Walking and cycling – getting the mainstream planning right

Roger Boulter, Boulter Consulting, tel 06 379 8909, mob 021 872 654, email roger@boulter.co.nz

Abstract

This paper showcases material from the author's forthcoming book (current working title "Humanising urban and transport planning"). Origins and reasons for the book are outlined, including a broadening of focus since the original conference paper abstract. A 'working synopsis' follows. The paper concludes with some pertinent questions and the process from here to publication. Massey University have provided peer review input to the book writing.

Philosophical developments from the 18th century onwards resulted in impersonal forms of planning during the 20th century, against which several influential 'shapers' of planning have 'rebelled'. 'Classic' transport planning developed from German theories on road user and road function hierarchies, coupled with synonymous pioneering in Chicago, USA, of data-driven "four-stage modelling" of motorised traffic projections. Cycling, which these approaches either downplayed (as 'inferior') or assumed would be superseded by the car (as representing 'progress'), attracted further societal 'rebels', such as early 1900s suffragettes and 1970s environmentalists. 'Classic' transport planning reached its greatest influence during the 1960s, and despite 'multi-modal' or 'integrated' transport planning developments since then, the primacy given to planning for motorised private car transport remains very strong, and is still unquestioned among a significant proportion of professionals.

Within this context, an orthodoxy of 'segregation' of cycling from motor traffic went largely unquestionably from the first 'cycling facilities' (for 'inferior' transport) in 1930s Germany, until a seminal change in thinking during the mid-1990s. By the mid-1990s, research and experience on the 'segregation approach', following the birth of 'cycle planning' as a conscious activity in the wake of the 1970s 'oil shocks', gave mixed results. Envisaged crash/ injury reductions, and attraction of new cyclists, failed to take place in a context of unchanged primacy given to planning for private car transport (as in Britain, North America and Australasia), but both showed notable and celebrated successes where accompanied by a substantial shift away from this (as in such places as the Netherlands and Denmark); with segregation of cyclists playing only a small part. These findings led to a shift away from segregation and a 'cycle facilities approach' in the mid-1990s, and towards a focus on reducing and slowing motor traffic, with a call to give planning for walking and cycling primacy over planning for the car through such strategies as a 'road user hierarchy' which was a reversal of the priorities of 1930s Germany.

A very significant wider change (internationally) in transport and transport planning since the mid-1990s/ early 2000s, or more recently, has been shown in a range of trends including a slowing of growth of, or static, total vehicle kilometres travelled; fewer adolescents seeking driving licences and/ or car ownership; downgrading in priority given to motorised transport (such as through urban densification, urban growth limits, reductions in on-street and off-street car parking, and reallocation of traffic circulation space to pedestrian-based 'place-making'); together with advances and innovation in alternatives to the car (such as light rail, trams, bus rapid transit, inter-urban high speed rail, and 'separated'/ 'protected' cycleways). This suggests that a move away from the primacy of planning for the car may find political support (regardless of 'hue') in New Zealand. Without this wider change, the current New Zealand government actions on cycling may show the same adverse results as were seen in the 1980s and early 1990s.

Reasons behind, and evolution of, this book

Author's long background experience

It would be fair to say that the author has had longer experience in planning for cycling than anyone else working in the cycling field in New Zealand. Originating in Birmingham, UK, with a local government part-time cycle planning role in 1982, this led on to a 1990-95 full-time 'Cycling Officer' position, which in addition to implementing Birmingham's Cycling Policy and planning and overseeing the development of a city-wide cycle route network, included representing the Association of Metropolitan Authorities on the Local Government Associations' *Local Government and Cycling Working Party*, which authored a national cycling policy. This national role was because of the lead role Birmingham City Council was playing at the time in a new roads/ public transport 'Integrated Transport Planning' approach, which was subsequently taken up internationally (including in New Zealand, WRC 1992).

Roger briefly chaired this Working Party in 1995, and at the same time contributed to the UK Institution of Highways and Transportation et al guide *Cycle Friendly Infrastructure: Guidelines for Planning and Design* (IHT et al, 1996), which introduced the highly significant *Five Point Hierarchy of Measures* (which gave the highest priority to reducing and slowing motor traffic as the main ways by which cycling could be helped).

After migrating to New Zealand in 1995, Roger undertook the 1999-2000 *NZ Cycling Strategy Foundation Project* and its concluding *Into The Mainstream* report (Boulter, 2000). This was influential on much that followed, including the 2004 *NZ Cycle Network and Route Planning Guide* (Land Transport NZ, 2004), which Roger co-authored.

Since the early 2000s (now as a transport planning consultant), Roger focused more on wider planning, including work (with another small consultancy) on regional and inter-urban passenger rail, and more recently, over three years (2013-15), delivering the *Transport and Urban Planning* undergraduate paper as part of Massey University's Bachelor of Resource and Environmental Planning degree. Roger's approach has been as a planner (not as a 'cycling advocate'), and the mid-1990s finding (IHT et al, 1996) that only through mainstream transport planning can cycling be significantly helped (for example through implementing the *Five Point Hierarchy of Measures*, and a *Road User Hierarchy* which places pedestrians and cyclists at the top of the priorities) vindicates the appropriateness of this move away from a focus on cycle planning specifically.

Roger strongly dissents from a view that engineers can cover 'transport planning' as incidental to engineering. This is not a new problem: planners have needed to fight against other professions who argue along the lines of "*Planning? We do that*", for example against surveyors on land use planning, as outlined in Caroline Miller's seminal *Unsung Profession* historical account of the NZ Planning Institute (Miller, 2007). On transport planning, it may be engineers who are more likely to say *"Transport planning? We do that".* Roger (with other transport planners) maintains that transport planning is a distinct professional field in its own right, defined by a primary focus on policy and strategy, as distinct from engineering which tends by its nature to start from a focus on infrastructure and technology. The flaw in the idea that engineers can cover transport planning as incidental to engineering is an implication that the outcome of planning should necessarily involve infrastructure and technology, which Roger would maintain is not necessarily the case, and in some cases can produce perverse results if policy and strategy are not appropriately addressed.

Need to hand on experience and historical lessons

In 2014 Roger realised that he had directly experienced a great deal which was now further in the past than most professionals working in planning for cycling had experienced, and that this knowledge of historical developments needed to be handed on. This feeling was added to by the realisation that planning for cycling was experiencing a new surge in attention, both from government and enjoying a renewed popularity among a wider public. It was after the 2014 Nelson *2 Walk and Cycle* conference that Roger sketched out an outline of a possible book on the history of planning for cycling.

Concern at the direction of the renewed government interest in cycling

Moving into 2015, Roger expressed concern at what he saw as methodological flaws behind the NZ Transport Agency's '*Cycle Network Design Project'*, maintaining that cycle networks can only be planned, not designed (because 'design' implies infrastructure changes, which are not necessarily the appropriate outcome). Even before this, Roger was concerned at an emphasis on the engineering techniques of 'separated' or 'protected' cycleways in isolation from broader transport planning, often carrying with it an implication that these would encourage more people to cycle, regardless of what the wider transport planning context might be. Roger saw the rhetoric as very similar to that of the 1980s, which had forecast increased cycling and reduced cyclist crashes, but which had then either failed to deliver these, or produced the opposite; which in turn had led to the change in approach towards a focus on mainstream transport planning and away from a focus on segregation and 'cycling facilities'.

Some of the popular adherence to Roger Geller's 'targetted marketing approach', with the idea that 'separated cycleways' would attract to cycling the (very large) 'interested but concerned' population segment, Roger (Boulter) saw as particularly naïve, bearing in mind the substantial other ways in which Portland had moved away from the primacy given to car-based planning, which he felt were the determining factors behind the success of Roger Geller's approach as applied in the Portland context, but which were lacking in the New Zealand context.

These concerns added a focus and a topicality to Roger's plans for a book: a need to warn against making the mistakes which had been made in the 1980s and early 1990s. Roger therefore 'diaried out' some time and completed a 150-page first book draft in September 2015, and arranged peer review input from Associate Professor Christine Cheyne of Massey University, which she gave in late 2015.

Need to marshal more substantial arguments

Since Roger's basic thesis is that cycling can only be significantly helped through paying attention to mainstream transport planning, it was logical (and Associate Professor Cheyne's peer review input confirmed this) that broader transport planning historical lessons needed to be brought in to supplement the cycle planning history of the September 2015 draft text. Since transport planning is only one aspect of wider urban form planning, Roger brought into the book's focus some separate material he had already been working on, again with assistance from Associate Professor Cheyne via peer review input, on historical issues and lessons for urban and transport planning.

'Diarying out' of further writing time during March 2016 led to the 'book synopsis' reproduced below. The next stage is rearranging all existing material around a chapter outline based on the synopsis, which will no doubt reveal some unnecessary material (which will be discarded or used elsewhere) and some gaps (which will be filled). It is expected that substantial progress will have been made on this by the time of the July 2016 *2 Walk and Cycle* conference.

The 'book synopsis' as it stands at time of writing this paper (April 2016) is given below (with references added), followed by some concluding pertinent questions, and an outline of the process for here to publication.

Book Synopsis follows
Humanising urban and transport planning

In about the 1700s (although the reasons and origins could be traced back further), western thought transitioned in how it saw 'God' from 'Theism' to 'Deism'.

Whether one believes in any kind of 'god' or not, this move was very important in its influence on how urban and transport planning is practiced today – and many down through planning's history have rebelled against this.

The 'Theistic' God was personal, emotional, loved, communicated (e.g. through 'prophets'), got angry, and worked miracles; this comes out clearly all through the Hebrew Scriptures and the Christian Bible.

The 'Deistic' god, in complete contrast, was impersonal and detached: possibly (s)he had created everything, but could not be 'known' in the sense of any personal relationship, and did not speak to human beings. Instead, the 'Deistic' 'god' created natural 'laws' to govern the cosmos and ecosystem, and had given us abilities and brains – notably, the ability to 'reason' – with which to assist in managing the world in which (s)he had placed us. The 'Deistic' god simply 'didn't do' miracles, and only ever acted according to the physical 'laws' (s)he had set in place.

Not surprisingly, 'Deism' led the way towards agnosticism and atheism. Because a 'god' who sits back and leaves us to sort out our world isn't much of a god really, and we must seriously question whether any such 'god' would even bother existing. Isn't 'god', so the thinking went, something we have invented for ourselves? Or as the 18th century philosopher Voltaire put it *"If God did not exist, he would have to be invented"* (Voltaire, 1768).

The change from Theism to Deism was associated with religious practice which stressed action in 'this' world, rather than anticipating an 'eternal' world, after we die. The late 19th century philosopher Max Weber theorised (Weber, 1905) that the 16th century advent of 'Protestantism' led on, through the 17th century to the 19th century, to 'Capitalism', with an idea that "*Heaven helps those who help themselves*", rather than having an eye to rewards in 'eternity'. A more recent example is 20th century religious 'Liberal' theology, with its strong stresses on 'this-wordly' issues like social justice and environmentalism rather than 'personal salvation'.

This is relevant to urban and transport planning because a 'Deistic' view of 'god' implies working towards concepts and ideals which promise a 'greater good', to the public in general, rather than meeting individual people's practical and emotional needs directly. This approach tends to argue instead that benefits will 'trickle down' later and indirectly. Against this, critics argue (as the examples outlined in this book) that such an approach misses (or even works against) real, practical, immediate human needs, and may even fail to deliver the indirect 'trickle down' benefits either. Throughout the history of urban and transport planning, there are examples of people trying to break free of planning philosophies which seek to enforce conformity to an ideal which,

in contrast to the rhetoric behind it, has the effect of dehumanising people. That's why people have sought to break free of it.

This book will look at some examples, through urban and transport planning's history, of formative thinkers and practitioners making their own bids to reclaim human freedom from a persistent tendency to see it forced into conformity with an orthodoxy which the individual may feel to be alien. Different examples could no doubt have been chosen, but those outlined in this book will serve to illustrate the main point – that urban and transport planning needs to be humanised. They include 19th century British Jewish reformer and Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli; New Zealand celibate Catholic (and later Rationalist) Prime Minister and public housing pioneer Michael Joseph Savage; New York housewife and anti-motorway campaigner Jane Jacobs; and Australian building painter, anti-motorway campaigner and 'street-reclaiming' consultant David Engwicht. These span a period from the mid-19th to early-21st centuries, but all were (and in one case still is) after the same thing: reclaiming planning for people.

In transport planning, cycling seems to have been a magnet for such people, trying to 'reclaim' their world, from early 20th century socialists and feminists, to late 1970s environmentalists. Planning for cycling, this book will suggest, is more than providing for a form of transport, but tends to be an indicator of whether planning is for 'real people' or for some elusive, and eventually illusory, 'greater good'. Cycling has sometimes been compared to a 'miner's canary': a transport system good for cycling tends to indicate a system good for everyone.

In transport planning, the late 19th century German philosophers Max Weber and Friedrich Nietzsche will be shown to have conditioned a transport planning based around planning for the motor car as representing 'progress'. Weber, besides his better-known work on the origins of capitalism (Weber, 1905), formulated the concept of a 'hierarchy', as enabling more efficient organisation of social groups such as the military or government staffs – and about 50 years later the same 'hierarchy' concept was applied to transport planning. Nietzsche built on Charles Darwin's theory of Evolution (Darwin, 1859; itself enabled by the 'Deistic' view of 'god', 'Creationism' being by nature 'Theistic') by suggesting that the human race would continue to 'evolve' towards a higher form of humanity, or 'Uebermensch' ('Over-person') in his classic work '*Thus Spake Zarathustra'* (Nietzsche, 1883-91). About 50 years later, together with Weber's hierarchy concept, this was applied to transport planning in the form of the concept of 'higher-order' or 'advanced' motorised 'fast transport', and 'lower-order' or 'inferior' non-motorised 'slow modes'. This led on to 1920s/ 30s Germany inventing both motorways ('Autobahns' for 'advanced' transport) and cycleways (for 'inferior' transport).

These German developments were paired, across the Atlantic at the same time, with the introduction of what since became 'classic' four-stage modelling of motorised traffic trends by 'the Chicago School', a methodology which went on to become the main basis for transport planning for the next three-quarters of a century (and remains so, among many traffic engineers, today). This employed a further use of the 'hierarchy' concept, to increase efficiency of traffic flow through a distinction between roads of different 'through-traffic' and 'local-access' functions.

Segregation of motorists and cyclists from each other was given fuller rein in 'New Town' building and urban expansion schemes of the 1960s and 1970s – although with the adverse outcomes of persistently high cyclist crash levels, and a strongly anti-cycling 'motoring culture', where implemented most fully, notable in UK's Milton Keynes (Franklin, 1999) and Australia's Canberra city expansion. Later, cycling was rescued from an impending demise presumed for it, as 'dying,

inferior transport', by late 1970s 'oil (price-rise) shocks', prompting an idea that cycling would play a key role in a 'post-oil world' assumed as likely to come by the 1990s.

The new field of planning for cycling from the late 1970s, not surprisingly, borrowed from 'motorised' transport planning the established transport planning concepts outlined above. These included 'segregation' from motor traffic as an ideal (invented, as outlined above, in 1930s Germany) and the presumption that accessibility by cycle is best served through a 'cycle route network', broadly corresponding to the 'arterial through-traffic' road network concept which, again as outlined above, can be traced back to Max Weber's hierarchy concept (although finding a fuller and more public exposition in 1950s United States and the 1963 UK '*Traffic in Towns'* report, the latter HMSO, 1963).

An orthodoxy of segregation of cycling from motor traffic along with provision of a 'cycle route network' prevailed from the late 1970s origins of 'cycle planning' (as a conscious activity) through until the mid-1990s, with much experimentation and research into the resultant benefits (or otherwise) in terms of encouraging more people to cycle whilst (hopefully) keeping at bay, or reducing, cyclist crashes and injuries. Typical 'cycle engineering' provision over this period included off-road cycle paths (often shared with people on foot) or on-road 'cycle lanes', together with certain design techniques at road intersections. In some cases (notably some Northern European countries such as the Netherlands and Denmark) this took place in conjunction with a wider substantial shift away from provision for car movement as the assumed default basis for transport planning (in the Netherlands prompted by strong public concern about child fatalities from motorised traffic). In other places (including Britain, North America, Australia and New Zealand) through the 1980s and early 1990s, this wider shift away from motor traffic did not take place; transport planning continued to be based firmly on the principles established in such texts as the 1963 UK *'Traffic in Towns'* report (HMSO, 1963), which collated and conveyed to governments and a wider public the principles originating in pre-war Germany and 1930s/ 1950s USA as outlined above.

Comparing Danish/ Dutch with British/ American/ Australasian experiences, by the mid-1990s it was established that segregation of cyclists onto a 'cycle route network' (which in an essentially motor-traffic-based planning environment rarely gave a satisfactory 'level of service') only delivered increased cycling levels with lowered crash and injury levels when pursued in conjunction with the types of move away from motor-traffic-based transport planning which had been pursued in places such as Denmark and the Netherlands. Without this, it was found neither to attract new people to cycling, nor to mitigate crash or injury levels. Ultimately, this was a failure of the 1930s German distinction between 'fast transport' and 'slow modes', bringing home the unpalatable truth that cycling could only realistically be helped by a downgrading of the prominence given to planning for the car within wider transport planning.

Meanwhile, also in the 1980s, it was discovered that building arterial motorways networks did not satisfy demand for car movement, as 'classic' transport planning theories had predicted would happen. Whereas the 1963 '*Traffic in Towns'* report had predicted private car use reaching a 'saturation point' in the early 1990s (and rising no further after that) at (the now-laughable) "*about one car per household*", empirical evidence showed car use continuing to rise, and the rise showing no sign of slowing. After much protracted and intense professional debate through the 1980s as to why this should be so, it was eventually established (SACTRA, 1994) that the provision of the 'arterial road networks' prescribed as a 'solution' by classic 1960s transport planning had

instead been shown to play a large part in causing a new problem of ever-increasing traffic congestion, together with damaged lifestyle quality through over-motorisation.

All this meant that transport planning in the mid-1990s was at a turning point. Building ever-more road capacity to meet motorised traffic demand would only defer the problem (or might even make it worse), and the best way to help cycling was to tackle mainstream transport planning rather than just add 'cycling facilities'. These two findings, coming within two years of each other, insisted on a change in direction, and so began a radical shift (internationally) away from the established basing of transport planning around provision for the car as a first priority. 'Embarked on' does not mean 'achieved', and there is still a strong conventional transport planning 'bedrock' based around modelling motorised traffic flow trends and building increased road capacity to meet those the modelled forecasts.

Nevertheless, right across the range of 'alternatives to the car' there has been a push, from the closing years of the 20th century onwards, to raise quality for people travelling by any means other than the car. Rail has led on to high-quality high-speed airline-style rail services between cities. Urban rail has become sleeker and more comfortable, and been supplemented by conscious planning of settlements around stations – 'transit-oriented development'. Trams have been rescued from their 1950s/ 1960s scrap heaps (to which they had been consigned for getting in the way of rising numbers of private cars) and radically improved into the high-quality light urban rail of today's cities. Even the humble bus has led on to high-quality 'bus rapid transit'. Provision for cyclists has moved from painted lanes on roadways to 'separated' or 'protected' dedicated 'cycleways' within cities, 'cycling superhighways' within or between cities, and the advent of public smart-card-monitored on-demand cycle sharing schemes within major cities. Walking meanwhile has transitioned from being seen as a 'road safety problem' to an indicator of advanced quality of life and prosperity, and a key element in 'place-making' as more and more public street area (including some demolition of urban motorways) is given over to motor-traffic-free circulation on foot.

The overall outcome has been a gradual but growing trend of reclaiming streets and public spaces, in various different ways, away from use as motor traffic routes and towards 'places' which people can enjoy for their own sake, or given over to some other forms of transport, varying from trams to bus lanes to dedicated and 'protected' cycleways. This trend, however, is still emerging, and application of this trend in practice is 'uneven' in that some places have embraced a move away from classic 1960s motor-traffic-flow-based transport planning more than have others. This may be dangerous, because without a downgraded role for the car, the other developments may deliver counter-productive results. An example of the latter may be 'separated' cycleways imposed in a transport planning environment still largely based on classic-theory motorised transport provision, such as is the case in New Zealand, which (without corresponding action in the wider transport planning context) may deliver similar adverse outcomes as the 'segregated' and 'cycle route network' orthodoxy which held sway during the 1980s and early 1990s.

Nevertheless, the trend away from the car being seen as 'progress' and the default 'desirable' form of transport, is already strongly embedded in underlying public consciousness. This means that planning on the basis of something other than road provision is 'going with the flow' of an already in-process public opinion trend. Although any form of radical change tends to face a public backlash when proposed – or 'bikelash' in a newly-coined cycling advocates' term for opposition to cycle engineering – proposals for reallocating road space away from car circulation and car parking are becoming more common, and enjoying gradually increasing generalised levels

of support, and with this experience is accumulating on how to avoid the planning and design pitfalls which tend to come with any new change.

At time of writing, 2016, technology has enabled a sharing of transport services, obviating the need to own the equipment. Not only can smart phones tell users train, bus and plane arrival and departure times, they can enable users to share or hire a bike or car. Total 'vehicle kilometres travelled', the ball-park indicator which in previous years has generally trended upwards (thus providing a solid underpinning of the road-building industry's established direction) has for up to the past ten years been static (or even declining) in many countries. Adolescents no longer aspire so much to car ownership as a 'rite of passage' to adulthood (their numbers taking driving tests have tended to show a decline), and the car's public perception has changed radically since the 1960s from 'passport to a better future' or 'status symbol' to an awkward burden people wish they didn't need to bear. These relatively new trends are already shaking transport planning to its foundations – albeit, this book argues, in a positive direction.

This book concludes with pointers as to how we – public policy makers, urban and transport planning professionals, and an interested general public – should respond.

We should 'reclaim' a more 'Theistic', humanised view of urban and transport planning – or as the Maori proverb says, "*What's the most important thing? It is people, it is people, it is people".* This means reversing the late 19th and early 20th century philosophical 'baggage' which gave us a mindset that urban and transport planning should be based around impersonal dream-like plans for remodelling cities, or theoretical concepts of urban form conceived in isolation from a wider public, and back to a dialogue with what lay people (as distinct from planning theorists) actually want.

On transport, rather than meeting demand for car movement, with anything else fitted around it (where the private car accessibility is not too adversely affected), we need to reverse the priority order – planning first for people on foot and cycles, building public transport around that, planning our urban form around these priorities, and as last priority planning for motorised transport to 'fill in the gaps', as services rather than a mass-ownership ubiquitous key to a higher quality of life. Related to this, we should capitalise on an already-emerging trend away from ownership of cars in favour of hiring or sharing them, with technology such as smart phones and autonomous (driverless) vehicles opening up further possibilities to see motorised transport transformed from the basis of our transport planning, to a new supportive role alongside the higher 'people-based' and 'place-making' priorities of walking and cycling.

In this scenario public transport would play a more central supportive role, although again with 'smart' or 'autonomous' technology opening up further possibilities in the forms this type of transport might take. In this rethinking of public transport, the 'place-making' advantages of 'transit-oriented' planning of urban centres also needs to be taken into account.

A full and comprehensive 'taking stock' of how we use urban places needs to be consciously addressed. This will show up some surprises, and prominent in this is likely to be significantly increased selectivity in providing for movement and parking of motor vehicles. For example, rather than asking what the 'demand' will be for parking (on-street or off-street) and then thinking we 'must' provide it (or face economic oblivion), we need to ask what the best use of the available space is – among a wide range of possible alternatives – remembering the opportunity cost of the

land use involved; economic and agglomeration effects of the different land use options; and that in real terms there is no such thing as 'free' parking (Shoup, 1997).

In all of this rethinking of urban and transport planning, technology and theoretical concepts must be servants, not the basic focus of our planning. Above all, in our priorities, "*It is people, it is people, it is people"*, which matter most.

Book synopsis ends

Some pertinent questions

Pertinent questions have already been raised, in the first section of this paper and in the book synopsis itself. However, since the book text is broader than planning for walking and cycling, and the material has yet to be marshalled around the synopsis, as well as to encourage feedback which will no doubt help in this, the following are given as 'thought-provokers' and 'discussion starters' – on which comments are welcome.

Planning and engineering

Are 'transport planning' and 'engineering' distinctly different professional fields (as the author has maintained above)? If so, what defines each, and for which areas of work should the skills of each be employed? If not, to what extent can one field claim expertise in the other? Whether so or not, what should the relationship be between planners and transport engineers – to what extent can these be combined, and what qualifications/ experience should be required for this?
Also what role do other professional fields, such as 'urban design', have (and, for that matter, what exactly is 'urban design'?)?

Primacy of planning for motorised transport

The author suggests that this is still strongly influential, still conditioned by the view of motorised transport as 'progress' – despite many years of talk (and official statements in support) of such things as 'multi-modal', 'integrated' transport planning/ policies/ strategies, as well as of a 'road user hierarchy' with walking and cycling at its top. Is this the case? Where and how strongly is this view held? Should we accept it as inevitable? Is it changing, will it change, and if so how will it change, in which direction, how quickly, and what influences are likely to bring the change?
Is the wider change in how transport is seen since the closing years of the 20th century (outlined above) making it more likely that a move away from primacy of the car would be politically acceptable (regardless of political party/ 'hue')?

Cycle Network and Route Planning

The 2004 New Zealand guide was called the '*Cycle Network and Route Planning Guide'* (Land Transport NZ, 2004), but does this very title not assume that planning for cycling is largely, or fundamentally, about planning 'networks' of 'cycle routes'? And is this not at least questionable? How central is planning 'cycle route networks' to planning for cycling, and why? What part should it play (if any)? How can this be reconciled with the watchword of the foundational 1977 Geelong Bike Plan (Victorian Government, 1977) that "*every street is a bicycle street*"?
How does 'cycle network and route planning' take account of the '*Five Point Hierarchy of Measures'* (IHT et al, 1996) priority given to reducing and slowing motor traffic? Despite respectable foundational cycle route network precedents (e.g. Delft, Geelong, Greater Melbourne, all 1970s/ 1980s) do not these precedents pre-date (so-called) 'integrated transport planning', and

thus suffer from failing to relate to planning for general motorised transport (still based as it is largely on the through-traffic/ local-access road hierarchy distinction and classic Chicago 1930s, as subsequently further refined, "*four-stage traffic modelling"*)?
Is there any way of 'planning for cycling' other than via 'planning cycle route networks', and if so what should this comprise?

Range of actions
The seminal and enormously influential 1977 Geelong Bike Plan (Victorian Government, 1977) postulated that cycling could be helped by "*the four E's": "engineering, enforcement, education and encouragement*". Although the terminology has changed (for example, we may now talk of "*promotion*" or "*travel behaviour change"* more than "*encouragement*") has cycle planning as practiced today changed substantially from the classic Geelong model? And if so, how has it changed and why?
Does 'planning for cycling', as practiced today, interface significantly with planning for other forms of transport (notably, for the car), or does this type of approach rather represent a 'silo', which will be ineffective? If the former, then how does this interface take place, how influential is it, and what are its results?
In other words, does not government action on cycling need to move beyond cycling infrastructure and promotion, to embrace programmes and areas of action which are not specifically 'cycling' programmes at all? If so, what should these comprise, how should this be done, and who in government and/ or the professional world will do this?

Planning for walking
The surge in government interest and action on cycling in recent years does not seem to have been matched by corresponding attention to walking – or has it? If not, how serious is this omission? If serious, then how, given its seriousness, could this omission have come about, and why?
Also, what should government action on walking comprise? Given its strong role in 'place-making' and face-to-face interaction, is planning 'walking networks' an inappropriate approach, and if so what should replace it? What changes, if any, would need to be made in planning for cycling, and/ or planning for other forms of transport, in order to appropriately addressing planning for walking – bearing in mind that walking is higher than cycling in the classic 'road user hierarchy'?

Comments invited; progress to publication

A 'default publisher' has been identified, although further publication options are being explored. The aim is for an 'interested lay' as well potential 'professional' and/ or 'academic' audiences.

Some restructuring of existing material, and further writing, will no doubt have taken place by the July conference, but the book draft will not have been completed – and intentionally not. Input is invited from those reading this paper, or who have heard the conference presentation. In parallel with further book writing, various conversations and site visits are currently 'testing' the appropriateness of the draft book material and will 'fill it out'. It is also likely that there will be further peer review input to a revised draft by Associate Professor Christine Cheyne.

As for publication date, this cannot be foreseen at this stage, but in the words of the *Mastermind* TV show host, "*I've started so I'll finish".*

The author declares no competing financial interest.

References

Boulter, R (2000), *Into The Mainstream: Final Report of the New Zealand Cycling Strategy Foundation Project,* unpublished.

Darwin, C (1859), *On the origin of species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life,* London.

Franklin, J (1999), "Two decades of the Redway cycle paths in Milton Keynes", *Traffic Engineering and Control* on www.cyclecraft.co.uk/digest/2decades.html

Her Majesty's Stationary Office, (1963), *Traffic in Towns,* London.

Institution of Highways and Transportation, Bicycle Association, Cyclists' Touring Club and Department of Transport (1996), *Cycle-Friendly Infrastructure: Guidelines for Planning and Design,* London.

Land Transport New Zealand (2004), *New Zealand Cycle Network and Route Planning Guide,* Wellington.

Miller, C. (2007), *The Unsung Profession: A History of the New Zealand Planning Institute 1946-2002,* New Zealand Planning Institute, Auckland..

Nietzsche, F. (1883-91), *Thus Spake Zarathustra, a book for all or none,* Chemnitz.

Shoup, D (1997), "The High Cost of Free Parking*", Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 17(1), pp 3-20, Los Angeles

Standing Committee on Trunk Road Assessment (SACTRA), (1994), *Trunk roads and the generation of Traffic,* London.

Victorian Government (1977), *Geelong Bikeplan*, Melbourne.

Voltaire (1768), letter addressed to author of 'The Three Imposters', personal communication.

Weber, M (1905), *Die Protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus*

Wellington Regional Council (sic), (1992) *Greater Wellington Area Transport Study*.