

15/9/99

Notice of Motion

To: Mr Howard Stone, General Manager, W.R.
Please take this as a Notice of Motion
to the Council for its meeting scheduled
to be held on 21/9/99:



That formal advice be obtained
as to whether the proposed strategy
satisfies safety & environmental
requirements sufficiently to make the
strategy binding on affected
organisations.

Mike Wilson

N.B.: Mr J. J. Horner attached
representations, as presented to
the Regional and Transport Committee
meeting on 15/9/99 & section 145(1)(b)
of the Road Transport Act 1983 etc.
are relevant to the above as is any
legal advice earlier obtained.

caring about you & your environment



TO: Wellington Regional Land Transport Committee meeting, 15 Sept. 1999
From: J C Horne, 28 Kainuia Street, Northland, Wellington 5, ph 475 7025

RE: Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy 1999-2004 - Sept 1999

Thank you for the document and the opportunity to comment on it.

The subtitle "Realistic Transport Choice" is unrealistic. The document ignores the reality of our commitments to the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991, Agenda 21, and Kyoto Protocol, and ignores the inevitability of continuing oil price rises. It ignores the lessons to be learnt from Auckland - that building more roads induces congestion, profligate use of finite fossil fuels, and increases pollution.

Foreword - page 1

Para 2 - it is NOT a balanced vision, because in the period 1999-2004 it proposes spending \$166.5m + on roads, and a mere \$52m + on public transport infrastructure,

Para 3 - there is no sign of the change necessary to stop immediately the promotion of car use by cancelling all projects which would increase the capacity of the road network.

Executive Summary - page 2-3

1. The vision is a mirage, because it fails to state when the transport system will become environmentally sustainable,

6. It cannot be argued that the strategy is a new approach to transport planning, when the proposed spending on roads is well over three times more than on public transport infrastructure. This meets the wants and objectives of the roading lobby, but NOT the essential objective of environmental sustainability. It is the same old, tired, failed, business - as usual transport planning, with the suggestion that road pricing might be used to fund increases in road capacity.

6b. It does not "balance the provision of road and public transport". On the contrary, it proposes spending well over three times more on the former.

Context - page 4-6

Regional Policy Statement - page 5

18e. It conflicts with bullet point 1, because by spending more on roads than on public transport infrastructure, it will increase the use of non-renewable fossil fuels, It conflicts with bullet point 2 because the proposed roading projects will encourage dispersed development, and increase the adverse effects of transport on human health, public amenity, and water, soil and air, and ecosystems,

76. Environmental Impact - page 13

This statement is correct, yet the strategy proposes spending far more on roads than on public transport infrastructure, so greenhouse gas pollution will increase.

Objective 5 - Sustainability - page 35

156. ... "operates in a manner that recognises" ... is clumsy, Why not. say "meets"? "Supports an optimal demand for energy" is gobbledegook. It should say "Reduces the use of non-renewable energy".

Theme 5.1: Minimise the impact of transport on the environment

159. CO₂ emissions. "Think globally, act locally". We are all responsible for curbing CO₂ emissions - NOW. This strategy will increase CO₂ emissions. It needs radical revision. All the projects which will increase the capacity of the road network must be eliminated, because each would result in "induced traffic", and therefore increased CO₂ emissions.

160. How is it that no mention is made of the most effective way to decrease the impacts of the transport system on the environment, that is increasing the use of public transport???

Corridor Plans: overview - page 37 -

I have added up the proposed spending on roading and on public transport infrastructure for the period 1999-2004, and used the figures in this paper,

Conclusion

The document is fatally flawed. It seeks to please as many voters as possible, rather than move our transport system towards **environmental, social and thus economic sustainability** for the benefit of this and **ALL FUTURE GENERATIONS**.

J C Horne