
From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Friday, 9 February 2024 11:49 pm
To:
Subject: Regional Land Transport Plan submission

Anonymous User just submitted the survey 'Draft Regional Land Transport Plan submission' with the responses below.

First name

Cameron

Surname

Bradley

Email address

Are you giving feedback on behalf of an organisation?

No

Select your local city or district council:

Christchurch City Council

Tell us how important each of these objectives is to you:

Maintenance	Neutral
Resilience	Important
Emissions	Very important
Growth	Very important
Safety	Very important
Freight	Neutral

If you think we should consider other objectives, please describe what they are and why they should be considered:

Mode shift away from private vehicles - a much more explicit way of achieving most of the above objectives. Density - while not transport, density done well improves access significantly. Access is after all the ultimate goal of transport.

Target 1: 40% reduction in deaths and serious injuries on Canterbury roads by 2030

Good target but I doubt current actions will achieve this. Things that will help but aren't mentioned enough are: mode shift away from cars, more speed cameras, continuing walking and cycling projects, lowering speed limits.

Target 2: 41% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from land transport in Canterbury by 2035

The target is not ambitious enough but even so I am almost certain current actions will not get us anywhere near this. Things that will help but aren't mentioned enough are: mode shift away from cars, electrification of vehicle fleets.

Target 3: 100% increase in tonnage of freight moved by rail in Canterbury by 2034

Target too narrow. This should be broadened to vehicles per capita or something. i.e. mode shift. That way it would cover shifting freight to rail or coastal shipping, and private cars to car shares, buses, bikes, trains, feet.

Tell us how important each of these priorities is to you:

Create a well-maintained network	Neutral
Manage risk of exposure to extreme events	Important
Support and develop connected public and active transport networks	Very important
Implementing safer systems (Road to Zero)	Very important
Support and develop freight systems connecting to air, rail and sea	Neutral

Are there specific actions you think should be taken to help achieve these priorities?

Mode shift away from cars and trucks, more speed cameras, continuing walking and cycling projects, lowering speed limits, electrification of vehicle fleets, increased density in urban centres. Also, why were emissions not carried through from an objective to an investment priority? The rest are pretty much mapped.

Do you support investigating alternative approaches to fund transport system improvements?

Yes

What sources of funding do you think could be used to pay for regionally significant improvements:

Should be fully funded by a fair road user charge scheme and not out of rates at all. i.e. maintenance costs go up, we pay more to drive around.

Are these the right measures of success?

No, these are not the right measures.

Are there other monitoring indicators or measures of success that you think should be included?

Maintenance - expected road renewal costs for next ten years, customer success measures e.g. faults reported or subjective happiness with quality Resilience - no. roads which if closed would cause >X min detour Walking & cycling - public transport frequency, urban density, mode share of cars, customer success measures e.g. subjective happiness with ability to and attractiveness of walk/cycle/bus Safer systems - break measures down by mode, i.e. DSA for people walking, cycling, driving Wellbeing - mode share of cars, emissions from transport

Do you have any other comments that you would like to make on the draft Plan?

This policy needs to be much more explicit on the need to strengthen other modes SIGNIFICANTLY to entice people out of cars as our current obsession with cars is completely unsustainable financially, socially, and environmentally, as well as literally making us kill each other and write it off as 'accidents'. One of the policies is to 'Avoid investment that has poor alignment with spatial planning and creates urban sprawl' but this should come through stronger. \$700m for the Woodend bypass goes against almost all goals in the plan. It should be wiped from existence. There is no funding for rail freight which questions the dedication to the last target. It would be great if the plan included a breakdown of funding share by mode of transport, i.e. road, footpath, cycleway, rail, other. You need to ensure potential costs of implementing MRT and PT Futures studies are accounted for so these can proceed ASAP. This needs to be binding on local councils or it will fail as the pressure for them to reduce rates and prioritise roads will swamp any desire to improve the future.

Would you like to speak to your submission at a hearing in March?

Yes

Please provide a contact phone number so we can arrange a suitable time for you to speak at a hearing:
