

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

From:

Received: 27/03/2018 7:24 a.m.

To: ECInfo; Mailbox Customer Services

Subject: Re: RE: Website footer contact form: #3765

H hebe,
thanks for your confirmation of receipt.
My address details are
made public.

I don't wish to be heard and I don't wish to have my my name

Many thanks,

Name *

**Email
Address**

*

**Contact
Number**

*

Enquiry type * Website feedback

Type your enquiry here *

Hi there, I'm trying to make a formal submission to the LTP 2018-2028, but am getting a 500 server error on https://consult-ecan.objective.com/common/event/answer_questionnaire.jsp.

here is the contents of my submission on the Public Transport Options.

Selected = Option 4 - none of the above.

I find all three of ECan's proposals hopelessly myopic when considered as a long term plan. Public transport, in my view is a public service, not something to be run within the constraints of a commercially viable enterprise, however arbitrary these constraints are. I would support an alternative approach not presented here that devotes more funds to improve Canterbury's Public Transport network from others sources of revenue rather than service users or general rates increases.

As the commentary in the <<plan>> details, I've also noticed an increase in private vehicle use since the 2011 earthquakes as the population around Canterbury has coped with and adapted to massive upheavals to regular life. Anecdotally, its just too easy and cheap to use private vehicles in and around Christchurch. Parking is cheap or free, journey times are pretty dependable and congestion is manageable, for now. However I'm aware that congestion and journey times will worsen unless we either build more network capacity for private vehicles or work to improve the reliabilty and usability of Public Transport (PT) in Canterbury. I've been heartened by Christchurch City Council's (CCC) commitment to building new Active Transport (AT) infrastructure with its Major Cycle Routes programme. And as a ratepayer I'd much rather be paying for more cost effective PT and AT infrastructure than

more expensive private vehicle infrastructure.

But how to fund improving the PT network? Chasing a target farebox recovery rate of 50% is a fallacy in current Canterbury environment. While the the recovery rate in Canterbury has improved over the last 4 years (1) even PT powerhouses Wellington and Auckland are still perilously close to this target level, and if we are to continue in this manner its likely we'll see the network pruned to something that poor coverage and poor levels of service, especially to the patrons that this service would benefit the most.

I'd like to see ECan take a more active approach to improving the PT network in Canterbury as a whole—there's only one provider of a bus service to Ashburton, and it runs at pretty inconvenient times—and explore ways to fund it such as surcharging parking in population centres that the network serves, regional fuel taxes or other such methods to have private vehicle users pay more of their fair share of cost to maintain the roading network in Canterbury.

1) <http://www.transport.govt.nz/ourwork/tmif/accesstothetransportsystem/am023/>

Referring <https://www.ecan.govt.nz/>

URL
