
From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Monday, 26 February 2024 3:08 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

Sara

Surname

Templeton

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	Neutral
Safety	Important
Freight	Not very important

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

I believe that Objective 3 is not strong enough. It mentions developing a range of solutions and not of actually putting those solutions in place to reduce emissions. I would like to see it changed to "Emissions: Develop and implement a range of transport emission reduction solutions across Canterbury to reduce negative environmental and health impacts."

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

Yes

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

This is a good target, however the actions within the draft RLTP actually increase emissions over this period of the plan. While some of the priority actions are highlighted as reducing emissions, the reality is that this does not compensate for the rest of the plan and the plan as a whole, goes in the wrong direction.

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

Agree

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?

Active transport is effectively missing from your draft plan and needs to be addressed. There is a lot of evidence, both national and international, that walking and cycling infrastructure in particular encourage people to switch modes of transport, lower carbon emissions, lower particulate emissions, improve population health and the environment.

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:

Congestion or time of use charging, road user charges, etc

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?

The measures are not specific enough and are unambitious. Eg: a specific % increase of emissions decrease needs to be included and that we can measure success - with the first measuring point in 3 years, before the next review. Having 1 more person catch a but in 10 years would technically meet the objective currently, but is clearly not what is needed. One measure should be if emissions are reduced by 41% - since that is what is in your vision statement.

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

The public facing documents on the Draft RLTP are misleading. The page on the Ecan website notes that completing the Major Cycleways Network is amongst the top priorities of the plan, and yet the network does not appear in the lists of projects put forward for the RLTP and NLTF funding. Several times through the document itself, it mentions the importance of finishing the network, but again, the incomplete or not yet started cycleways - Avon-Ōtākaro, Southern Lights, Ōpāwaho etc do not appear, when they were listed in the last plan. The deliberate lumping together of active and public transport in the funding section hides the fact that it is almost entirely for public transport and not to complete the network. The vision statement which details the 41% reduction in emissions leads the public to believe that the plan seeks to achieve this, when it does not. As a committee you get to choose the plan and you have chosen to put forward a plan that increases emissions. You will likely get fewer submissions on climate than you should because of this greenwashing. Our region relies on a stable climate for its agriculture, something we have seen under increasing threat in recent times. Think of your grandchildren and the future you are leaving to them when you sign off the final plan. Will you be able to look them in the eye and say that you did what you could to fight climate change, or will you look away? Additionally - I know that you will have had many submissions urging the re-prioritisation of the Pages Rd Bridge and I support them. It is a regionally significant project due to the number of people impacted and is a lifeline route that should still be at the top ranked position and not delayed any further. People will not merely be inconvenienced for a few weeks (as is the case for other projects ranked higher) should it fail - thousands could die.

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:

I will be at a conference in Wellington, so will need to Zoom in.
