
From: midhurst.sarah@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, 25 March 2018 11:55 p.m.
To: Mailroom Mailbox
Subject: LTP SUBMISSION
Attachments: Submission on Ecan LTP March 2018.docx

Sarah Walters
143 Midhurst Road
Aylesbury
RD 1 Christchurch 7671

midhurst.sarah@gmail.com
027 270 1215

I wish to attend a hearing.

Submission on Ecan LTP March 2018 – Sarah Walters

Regional Leadership – I support the need to co-ordinate and provide leadership across the region so that a cohesive, well-supported and evidence-driven approach can be taken across the Canterbury region. However I intensely dislike the term “natural resources” in nearly every context, including this one – resource implies something to be used (“a source of supply, support, or aid, especially one that can be readily drawn upon when needed” according to dictionary.com). Our precious natural environment is not a “resource” to be used, but a fragile and irreplaceable ecosystem and should be recognised as such.

Freshwater Management – Again referred to as a “resource” to be used, not the “clear colourless tasteless odourless liquid that is essential for plant and animal life” as defined by Collins dictionary. We can all survive without gold, silver, platinum, diamonds and even oil, but none of us can survive without water. Of course you need to be proactive in managing water, but it is as much a matter of fixing up the problems of many, many years of abuse as it is preventing ongoing abuse. I have no doubt more could be done faster if there was will to so. So yes, it is a priority so do good things, but not at the expense of other areas - the opportunity to have the most impact economically, environmentally, socially and culturally is sorting out transport issues, but this is not well recognised. It is also a far bigger portion of budget (\$31.2M vs \$70.2M), but still a poor underdog.

Biosecurity Changes – I support the proposed changes to funding and governance of pest management, as well as the change of focus from production pests to all pests. These problems will only get worse without ongoing commitment (that’s why they’re pests!). I would also like to see increased controls on the planting of Pinus species in areas where they are likely to cause future problems – again a leadership opportunity across regional and district planning.

Air Quality – I support the proposed changes to the Revenue and Financing Policy to assist homeowners to improve their heating and insulation. However, there will still be many households that will not be able to afford this scheme and other options need to be available as well (eg. working with other agencies to help very low-income households, providing flexible approaches).

I also don’t agree with the statement that rural burn-offs only contribute to poor air quality during the summer months. There are many longer, slower, often very smoky, vegetation burn-offs at other times of the year. Spraying of farm effluent, while not such an issue for particulates, also contributes to poor air quality and can be more of a problem in the winter.

Why is there no recognition that transport has an impact on air quality?

I would also note research that shows that domestic products have a significant impact on air quality – from a recent article in *The Press* - “Shampoo, oven cleaner, deodorant and other household products are as significant a source of the most dangerous form of air pollution as cars, research has found” ... “PM2.5 particles are one of the biggest global air pollution concerns. Scientists who had blamed them mainly on traffic realised they could not account for measured air quality levels simply by looking at car emissions, however.

They estimated that in Los Angeles, as much as 50 per cent of VOCs came from domestic products, and said there was no reason why the research would not be replicated in other cities.”

Health in All Policies (HIAP) – Ecan is a signatory to this policy, but I didn’t see any reference to it in the LTP summary document. This impacts across the board but is perhaps particularly relevant to air and water quality, urban planning and transport. Has this policy been well considered in the development of other activities and priorities? It doesn’t appear that it has.

Transport – the last minutes of the Regional Transport Committee meetings available on the website are 24th June 2016. They seem to have been made available for all the previous meetings since late 2012 – why are they no longer available? I understand the current committee no longer includes non-voting expert advisors (previously environmental sustainability, public health, economic, and safety). I don't know why this is, but during my time on the committee (Selwyn District Council representative 2013 – 2016) I found their input and knowledge to be a worthwhile and helpful contribution. Is there still support for active and passenger transport? How is road safety supported through the committee? Do they still have presentations from external parties to help in their knowledge and decision making?

In the briefing paper to the incoming committee dated 24th February 2017, it was noted that “There is, in particular, an opportunity for the RTC to increase its strategic role.” Is this opportunity being followed up on? How?

During my time on the committee I pushed for a more comprehensive, integrated and well informed Regional Land Transport Plan than the sub-standard effort our committee had earlier accepted, and I was pleased to see this (the current plan) adopted in mid-2016. The vision encapsulated in the plan remained that “Canterbury has an accessible, affordable, integrated, safe, resilient and sustainable transport system” and I call on the current councillors to commit to that vision. I have attached as appendix 1 a summary of the issues and options identified in that plan as a reminder to the current councillors of their leadership role in this important area as it doesn't appear that this role is given the importance it should have.

Public Transport – In your summary document you ask the question “What would a great public transport service look like?” My response – not what you propose. How well does this meet the statement from the front page of the transport section of your website? “We want everyone to have access to a safe and affordable transport network. Canterbury's network has been built over generations and provides us with access to economic and social opportunities. Our region is constantly changing and our growing population demands ongoing investment.”

However, I am pleased to see that the minutes of the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee (GCPTWG) are available on your website as their availability previously has been sporadic. I am also pleased to see that Canterbury District Health Board representative Dr Anna Stevenson has been included as a member of this committee as this supports the “HiAP” approach.

I believe there are major shortcomings in your proposals for public transport:

- The Regional Public Transport Plan has not been completed in time to be considered for this LTP round. Already there are several funding and other issues (eg. central city shuttle trial) that have been identified but unless they are considered now will be difficult to implement. It is very disappointing to see that this work which was already underway in 2016 has not been completed. Perhaps due to lack of resourcing or to the lack of continuity in your committee representatives?
- I have been involved in public transport issues at a governance level for many years through the Public Transport Advisory Group, more latterly the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Working Group and finally the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee, as well as through the wider Transport portfolio. Over this time I have seen some changes and improvements to the services offered, but also many missed opportunities. What is happening with the Public Transport Advisory Group as there doesn't appear to have been any consultation ahead of the LTP?

- While I was on the GCPTJC we were advised that the routes would undergo a full review by an international expert. I don't know what has happened, but even without being an international expert or doing a full review I can suggest several problems with the current network and its inability to fully service the Greater Christchurch area. Many of these have already been raised but there has been no recognition of this.
- I don't have sufficient knowledge to comment on the "financial viability" of the routes proposed for removal, but the circumstances of their removal without an overview of the entire network fully reflects what it is – an entirely knee-jerk financial decision.
- Every single one of the issues and options listed in Appendix 1 is strengthened or enhanced by a strong public transport network and the stated aims are not met without it.
- I agree with the statement in your LTP summary that "A resilient, multi-modal transport system does much more than move people and goods. It limits the environmental impact of transport; improves social connectedness and wellbeing in communities; supports visitor strategies and tourism; enables a strong economy; and improves road safety." Public transport does all of that on its own, but its importance is not recognised to the extent it should be and the key objective for the LTP timeframe is to restore the financial position of the network. Really?
- Large facilities purchased as a community provide a better service at a cheaper cost than the service purchased as an individual – not many people could afford a large park or sports field for their backyard, a library stocked with thousands of books and other services and an Olympic swimming pool, but as a community we can pool our resources and provide access to these facilities at a reasonable cost – public transport is the same.
- Given the important role public transport (under) plays in the current transport network and the significant benefits active and public transport users provide, especially over the many negatives of single occupancy private vehicles, we should all be recognising and enhancing the service not treating PT users as sub-standard second-class citizens. A higher contribution of rates to subsidise public transport rather than subsidise private car use is a good investment – it makes a nonsense of the proposal to "hike" the \$25 example used in your summary to \$25.66.
- A good transport network should be fully multi-modal (trip chain) – just as it makes sense to have some freight on trucks and some on trains, it also makes sense for people to be able switch between cars, active and bus (or whatever form PT takes) transport for their travel requirements. Looking at PT as an isolated mode results in what Tom Godefrooij* describes as "System weakness public transport [which] brings you from a place where you are not to a place where you don't need to be (at a time that doesn't suit you)". There have been improvements in the network, but not to the extent there could be.
- The most critical element of PT is reliability – and this requires more investment not less. I was very supportive of the formation of the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee as a means of taking PT in Christchurch to the next level. The potential is there, but it seems in Environment Canterbury the will is less so.
- There are many people, such as myself, who choose public transport as a more environmentally friendly, (sometimes) effective transport choice and I would love to see more well-informed people making that choice. There are also many people who cannot or do not drive, either temporarily or permanently. For many of them public transport is not a nice-to-have alternative option – it is an essential human right. If we are to be a fair-minded and decent society then we need to be far more fair-minded and decent in our support of a fully accessible transport system.
- Though the "well-beings" (environmental, economic, social and cultural) are not currently the purpose of local government, they are very admirable purpose for a good public transport system. Please aim higher!

Appendix 1: Summarising the issues and challenges identified in the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) 2016

- Providing transport options – supporting, and in some cases supplying, a range of transport and non-transport options to ensure the accessibility needs of all people and businesses can be met.
- Supporting freight growth – ensuring the region’s transport system effectively supports economic development and growth in freight volumes by taking a multi-modal and integrated approach.
- Supporting domestic and international visitor growth – developing the transport system to support domestic and international visitor growth and ensure the safety of visitors and other road users.
- Funding and affordability – delivering high quality transport options that meet the needs of all Cantabrians in an affordable manner within the funding available.
- Managing private household vehicle traffic growth – effectively managing traffic growth to ensure that accessibility is maintained and that the region’s economic performance is not adversely affected.
- Improving road safety for all road users – improving safety outcomes for all road users.
- Use of the transport system has implications for the population’s health – ensuring transport makes a positive contribution to the health of Cantabrians
- Managing the environmental impacts of transport – maintaining and improving levels of access and mobility in an environmentally sustainable manner.
- Network security – minimising the risk of disruption on key regional and inter-regional transport routes.
- Meeting the transport needs of dispersed communities – future land use development occurs in a manner that social and economic needs can be met most efficiently and affordably.
- Oil supply security and fuel price volatility – in the short term, ensuring the region is resilient to energy supply and fuel price volatility. In the longer term, moving toward a transportation system that is less reliant on oil.
- Managing the transport impacts of anticipated population change (proportion of population aged 65 and older) – predicting and meeting the needs of a changing population and providing transport that enables access to these.
- Uncertainty about international technology trends – Positioning the region to take advantage of iterative technological advances and being aware of the possibility and likelihood of more disruptive technological advances so that strategy and investment plans can be amended appropriately.
- Earthquake recovery – managing traffic issues as a result of short to medium term land use change whilst targeting major investment on long term strategic network priorities arising from permanent land use changes.

The committee supported a strategic response for the roading system that:

- Looks after what we have through cost effective road maintenance and renewals
- Finishes what we started, like the RoNS programme
- Focuses investment on strategic priorities while enabling local priorities
- Provides more travel choice for people over time, and
- Does things smarter, by making efficient use of existing infrastructure.

Appendix 2: Timeline for adoption of the Regional Public Transport Plan

The indicative timeline for completion of the RPTP is as follows:

- Draft RPTP presented to Joint Public Transport Committee for approval to go to public consultation: 18 July 2018
- Public consultation on the RPTP: August – September 2018
- Public hearings: late September 2018 (dates to be confirmed)
- Draft RPTP approved by Joint Committee: 17 October 2018
- Final RPTP adopted by Environment Canterbury: 8 November 2018

* Dutch Cycling Embassy – Integration of Cycling & Public Transport in The Netherlands, Tom Godefrooij, Copenhagen, 1 October 2012