Extension of the Tram Route Submission - Received by Email

Name:	D or A Rushworth [forbaxter@paradise.net.nz]
CC:	
Sent:	Sun 20/04/2008 8:33 pm
Your Submission:	SUBMISSION AGAINST EXTENDING TRAM LINE THROUGH CITY MALL.doc

SUBMISSION AGAINST EXTENDING TRAM LINE THROUGH CITY MALL

1. 1. EFFECTS ON TRAFFIC. Must be seen as very major.

-Trams will just be a major obstacle to traffic flow in Oxford Tce (altering the direction of traffic flow causing additional traffic to alternative route), City Mall (Goods delivery Vehicles), Cashel St with three hotels(Tour buses loading and unloading and car park building entrance and exit), Manchester St (notorious for its traffic congestion, High St (for access to on street parking) Colombo—Hereford St intersection and the Bottleneck into the Square (another light phase will add to the congestion in Colombo St slowing buses) and Cathedral Square (again slowing traffic especially buses).

The major problem will be behind the Cathedral where the proposed line will join the existing line. The turn is very tight for a tram and with allowance made for the tail overhang swing of the tram it means that the tram will have to take priority over all other traffic in both directions as it manoeuvres very very slowly to avoid dewirement.

To me the solution to the Square problem could only be solved by banning all other traffic other than the tram. Wait for the howls of protest when this is proposed! What will happen to the bus routes and timetables then?

2. 2. EFFECT ON TOURIST TRAM ROUTE

-The proposal as shown really does nothing to complement the existing route. Apart from giving direct access to Ballantynes, which has an International reputation, the Bridge Of Remembrance and a view of the Avon, there is not a lot to interest people except looking at businesses and empty shops.

I think that there are far more interesting places to see and our city's reputation as a tourist destination is not going to be enhanced when we take people through boring commercial areas, traffic congested areas especially Cashel St and Manchester St with its eyesore building on the corner of Bedford Row on an iconic tour.

This proposed extension does not complement the existing tour, which is rich in points of interest and full of history and culture, at all. There is plenty to talk about in a commentary on the tour as it stands, but very little except advertising commercial premises for most of the extension. Perhaps this is how the Tramway Company will make its money on the extension (See no. 4 later).

I believe that this proposal is really a task that would be much better undertaken by the yellow shuttle buses as it is really public transport that is wanted rather than a tour service.

Your Submission (Cont'd):

3. COSTING

The additional cost of putting the tramline through the Mall cannot, in my opinion, be justified. Has a cost benefit analysis been done? Has it been published so that ratepayers can see it clearly for themselves? Ratepayers will want to see value for money in this rather expensive project.

- As this proposal will benefit mainly private enterprises, including the Tramway Company, I can see no valid reason for ratepayers to provide additional services to them free of charge.
- The Council should not see this proposal as the panacea of the ills of City Mall. The number of tourists travelling on the tram is really quite small for a large part of the year. The high tourist season is the only time that more people would visit.

As the proposal is designed to benefit the businesses on the route I am surprised to see no mention of what their contribution to the costs of the scheme will be.

Has the costings included the provision of an additional tram shed and where is this proposed as this will have a big impact on cost, as will the public backlash if it is to be sited in a very well used public car park.

4. COST OF TICKET

The cost of a normal tram ticket is \$14.00 for two days travel. How many locals are going to pay that to ride down to the Mall to go shopping? Few, if any. There used to be a locals year pass for the cost of a two day ticket which was much abused and abolished when the current operators took over. Their 'local's deal' is an expensive combi with the Gondola at around \$60.00. Too dear for most citizens. My big fear is that locals won't use it because it is a tour therefore far to expensive and not public transport, which would attract many more locals if the fare was a dollar or two. Ratepayers would be left picking up the tab to run what I fear will be a white elephant.

5. CONCLUSION

For all the reasons above, I believe that it would be really \$550 000.00 of ratepayer funding wasted by allocating any money to the proposal before the full and final plans have been drawn up, and all consultations held and overwhelmingly supported by a <u>majority of the ratepayers.</u>

FOR THE REASONS ABOVE <u>I URGE YOU NOT TO HAVE TRAMS IN</u> <u>CITY MALL.</u>

Submission by David Alaister Rushworth 6 Arawa Street Shirley Christchurch 8013

Phone 398 0483

Unfortunately I will NOT be able to discuss my submission at the hearing and ask that this written submission be considered.