
From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Sunday, 25 February 2024 11:10 am
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

Donald

Surname

Matheson

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 | Important |
| Resilience | Very important |
| Emissions | Very important |
| Growth | Important |
| Safety | Very important |
| Freight | Important |

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

Transport is at the heart of inclusive and safe communities, which you recognise in the statements on wellbeing and health but they're not prominent in the transport priorities. Quality lives should be a central goal (and if we prioritised that, then we'd prioritise giving streets back to kids to play on and walk or cycle to school, reducing noise and air pollution in neighbourhoods, making sure those without cars have transport options and so on).

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

I support the target but I don't see the lower-level plans as likely to get us there. Much faster and greater investment in public transport is needed, especially given the growth in commuter towns in Waimakariri and Selwyn. Sticks as well as carrots are also needed, such as congestion charging and car-free or 30 km/h zones in Christchurch.

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Create a well-maintained network | Important |
| Manage risk of exposure to extreme events | Very important |
| Support and develop connected public and active transport networks | Very important |
| Implementing safer systems (Road to Zero) | 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?

I think a major focus needs to be moving the commuter traffic from Christchurch's sprawl into public transport and other lower emissions modes. I drive to work currently because there are no other feasible transport options. A park-and-ride facility plus bike lock-ups at Halswell served by 10-minute buses to the city and Riccarton would make it easy for me to shift to a bus or bike from the edge of the city. There are other sites where hubs could be set up, such as at the entry of SH1 into the city and at Yaldhurst, connecting with the rapid transport plans. Priority parking and lanes for electric, multiple-occupancy and car-share users would also help reduce commuter traffic and pollution. Given the emissions targets, these infrastructures for a sustainable city need to be planned for now and implemented in the next 5 years.

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:

Charging commuters into the city, via tolls and congestion charging.

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?

For sustainable communities (e.g. in terms of wellbeing and emissions), success is about reduced distances people need to travel to the services they need such as schools, healthcare and shops. 15-minute cities are one of the best measures. Mode shift is the other important measure of success and i suspect it's not a specific target because you don't think we'll reach any targets set. That's not a good basis for planning.

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

The plan wants mode shift but the specific funded measures aren't building the infrastructure for that. For example, shared travel modes connecting towns and cities are the third policy point on p.36, but the plan is a bit vague on getting there. This kind of a document needs to be much more directive on the MRT and similar initiatives.

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

No
