

## Make Submission

<b>Consultee</b>	Mr Ken Maynard (76843)
<b>Email Address</b>	LyttCA@gmail.com
<b>Company / Organisation</b>	Lyttelton Community Association Inc
<b>Address</b>	83 Canterbury St Lyttelton 8082
<b>Event Name</b>	Long-Term Plan 2018-28 Consultation
<b>Submission by</b>	Lyttelton Community Association Inc (Mr Ken Maynard - 76843)
<b>Submission ID</b>	2018-28 LTP -1136
<b>Response Date</b>	24/03/18 2:29 PM
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Transport and Urban Development ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

### Transport and Urban Development Support/Oppose

See page 13 of the Consultation Document.

**Please select one of the following:** I generally agree with the activity proposed for Transport and Urban Development.

### Transport and Urban Development Comments

#### Please provide any comments

The grand plan of 'enabling a resilient multi-modal transport system' is certainly needed. There is almost no detail about how any of this is going to be achieved, and it is of concern that the detail when developed might not actually support this 'motherhood' statement. The one part which has some detail concerns bus routes, which you propose to disable rather than enable. Proposals for providing passenger rail services to the north and south over existing track have had cold water poured on them in the past. One might add that a (light) rail link to the airport would be advantageous. Other cities (London, Sydney, Brisbane, Melbourne) resisted such schemes, but eventually provided them when congestion got the better of them. I challenge you to name a city whose airport link proved to be a white elephant! We should be planning for the future, not reacting unwillingly to energy-sapping congestion once it is with us.

The rail proposal has been dismissed out of hand because (a) there is too much freight traffic and (b) Christchurch station is in the wrong place. No effort appears to have been made to solve these problems, but rather an apparent sigh of relief that the passenger rail proposal could be made to go away.

(a) Most freight travels at night. Most passengers travel in the day. The capacity of the line could be increased considerably with modern signalling to increase traffic density. The rail network used to have an efficient wireless-controlled signalling system. This was replaced by a cumbersome manual system, where a controller radios the loco engineer, and gives him permission to enter a section. The permit is written down, and the loco engineer descends to the track, and manually sets the points and signals, remounts the loco and drives on. This is repeated at each section. Such a system is not conducive to high traffic operations, but it could be restored to its former glory, preferably accompanied by an enquiry about why the better system was allowed to be removed. The London Underground manages a train every 2 minutes, but not with the driver working the points himself.

(b) The station is in the wrong place. It is located for the convenience of the railway junction rather than the passengers. Thirty years ago in Manchester, they got a new tram system. The rolling stock at the touch of a button could be 'rigged for track' or 'rigged for street'. This meant that the multi-unit tram could travel at relatively high speeds along railway track to serve remoter parts, but could deliver passengers to multiple stops in the city centre when in street mode. Perhaps CCC could be convinced that a real tram system could be implemented, rather than the toy train which goes round in a circle to entertain tourists. Christchurch once had an enviable network extending to Victoria Park in the Port Hills and out to Ferrymead. All this costs money. Grant Robertson recently said that much needs to be done to improve the infrastructure of New Zealand to encourage tourism as a significant revenue earner. He mentioned 'public/private partnerships' as a way forward. This should be seriously considered.

The Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee is presumably intended to ensure that the plans of CCC and ECan mesh together properly. I am not sure that it does. Looking at CCC's actions, it would appear that the vision is of a city of cyclists and pedestrians, an acknowledgement of public transport, and discouragement of private cars. The ECan view is to kill off public transport if it doesn't pay, which forces many people to use cars. With an increasingly ageing population, cycling and even walking far may not be attractive to many. The priorities of CCC and ECan don't seem to match. We need a proper, funded, integrated plan, not two plans pushed uneasily together.

## Make Submission

<b>Consultee</b>	Mr Ken Maynard (76843)
<b>Email Address</b>	LyttCA@gmail.com
<b>Company / Organisation</b>	Lyttelton Community Association Inc
<b>Address</b>	83 Canterbury St Lyttelton 8082
<b>Event Name</b>	Long-Term Plan 2018-28 Consultation
<b>Submission by</b>	Lyttelton Community Association Inc (Mr Ken Maynard - 76843)
<b>Submission ID</b>	2018-28 LTP -1134
<b>Response Date</b>	24/03/18 2:17 PM
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Public Transport Options ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

### Public Transport Options

Public Transport is one of the programmes in the Transport and Urban Development portfolio. For the first year of the Long-Term Plan 2018-28 we are proposing changes to the Public Transport programme as outlined in the **Consultation Document**.(on page 14)

To make comment on the Public Transport proposed changes please complete the selection panel below.

To make comment on the the whole Transport and Urban Development portfolio, please use the tab on the left.

**Please review the options in the Consultation Document and indicate which option you support:** Option 4 – none of the above. (Please provide comment/ideas for an alternative solution)

### Public Transport Comments

#### Please provide any comments.

It is disappointing to see that all of your proposed options involve axing the least-used routes. A better approach would be to encourage more use to increase patronage. Extending rather than shrinking services might help. For example, extend the 535 from Rapaki to Governors Bay. Also extend the timetable to provide a later service. You say 'public transport is a key part of connecting communities and enabling work and social travel'. How does stopping the service at 7pm, or if you get your way, stopping it altogether 'enable social travel'? A number of commenters on social media say that it's cheaper to take the car than the bus. I find that hard to believe, but the misconception and revenue

raising could be addressed the same way: have a levy on parking meters, and on car parking. Mr Wilson's enterprises spring to mind. Those who do not wish to subsidise bus travellers could switch to bus travel, and have someone subsidise them instead. The proposal would no doubt be dismissed by some as impractical as it would require a law change - well, if so, get it changed. The government has changed and would be more sympathetic. Others would say it would need the co-operation of CCC. Well, get the co-operation. Ecan and CCC are both on the Joint Committee. We need more travellers, not fewer buses. Christchurch people need to be disabused of the notion that buses are 'loser cruisers', which won't be easy!