

From: Juliet Adams <julietruthadams@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 21 March 2018 4:09 p.m.
To: Mailroom Mailbox
Subject: re: LTP SUBMISSION

Categories: Tracey

SUBMISSION ON ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY'S LONG TERM PLAN 21.3.18

I appreciate that Environment Canterbury wishes to secure more funding for "Hazards, Risk and Resilience" because of the increasing and speeding-up demands of coping with the effects of climate change. Therefore a major policy is to cut costs and raise charges and rates wherever possible.

In "Transport and Urban Development" the loss of patronage of the bus service since the quakes is apparently to be handled by the decision to cut costs by discontinuing six routes, and by raising fares/ rates.

For two reasons, I object to all three proposals.

ECAN should be following examples in many countries working on climate change, where the use of cars, especially single-occupant use, is being reduced by increasing public transport services. Auckland and Wellington have already done better than Christchurch in this regard. Reducing emissions from cars by reducing the number of cars, through improving public transport, will help to slow down the speed of climate change. Surely every governing body should be playing its part in this aim. It is too late to stop climate change, but we all, governing bodies and citizens, have a responsibility to slow it down, for the sake of our children's future, and to reduce the costs of mitigation.

The second reason for my objection is financial. If public transport is losing money through a failure to get more customers paying for it, then it will lose more money if fares are increased, routes are discontinued, and citizens know they are paying more in rates for it. Usage will drop further, and so economic losses will be greater.

I suggest that, instead, citizens be encouraged to reduce their use of cars (and so reduce problems of parking space, congestion, threats to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, and lack of exercise causing poor health and more costs) and use public transport more, so avoiding some of the above problems. But simply telling them to do this will not work.

With the long-term view in mind, not just 10 years, I suggest that ECAN should make public transport more attractive and convenient. When we see large buses with few passengers we know the system is not working. When we see elderly/disabled people paying for taxis or having to walk long distances, we know the system is not working.

Why are there so many large buses on most routes? Why does ECAN not change, gradually, to many more of the little red buses on more routes, replacing the large ones, especially at off-peak times, and increasing the frequency of service? Yes, I know that would mean paying for more drivers – but it would help the rising unemployment levels too. The cost of more little red buses would be immediate and substantial, perhaps reduced by selling off excess large buses. But I am sure the increasing patronage by improved frequency and convenience would balance that cost in the long run.

If this change were to be accompanied by widespread promotion of the point that ECAN aims to improve the health of the city, its air, and its citizens, as well as its service, I think more people would use the service.

This is a Long Term Plan. Plan for the long term health of our environment and our people and our economy.

Juliet Adams
34A Voelas Road,
Lyttelton 8082



Virus-free. www.avast.com