

Glyn Lewers for the Frankton Community Association.

CHAPTER 38 OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION: FRANKTON CAMPING GROUND

1. Against any creep in boundaries of the camping ground footprint from the actual current use. Especially numbers 8 and 10 Stewart Street.
2. It is not used as a camping ground at present more as a blight on the landscape and for car parking.
3. QLDC indicated that a Camping Ground Strategy would be forthcoming by now, coupled with the Frankton Master plan. This zoning will restrict any implementation of the communities view.
4. Proposed boundaries need to be looked at. At present the proposed camping ground zoning encroaches onto private land (Lot 1 DP22500), and what seems to be a Privately owned dwelling

CHAPTER 29 TRANSPORT: PARK AND RIDES

1. Our main concern here is it seems that the planners have assumed that PnR reduces traffic and encourages PT use. When all the research indicates the PnR option results in very marginal, temporary improvements to these two goals and in the majority of cases it actually increases traffic and reduces PT use, as well as discouraging active mode travel. We find it odd that we can allow Council to spend ratepayers' money on something that has a low probability, to achieve temporary marginal gains in pursuit of the transport objectives without some form of public scrutiny. Especially when the location of PnR's will occur near or on sensitive land on the urban/rural boundary.
2. No technical advice has been sought on the efficacy of PnR in traffic reduction or increase in PT use, or if it has, it was not part of the S32 reports.
3. The S32 just makes assumptions that PnR's:
 - a. Will reduce traffic congestion (Research indicates otherwise)
 - b. Increase uptake in PT and active modes (Research indicates otherwise)
 - c. Reduce pollution (Research indicates otherwise, even NZTA's own report states PnR do not do this)
4. Since submitting our evidence, Auckland Transport has released their survey of over 10,000 PT passengers about their views to increase PT use. Of the 16 initiatives proposed, PnR came in thirteenth. The top seven initiatives being:
 - a. Increased service frequency,
 - b. Reduce service cost
 - c. Punctuality and reliability
 - d. Route service and coverage
 - e. Better information and communication
 - f. Extended hours of operation
 - g. More direct/express services
5. Furthermore a 2016 study by the US Transportation Research Board, asked 37 Transit agencies in the US to rate 13 strategies to draw in PT Riders. PnR's came in 10th out of the 13.
6. The FCA could not agree more with these findings, we would rather see the money spent on items 4a to 4g above than on PnR's high cost and at best, a temporary marginal gain in traffic reduction.
7. We ask that any plans for Park and Rides in the PDP should allow for community participation given the marginal effect on any of the Transport objectives proposed coupled with there high cost.