

## Appendix 7: Technical commentary of Andy Carr

---

### Commentary on Board's submission

- paras 6.1 to 6.3: no comment

- para 6.4: there's a subtle change to the wording that has been made. The wording of 'transportation assessment' wasn't in the joint statement, and the joint statement says that the infrastructure "at" the schools would be reviewed whereas the submission says "around" the schools. The effect of these changes is that the submission indicates that the scope of the assessment is far more wide-ranging than I had envisaged. In essence, I had in mind that the review would be limited to what's provided at the school gate whereas the submission could be read as suggesting that it includes the roading network further afield. I should also add that the joint witness statement is silent about whether the Ministry has already carried out such an assessment - it simply says that it would be prudent to do so before students move.

- para 6.5: Part (a) of this is correct but is incomplete as it doesn't give a timeframe (which is 40 years). Part (b) is incorrect - the joint statement says that it would have been open to the BoT to calculate the vehicle operating costs, but goes no further. No numbers were discussed or agreed, as they had not been presented.

- para 6.6: It's a reasonable assumption to say that more children would walk to school unchaperoned because of the close proximity, but as far as I'm aware, there's no actual data in this which would enable a quantitative assessment to be made. The comment about "route safety" isn't correct though, as there's no evidence of any significant road safety issues involving child pedestrians.

- para 6.7: The calculated dollar value assumes that the extent of walking and cycling by ex-Redcliffs students would reduce to completely zero. This potentially isn't the case, as there will be some children that could continue to walk, but the proportion will be small and it will be very hard to quantify in advance. The use of the word "minimum" is somewhat misleading in that respect.

- para 6.8-6.9: no comment

- para 6.10: the four goals are correctly stated, but all four are listed whereas only the first one is relevant. The full description of the four goals is set out below. It can be seen that Goals 2, 3 and 4 are unaffected by / irrelevant to what happens at Redcliffs School.

1. Improve access and choice: Delivering resilient transport networks with an emphasis on efficient road use, public transport, walking and making Christchurch a cycle city. Introducing a new road classification which recognises both the road function and the environments each road passes through. Working with our transport partners to manage our existing road network more efficiently and cost effectively by adopting a "one network" approach.

2. Create safe, healthy and liveable communities: Adopting a safer systems approach. Transport actions which support the recovery of the Central City, suburban centres and new growth areas. Strengthening the integration of land use and transport planning through District Plan changes.

3. Support economic vitality: Developing local freight routes to improve access to Christchurch airport, Lyttelton Port and freight hubs. Parking and congestion management to support the growth of commercial centres.

4. Create opportunities for environmental enhancements: building green infrastructure and adapting to climate change and peak oil by encouraging new technology and infrastructure enhancements.

- para 6.12: The transport experts didn't argue that further analysis of the safety effects on the routes to school was required. There's a comment made that the safety effects "at" Mt Pleasant and Sumner schools should be looked at, but there is no comment made about a route analysis.

- para 6.13: Partly agreed - but an increased risk does not translate to an increase in actual numbers. The wording of the joint witness statement is very clear in this regard - it only talks about risk.

- para 6.14-6.16: no comment

### **Commentary on Appendix 22**

I can confirm that the Joint Witness Statement included as Appendix 22 is the same one as I signed back in March.