

From: David Hawke <secretary.hra@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 19 March 2018 8:18 p.m.
To: Mailroom Mailbox
Subject: LTP SUBMISSION
Attachments: Submission ECAN LTP 2018v4.pdf

Hi

Please find attached a submission from Halswell Residents Association for ECan's Long-Term Plan.

I am the Secretary, and my address is 135 Halswell Junction Road, Christchurch 8025.

We would like to present our submission at the hearing.

Sincerely
David Hawke
Secretary
Halswell Residents Association (Inc.)

Phone: 021 0854 0215



Halswell
RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION (inc)

The Chairman:
448 Wigram Road,
CHRISTCHURCH, 8025

Submission: Long-Term Plan 2018-2028 (Canterbury Regional Council)

Date: 19 March 2018

Standing: Halswell Residents Association (Inc.) is an incorporated society and a registered charity, and represents the interests of people in Halswell. Activities are largely carried out by a Committee of 6-8 members, which holds monthly meetings open to the public. Submissions such as this are circulated to our mailing list for comment, then minuted and formally approved at our monthly meetings. The Association Chairperson is John Bennett; the Secretary is David Hawke and the Treasurer is Matthew Shallcrass. The Association can be contacted by email at chair.HRA@gmail.com

Executive Summary

- The Long-Term Plan 2018-2028 (the “Plan”) lacks clear, measurable and potentially effective steps that ECAN intends to take over the next 10 years to improve public transport (and transport generally) in greater Christchurch. The Plan needs to be revised to include these steps.
- The Plan ignores the inclusion of safety in NZTA’s 2015-2019 priorities, even though NZTA is a key stakeholder and Christchurch has a poor crash record in relation to other similarly-sized cities. The Plan needs to be revised to reflect NZTA’s priorities.
- Data collected by Halswell Residents Association show that morning peak hour buses are full and run excessively late but nevertheless carry a substantial proportion of commuters.
- Proposed fare increases and the Total Mobility Subsidy decrease should be removed.



A comprehensive public transport system is fundamental to the health of our community, but this Plan fails to address key issues under the direct control or influence of Environment Canterbury.

Detailed Submission

1. Our primary interest in ECAN’s Long-Term Plan is in the area of public transport (PT). We see PT as being fundamental to our community for the following reasons:
 - a. Catching the bus provides opportunities for unplanned, random meetings with friends and acquaintances from the neighbourhood, thereby strengthening the community;
 - b. A successful PT system decreases congestion, thereby reducing the need for road widening that can destroy communities. A decrease in congestion also shortens journey time and improves journey time predictability for other road users;
 - c. Running a car costs a large amount in both running and fixed costs, which are a burden for many in the community. A comprehensive PT system should remove this burden;
 - d. PT is good for our environment, at a time when our society needs to be decreasing its climate change footprint.

2. The Plan fails to state how and why PT fits into the wider transport infrastructure. The tables “Programme 1 – Regional Transport” (p41, working document) and “Programme 2 – Urban Development” (pp42-43) propose a list of reports and plans, rather than actions that will advance the objective of “enabling a resilient, multi-modal transport system for the efficient movement of people and freight into, and out of, and within the Canterbury region” (p39).
 - a. We appreciate that transport plans from other agencies and committees might take a multi-modal look at transport, but ECAN is the agency responsible for PT and we had expected a detailed statement as to how they will evolve the place of PT over the next 10 years. Stating that another committee (the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee) is investigating PT does not constitute a Plan.
 - b. We recognise that plans and strategies are important, but the Plan places an undue reliance on these documents. Implementation is fundamental; for example, the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy should have guided resilient and sustainable development but has failed to be implemented (Salmon 2015).
 - c. Furthermore, issues around long and unpredictable PT journey times are increasing but have been known for many years, and have been highlighted by various interest groups (including us). The committees, plans, strategies and reports engaged by ECAN and other agencies have gotten our city nowhere. We recommend a trip at peak hour on the Orbiter bus along Whiteleigh Avenue, or on the Route 60 bus along Selwyn Street to bring home to this Council the ineptitude of responses to date.

3. The overarching headline statement that appears intended to guide the Plan “Enabling a resilient, multi-modal transport system for the efficient movement of people and freight into, out of, and within the Canterbury region” (p39) is missing the safety dimension that is part of NZTA’s 2015-2019 priorities. (These are given at <http://nzta.govt.nz/about-us/news-and-media/keeping-connected/new-priorities-for-the-transport-agency/> .)
 - a. Given the importance of NZTA as a key stakeholder and funder, we had expected ECAN’s priorities to match those of NZTA, and for these priorities to be reflected in the Plan.
 - b. Christchurch has the rates of casualties and of crashes in Christchurch are among the worst in the country, and are not decreasing. Data from the Ministry of Transport:

Year	City	Crashes/10,000 population	Casualties/10,000 population
2015	Christchurch	22	28
	Wellington	14	17
	Auckland	20	24
2014	Christchurch	23	28

	Wellington	16	18
	Auckland	17	22
2013	Christchurch	23	28
	Wellington	16	19
	Auckland	19	23

In light of these statistics, we find it very strange that ECAN has chosen to ignore safety in the framing of its Plan.

- c. A key attribute of PT is its safety. Increasing fares as proposed in the Plan will inevitably decrease patronage, pushing users into less safe modes of travel. (There is a strong international literature on the effect of fare increases on patronage levels.)
4. Being a “Plan”, we had expected to find concrete steps listed for the next 10 years that address the challenges in patronage numbers (p44).
 - a. All that we could find is a paragraph (p44) stating the need for a “short-term solution to the financial situation” as a committee of all the local stakeholders takes a “longer term look at the future of public transport services”. In our view, listing some options for fare increases and stating a role for a committee is not a Plan – it is an avoidance of a Plan.
 - b. The table “Programme 3 – Public Transport” (p45) lists six targets, but provides no clear indication as to how and when these targets are going to be met over the next ten years.
 - c. Halswell Residents Association believes that ECAN needs to be more innovative in its approach to fare pricing and patronage. Lakes District Council has recently dropped its fares in Queenstown to \$2 and seen its patronage go from 41,000 in January 2017 to 100,000 in January 2018 (<https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/101901204/ritchies-buys-properties-in-queenstown-to-accommodate-bus-drivers>).
 5. Halswell Residents Association had been expecting the Plan to summarise the relevant data that will provide the framework for future decision making around PT. While we accept and understand the roles of various multi-agency committees, we cannot understand why this data summary was not provided.
 6. Our association has been gathering data since August 2017, in anticipation of this Plan and the upcoming three-yearly review of public transport routes. Our data collection has focused on the Halswell/Wigram/Addington area, because Halswell is a dormitory suburb and many people in Halswell travel toward through other suburbs (such as Addington) toward other inner suburbs (such as Riccarton) and the central city. We have collected the following, and they are available to ECAN on request:
 - a. Traffic counts (including vehicle occupancy) during the morning peak (0745-0845) on Lincoln Road at the intersection with Whiteleigh Avenue;
 - b. Bus boarding and alighting numbers for Orange Line and route 60 at morning peak during school term, during school holiday time, and off-peak;
 - c. Bus arrival time for the above services at the Central City Bus Exchange;
 - d. A survey of Halswell residents taken from a link off the Halswell Community Facebook page, which we presented last time ECAN proposed raising fares.
 7. These data show the following:

- a. Of traffic proceeding through Addington, 78% of people were in cars, around 12% were on the bus, 9% were on bikes and 1% were walking. Importantly, the four buses (Orange Line runs every 15 min) were full or nearly so;
 - b. Despite being full, the bus operator does not routinely run three-axle buses for all Orange Line services at this time so that many people are standing for much of the journey;
 - c. The route 60 bus runs every 30 min during the 0745-0845 peak, and the bus we sampled (a three-axle bus) had people standing for much of the journey;
 - d. Both Orange Line and route 60 buses run on-time during off-peak hours but very late during the morning peak. For example, the route 60 bus we surveyed arrived 28 min late for a nominally 36 min journey;
 - e. Overwhelming opposition to any fare increase.
8. Furthermore, “park-and-ride” has long been widely accepted as a potentially important contributor to the transport system in Christchurch, but nothing of significance seems to happen.
- a. In the Longhurst subdivision of Halswell, local businesses have complained about cars being parked outside all day. It turns out that these cars are parked there so that the owners can catch the Orange Line to the central city. In other words, they have their own informal “park-and-ride” in the absence of any action by either ECAN or City Council.
9. Cr Anne Galloway (City Councillor, Halswell Ward) runs a six-weekly Halswell Community Forum that includes people from youth and migrant communities, Halswell Community Project, and Halswell Residents Association.
- a. In our January 2018 meeting, we discussed barriers to PT use. Fare pricing was a common theme, but a representative of the migrant community stated that many in her community lack the confidence to use the bus.
 - b. People on our mailing list have come up with various ways of addressing both these issues. These ideas include gold-coin fares e.g. at particular times of day, and “freedom of the city” days every so often so that the less confident can get the idea of how the system works. Another respondent suggested that a more comprehensive availability of multi-lingual timetable information would be a simple, low-cost way to start addressing the lack of confidence of those in the migrant community. These ideas all have in common a concerned and innovative approach, which we find totally lacking in ECAN’s approach to PT.
 - c. Halswell Residents Association has also met with two of our local MPs (Ruth Dyson MP, and Nuk Korako MP), to explore the challenges they see for the Halswell community. Both MPs independently highlighted the need to better integrate migrant communities into local decision making. ECAN needs to include ways of doing this engagement in their Plan.
10. The Total Mobility Subsidy is fundamentally important to the less mobile in our community. Typically these people have mobility that is sufficiently impaired to prevent use of the bus or of a private car, or the place where they live is not serviced by public transport.
- a. Many of these people also live in considerably straightened financial circumstances, and we are therefore really disappointed to see a reduction in the maximum subsidy from \$35 to \$30.
 - b. Furthermore, this subsidy is occurring at a time when the urban footprint is increasing and costs potentially increasing as a result.
 - c. The level of the subsidy compares poorly with other centres, particularly Wellington (\$40) and Hamilton (\$30).
 - d. We request that the subsidy remain at its present level of \$35 maximum.

11. We conclude that:

- a. There is no spare capacity during peak times for more people to catch the bus;
- b. Bus journey times during peak times do not bear any resemblance to the timetable;
- c. A fare increase will substantially disadvantage people in our community;
- d. Significant sections of our community need to be better engaged so that their PT needs are met;
- e. ECAN needs to take a more innovative approach to boosting PT accessibility and utilisation;
- f. ECAN needs to engage urgently with City Council about planning and implementing roading improvements (such as bus priority lanes) that will improve bus predictability;
- g. ECAN needs to engage urgently with City Council about planning and implementing park-and-ride schemes;
- h. There is no long-term vision or planning for the growth of greater Christchurch, at ECAN or the other agencies involved in transport planning.

12. A fit-for-purpose Long-Term Plan will provide a “road map” for:

- a. Inclusion as safety as a key underpinning parameter guiding transport planning;
- b. Matching bus size and service frequency to demand during peak times;
- c. A possible search for yet larger buses to service peak time demand;
- d. Working with City Council on an implementation timetable of roading network measures to allow buses to adhere to reasonable and expected journey times;
- e. Engaging with migrant and youth communities about how PT might better meet their needs;
- f. Implementing information systems such as a roll-out of more real-time displays at bus stops;
- g. Implementing multi-modal transport systems involving PT;
- h. Planning the role of PT in getting people from the SW of greater Christchurch (including Prebbleton, Lincoln, Rolleston as well as Halswell, Wigram etc.) to the city.

13. We request that the Long-Term Plan be rejected as it stands and sent for a re-write, as outlined in paragraphs 11 and 12 above.