

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	380
Response Date	5/04/21 2:06 PM
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4
First name	Tony
Surname	Ireland

Email address

Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation? No, I'm submitting as an individual

Are you willing to tell us more about yourself? Yes

Which age category are you in? 40-64 years old

Which suburb or area do you live in?

Do you think we've prioritised the right issues and opportunities? Yes

Which of the proposed options would you like to see us progress with? Option 1: statutory work, prior commitments and accelerating key initiatives

It is important that we hear what you would like to keep in the plan, what you think should be removed, and anything that you think we have missed?

You have not included a rail option in your transportation section.
I believe you have a city that could well implode,
From observation you do not appear to be creating well paid sustainable Jobs.
I would suggest that once the insurance funded rebuild is complete the economy will contract and will only be sustained by below living cost wages, making housing unaffordable with the resulting population flight.
Or the repopulating of the city with 3rd world operatives.
The plan need to take a long term look at the economic out comes.
Economics has simple fundamentals lower costs or increase income. These values cannot be ignored,

if you do, over time, eventually your economy will collapse and your community with it.
 So this is why your biggest expenditure needs to be carefully scrutinised.
 When we talk about transport we must take an overview, all transport is public transport the roadway is publicly owned we allow private operators on the public space we do not charge for this with the rate of car ownership in NZ this dramatically distorts the economy.
 The massive infrastructure vehicle operation involves, comes at considerable cost which is not described in a transparent manner, The supermarket carpark is paid for by all customers whether they are car owners or not this is a major impost on supermarket prices councils demand that supermarkets provide Parking.
 So this is where proper analyses of the economics of transport must be studied and where so called public transport funding comes in.
 Public transport should be funded by what it saves in a society, and the benefit it brings, not what it costs.
 Firstly by removing vehicles off the road the roads become service lanes this means the unimpeded movement of Goods and services if these groups do not move freely this will result in major economic costs.
 Secondly large groups of society are screen based in their work and leisure these groups cannot and should not operate a vehicle at the same time by allowing these groups to maintain screen connection will result in significant economic benefits as their travel time will remain productive what's more this group are an important contributor to your economy improving their output is essential.
 Thirdly transport needs to be based around a track base spine this could be achieved in Canterbury using existing tracks. Track based transportation is not dependent on the irregularities of the road network, it can be made completely timely this is another benefit to your economy. By reducing appointment time, and reducing failed appointments produces further efficiency's.
 And then there is vehicle infrastructure what is the real cost? It operates in a combination of private and public owned spaces and until only recently benefitted the world's largest corporations whose patronage of the popular narrative ensured true costs have been obscured and ignored.
 Schroup the Head of planning at UCLA quotes in his book 'The High cost of free parking' the cost of parking to housing as 20/20 being 20% of the cost and 20% of the land use, a significant amount, in NZ it's worse, the last development I was involved with, the vehicle infrastructure cost 45% of the development cost.
 And then there is the human cost last year 30 pedestrians were killed nationwide an appalling figure that is more than died of covid and five times that of Australia.
 ACC distorts this cost, the insurance industry gives the cost of death at \$8 Million this figure needs to be included in transport costs.
 Add the well documented benefits to Global warming, and the environment funding for transport should be a no brainer as it's best for the economy.

Do you generally support the activities proposed in the following portfolios:

Water and Land	Yes
Biodiversity and Biosecurity	Yes
Climate Change and Community Resilience	Yes
Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development	Yes

Do you have any further comments on the activities proposed in specific portfolio/s (please select all those you wish to comment on):

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable for your household? Option 1 is affordable

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

An explanation of affordability is needed population will not complain about rate increases if they can see benefits

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable as a whole for the Canterbury community? Yes

Do you support the changes we're proposing to how we apply Uniform Annual General Charges? Yes

Would you support the use of borrowing for operating expenditure to offset some of the first year rates? Yes

Any further comments on the use of borrowing for operating expenditure?

Rail transport is capital intensive at the onset but reduces over time, borrowing can offset excessive rate increases.

Do you support the rationale and proposed changes in the draft Fees and Charges Policy? Yes

Where do you live in Canterbury? Select your district below: Christchurch city including Banks Peninsula

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Kaikoura

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Hurunui

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waimakariri

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Christchurch

- . Using aquifer recharge to manage freshwater quality
- . Other initiative/s (please specify)

Other initiative/s (please specify) Christchurch

Not sure of on-demand transport sounds unsustainable.
Aquifer recharges sounds dubious Brisbane city council reduced water consumption by 30% it is not difficult.

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Selwyn

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Ashburton

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Mackenzie

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Timaru

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waimate

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waitaki

if you would like to give feedback via video, add a link to a downloadable YouTube clip or Dropbox file below

If I need to answer questions in regards to my submission. I am prepared to do so if required, I am not sure of the format.

Do you wish to speak to your submission? Yes

We may use your phone number to contact you to arrange attendance at a hearing. This information will be kept private.

Phone number

Would you like to be kept up-to-date with the outcome of this consultation? Yes

How did you find out about giving feedback? . Meeting, hui or event

Your information is held and administered by Environment Canterbury in accordance with the Privacy Act 2020 and Environment Canterbury's Privacy Policy.

There is personal information/contact details in my submission I do not want disclosed: No