

**From:** [ECInfo](#)  
**To:** [Mailroom Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Long-Term Plan submission form [#75] EMAIL:05980034  
**Date:** Friday, 10 April 2015 10:24:40 a.m.  
**Importance:** Low

---

Hello Team

This email came in through our Customer Services email. Please can you workflow?

Nga mihi

Tracy

Customer Services

----- Original Message -----

**Received:** 9/04/2015 11:42 p.m.  
**To:** ECInfo; Environment Canterbury; Services Customer; Services Customer;  
Webmaster@ecan.govt.nz  
**Subject:** Long-Term Plan submission form [#75]

Your name \* Brad Williamson

Address \*

Postcode

Contact phone number \*

Mobile number

Email

Date Monday 10 January 1966

Your submission

Regarding Public and Land Transport Policy.

One of Ecans stated goals is to "Increase the use of public transport". This is a commendable goal as the benefits are obvious – less traffic congestion and less money spent on building motorways to alleviate traffic congestion.

However I have a problem with the strategy that Ecan are proposing, which is to support "a behavior-change programme that will encourage more people to get out of their cars and onto a bus". Does Ecan know examples of where this behavior-change has been successful and especially in a NZ context? I only know of it working in Edinburgh, Scotland where the bus service was heavily subsidised with cheap fares and frequent services in a compact city in a more crowded country where the populace have grown up with a greater use of public transport. I believe this strategy will only have limited success in Christchurch and won't provide effective value for money spent. The commissioners should ask themselves: would they honestly use a bus service to get to work themselves. If they wouldn't, why would they believe anyone else would?

Buses generally don't work that well in NZ. People ask, what is the point? You are stuck in the same traffic and you have to walk to and from the bus stops at each end so there is no time saving. And the cost is usually more than the cost of parking. And everyone has a car anyway that costs money to own so we might as well use it rather than leaving it languishing unused at home.

I believe this strategy is flawed and will not be cost effective.

What do you want Environment Canterbury to do?

Ecan should look more seriously at public rail transport into and out of the city. It is well known that large traffic build ups are occurring for vehicles coming into the city from the Northern satellite towns of Kaiapoi and Rangiora as well as the Southwest satellites of Templeton and Rolleston. Since the Christchurch earthquakes and the red zoning of large parts of the Eastern suburbs there has been a large population shift out to these satellite towns. The growth in these areas has been fast and will only continue. Relying on cars and buses will require huge increases in motorway spending which will only shift the traffic problem from one place to another.

There is already a railway infrastructure feeding these areas. In the north the existing rail tracks go through Northcote – Redwood – Belfast – Kaiapoi – Rangiora and out to Amberley. In the south west the tracks go through Hornby – Templeton – Rolleston – Kirwee and out to Darfield. So we just need some commuter trains and good timetables to get it going.

And while we are at it, its time to re-instate a central city station on Moorhouse Ave near Manchester or Colombo St, so that commuters can actually get to their place of work as business starts to migrate back to the centre. A shuttle bus looping around the city may be useful (free as part of the rail ticket).

I think some targeted rail transport is the best solution for our long term transport network and we need to have the vision to start introducing it now.