we need to know?	Name
10006	Somewhat		Removing the u-turn will cause congestion at the next one that will spill into Linwood Ave creating a hazard. I do not agree with removing the u-turn.	Jamie Glass
10007	No	All this is going to do is encourage parents to double park along the proposed slip lane design. I've seen it at other schools, which creates more chaos and less safety for the children. Also, removal of the U turn from eastgate mall side to the school side will create more congestion down Linwood Ave as well as making it less desirable to use or access the mall. Have you consulted with the mall on this issue? The mall also needs to be user friendly and if you're going to restrict how people can leave from there, it's going to put a lot of people off from using it.	Maybe slowing traffic down around schools as it should be, should be a focus. Not unnecessary changes that don't help anything.	Angelina Craven
10008	Yes			Cecile
10009	Yes	This looks like a great start.	Suggest not consulting on basic safety changes like this. Unless it's impacting someone's home (guessing it's not?) Just go for it.	Craig Martin
10010	Somewhat		Fabulous with regard to the changes to the slip lane. Long overdue. I constantly see idiots rush through the lane to get past traffic queuing at the lights. And they have no regard for safety in the slip lane. Make those speed bumps huge and plentiful!!! I don't agree with the removal of the U-turn lane however. This is an essential part of the traffic flow existing the mall and will congest the Smith Street intersection, adding to, rather than removal of, poor driving behaviours.	William Goudie
10011	Yes		My concern is that removing the u-turn there will force people to use the one at the end of Smith street, creating more traffic at that interection, which has already seen a large increase in traffic due to the new swimming pool.	Marcel Peek
10012	No	leave this as is		a non
10013	Somewhat	Addition of the electronic school speed signs that are a 40kmh led sign only active before and afterschool	Please done remove the u-turn section it's a vital connection for traffic needing to turn after exiting the mall. If you live the opposite direction there isn't a better option. The traffic that uses this doesn't interact with school kids as they now have decent crossing facility's at the end of the shared pathway. The quality of the roads around linwood have deteriorated with harsh divets forming these being repaired would be better for all users of roads.	Ryan Zegerman
10014	No	I think it is about as safe as it needs to be	This is a poor location for a school (right on a major arterial route with no side street access). Please don't close the slip lane, what an inconvenience.	Ali Plunket
10015	Somewhat	Create a carpark back entrance through the park with the entry off Aldwins Rd.		Helen Cox

Submissions received on Way Safer Streets, June/July 2023

ID	Do you think this proposal will improve safety for tamariki travelling to school?	Is there anything else we could do to improve school travel safety in this area?	Is there anything else we need to know?	Name
10017	N/A - manual submission	N/A - manual submission	<p>I would like to voice my support for all of the listed projects being advertised on the map: https://ccc.mysocialpinpoint.com.au/way-safer-streets/way-safer-streets-map#/</p> <p>There are too many projects to comment on individually, and regardless it is important that these are looked at holistically so our whole system improves how it caters to people not in cars.</p>	Cameron Bradley
10018	N/A - manual submission	N/A - manual submission	<p>Hello</p> <p>I wish to make a submission on your safer streets for linwood plan.</p> <p>My subject is what the CCC call the shared path from Hargood Street to Smith st at the back of linwood pool and linwood park. The locals all laughed at the insult of a cycleway as a new never been before linwood cycleway on linwood Ave.</p> <p>Because your shared path that connects with the official cycleway via linwood park and now also connects people to linwood pool has been the subject of major neglect for over 45 years since it was built and saw none of the big splash out for linwood Ave official cycleway.</p> <p>The bureaucratic irony that people walk on that cycleway in the trees but our 1st cycleway must be call a shared path and not a cycleway because people walk on it is just crazy.</p> <p>I have been cleaning up weeding and planting all along the out fall drain cycleway for the last 14 years. During this time I have only seen 2 repairs to this section of path. With the very dangerous path fall away by the gow place Arron crescent bridge needing a partition from the local labour MP to get anything more than the safety tape that was put up weeks after the damage.</p> <p>My submission to you is that the current state of this path needs a lot of fixing.</p> <p>With iusses such as major cracks that grow weeds and I keep spraying</p> <p>Hollow sections in the path that leaves gather in and rot creating a trip hazard until I clean it out</p> <p>Tree roots rasing sections of the path creating trip hazard and so sloped it is hard for wheel chairs.</p> <p>Not all of this path has lighting. The section between Smith st and Tilford st only has 1 light</p>	Richard William Rowe

Submissions received on Way Safer Streets, June/July 2023

ID	Do you think this proposal will improve safety for tamariki travelling to school?	Is there anything else we could do to improve school travel safety in this area?	Is there anything else we need to know?	Name
			Yet this path didn't even get a mention in the CCC safer street for linwood plain even when it connects to linwood pool on Smith street.	

Comments on the removal of the slip lane

Comment	Upvotes	Downvotes
There should be controlled pedestrian crossings down Linwood Ave. Between Jollie and Hay St.	2	0
Are the carparks where the solid black line is? It's not marked on the key. I think it's good that the berm at right of the map is cut-down as it is often used as a carparking space.	2	0
I think this is a good solution to avoid some of the chaos at pick up/drop off, stop the backing out and maintain visibility, and generally make it safer for the kids.	2	0
I support the proposed changes. It will be safer and better for the whole school community. Thanks for your efforts.	2	0
Thank you for this change to the slip way - it will make our kids a lot safer. In the total of 30 parks there is no disabled parks. Shouldn't there be at least 1 disabled park if at all possible outside Ferndale end	2	0
Thanks for all the efforts of the CCC team - for all these changes to the slipway, particularly important to keep the local families safe, please still do not forget to reduce the speed on that part of Linwood Ave to 30 km/hr, even though we still will have a slipway, kids are still crossing over. And keep the turning lane so families from the other end of our zone nearer town can still get their kids to school rather than driving two blocks further to get into the other side of Linwood Ave,	1	0

Comments on the U-Turn Removal

Comment	Upvotes	Downvotes
I support the removal of the U-turn as it will help avoid some of the chaos at school pick up/drop off and keep kids safe.	1	1
Even though the u-turn is convenient, removing it will ease the flow of traffic for the school community in the mornings and afternoons, and encourage folks to drop their kids off in other areas, keeping everyone safer.	0	1
I understand the safety aspect of removing the turn, even though it is useful. My concern is that people will be more likely to u-turn at the linwood ave/aldwins rd southbound lights, which is dangerous and disrupts traffic. Perhaps a no u-turn sign there as well would help mitigate the risk?	0	0
My concern with this is the lack of other safe u-turn options there are already a lot of traffic accidents at the smith Hay St U-turn bays as the east and west turn bays are so close together and are in close proximity to the above side streets causing people cut across two lanes.		
Removal of this slip lane will result in greater numbers of cars turning at Hay st or worse making a tight U-turn at the Keighleys road intersection.	1	0
I'm a member of the school community at Linwood Avenue School and I've had it confirmed the removal of the u-turn was not part of our original consultation with CCC. The new slipway plans are good and the school supports them, but we're not sure about the u-turn removal. One concern raised is that it will send more traffic further down Linwood Ave to reach the next u-turn, thus increasing possible interactions with school kids and make traffic worse. Please clarify.	1	0
Do you not realise how many cars come out of all the fast food outlets and use the U-turn road?? Why force them to drive further up Linwood road just to turn around? This poses an even greater area of danger along Linwood ave for other road users. The U-Turn is very effective especially as it is right beside traffic lights so can be used VERY safely.	0	0



Disabled Persons Assembly NZ

July 2023

To Christchurch City Council,

Please find attached DPA's submission on Way Safer Streets

For any further inquiries, please contact:

Chris Ford

Kaituhotuho Kaupapa Here ā Rohe - Regional Policy Advisor (Local Government)

policy@dpa.org.nz

Introducing Disabled Persons Assembly NZ

We work on systemic change for the equity of disabled people

Disabled Persons Assembly NZ (DPA) is a not-for-profit pan-impairment Disabled People's Organisation run by and for disabled people.

We recognise:

- Māori as Tangata Whenua and [Te Tiriti o Waitangi](#) as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand;
- disabled people as experts on their own lives;
- the [Social Model of Disability](#) as the guiding principle for interpreting disability and impairment;
- the [United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities](#) as the basis for disabled people's relationship with the State;
- the [New Zealand Disability Strategy](#) as Government agencies' guide on disability issues; and
- the [Enabling Good Lives Principles](#), [Whāia Te Ao Mārama: Māori Disability Action Plan](#), and [Faiva Ora: National Pasifika Disability Disability Plan](#) as avenues to disabled people gaining greater choice and control over their lives and supports.

We drive systemic change through:

- **Leadership:** reflecting the collective voice of disabled people, locally, nationally and internationally.
- **Information and advice:** informing and advising on policies impacting on the lives of disabled people.
- **Advocacy:** supporting disabled people to have a voice, including a collective voice, in society.
- **Monitoring:** monitoring and giving feedback on existing laws, policies and practices about and relevant to disabled people.

UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

DPA was influential in creating the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD), a foundational document for disabled people which New Zealand has signed and ratified, confirming that disabled people must have the same human rights as everyone else. All state bodies in New Zealand, including local and regional government, have a responsibility to uphold the principles and articles of this convention. There are a number of UNCRPD articles particularly relevant to this submission, including:

Article 3 – General principles

Article 9 – Accessibility

Article 19 – Living independently and being included in the community

Article 9 refers to the obligation for States parties to identify and eliminate obstacles and barriers to accessibility, including “buildings, roads, transportation and other indoor and outdoor facilities”.¹

New Zealand Disability Strategy 2016-2026

Since ratifying the UNCRPD, the New Zealand Government has established a Disability Strategy² to guide the work of government agencies on disability issues. The vision is that New Zealand be a non-disabling society, where disabled people have equal opportunity to achieve their goals and aspirations, and that all of New Zealand works together to make this happen. It identifies eight outcome areas contributing to achieving this vision. There are a number of Strategy outcomes particularly relevant to this submission, including:

Outcome 5 – Accessibility

¹ United Nations. (2006). UNCRPD: Article 9 – Accessibility. Retrieved from: <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities/article-9-accessibility.html>

The Submission

DPA welcomes this opportunity to engage on the Way Safer Streets Strategy being proposed by the Christchurch City Council.

DPA notes that the plans being mooted are very extensive in scope and nature. That is why we focus on three key areas from a disabled community perspective.

We provide feedback on the principles which should be applied around pedestrian improvements, cycleways, and public transport upgrades.

DPA supports the principles behind current central government transport strategies which are being implemented in Christchurch via its funding of the CCC to provide improved safety and transport choices through pedestrian safety improvements, intersection safety upgrades, lowering speeds around schools and neighbourhoods, better cycling connections and bus stop improvements.

All the above will benefit disabled people just as much as it does the general population given the safety issues that present for us as road users, pedestrians, and public transport users.

Transport safety issues for disabled people were canvassed in Waka Kotahi commissioned research from 2022 (in which DPA collaborated) entitled 'Transport experiences of disabled people in Aotearoa New Zealand'.²

This research illustrated the ongoing accessibility and safety challenges faced by disabled people when using public transport. Disabled people's main challenges include, for example, issues around using Total Mobility (TM), the inaccessibility of bus services, lack of footpaths and safe crossing points, and feeling excluded from the planning of sustainable city centres, as well as the ableist attitudes of some transport planners.

² Doran, B., Crossland, K., Brown, P., & Stafford, L. (2022). Transport experiences of disabled people in Aotearoa New Zealand (Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency research report 690). Retrieved from <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/research/reports/690>

The need to overcome these barriers for disabled people in accessing our public transport infrastructure is crucial if disabled people are to have the ability to fully participate in communities, including in Christchurch.

DPA welcomes the proposals to improve street safety, especially in the areas of Linwood, Bromley, Richmond, Shirley, and Cashmere. We note that some of these communities are relatively lower socioeconomic communities which have a higher proportion of disabled people compared to the rest of the Greater Christchurch area.

We group our responses to this submission under the headings of pedestrian/road improvements, cycleways, and public transport upgrades. We also reiterate the general principles that we have outlined in past submissions to the CCC around what is accessible and works best for disabled people.

Pedestrian/road improvements

Footpaths and pedestrian infrastructure

DPA favours the installation of pedestrian crossings, especially in busy areas, with good lighting, the ability to enable pedestrians to be easily visible to oncoming traffic and with tactile strips on both sides of every crossing to enable easy navigation by blind and low vision people.

It is important when installing pedestrian crossings that there is sufficient turning space available on both sides of the crossing for disabled people who use wheelchairs and other mobility devices (i.e., mobility scooters, walking frames) to turn around without the fear of, for example, colliding with fences or bushes. An example of where pedestrian crossings and upgrades need to avoid issues such as those outlined above are in Rhona Street, Linwood.

Recommendation 1: that pedestrian crossings are installed in high traffic volume areas and are safe and visible for everyone, including disabled people, to use through installing features such as:

a.) good lighting;

- b.) tactile strips on both sides of the crossing;
- c.) mobility kerb cuts;
- d.) sufficient turning space at both ends, especially for people using wheelchairs, mobility aids or pushing bicycles or micro-mobility vehicles on the footpath.

DPA supports calls for more pedestrian crossings on Gloucester Street as there are currently none planned. This is surprising given that Gloucester Street is a high-volume traffic area.

The safety of school pupils is also an issue, particularly in the Linwood area. While we acknowledge the many changes being proposed there, it would be worthwhile to increase the focus on the safety of students by placing more safety features (including pedestrian crossings) around more schools and early childhood centres in this area, a move which would benefit disabled students too.

DPA supports the speed reduction proposals being made for all school zones as part of this package.

An aspect which needs to be carefully considered when introducing safer speeds around schools (and other areas) is the use of traffic calming measures to support them. While there are positive safety benefits of having calming measures like speed humps on roads where traffic volumes are high DPA is also aware of the concerns raised by some disabled people who are vehicle drivers and/or passengers about the physical impact that speed humps have on them when they are being driven over, even if at low speeds.

Recommendation 2: that Council fully consult and involve disabled people in decisions about introducing traffic calming measures, especially if speed humps are proposed for introduction.

Pedestrian crossings in high traffic volume locations should have refuge/traffic islands for pedestrians installed and this would be beneficial for disabled people who tend to take more time crossing the road than non-disabled people.

Recommendation 3: that pedestrian safety features including refuge/traffic islands should be installed on busy and/or wider road crossing points.

Traffic light timings need to be reviewed to enable pedestrians, including disabled people, the ability to cross in a safe and timely manner. Our preference would be to see longer pedestrian light timings introduced in more areas.

There is a need for the CCC to install more audio signalled crossings, something which would benefit blind and vision impaired people. This should be done in close consultation with the blind and low vision community who can best identify the areas that need them most.

Recommendation 4: that more audio signalled crossings be installed after consultation with the blind and low vision community.

Recommendation 5: that longer crossing times at intersections and crossings with traffic lights be considered to increase safety for disabled and older people.

Another important aspect for disabled pedestrians is the need to feel safe on the footpath and the ability to full traverse them without unnecessary barriers. This includes ensuring that footpaths are of sufficient width to enable all pedestrians, including disabled pedestrians, the ability to pass one another safely.

Recommendation 6: that pedestrian footpaths are of sufficiently wide width to enable pedestrians to safely navigate and pass one another.

A common safety issue faced by disabled people using footpaths is the gradually rising camber of them which occurs over time due to 'mill and fill' processes where successive upgrades/repairs to footpaths have tended to raise their gradient.

This means that disabled people who use mobility devices including wheelchairs or mobility scooters tend to experience difficulties in maintaining the stability of their devices on paths which have become progressively much steeper and/or sloped over time, and this can occur even at intersections where there are mobility kerb cuts installed too.

One of our Christchurch members outlines their experiences as a mobility scooter user when navigating higher cambers and the resultant impact this has on their ability to participate in the community:

"I use .. a small mobility scooter and have found I am not going out as much. The camber of footpaths seems to be getting more of a lean, so I need to be at the top of the footpath e.g., by the fence as closer to the road I feel like I am going to fall off. It can also be worse when you go over a driveway. If there are other people using the footpath, I am unable to "follow the rules" walking on your left which can cause issues."

Uneven surfaces are another common occurrence in the city, and they pose a significant danger for disabled people given that many in our disabled community cross the road to avoid them - and in winter this danger is exacerbated by increased slip risks.

On this issue, a DPA member in Christchurch shared:

"Footpaths around the city can be quite dangerous, in particular uneven surfaces, which become scary in winter when small puddles can turn to ice and become a slip risk".

Overgrown vegetation is another pedestrian hazard as disabled people who use mobility devices as well as blind and low vision people often encounter significant

difficulty when trying to negotiate barriers like long grass and protruding tree stumps on footpaths.

On this issue, a DPA member in Christchurch shared:

“When I am walking around my neighbourhood [Avonhead], I often come across trees and shrubbery that are overgrown and impede my ability to continue on the footpath. I can’t manage the step down onto the road, so it’s difficult to navigate”.

While the abovenamed safety concerns are faced by every local authority around the country, it is important that the CCC and other local authorities work together with disabled and non-disabled people alike to proactively identify pedestrian safety risks and eliminate them.

DPA believes that the best way this can be done is through the development of a common safety checklist that can be used by Council and other local authority staff when planning future pedestrian projects and in also managing existing ones.

This planning and management checklist should include key components like the need to check for and manage vegetation, camber heights, public toilet placements, and uneven surfaces.

Recommendation 7: that the CCC create a common pedestrian management checklist which encompasses the need to plan for and manage various safety factors.

Cycleways

Disabled people are both cyclists and pedestrians.

DPA appreciates the CCC’s commitment to building new cycleways since the earthquakes.

DPA welcomes the establishment of cycle ways as long as these remain separate but parallel from pedestrian infrastructure such as footpaths and walking tracks.

The need for cycle ways and footpaths to remain separate is important for disabled people given that many of us experience safety issues when trying to navigate footpaths or shared spaces where there may be other cyclists or micro-mobility users on it at the same time.

Collisions have sometimes resulted between disabled and non-disabled pedestrians and cyclists or micro mobility users both in Christchurch and throughout the country.

Recommendation 8: that the CCC adhere to the principle of building and maintaining cycle ways which are separate but parallel to pedestrian footpaths and walkways.

CCC needs to plan for meeting the needs of all cyclists, including disabled cyclists, and disabled cyclists who use adapted cycles such as children's and adult's tricycles and blind and low vision cyclists who ride tandem-style with sighted cyclists.

Cycle ways should be of sufficient width to admit all types of cycles, including those adapted for the use of disabled people which maybe either slightly wider or longer in width.

Supporting infrastructure including bike racks and lockers should be built to accommodate all types of cycles including those used by disabled people.

Recommendation 9: that the CCC construct and maintain cycle ways which can accommodate all types of cyclists, including disabled cyclists, in a safe and accessible way.

Recommendation 10: that the CCC build and maintain supporting cycling infrastructure, which is accessible to everyone, including disabled people.

DPA acknowledges that there will need to be car parks removed to make way for the proposed cycle ways across the city as part of the Way Safer Streets plans.

Recommendation 11: that the CCC to consult with disabled people and disability organisations before removing any mobility parks.

Our preference is that if any mobility parks which are removed to make way for cycle lanes are replaced with new ones close by and after consultation with disabled people.

Public transport

Bus stops

DPA believes that any upgraded or new bus stops created under this plan must be safe and accessible for everyone, including disabled people, to use.

DPA believes that all bus stops must be adequately covered so that people can be sheltered against all weathers in terms of high temperatures and sun in the Summer and coldness/wetness in Winter and at other times.

All covered bus stops should have seating gaps where disabled people including those using wheelchairs and mobility aids can easily fit into and have enough turning space.

All bus stops, both covered and uncovered, should be well lit or in spaces where street lighting is sufficient to enable people, including disabled people, the ability to safely use these spaces.

Another important aspect is the need for all bus stops to have tactile sensors or the ability for blind and low vision people to be able to get on and off buses safely.

Electronic and audio announcements of bus timetables should also be available at every covered stop, something which would benefit disabled people especially Deaf people, hard-of-hearing people, blind and low vision people and other members of the public.

Recommendation 12: that all covered and uncovered bus stops be accessible, safe and user friendly for everyone, including disabled people.

DPA notes that there is a significant gap between some of the bus shelters/stops proposed for development under the Safer Streets plan. Some people, including disabled and older pedestrians, may find the distances between shelters too long to mobilise between. That is why sheltered seating is needed between bus shelters/stops to enable people to rest when moving from one shelter/stop to another.

Recommendation 13: that sheltered seating be installed in places where there are considerable distances to travel between bus shelters/stops for pedestrians.

Similarly, there is the need for the CCC to use the opportunity afforded by Safer Streets to address the issue of the step gap which sometimes occurs at bus stops which means that, even if buses are able to be lowered to admit passengers, there is still the issue of the gap between the bus and the footpath being too high, meaning that people with physical impairments who have limited mobility may find it too difficult to get on and off buses.

Similarly, the issue of the gap between the footpaths around bus stops and buses themselves can also present other safety issues, including the potential for falls and/or tripping, which can affect both disabled and non-disabled passengers alike when entering or exiting buses.

On this issue, a DPA member in Christchurch shared:

“There are no bus shelters on the side of the road I get a bus from and often have to stand in the rain. When the bus stop behind another bus, I have to walk on the muddy verge to enter the bus, which is not only messy, but also creates risk of slipping. If I fell, it would be pretty serious.”

That is why we believe that remedial works should be undertaken at all bus stops where significant step gaps have been identified as an issue by both passengers and bus operators to rectify this and similar issues.

Recommendation 14: that all bus stops with significant step gap issues be identified and have remedial work done on them to eliminate these hazards

Bus interchanges

That where bus interchanges are being proposed under this plan that they are built to universal design principles in terms of having (as for covered bus stops) sufficient all-weather shelter, lighting, seating (including gaps for wheelchair and mobility aid users to sit), electronic and audio announcements plus accessible toilets and space for people to buy tea/coffee and other refreshments from vendors, plus the ability to temporarily secure cycles and micro-mobility vehicles.

Recommendation 15: that any bus interchanges are built to universal design standards to enable everyone, including disabled people, the ability to access buses safely and accessibly.

Involving disabled people in planning processes

DPA notes that further consultation will be carried out with affected communities around these changes.

One of the principal communities who should be involved are the disabled community and disability organisations, including DPA.

We believe that there are benefits for the CCC and other local authorities in being proactive about the need to involve disabled people in safety planning right from the start so that accessibility can be built in, enabling long-term savings to be made in terms of both money and (most importantly) lives.

That is why we remind the CCC of its obligations under Article 4.3 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCPRD) to involve disabled people and our organisations as co-design partners in these changes.

DPA has members throughout Christchurch whom we could tap into to ensure that our voices are heard during the remainder of the planning process for Way Safer Streets.

Recommendation 16: that disabled people and disability organisations are involved as co-design partners during the remainder of the Way Safer Streets planning process.