

Submission to the Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Statement.

Prepared by: Simon Rutherford on behalf of myself and my family
180 Aorangi Rd, Bryndwr, Christchurch 8005
03 351 8224
simonrutherford@paradise.net.nz

I wish to speak to this submission.

What is Sustainable? If a situation is sustainable it is supportable and maintainable, and the background chapter is clear to me that we cannot sustain the current situation let alone the projected trends if we carry on with the same "lets redesign this bit to carry more traffic" philosophy. I think that you should define what you mean by sustainable in this document.

The Vision

A Transport system that supports a quality of life second to none

Whose vision and whose quality of life are we talking about here, that of the Fendalton mum with an urban tractor who drives the children to their within walking distance school, or the woman who lives ten blocks away from her in a state house who does not have a car and walks and buses?

The true vision leads to a series of answers which followed by consultative planning, with the compromises that come from that, provide positive and innovative incentives for people to change the way they get around. I now drive around the city more slowly than I used to and I get where I am going in the same time or even quicker! I do not see that this draft will lead to anything that will lead to significant change.

A real vision for Christchurch would look to see how Christchurch would be "best" and then plan for that from a perspective of a net reduction of negative impact on the environment, economy and the community (social/cultural). Then perhaps it can be second to none.

1.2 The RLTS is currently in the early stages of redrafting, and will further develop the role of alternatives to the private motor vehicle (pmv), itself having to be consistent with the MOT Walking and Cycling Strategy currently being finalised. This document should anticipate the direction of those documents.

These “Key aims of the MCTS

- Overall direction
- Major projects
- Level of investment”

are listed but the document does not result in a clear overall direction.

The major project section was more straight-forward for a department that works from the perspective of traffic and roading engineers.

Perhaps the way our transport system is managed is due for review. I propose that the 75% of our “roads” that are local community roads – where people live - being administered through the Community Boards by the “Living Streets” section with a primary focus on the CCC “Living Streets” philosophy **Creating a Better Balance**. The remaining 25% of the Arterial network being managed centrally. This change would allow for the development of more local character within communities which can also help to change the way people think about how they get around and where they go.

1.5 Integration of existing Strategies

There is a gap in the list for a Private Motor Vehicle Strategy and perhaps a Strategy for Commercial Transport. A significant number of the strategies deal with the requirements of the PMV or the impact of them on the transport system but it is not considered in the same way as Cycling or walking for instance.

2 Background

Is a transport system that kills and injures people sustainable? Let alone acceptable.

Building any more roads or more road capacity will not relieve road congestion.

3 Where do we want to go?

Looks great, but what will we do with them?

4. What must we do?

Building any more roads will not solve any of the problems that are with us now, or will come with the storm clouds. Four lanes on Ferry road will only mean that the community will build high fences to shut out some of the noise, smell and dust and there will be a few minutes saved for commuters. Reducing the speed limit to 30 or 40kph may produce the same result from a transport perspective and save a heap of money.

Instead provide the alternative.

A. Firstly **provide Buses every ten minutes** on all key routes immediately. Key routes could be defined as routes that pass through a proposed interchange. If buses are already scheduled at that or better improve the service by an extra bus per hour. On all other routes incrementally improve the service by a bus per hour, with a prime goal to reach one bus every ten minutes on all routes. While this is ecan territory funding from the CCC vote can achieve the desired results.

B. Bus lanes are essential on all congested routes.

C. Develop major **walking projects**. Invest \$1.2M+ in a comprehensive walking network from the Square out to 500 metres beyond the Four Avenues (Deans not Rolleston) as a viable walk to work zone. This should also include all on street parking in the area having a time restriction of less than four hours. At the moment the people of Christchurch provide significant free parking to people who start work early, and changing this will be a significant incentive to change modes. Follow this up with reviews to better inform the next project and two a year for the years following. The first could be funded by not doing the Bealey Ave / Carlton Mill Rd / Harper Ave / Park Tce project.

D. Develop major **cycling projects** on the same scale as the walking project, but perhaps **completing** "cycling corridors", rather than piecemeal projects as at present. A corridor should provide for cyclist different needs and provide cycle lanes on arterials and busier roads and ideal infrastructure on the side streets.

E. An immediate investment in the delivery of a significant **Demand Management Programme** with a clear goal to get cars off the road. This needs to be a dual programme targeting workers on the one hand and School students on the other. This needs to be spent now and not slowly built up over five years.

F. Positive reinforcement of improving "modal share". If 10% of traffic movements in a given location are cycles, the location gets reviewed for improved and priority facilities for cycling and walking. As the modal share increases so the priority increases. When walkers represent 50% of traffic significant restrictions of pmv's should be put in place. Ilam road at the University should be in planning for restrictions now with work in the 2004/2005 plan.

- G. Adopt the Living Streets Charter. In particular I highlight
- To ensure a better balance while maintaining current levels of service, the priority when planning should be changed to the following:
 1. Pedestrians
 2. Cycles
 3. Public Transport
 4. Taxis
 5. Service vehicles
 6. Cars
 - A vision of zero growth in car kilometers traveled.
- H. Lobby Government for a change to tighter school zoning. All students should be able to, within reason, walk or cycle to school.

5. What will it Cost?

When roading engineers write a document it seems that they write from the perspective of providing roading projects. Where are the cycling and walking projects?

These departments are so poorly resourced that the staff are not able to plan further ahead perhaps?

6. Conclusion

The CCC Living Streets Charter is only listed on page 8, when it could well serve as the overarching document for the planning of the wider Christchurch community.

Key aims of the MCTS

- Overall direction
- Major projects
- Level of investment

The overall direction when the appendices are read is for a tinkering only with the status quo. The need for more investment in roading projects, at the rate of \$50m plus P.A. is not proven in this document.

Taking an innovative approach is well noted however, so that shifting how the money is spent as I have suggested above, I believe will prove much more effective than the proposal to complete more major roading projects.