

Individual Submissions A - I

Contents Page

Please note: As some submitters did not provide their first names they have been ordered in the submissions received list under their title. These submitters are as follows:

- Mr Burgess is ordered in the submissions received list under 'M' for Mr
- Mrs Davey is ordered in the submissions received list under 'M' for Mrs
- Mrs Dromgool is ordered in the submissions received list under 'M' for Mrs
- Mrs Peters is ordered in the submissions received list under 'M' for Mrs
- Mr Ripley is ordered in the submissions received list under 'M' for Mr

We apologise for any confusion the above ordering of submissions may have caused.

If your submission is not displayed here, contains incorrect information or is missing some parts, please email us on rptp@aucklandtransport.govt.nz or contact Mathew Stewart on (09) 447 4831

Sub #	Submitter	Page
707	A Marshall	9
683	A McDonald	9
12	Aaron Grey	9
624	Abbie Ngatai	9
275	Adam Weller	9
417	Adam White	10
515	Ailbhe	10
467	Alan James Bray	10
525	Alan Kennard	11
864	Alana Lane	11
400	Alastair Norriss Upton	11
115	Alec Robert Looney	12
878	Alfred Hawtin	12
306	Alison Rust	12
542	Allen Davies	13
497	Allyson Hamblett	13
796	Alyxandria Waerea	13
248	Amanda Chapman	13
376	Amanda Lees	13
669	Amber French	14
861	Amber Piggott	14
599	Amy Bhana	14
840	Amy Chaiyakhun	14
167	André Taber	14
627	Andrea McAuley	14

Sub #	Submitter	Page
21	Andrew Allen	14
825	Andrew Glover	14
862	Andrew Hunkin	14
386	Andrew John Knox	14
1	Andrew Lewis	15
86	Andrew Lindesay	15
13	Andrew Stevenson	15
136	Andrew Walters	16
205	Angela Stones	17
630	Angela Sullivan	17
774	Ann Anderson	17
20	Anne Gibbins	17
626	Annette Sullivan	18
463	Anthony Beaschke	18
220	Ariel Kulaitis	18
67	Arthur Christopher Kitt	18
770	Ashlee Harrison	19
607	Atuarangi Muru	19
830	Ayesha Tate	19
	B Cowsill	19
637	Babette McMillan	19
432	Barbara Insull (Personal)	19
569	Barbara Keith	19
285	Barry John Hannah	20
560	Baseisth Rai	20
385	Benjamin Ross	20
367	Bera MacClement	21
142	Bernadette Elizabeth Lim	21
791	Bernadette Jackson	21
811	Bill Clifford	21
638	Bob Taylor	21
703	Bobbi McConachie	21
241	Bradley Hinchco	21
619	Brandon Hook	21

Sub #	Submitter	Page
249	Brendan Doherty	22
17	Brendan Weir	22
292	Brian Boys	22
267	Brian Gill	22
812	Briar Gray	23
641	Bronwyn Watson	23
213	Brook Warner	23
841	Caitlin Potter	23
613	Callum Bisley	23
346	Cameron Bennett	23
428	Camilla Abernathy-Ardern	23
230	Carl Frederick Rosel	25
152	Carl William Gorham	25
696	Carmen Chatfield	25
391	Carol Green	25
221	Carol Han	25
763	Carole Chambers	26
631	Caroline Dobbs	26
160	Carolione Tahu	26
629	Carolyn Edwards	26
593	Carolyn Payne	26
728	Cass Young	26
204	Catherine Bryant	26
414	Catherine Gilhooly	26
572	Catherine Harland	27
194	Cathy Milligan	28
760	Chad Keven	28
540	Chantelle Philip	28
777	Char Te Ao	29
425	Charles Johnston	29
389	Charlie Ingg	30
351	Charlotte Reed	30
475	Cheryl Calvert	31
794	Chris Betty	31

Sub #	Submitter	Page
677	Chris Laumahina	31
369	Chris Walden	31
807	Christina Poutai	31
272	Christine Obbeek	31
390	Christine Smith	31
229	Christine Thompson	32
237	Christine Thorpe	32
819	Christine Tilyard	32
73	Christopher McArthur	32
461	Christopher Norman Grove	32
737	Cindy Conroy	33
778	CJ Telford	33
874	Clint Hotson	33
771	Clinton Pellow	33
666	Clive Wilson	33
148	Clyde Peter Johnson	33
823	Cody Gaskell	33
460	Colleen Crampton	33
706	Colleen Smith	34
625	Connie Aitken	34
636	Connie Birch	34
508	Constance Williams	34
788	Coralie Thompson	34
550	Corinne Wichmann	34
411	Craig Conner	34
459	Craig Darren Henderson	35
694	Craig Lozell	35
3	Craig Richards	35
699	Cypris Teau-Harris	35
615	Damon Eaton	35
700	Damon Skellams	35
689	Daniel Preston	35
343	Daniel Taumihau	35
551	Daniel Wichmann	36

Sub #	Submitter	Page
334	Danielle Boven	37
6	Daphne Lawless	37
225	Darrell Farley	37
651	Dave Cadwallader	37
63	Dave Wellings	37
462	David (Cam) Cameron Gulland	38
645	David Cameron	38
399	David Clemow	38
325	David Cooper	38
488	David G Vaughan	39
321	David Garrett	39
364	David MacClement	39
328	David Talmage	39
688	David Thompson	40
573	David Tyler	40
165	Dawn Sheldrake	41
881	Daya Ram	41
655	Debbie Ewe	41
484	Debbie Pascoe	41
478	Deborah Duncan	41
710	Debra Leith	41
545	Dee Bond	42
604	Deklan Pompallier	42
674	Del Elliot	42
362	Denise Wellm	42
876	Deon Strydom	43
186	Des Leader	43
206	Detlev Jackson	43
667	Diane Vaioleti	43
483	Dion Lynch	43
238	Don Robertson	45
820	Doug Millynn	45
487	Douglas and Barbara Pitfield	45
639	Douglas Fursdon	45

Sub #	Submitter	Page
157	Dylan Snow	45
617	E J Geraghty	46
749	E M Young	46
19	E Wrench	46
805	Eddie Preston	46
416	Edward Exton Fletcher	46
869	Edward James	46
839	Edwin Judd	46
384	Edwina Pio	46
383	Elaine Beryl Read	47
552	Elisabeth Alkemade	47
419	Elisabeth Laird	47
439	Elizabeth	48
786	Elizabeth Hill	48
250	Elizabeth May Appleby	48
757	Elliot Hira	48
722	Elroy D Muller	48
318	Emma Joyce	48
775	Erin Todd	48
108	Eva Cadario	48
10	Evan Keating	49
291	Faith Read	49
679	Fay Ivey	50
566	Fay R Greer	50
690	Fe Day	50
824	Fiona Proctor	50
431	Fran Allen	50
842	Fran McArthur	50
776	Fraser Deans	50
816	Gail Cook	50
582	Garry & Aileen Seal	50
245	Garry Venus	50
561	Dr Garth Harris	51
434	Garth Wayne Macleod	51

Sub #	Submitter	Page
809	Gary Lennox	52
480	Gary McGuire	52
837	Gary Orrell	52
491	Gay Richards	53
752	Gay Rowe	54
611	Gemma Dorotich	54
603	Geordan Tararo	54
151	George Douglas Lowe	54
277	George Gibbs	54
218	Dr George Uhe	55
25	Georgia Stillwell	55
345	Gillian Mary Jeavons	55
412	Glen McCabe	55
815	Glenys Tabrum	56
768	Grace van den Brink	56
9	Graeme Dudley Knox	56
84	Graeme MacRae	56
529	Graeme Milligan	56
106	Grant Drabble	60
502	H M Hungerford	60
216	Haami Toi	60
64	Hamada Eleleimy	61
438	Hamish O'Neill	61
534	Hamme Paterson	61
11	Hanno Schoonraad	61
506	Hans Versluys	61
408	Harda Waite	63
628	Harold Thompson	63
563	Haroon Bhatti	63
762	Hayley Graham	63
406	Heather Barker	63
779	Heather Glover	63
698	Helen Duyvestyn	64
712	Helen Elley	64

Sub #	Submitter	Page
642	Helen Fitchett	64
192	Helen Moore	64
649	Hemokai Kani	64
826	Hilary Harry	64
532	Hollenstein Family	64
661	Huia Flavell-De Thierry	64
672	Ian Elliot	64
680	Ian Henderson	64
420	Ian Mohan	64
211	Ian Munro	65
734	Ian Wilson	65
877	Ineke Dirkzwager	65
473	Isaac Broome	65
314	Italia Toelieu	68
813	Ivan Hoete	69

If your submission is not displayed here, contains incorrect information or is missing some parts, please email us on rptp@aucklandtransport.govt.nz or contact Mathew Stewart on (09) 447 4831

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
707	A Marshall	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
683	A McDonald	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
12	Aaron Grey	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: Good work. Can't wait for it to be implemented.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Regarding the proposed zones, some of them are very large and inproportional, leading to unfairness. I would suggest splitting the south zone into a south and east zone, splitting the isthmus into a central-east and central west zone and splitting north shore roughly around constellation station.</p> <p>Also, I think there should be increased buffer zones, especially if the number of zones increase.</p>
624	Abbie Ngatai	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
275	Adam Weller	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: I think the general thrust and aims of the Auckland Regional Transport Plan are excellent and this document shows how having a super city can benefit the wider community.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Ticketing concessions: Ticketing concessions should go beyond target groups during peak times to 'quiet' times. Especially during the weekends to promote use when public transport is not currently busy. For example a successful public transport system will encourage families to catch a train to go visit the waterfront during the weekend. The only concessions in the draft plan seem aimed toward business users during the week (monthly passes) and the elderly.</p> <p>Other Comments: 1: Business Engagement; By this I mean what is required is not just providing improvements in public transport as identified in the draft plan but also by providing direct support to business in the Auckland area to encourage their employees to use public transport or to either cycle, walk.</p> <p>It may seem a strange idea when first read, but having just completed a Masters in the UK where my thesis was on Organisational Travel Plans, the UK government at both central (Westminster) and local government level currently provide direct support in the form of specialist knowledge in helping creating a Travel Plan for an organisation. A great example is 'smarter choices' – a UK Department of Transport initiative to provide techniques to influence people's behaviour towards public transport – and I feel Auckland Transport could, and should provide similar support. http://www.dft.gov.uk/topics/sustainable/smarter-choices</p> <p>I believe business engagement is so important is should be separate under the policies and actions. To meet the target of doubling the total passenger boarding's per annum from 71.1 million to 140 million; what is required is more than just services such as trains and buses, and what is also needed are the use of subjective factors to create a behavioural change and in doing so create a culture change within the wider community towards using public transport.</p> <p>The amount of funding for extra support staff to offer travel planning support to businesses compared to expensive capital investment and the actual running of the services would be a minimal cost but with a huge actual benefit – much higher use in public transport, fewer cars on the road and less CO2 being emitted.</p> <p>2: Frequent Service Network finishing at 9pm. Objective 1 identifies Frequent service times are from 6am to 9pm and weekend 7am to 7pm. 9pm is a far too early time for the frequent service network to be reduced. If I go out at night, for example going to the theatre in the city it is very frustrating currently as there is no trains after 9-30pm to Onehunga at all, let alone once every 15 – 30 minutes. Regular services to midnight would encourage a far greater use and trust in public transport. And it is not unreasonable to expect people to be out and using the City at night – creating 'the world's most liveable city' – the widely shared high level vision for Auckland, especially on a Thursday, Friday or Saturday night.</p> <p>3: Cycle facilities at Major Interchanges. I have noticed that there are very few cycle racks at train stations. Major interchanges such as Newmarket, Britomart, Panmure etc. should be providing a large number of secure and covered cycle racks so people can cycle to the station – leave their bike there and continue onwards using public transport. The Northern Busway has large park & ride facilities, so why are there no large cycle facilities identified in the draft plan? Their cost would be minimal, and the space / footprint required compared to the number of users tiny. To encourage public transport use requires supporting other non-car usage in a large and very public way – and identifying cycle racks in the draft plan would help achieve this.</p> <p>4: Communication to the public: Objective 3; There is no mention of providing the results of contractor performance to the public, which is important for creating an environment of openness and positive communication plus creating awareness of the</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Adam Weller (#275)	performance levels easily to consumers. It is easy to under estimate how important and how greater openness can create a positive environment towards public transport, no matter what the actual performance results are.
417	Adam White	<p>Q1 - Opposed Comments: I am opposed on the grounds of the wonky economics involved. Central government cannot rely on Auckland for a recovery and not support it. Reality is Auckland doesn't work as effectively as it could, it will not take another efficiency drive to fix. Indeed it has passed the tipping point for efficiency to offer real benefits. Auckland needs some major structural and effective changes for the network to work. The constant lack of direct access to the airport is but one example of this. But let's avoid specifics about this line or that - Auckland needs to move and it can't in a clutter. The plan acknowledges this - which must be commended.</p> <p>What we need is three rail loops - not one some time in the future. / Buses do not cut it from key locations - it makes us look just average and we are Auckland - we don't do bad image well.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Opposed Comments: One gold coin. The economic spin offs work. Time we released this. Business makes more money when roads are uncluttered - they need to pay for this privilege. Otherwise they will keep paying the indirectly cost of our roading network - over and over again. With more people using the system means less cars, equals less clutter. Also by one low fair we remove discrimination (children, disabled, old) and the bureaucracy associated with that discrimination.</p> <p>Other Comments: 1. The system is discriminatory - when there is no reason for it to be. 2. Economic holes in the central government model will create anarchy in Auckland road network - despite the best efforts of drafters of this plan. 3. We need to change the buses - in a physical sense - for environmental reasons - and to make them more comfortable. / We need more comfort in public transport - yes comfort - were not soviet Russia here - nor north Korea. Most kiwis have bigger bottoms than what is on offer - yes the seats are bad. 4. Rail loops are more than necessary, they are the only hope against this ongoing economic waste created by the cluttered road network. 5. The targets across the board are too low, way too low. Double them and we may have the new minimum. 6. The application and modelling of section seven, I have major questions about. - why discriminate? - why not model from the bottom up?</p> <p>7. This whole exercise is a question of economics - why tag on socio-economics - The whole picture must have socio-economic outcomes and inputs or it is not a model but an ideology. 8. Quite frankly I'm sick of ideology getting in the way of good planning and development of good frameworks.</p>
515	Ailbhe	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I was wondering if there are any plans to have more than 1 bus every 45 minutes to an hour in the evenings and weekends from the city to Glenfield Road. This seems a long time to wait and I believe there should be one every half an hour at least (that is the 955 bus) outside of rush hour. I also believe Eskdale Road is very badly serviced by public transport. I live in Vonnell Place and to get to work I have to walk 15 minutes to Glenfield road, then get the bus to Victoria Street and then walk 25 minutes to Upper Queen Street (unfortunately it is a bit expensive to get 2 buses each way). It takes me an hour and 15 minutes to get to work which considering the distance from A to B is a bit of an effort. I know there is the possibility of walking a bit further and getting the bus from Birkdale Road to K Road, however with these buses so occasional, it would mean waiting a long time should the bus not turn up so Glenfield Road is the better option.</p> <p>It would also be a great option to have a free 2nd bus journey if it is within an hour of the first journey (such as they do in the US). This would be great for people who have to take 2 buses to work as it seems a bit harsh to have to pay 2 bus fares. I'm not sure if there has ever been a bus down Eskdale Road but it would be great if that were a possibility. I understand if this is not an option, but more regular buses up Glenfield Road outside of rush hour would be great.</p>
467	Alan James Bray	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: 304 buses often run later, some bus stops have no seats or shelters. We need buses that I can travel on from Mangere to Pukekohe, to Henderson, to North Shore, to St Heliers (without changing buses). Some drivers don't stick to the time tables: 305s at night time leave Onehunga early; the 8.50pm arrived at Mangere Bridge 8.50pm last Wednesday night</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: Gold Card holders 24/7; One fare for all. In Edinburgh you travel for £1.40 = 24/7 distance doesn't matter.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
525	Alan Kennard	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>1. Introduction Auckland Transport has prepared a draft plan for public transport services based on a vision of an integrated, efficient and effective public transport network. A number of policies and actions have been developed to support the vision and submissions have been invited. This submission relates to Infrastructure but at a detailed level, and as such is probably better considered during the implementation stage. It builds on a previous concept of reducing the frequency and extent of excavating and subsequent repairing of roads thereby reducing costs and maintaining optimum appearance. It strives to avoid digging up a newly constructed road.</p> <p>2. The Problem During a visit to my son's place, the conversation turned to the extensive road works and installation of underground services outside his house and how messy it looked after the reinstatement.</p> <p>3. A Solution My daughter-in-law mentioned the concept of 'Clash Grids' that are used in industry to avoid clashes – in her company's case – dates of competing promotions. She said they were based on Excel and could be bought off the shelf or custom-built. The idea could be turned around to 'encourage' (and thereby identify) clashes. The process is to identify all projects that involve road construction, (reconstruction, maintenance and excavation and repair for access to other services) so that there is a co-ordinated approach in programming these roadworks for construction with minimal repeat works and maximum construction-free timeframes. As stated above the objective is to strive to avoid digging up newly constructed roads. Clash Grids are seen as a possible mechanism to facilitate this objective. Most standard software is based on 'Date Clashes' for obvious reasons. The clashes we wish to identify specifically are duplicate (or multiple) occurrences of the same Street Names i.e. works that have been programmed in the same Street at different times under different projects for different services for different utilities. The objective then would be to re-programme the separate projects so that works in that street were done at the same time. This would require the cooperation of the various Utilities or service providers. It would be desirable to list projects in financial years.</p> <p>4. Prototype A simple model has been developed to demonstrate the feasibility of the 'clash detection' process. Project Leader – Transport Funding Utilities</p> <p>5. Summary Roads are continually being dug up to accommodate the installation of utility services. Reinstatement works are never up to the original standards. This submission proposes the use of a 'clash detection' process as a means of identifying the prospect of excavations and repairs in new roads so that preventative measures can be employed before it's too late. The 'clash grid' is based on the use and manipulation of Excel spreadsheets to flag and identify the location by using street names as identifiers. This is probably too much detail for this draft plan and is better addressed in the implementation stages.</p>
864	Alana Lane	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
400	Alastair Norriss Upton	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: I am strongly supportive of the strategic concept of having fewer, more frequent services utilising interchanges. I agree that this will be more attractive if implemented alongside the proposed fare zone areas, and so I would not like to see the network changes implemented without the fare zone changes. A further relevant indicator could be 'number of jobs located within X metres of frequent service line' as this figure could guide both location of the routes as well as future land use plans.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: I strongly support the move to integrated ticketing, and in particular the measures to make it more attractive to use multiple modes for one trip. I do not support the 'off-peak' fares as they would be overcomplicated and unnecessary. The overall price should be kept at a reasonable level and if differentiated they may be seen to 'milk' commuters. If there are improved services throughout the day (and week) people will likely take advantage of that improvement to avoid peak traffic in any case.</p> <p>Other Comments: I am strongly supportive of the proposals. I would like a greater emphasis on the connection between land use and transport in the strategy section. While this is outside the operational side of the RPTP I believe the level of integration of land use planning should be a primary consideration when considering the design of the PT network. It appears to not have been addressed at a high level in the Draft RPTP although it forms a core part of the Auckland Plan (items 111 144 and 145 for example). Specifically I would like to see a strong emphasis on the interchanges, as it seems they will become increasingly important. New Lynn is a great existing example of</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Alastair Norriss Upton (#400)	<p>design for development around a transport interchange. Using the example of Mt Albert (because as I am a local and have observed this area closely) I suggest that there more many opportunities to integrate interchanges with areas of employment and higher density. The presence of good quality services will likely have a 'magifier' [sic] effect on demand (both travel and land) in these areas.</p> <p>From a network point of view the Mt Albert will be very well connected under the proposal - 8 connection directions compared with say New Lynn which has 6, or Britomart which has 14. While this does not reflect passenger volumes I think it is significant because of the opportunities for activity to be located at the interchange point. Mt Albert's transport infrastructure is really inadequate given its status in the network (poor intermodal connection to buses on adjacent roads, horrendous pedestrian and cycle connections and no car-drop points, for example) and has the potential to be much better integrated with employment, services and housing than it is currently is or will be in the upgrade plans.</p> <p>I think this transport plan offers an opportunity for a more dispersed and mixed use of the network compared to a highly centralised 'CBD' model of development, which could create more vibrant neighbourhoods, less commuter congestion at the centre and shorter travel times.</p>
115	Alec Robert Looney	<p>Q1 - Strongly Opposed Comments: I think one of the BIG impediments to people using public transport is having to change services, and here you are proposing a system that relies on numerous interchanges. I think you see a system where people jump off one bus and are on another in a minute or so. Whereas patrons see a 10 minute wait, get a couple of those and the journey becomes too long and we take our car. There may be ways around this, perhaps express services that don't stop every other block. Perhaps Britomart is NOT the hub, but at the end of a spoke of several surrounding smaller hubs.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral Comments: The one ticket to go anywhere on any mode is a good idea. I would not have the City zone, but integrate it with the Isthmus zone to make one Central zone. The City zone smacks of an ignorance of the 7 council areas making up the supercity. I think it is an extra level of complication for the "old money" St Heliers, Remuera, St Mary's Bay, etc residents who consider themselves proper Aucklanders. Without the City zone you could have a 2 zone fare structure. Central zone & perimeter zone. Very simple and fair.</p> <p>Other Comments: Being surrounded by water the Ferry service is not utilised as much as it could be to meet Auckland's transport needs. it is a far more pleasant way to travel than by bus or train. This draft plan does not address the main impediments to using Public Transport for me. As mentioned earlier if I have to change service I'd be unlikely to use it, The buses (& to a lesser extent the trains) seem designed for smaller framed people not the average NZer. The bus drivers are on too tight a time frame and (eg) cannot wait for people to sit before having to drive off. Education of patrons on social etiquette so one does not get sat next to someone who has had pickled garlic for breakfast etc. Are all things that would enhance public transport for me rather than being able to buy one ticket. There also seems to be a huge imbalance across the greater Auckland region, the Northshore has a gold plated bus service with huge spending recently. Out west, a lot of investment in trains, even taking existing services to the next level with underground station and pedestrians on top. The south has always had a train service. Out east toward Howick Pakuranga not a lot really, the forgotten suburbs. The Ferry gets to tie up outside of the local marina, no train service, and we have to have our own bus service! [sic]</p>
878	Alfred Hawtin	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
306	Alison Rust	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: I support the integrated network concept (section 2) that makes better use of existing resources. As stated in Policies 5.1 and 5.2, it is essential that service planning is aligned with infrastructure planning such as bus priority measures to ensure reliability and secure connections that minimise waiting time and that interchanges are easily accessible. / I suggest that an action is added to Policy 5.4 to the effect that AT organises or supports a campaign to "Let the bus go first" to encourage drivers to give way to buses leaving on-street bus stops.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Section 4. I am totally supportive of integrated ticketing but have some concern about integrated fares. The proposed zone structure appears inequitable, especially in that fares for North Shore residents travelling to the CBD will be lower than at present with a negative revenue impact that will have to be made up by fare increases or increased subsidy. A split across the North Shore at or around Constellation Drive would produce a more equitable outcome. / In the south, the Manukau fare boundary requires further consideration.</p> <p>I understand that the zone structure is subject to further review and suggest that the RPTP makes this clear and outlines the principles that guide the zone definition process. Boundaries should have more regard to travel patterns than to assumptions about socio-economic status.</p> <p>Other Comments: I note that the existing commercial ferry services to Waiheke, Devonport and Stanley Bay are to be exempt services (policy 8.3). It is understood that there are pragmatic reasons for this but it may well be seen as a sell out by AT. The draft RPTP does not explain the implications. If it means that AT will have no influence on service provision, standards and fare levels I would anticipate that affected customers, especially the captive market on Waiheke, will not be pleased. The Devonport service is shown in figure 5.5 as a Frequent service and an essential part of the network. It is important that its efficient operation is not compromised. While an exempt service is, I think, not immune from competition, past experience indicates that it would be very difficult for a competitor to enter this market. The RPTP should provide more clarification of the implications.</p> <p>Although Policy 7.4 proposes a review of concessionary fares, I support the retention of those listed in policy 4.7. I support a review of the Super Gold evening peak free travel.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Alison Rust (#306)	<p>I support retention of discounts for full time tertiary students as they are an important off-peak market, and travel in significant numbers to point destinations that are easy to target. In 2006 there were 66,370 full time equivalent students at the 5 major tertiary campuses in metropolitan Auckland with 45,000 of them at AUT and Auckland University. Overall, there were more almost 98,000 students.</p> <p>I totally oppose any suggestion that dogs (other than guide dogs or guide dogs in training) should be allowed to travel on buses or trains.</p>
542	Allen Davies (Personal)	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I would like to say that I support the general intent of the plan. I particularly support a 15 minute bus service from the Massey area across the North Western Motorway to Downtown Auckland. I also support the introduction of the fare zones. But I am concerned that looking at the rings of distance from Downtown Auckland that the North Shore area past Upper Harbour and Constellation Drives and beyond to Orewa etc are greatly advantaged over areas such as Kumeu etc.</p>
497	Allyson Hamblett	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I have cerebral palsy. When I started using a walking frame at the beginning of last year I've found catching buses has been difficult. The difficulty occurs when getting on and off the bus. Part of the problem is the way busses pull up to the bus stop, and a gap occurs between the bus door and the pavement. When using the walker to get off the bus, it involves having to move my body in a potentially risky way, leaning so far forward before I can get the wheels of the walker onto the pavement that I could easily fall.</p> <p>If the bus stops really close to the pavement, so there is no space between and the floor is lowered then the problem is minimised.</p> <p>I am aware that buses have ramps that can be used to assist people with mobility difficulty. I caught the bus once and was told the ramp could only be used by people in wheelchairs. When the ramp has been used on several occasions it's so much easier.</p> <p>Bus drivers need disability awareness training, but recognition of the diverse ways people with mobility difficulty can access buses. For example, some people use manual wheelchairs, some use electric wheelchairs, some use walkers, but other people may be able to walk without assistance but still might require help to get on and off the bus.</p> <p>Think about how this might also apply to parents who have young children who might need help getting push chairs onto the bus. It's the same type of problem, the gap between the entrance of the bus and the pavement.</p> <p>I was in Melbourne last year for a holiday and was interested by their accessible tram stops, where the level of the stop was at the same level as the floor of the tram. Would there be a way to make stops more accessible?</p>
796	Alyxandria Waarea	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
248	Amanda Chapman	<p>Q1 - Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Support [no comments provided]</p>
376	Amanda Lees	<p>Q1 - Support Comments:</p> <p>1. The 'rapid' transport lines, especially on the Northern Busway, need more stops eg. Tristram Ave (land adjoining this area is parks/recreation, and could readily be utilised for a bus station), Greville Rd. Have less stops on the suburban (frequent, connector, local) routes, because current suburban stops are often easy walking distance between each other (suggesting they could have greater spacing between them). The bus-stops shelters would need to be a decent size to accommodate more people. (policy 2.1)</p> <p>2. The higher priority to 'frequent services' (that connect growth areas and the city), and the lower priority to 'connector services' (with connections to metropolitan and town centres, employment and activity centres), is the wrong way round (policy 2.1). Growth areas can develop more frequent services as they grow. For example, the proposed plan prioritises transport in Browns Bay, Milford, Takapuna, and the rest of the east coast bays would get less frequent services, including at peak hours. It makes more sense to give priority to transport services that connect metropolitan and town centres, employment and activity centres - these are the 'bread and butter' core services that warrant more frequent services. Simply have more frequent service of these 'connectors' at peak hours, and less frequent in off-peak (see comments below about routes). All services need to connect - at peak times they need frequent connection with the 'rapid' routes. My proposal is to have services that connect differently to those proposed ('frequent' & 'connectors') - the RPTP uses the term "local geographic catchment" - base bus routes on these geographic catchments. In the North Shore east coast bays area, each bay forms a "local geographic catchment" - most existing bus routes go along the bay (Beach Rd), and ridgelines to the north, west, and south of the bay (for example Campbells-Mairangi Bay area bus routes traverse Beach Rd, Ramsgate-Mawelton, East Coast Rd, Aberdeen Rd). The geographic catchments can be serviced by link (or 'feeder') buses, (like the city LINK buses) that link the bays areas to the 'rapid' transport service. At peak hour, they would be more frequent, and off-peak they service by linking/connecting people with town/metropolitan centres and activities, as well as the 'rapid' service line.</p> <p>3. Giving priority to buses over the harbour bridge and motorway in St Mary's Bay (Bridge to City) eg. 1-lane busway at peaks hours, leaving four lanes for other vehicles peak hours on the bridge. (policy 3.2.c) (policy 5.4.a)</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Amanda Lees (#376)	<p>4. In suburbs that link with ferry services, encourage more routing of buses and passengers toward ferry, rather than to buses that link with the Northern Busway, eg. Devonport, Stanley Bay & Bayswater - cheaper in-zone bus fare when it links with ferry.</p> <p>5. In the North Shore area, the RPTP gives priority to Browns Bay, Milford and Takapuna (which Ak Council seek to intensify residential). However, the other (North Shore) east coast bays appear to have less frequent or less suitably routed buses. Frequent service networks 2016 or 2022 maps. See also comments in point 2 above.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments:</p> <p>1. The Super Gold Card is VERY costly - sitting at more than 50% of transport costs - (Table 2.2). The money directed to this would be better spent on services and infrastructure for everybody in Auckland. Auckland Transport, and Aucklanders, need to lobby the government to abolish or significantly reduce the Super Gold Card. (I know many wealth elderly who 'abuse' it). The elderly could be restricted to using the service 1-3 times per week for one-zone trips (eg. one shopping trip, one social or health trip), AND expected to pay equivalent to the tertiary student price each time they travel for other trips. (policies 4.7.a, 7.4.b; Appendix 5)</p> <p>2. Section 6.4 Fares and Ticketing. Rather than the AIFS having a 50-cent reduced cost for an onward transfer (by bus or rail), charge for the total distance (ie. zones travelled). . The proposal as I read it would suggest the AIFS will be a scenario of ... catch a connector bus (pay for one zone), catch rapid bus/train to complete journey within two zones (pay two zones) - whereas the whole journey was only two zones in total distance. Move to a scenario of ... catch connector bus, then catch rapid bus/train, travelling 2-zones in total - cost is for distance of a 2-zone fare, and NO extra fare to change transport for bus-bus or bus-train. Overseas cities charge for total distance travelled, not charging for how many times the traveller needed to change routes or modes of transport.</p> <p>Other Comments:</p> <p>The RPTP needs less emphasis on communication that pushes 'branding' (as this costs money), and more emphasis on communication that provides information to the user, and seeks user feedback. A good customer interface that has clear signs, wayfinding and direction signs, transport lines and timetables information, etc, with less marketing 'hype' about brand (yes, buses and stations will be 'branded' anyway). (policies 5.2.c&d, 6.2.a&c, 6.3.b, 6.5)</p>
669	Amber French	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
861	Amber Piggott	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
599	Amy Bhana	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
840	Amy Chaiyakhun	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
167	André Taber	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments:</p> <p>The proposed Public Transport Network is an excellent proposal and I support it.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments:</p> <p>The proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy is a good proposal and I support it.</p>
627	Andrea McAuley	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
21	Andrew Allen	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments:</p> <p>This is a fantastic idea to provide rapid transport and an integrated network/ticket system for Auckland.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p>
825	Andrew Glover	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
862	Andrew Hunkin	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
386	Andrew John Knox	<p>Q1 - Opposed Comments:</p> <p>A simpler more connected network is great but many people do not wish to have to walk long distances to get to public transport - also MANY AREN'T ABLE TO WALK LONG DISTANCES - it creates a significant barrier for the elderly and / or disabled and/or (let's be realistic) the unfit and if the network is not easy to use it becomes simple - people won't use it.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Andrew John Knox (#386)	<p>It is great to have a service every 10minutes rather than every 15minutes but if it takes you an extra 10 minutes to get to the service you will be later. Thus there is no benefit to such a customer.</p> <p>Q2 - Opposed Comments: The proposed charging system with so many zones is too difficult and unfair to some consumers. It would be better to have a system such as that in Melbourne where you can travel all day in Zone 1 for <NZD10/day (and Zone 1 includes a large area of the city - an equivalent area in Auckland might be Albany-Manurewa:Titirangi-Howick). If the price is not affordable and easy to understand people will not use the system. Melbourne's system is also good because you can get on or off public transport as often as you like without having to pay another fare.</p> <p>It must be remembered that for many of us using public transport creates inconvenience - if we can't stop at the shops on the way home or visit relatives on the way home from work there is an incentive to use the car instead. When the price of using public transport is more expensive (remember many of us must have a car anyway so fixed costs such as registration, wof, insurance, depreciation are still relevant) why would one use public transport when it also generally takes more time as well.</p> <p>For my wife and I we can travel to and from work in 30min each way for a total return cost of less than \$10 but if we were to use public transport it would take us greater than 90min each way and cost more than \$30 return. We would not be able to shop on the way or visit our elderly relatives. Any system needs to be both accessible for the majority of people and affordable so that people use it.</p>
1	Andrew Lewis	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: What level of commitment will there be for feeder services if the patronage drops as a requirement to transfer etc</p> <p>What level of safety and security will there be at places like Te Atatu Rd and the motorway if you are required to transfer especially at night. I would suggest Henderson Interchange would be a better place for weekend and evening connections and transfers.</p> <p>Q2 - Opposed Comments: Will integrated fares be in place and will there be fair as the proposal doesn't seem fair for West and South Aucklands and favours cheaper fares for passengers on the North Shore. Oppose only because the proposed plan isn't fair at this stage</p> <p>Other Comments: Will problems be addressed early when they arise? How well will public transport providers be monitored for reliability and capacity issues? What contingencies will be in place if trains fail or cant' deliver?</p>
86	Andrew Lindesay	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: It is good to see the concept of busses feeding and connecting onto the mass-transit corridors such as the northern gateway and the rail lines rather than duplicating them; this seems like a better use of those assets. In general the plan seems sound and may make more of Auckland easier to live in. I am in support.</p> <p>The only downside I can see is that the passenger transport density may reduce; it may take longer to walk to the bus. However I guess the pay-off is that you won't need to wait so long for the bus.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral Comments: The up-side of this is that it is very easily comprehensible. The downside is that there can be some unfair situations arise around zone boundaries. With the swipe-on / swipe-off technology is it not possible to orchestrate a per-kilometer and base-charge type of pricing model? This would also seem easily comprehensible and the technology should make it possible.</p> <p>I hope the in-CDB fare will remain very low; presently \$0.50. This is commonly used by people operating in the city to get from up-town to down-down and I think it helps to make moving around the CBD easy without resorting to driving around.</p>
13	Andrew Stevenson	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: I think the rapid and frequent network is a good idea.</p> <p>I know you're not looking for feedback on specific services, but I'd like to mention a few to illustrate a principle I think you've overlooked - a far east to far west route. (The one from Pakuranga to Mt Albert is a good start, but it should be changed to Pakuranga and New Lynn.) Specifically I welcome connections from Onehunga to Pakuranga, and Sylvia Park to Pakuranga. Although both of those trips can happen at the moment (having to change in Ellerslie and Panmure respectively) a direct route is fantastic.</p> <p>The Onehunga to Manukau route is also excellent, but should either go further west or have the yellow Pakuranga/Mt Albert route go further west. (Why not have a New Lynn to Manukau route, going via Onehunga, Mangere and the airport? Imagine standing at New Lynn and seeing a bus saying "airport" on the front - fantastic!)</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Andrew Stevenson (#13)</p>	<p>Again, I understand you're going to consult on specific routes in the future, but I think you've missed a major route off which makes the system look not as useful as it could - the far east/far west route. (And secondly decent connections from the west to the airport.)</p> <p>I guess it depends on what you do with the 008 and 009 routes (they don't appear to be getting the rapid/frequent transport upgrade) but look how easily you can go north/south on the map. One change will get you from furthest north to furthest south. But furthest east to furthest west is quite painful. Either you have to go into town as far as Newmarket, or you can change twice (Pakuranga and then Mt Albert) but that also means not heading towards your destination at times. I'd suggest a corridor running east / west that is given almost the same attention and priority as a rail corridor.</p> <p>It could start at New Lynn (why duplicate the rail corridor?) and go to either Pakuranga or (better yet) Botany then Howick.</p> <p>It could run from New Lynn along Taylor, then Donovan, then White Swan, Hillsborough, then on the motorway to Nielsen, all the way along Nielsen and then Church. The Sylvia Park bit would be tricky (either you use the motorway then go back through the mall to the existing bus terminal, or you go around Hamlin's Hill via Westfield). Then to Pakuranga via the bridge. (The route you've got shown at the moment does that weird dogleg and through some back streets before going to Sylvia Park. I've caught the 009 a dozen times either way and never seen anyone get on or off in that section of the route - if you're planning rapid transport, then make it rapid between interchanges and let the local routes pick up the other bits.)</p> <p>I know it's details - and you're not looking for that now - but for me it's about the principle of being able to move from east to west as fast as possible. At the moment the 008 or 009 will do it in about 40 minutes, and the system you've got here will not improve that at all. New Lynn and Onehunga and both shown as major interchanges, so why isn't there a direct connection between them?</p> <p>The new airport connection (from Onehunga) is good but again anyone working there and living west of Onehunga will struggle to take PT there. Going in the wrong direction toward Mt Albert and then cutting back to Onehunga will put a lot of people off, but a direct and fast connection from New Lynn would again solve this. Anyway, I think is a great idea (I've been boring my friends with this idea since I visited Vancouver in 2004) as long as you get the east/west route right, and improve connections with the west and airport.</p> <p>Thanks for your time, attention and hard work.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: Great idea. Other places use it and it seems to work well. The only thing I'd say is don't require it to be "validated" after purchase like Italy does. Painful... It should be fine, because the time starts when you get on board and buy the ticket, but in Italy you CAN'T buy the tickets on-board and then have to validate them on-board.</p> <p>Other Comments: I'm reasonably familiar with the LGA 2002 - can you tell me where it says people have to provide their names and addresses for submissions?</p> <p>I don't mind, but I think it says that TLAs need to consider the views of those interested or affected - not those who provide their names and addresses. Can someone find the relevant bit in the LGA and get back to me please?</p>
<p>136</p>	<p>Andrew Walters</p>	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: The proposed network is excellent and is something Auckland has sorely needed for a long time. I very strongly support the proposed network.</p> <p>I would like to see some mention of ensuring that LCN connector services are well timed to feed both from and to key RTN services - particularly from, as missing a connection from a frequent to an infrequent service means a long and frustrating wait.</p> <p>Wherever possible, where a local connector service starts from a FTN (or RTN) node (such as St Lukes Mall, New Lynn, Westgate), its timetable should be such that it lines up closely with its connecting FTN service, in order to facilitate passengers transferring FROM the main FTN service TO the lower frequency LCN service. The LCN timetable should line up with (and if late, wait for) the arrival of pre-determined FTN services coming from the direction of the biggest upstream node of that connecting FTN. / To use a specific proposed service in the draft as an example, outbound Wesley LCN services from St Lukes should line up with (and if late, wait for) pre-determined New North Rd FTN services coming from the CBD. The Wesley service's timetable should show the times of CBD departures of New North Rd FTN services to catch to make those connections.</p> <p>I would like to highlight that I am only proposing that LCN services wait for RTN services - not the other way around, due to the higher frequency of the RTN service meaning a missed connection doesn't cause as long a delay for inbound passengers, and that an RTN service waiting for an inbound LCN service would be quite disruptive.</p> <p>I also propose that the 15 minute threshold of the definition of the FTN be a starting point, and that a long term goal be to work towards improving the minimum standard to 10 minutes by 2022, and 7.5 minutes by 2032, or a similar timeframe.</p> <p>A 15 minute wait is only just "turn up and go", higher frequencies would better achieve this level of ease of use.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: I strongly support moving to a zonal fare system and believe it should be implemented at the earliest possible opportunity.</p> <p>The proposed draft could also do with some changes in zone boundaries and overlap areas - currently it unfairly favours the North Shore. This could be resolved by introducing a Zone 2-3 boundary along a similar east-west</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Andrew Walters (#136)</p>	<p>line intersecting Constellation Station, similar to the present-day Northern Pass upper-lower zone boundary. I would however include Greenhithe in Northern Zone 3.</p> <p>I would suggest primarily referring to zones using numbers - Zone 1 for the CBD, Zone 2 for the rest of the Isthmus and lower North Shore (as per the above zone boundary suggestions), and Zone 3 for the upper North Shore, Greenhithe, West and South/South-east Auckland, with Zone 4 being the proposed "Outer west/south" zones. The fare payable would be the total number of zones travelled through.</p> <p>For short trips that cross zone boundaries, I would also recommend the introduction of a "short distance fare" - where a round trip less than (say) 4km is counted as a one-zone fare regardless of any zone boundaries crossed.</p> <p>I also strongly believe that the entire FTN network come under the AIFS and zonal fares for simplicity and legibility. The current draft RPTP leaves the Devonport Ferry as a strange anomaly for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The FTN schematic and map include the Devonport ferry as a solid line, meaning a service every 15 minutes 7am-7pm 7 days, yet; 2) Page 96 shows Devonport ferry as being 15 minutes peak only - offpeak and weekend is 30 mins, evenings 60. This fails to qualify as a FTN. 3) Additionally "Ferry fares will remain point-to-point, outside the future zonal system." (Draft RPTP page 33). <p>I do not support the inclusion of the Devonport Ferry on the FTN map without FTN frequencies and inclusion in integrated zonal fares.</p> <p>Other Comments: One point of confusion I can see happening is confusion as to how zonal fares would be applied.</p> <p>The Auckland travelling public are accustomed to the stage system where the fare is calculated using the number of stage points crossed plus one. The zonal system will be different - it is the number of different zones passed through.</p> <p>It needs to be made clear that zones and zone boundaries are not the same as stages and stage boundaries.</p> <p>Promotional material should clearly differentiate between "zones travelled through" and "zone/stage boundaries crossed". Present-day public understanding of stages, if applied to zones, would result in misunderstanding and a perception that some fares would be higher than in reality. As an example, if applying "stage-based" thinking, a trip within the isthmus passing through the CBD would seem to be a three-zone fare (two zone boundaries crossed - from isthmus zone to city zone, and again from city zone back to isthmus zone), whereas it will need to be made clear that it will in fact be a two-zone fare (two different zones passed through with the trip passing through the city zone, but starting and ending in the same isthmus zone).</p> <p>Overall I think the overall direction of the draft RPTP is something Auckland has sorely needed for a long time, and I hope that it will not be materially changed from the draft. I look forward to using the new network. It is far more deserving of the label "network" than the 2012 present-day disjointed and jumble of services. When the RPTP is fully implemented, we will look back at the old 2012 level of service and wonder how we managed to endure it for so long.</p>
<p>205</p>	<p>Angela Stones</p>	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: I agree with the proposed network system in theory, but some lessons on public transport are still not being learned by those who devise plans such as this. The closer someone lives to the city centre, the more likely they would be to use public transport to get to work - right? No, as by the time the buses reach the suburbs skirting the city centre they are full and cruise right on by those waiting at stops. There needs to be intelligent thought put into the network system by people who ride public transport every single day, not those who devise what is surely a logical plan that doesn't function at all that way in practice. The problems with Auckland's public transport system are that it isn't logical, is horrifically unreliable, never runs on time, makes no apologies for any failings, is not accountable to anyone and discourages use by those who would be most likely to use it.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Keep prices realistic. If there is a difference of \$3-5 per day between taking public transport and parking, I'd rather drive so I don't have to be let down by late or absent services. / / Bumping up the prices of parking in the city is not the answer either - some people have to drive to work. I drop my daughter at a before-school care program before driving to work the city, and pick her up from an after-school care program when I finish work. It's already a really long day for an 8 year old but some of us don't have a choice. If I took public transport I would be leaving the house at 7:15am to walk my daughter to the program, get myself on a bus by 7:45am to be at work by 8:30am; in the reverse, I finish work at 4:30pm so would not be able to collect my daughter until 5:15pm and be home by 5:45pm. It's a long day to put on a child, so I choose to drive and pay the \$13 per day parking. Any higher prices would be insulting when I'm trying so hard to get ahead.</p>
<p>630</p>	<p>Angela Sullivan</p>	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view**</p>
<p>774</p>	<p>Ann Anderson</p>	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view**</p>
<p>20</p>	<p>Anne Gibbins</p>	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: I would like to see more feeder services to main transport corridors such as the bus way, train stations etc. Overseas transport systems I have used have transfer ticket machines to allow for seamless travel between services such as from a subway car to a streetcar (tram) or bus to continue on to your destination. Not everyone uses a card and would be good for tourists getting around tourist spots in Auckland for example. Integrated ticketing is a must and one which we have waited too long for.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Anne Gibbins (#20)	<p>Auckland is a spread out city so a lot of the bus services we have now do ensure that people can get around and we have to remember the elderly who may not be able to walk far to a bus stop when planning new routes.</p> <p>More frequent services in peak time are a great idea. Even in peak hours you can be waiting half an hour between buses going to your destination. Shortening that time would encourage more people to use public transport. The frequency of the Northern Express is a good example of where frequent 10 minutes services see a lot of people using it.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: I see that the North Shore are the losers in the proposed zoning change so would like the zones to stay as is but we do need an integrated ticketing system across the entire region and all operators to allow for ease of travel. Transfer ticket machines at transport centres, trains, buses etc as they have in Toronto also make it easier when a transfer is needed to continue on to your destination. You just grab a ticket from the machine, show it to driver or the guy in the booth and you're away. Good for those who do not have a hop card such as occasional users, elderly (who may not want a extra card) and visitors.</p>
626	Annette Sullivan	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
463	Anthony Beaschke	<p>Q1 - Support Comments:</p> <p>PUBLIC TRANSPORT ROAD</p> <p>* I believe one aspect has not been looked at in the whole question of public transport and that is the welfare of the operating staff, that is, the bus drivers themselves.</p> <p>* Concerning the workforce of that company known as NZBUS: the drivers have been constantly exhorted to give the best of themselves for the sake of the great vision that is Auckland Transport - yet the physical conditions and environment under which they operate has been and currently is so far from satisfactory that most drivers are not of a mind to contribute to this vision.</p> <p>*NZBus is a company with great financial resources behind it and yet the facilities afforded and in fact been the indirect cause of various accidents involving the public, for reason of driver fatigue. I challenge you to look into this whole matter as part of your survey.</p> <p>Q2 - NA [no comments provided]</p>
220	Ariel Kulaitis	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: Firstly I would like to say that is great to live in a city where the population is encouraged to put their point of view and say something about the projects for the city.</p> <p>Well done Auckland.</p> <p>I'm from Brazil and from a City called Curitiba.</p> <p>Curitiba is worldwide known as having one of the best public transport systems in the world. Many cities around the world try to learn something about what has made the public transport system in Curitiba so special.</p> <p>I could spend hours trying to tell you the benefits of its transport system in a city with 1.800.000 habitants (2010) and growing fast.</p> <p>I prefer to paste here some links that will lead you to more accurate information.</p> <p>Another option is simply Google – “Curitiba public transport system”</p> <p>Please see the links bellow for more information. http://www.metroplanning.org/multimedia/presentation/583 http://improve-public-transport.wikispaces.com/intro_BRT http://www.solutions-site.org/node/83 http://inhabitat.com/transporation-tuesday-curitiba/curitiba-public-transportation-systems-great-public-transit-mass-transit-brazil-mass-transit-public-transportation-transportation-tuesday-sustainable-transit-2/ http://www.pps.org/great_public_spaces/one?public_place_id=613</p> <p>I'm happy to meet at any convenient time to tell you more about the Curitiba transport system and how it works with a point [of] view of one of its citizens.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p>
67	Arthur Christopher Kitt	<p>Q1 - Support [no comments provided]</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Arthur Christopher Kitt (#67)	<p>Q2 - Strongly Opposed Comments: The zoning as proposed is discriminatory against people who live in West & South Auckland they will have to pay more to travel into Central Auckland than people who live on the North Shore. The fares must be based on how far you travel not your post code</p> <p>Other Comments: I hope you do not forget that people need feeder services to get to the frequent or connector services, park & rides are not the answer to get people out of their cars,once you stat up your car in the morning you will drive it to your destination.</p>
770	Ashlee Harrison	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
607	Atuarangi Muru	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
830	Ayesha Tate	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
852	B Cowsill	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
637	Babette McMillan	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
432	Barbara Insull (Personal)	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: I agree that a transformational change is needed to improve Auckland's transport system.</p> <p>I believe there is a strong demand for good PT and alternatives to car travel.</p> <p>I ride a bike for transport and would like to see bikes considered a serious transport mode that complement the PT system. I know many people who drive a car in Auckland for all journeys- even though they would like to bike - who are too afraid because they perceive the roads to be too dangerous.</p> <p>I agree with prioritising routes to key destinations -if this reduces inner suburb routes we need very good walking and cycling access.</p> <p>Q2 - Opposed Comments: School children should have very low fares, families a discount fare, and elderly with gold card able to use it on all rides. Bikes should be free on all PT modes as they represent fewer cars on the road. Pay for fare subsidies by charging more for parking -congestion charging.</p> <p>Other Comments: Look more broadly at what are the key elements to optimising our transport system. / Include riding a bike as a transport mode that complements PT. Make access to transport hubs safe and easy to increase PT patronage. Include a Public Bike Hire system in the PT system to reduce car congestion in the central city.</p> <p>It has been shown in other cities that people will use PT when they find they can get from A to B faster using PT than in their car. Transformational change will require transformational thinking by funders/decision makers and the transport planners.</p> <p>We need urgency and bravery to take a new, fast course - and to invest in it. It has been done before in many world class cities - we are not being ground breakers!</p>
569	Barbara Keith	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>We really need our once a week bus to Port Waikato. Many rely on this service. I am 73 years old, and I use this bus every Thursday. Please do not take this service from us.</p> <p>Please support the Maxx trains for Tuakau.</p> <p>It would be used.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
285	Barry John Hannah	<p>Q1 - Neutral [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Opposed Comments: I strongly oppose the inclusion of the Hibiscus Coast in the "Outer-north Zone" — it does a disservice to the population size of Whangaparaoa/Orewa/Silverdale area, and the number of residents of this area who must travel to the city for work.</p> <p>I appreciate the geographic challenges, but I believe that defining zones by "drawing a circle on a map" is unjust and overly simplistic. It will penalise residents living on the Whangaparaoa Peninsula when the reality is that Whangaparaoa is a short trip down a very fast motorway and in that regard is no more remote than any of the East Coast Bays. Taking into account the number of public transport users makes this all the more unfair. / / The HBC area is much more inhabited than any other locale included in the "Outer-north Zone" or even the "Outer-south Zone"; it should be treated as the special case that it is. Define it by geographic boundary; don't just include it in the widest circle.</p> <p>Other Comments: Please please please sort out integrated ticketing. Please please please DO NOT let NZ Bus create passes that: a: cannot be bought on the bus; b: are valid for a calendar month only; c: are nonsensical and several steps backwards from anything available previously — every new product introduction needs to be an improvement on the last or it should not be introduced.</p>
560	Baseisth Rai	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>Thank you very much [for] providing us good transport service in Auckland area. I have been a regular user of public transport and I will be in future also.</p> <p>I have suggestion for stage fare charge of bus since long time, but the time has come now to say I am a low income person and can afford only public transport. I feel good and [e]njoy my every day journey by bus.</p> <p>I travel from 1173 Dominion road (Bus Stop No. 8441) to Balmoral by bus No 267 stage. From 1173 Dominion Road to Mt Roskill is one stage (one and half kilometre). I pay \$1.90 up to Mt Roskill shops. Means \$1.90 being charged for the travelling up to one and half kilometre distance. Again from Mt Roskill shops to 879 Dominion Road (my veg shop, bread, milk shopping) I pay another \$1.90. If I get down to Balmoral shops then also I pay \$1.90. So I have travel from my stop to Balmoral, hardly 3 kilometre or maximum 4 kilometres and I pay \$3.80. Do you think \$3.80 is a good fare to travel[?]</p> <p>At present, fare is on stage basis, means one point to another point. Even people travel just for a short distance and they pay for full stage.</p> <p>It will be nice, fare and [illegible word] if the money is charged on distance basis not one stage basis. For example from 1173 Dominion Road to Mt Roskill shops one stage (1½ kilometre) fare should be 95 cents, not \$1.90. If you divide your one stage distance it's hardly 3 – 4 kilometres maximum. If one stage is 3 kilometres then divide one stage into three and then charge on kilometre basis.</p> <p>Simple: - 1 stage, divided into 3 then charge on kilometre basis.</p> <p>From Mt Roskill shops to Three Kings, fare should be charged on kilometre basis.</p> <p>Most of the country's public transport fare is charged on distance basis, not one point to another point.</p> <p>I go three times in a week (Monday, Wednesday, Friday) to Greenlane Hospital and I have to be there by 7.00am. It's good for normal weekdays, but no service if [it is a] public holiday. First 267 is from Lynfield [on a public holiday] is 7.30[am]. It will be nice if it can be improved public holiday also.</p> <p>My opinion: - fare should be charged on distance basis, not on point basis.</p>
385	Benjamin Ross	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: The proposed public transport networks (as illustrated in the Chapter Five graphics) seem to cover both existing and potential greenfield development urban areas well enough. However I have noticed the missing South Manukau Rail Link that would allow direct train services from Manukau Station to Papakura/Pukekohe without needing a transfer (like current) at Puhinui Station as part of either the frequent or all day service network.</p> <p>Now I know the physical link has to be built, but I am emphasising that it needs to be built by 2016 to enable the roll out of either an All Day or as Frequent Service Network as such a link and accompanying services to Manukau Station direct from Papakura/Pukekohe would be deemed faster, more efficient and able to move a greater number of passengers than any bus ever could. There is "latent" demand for such a South Link that would deem the investment economically and socially viable. Manukau Station is better served and optimised regardless of the tertiary institution there with direct services to Papakura and Pukekohe as it is believed that is where the bulk of your revenue paying passengers would be coming from, rather than north of Papatoetoe as the current link does. No South Link basically discriminates those residents south of Manukau who want and need very easy access that rail provides to their major employment and recreational/leisure hub.</p> <p>While feeder services are mentioned in the RPTP, I am willing to wait until AT have further developed the idea at a later date in which I hope there will be dialogue between the ratepayer, businesses, Local Boards and the public transport operators (bus and rail)</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Benjamin Ross #385	<p>Q2 - Support Comments: Please head to this link http://voakl.net/2012/10/07/submission-to-rptp/ on my thoughts and opinions on your Fares and Ticketing</p> <p>Other Comments: Infrastructure wise: High Priority to have the Walters Road (Takanini) Station and Park and Ride facility built by 2018 with the continued urban development in the area (including Papakura) Close Te Mahia and Takanini Stations (relocated Takanini Station to near Spartan Road crossing and add Park and Ride) Look at adding a 20 minute frequency bus service between Manurewa, The Gardens/Totara Heights, Porchester Road and Papakura Town Centre to serve new urban developments in that area. This new service would also feed into Manurewa, Walters Road and Papakura Train Stations.</p> <p>Please refer to Attachment 4, Page 4 – 9 of the Attachments to Submissions Document http://www.aucklandtransport.govt.nz/submissions</p>
367	Bera MacClement	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: I strongly support having a frequent 15 minute service on the main routes, having seen how popular the Northern Express has become. I strongly support the City Rail Link, because rail can carry many more passengers than buses. Unless this Link is built, inner city roads will become hopelessly congested with buses during rush hour. I also strongly support efforts to ensure that public transport runs reliably and on time, because people won't use it otherwise (particularly to get to work). I have reservations about evening services that only run hourly, because it would be pretty useless to run buses at 8pm and 9pm with nothing later. What people need is a service that will get them home after an evening out, in other words one bus in each direction at about 10.30pm or later on almost all routes. At age 71, I am getting tired of walking nearly five kilometres to get home at night, and taxis are too expensive for people living on NZ Super. (Will I still be able to walk 5km when I'm over 80?)</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: Having used Oyster when in London, I am really keen to have a similar system in Auckland. I in favour of an integrated ticket system, partly because it simplifies transfers between operators and partly because of the promise to remove transfer penalties. The Northern Pass (integrated ticket) has been excellent, and I have already bought myself an AT HOP card</p> <p>As a pensioner with a Gold Card, I would be willing to accept paying full fare during peak periods, provided I could be sure of a usable service, including one bus to get me home late at night. In terms of the Super Gold concession, the afternoon peak period in Christchurch is from 3pm to 6pm with a second off-peak period after 6pm. I am somewhat doubtful about the 50% cost recovery policy, because it would be likely to increase fares and discourage people from taking public transport, but I don't see how else the proposed improvements can be funded under the present government.</p> <p>Other Comments: Not an answer to this question, but there is nowhere else on the form to say it: the reason I asked for a hearing in Central Auckland is that would be easy to get to by public transport from Greenhithe. In fact Takapuna would be even easier for me to get to, but other parts of North Auckland (such as Glenfield or Orewa) would be pretty awful in terms of public transport</p>
142	Bernadette Elizabeth Lim	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: I live out at Port Waikato and are very keen in getting a job in Auckland Central, I would love to be able to drive to Tuakau and park my car and catch a train into Auckland City. I have held off applying for City Jobs as I am not keen on the daily drive in peak hour traffic each day. It will also open up the Country Life Style to a lot of City Workers. And help keep us as green as possible having less cars on the road.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p>
791	Bernadette Jackson	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
811	Bill Clifford	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
638	Bob Taylor	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
703	Bobbi McConachie	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
241	Bradley Hinchco	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p>
619	Brandon Hook	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
249	Brendan Doherty	<p>Q1 - Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: As someone who lives in the City Zone, I think it is unfair that the City Zone is so small, and all the other zones are much larger. If I want to catch the bus that goes 2km west, it will cost me two zones, but people who live on the shore can travel long bay to Devonport in 1 zone.</p> <p>From an earlier submission: Regarding switching to a zone system, I think it is important that there a overlapping boundaries of all zones that are not separated by water, instead of just having overlapping zones at specific points in the boundary. I live within the proposed city zone close to the western boundary (in freemans bay). I would hope that it would be possible to catch buses that head west to grey lynn or westmere for the one zone price without having to walk to the zone boundary. In vancouver they call this system "common fare zone locations for a one-zone fare", See http://www.translink.ca/en/Fares-and-Passes/Fare-Zone-Map.aspx</p> <p>Regarding transfers, I would hope that Auckland would adopt a model like that of Vancouver or San Francisco, where / the one fare covers you for 90 minutes of travel within the same zone. This made it easy to transfer from one bus to another when I wasn't travelling when a single bus would take me. See http://www.translink.ca/en/Fares-and-Passes/Single-Fares.aspx and http://www.sfmta.com/cms/mfares/transfers.htm For example, to catch a bus from College Hill to Grey Lynn shops I could catch the 010, or an Inner Link and a 191 for the same price.</p>
17	Brendan Weir	<p>Q1 - Strongly Opposed Comments: As recent events in Christchurch have so tragically shown, rail transport becomes completely useless in the event of even a minor quake (or other natural or man-made disaster). Even a tiny movement in the track, a tiny line blockage or signal power-failure, a gas-leak or accident renders the entire network useless. However, buses are self-propelled and autonomous transport-cells. Unlike a train, they can back up and take a different route, manoeuvre around blockages or problem areas and remain active and useful during a problem or disaster. Ignoring the fact that Auckland is built on an active fault-line is short-sighted at best and criminal at worst. RAIL IS A NIGHTMARE DURING A DISASTER. We need to be investing ONLY in disaster-proof public-transport systems. It would be horrifying to see the authors of Auckland's Transport Plan one day sitting in a court answering to a royal commission about their part in a rail-network that was always doomed to compound the effects of a natural disaster.</p> <p>Infrastructure expenditure should concentrate on creating an integrated network of bus routes that allow all Aucklanders to transit from their local area to any destination in Auckland without the inconvenience of changing transport-mode. Infrastructure routes should also eliminate the costly (and environmentally damaging) mentality of all users having to pass through a central nexus (Britomart). A network of road-based buses with strong direct routes between outlying areas of Auckland will have no need to waste time, fuel and efficiency transiting through the primary blockage-point that is Britomart. ALL international studies have clearly shown that changing between modes of transport (buses and trains) is an impediment to users.</p> <p>When one single type of transport has been available (either bus or train) then public usage has been significantly higher.</p> <p>An integrated network will not be achieved through the creation of a central rail-loop. Most Aucklanders have no access to local rail transport. In fact, as an example, since Auckland merged into a supercity, all weekend rail-services to Franklin have been axed on the grounds that track-maintenance is too expensive.</p> <p>Spending money on the aging rail infrastructure is short-sighted when experience in other countries shows that rail networks tend to become more and more financially unviable. We already have a transport infrastructure that directly serves every household in Auckland - ROADS. We must think creatively to revamp our roading infrastructure to incorporate our increasing public transport needs. We must NOT continue any further with public expenditure on the trap that is rail. While there is a knee-jerk reaction to support rail on the grounds that is 'environmentally friendly', a quick analysis of the long term costs will show that, in the larger picture, buses are a comparable environmental option.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Opposed [no comments provided]</p>
292	Brian Boys	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: I would like to see bus services to Regional Parks at least on a daily basis especially on weekends, holidays and school holidays.</p> <p>I feel bus transport is the most efficient and effective. For bicycle use to improve it needs to be separated from normal transport. Mixing the bike and bus use in the same lanes seems incongruous.</p> <p>For public transport to succeed there needs to be dedicated lanes that ensure effective transport time frames. Up to the minute information on the next available bus etc is vital to keep the public confidence in the system.</p> <p>Best wishes for a complex task.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral [no comments provided]</p>
267	Brian Gill	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments:</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Brian Gill (#267)	<p>I am very excited by the new proposals for rationalised major bus routes and a concentration of frequent bus services on the main routes. Achieving high-frequency bus and train services during weekday off-peak times and at weekends could be a key to getting Aucklanders out of their cars. I'm a keen public transport user but at present even I wouldn't attempt to get about the city by public transport on Sundays with the current services so infrequent.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: I'm a bit concerned that the inner-city fare zone may be a bit tight and needs to be expanded to take in city fringe areas that are currently a single-stage journey from Britomart.</p>
812	Briar Gray	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
641	Bronwyn Watson	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
213	Brook Warner	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: The direction seems good but I am not convinced it is enough. I think Auckland, if it wants to become a truly international city, needs to look beyond what cities are currently doing and try to innovate - rather than simply playing catch-up as we always do.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: The zone system is a good start, but I do not think it is quite right yet. There are many people who will be penalised for simply crossing a zone border (ie travelling between Glen Eden and New Lynn or Glen Eden to Avondale) when in reality they are travelling less distance than those who commute from Britomart all the way to New Lynn. I would rather see a single flat rate for any travel within zones 1-3, or some system that works on the distance (in km or # of stops) between where you tagged on and where you tagged off.</p> <p>In addition, the fares (at present, and even with a 20% discount as indicated) are still very very high. When I travelled as a tertiary student with a 40% discount, even then that was quite high but was more in line with affordable and expected. For the service we get I think the fares should be much less. Especially if we want to encourage people to use the trains and public transport, we need to incentivise this much more.</p> <p>Other Comments: It's a good start, much overdue. I am concerned however that it is too little, too late.</p>
841	Caitlin Potter	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
613	Callum Bisley	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
346	Cameron Bennett	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: This is exactly the direction Auckland should be heading. One of the biggest problems with the current network is that it is fragmented separate fares competing services and varying degrees of reliability make it very difficult for people to what to use the network on a regular basis.</p> <p>If we implement what is proposed here then we solve a ,lot of these problems. I think initially some commuters who are not used to it will find it difficult to get used to the idea of regular transfers but over time this will grow public transport use as people begin to experience the convenience of regular, reliable and cost effective services working as a network.</p> <p>I do think that zonal fares need to be introduced as soon as possible. This is one of the best features of overseas public transport networks- being able to transfer penalty free.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: This is essential zonal based integrated fares should be introduced as soon as is possible. With the ability to load day, week or month passes on the integrated card.</p> <p>Other Comments: This is a huge opportunity for Auckland. What has been presented in the RPTP, if implemented, would provide a massive step forward for Auckland as a city. A proper integrated network of regular planned services complimenting each other (as opposed to competing) and full integrated ticketing with zonal pricing are exactly what we need. Well done Auckland Transport I'm really looking forward to seeing this happening over the next few years.</p>
428	Camilla Abernathy-Arden	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: If the connections were viable and reliable this would be an excellent plan. * A Suggestion - That all members of the hearing panel use buses ONLY for transport between the time of the submission closing date and the day of the hearing.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Camilla Abernathy-Ardern (#428)</p>	<p>Q2 - Don't Know Comments: An integrated card and cash fare system is a very good idea.</p> <p>Expecting to make money or break even is unrealistic, no one wants to have to pay high amounts for tickets.</p> <p>Other Comments One of my concerns is the statement about making the service pay for itself. It is time to take the wider view. An efficient and inexpensive transport system would REWARD this City by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reducing the number of cars on the roads - less maintenance and way less congestion. - Economic benefits to carriers, couriers, trades people ie. those who have to use a vehicle. - Fewer cars; fewer accidents - Less time lost all around - A much improved quality of breathing air an absolute essential for a truly liveable City. <p>***Separate Sheet*** (poem) You ask our opinion You tell us, "have your say", And when we start to speak You simply turn away.</p> <p>The system it needs shelters To keep us from the rain, No-one's going to catch a bus When they've caught a cold again.</p> <p>Then there is the summer, When we swelter and we burn So next time, instead of bus, It's to our car we turn.</p> <p>Of seats there are too few For us to wait and sit Let alone our bags and stuff – There's such a lot of it.</p> <p>We wait wearily for a bus After days that are 'enough' For tired elderly gentlemen And woman with their shopping To feed their hungry bunch, And mothers with little children, Crying for their lunch. We stand and wait and wait and WAIT Our legs are 'falling off', The bus again is late.</p> <p>The stops they are so far apart, It really breaks a heart - The bags they are so heavy - It seems too much to start.</p> <p>I really want to go to town, I really really do So when it comes, I board the bus, and find I'm out of funds; The ticket is expensive though to you it seems so cheap; It's me, not you, that has to live on a hundred dollars a week. You want to make some money; to make the buses pay, So you make it quite expensive and the patrons stay away. They'd like to use the bus but it doesn't go their way; You can have one, you simply can't have both,</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Camilla Abernathy-Ardern (#428)	<p>The plan either runs for cost or leave it to the moths.</p> <p>It's no good spending money On a plan that will not "run", When all is said and done It's OUR funds you're spending; It hurt your pockets none.</p> <p>So if you take no notice When we try to have our say, Just leave the routes as they are, And put your plan away.</p>
230	Carl Frederick Rosel	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p>
152	Carl William Gorham	<p>Q1 - Strongly Opposed Comments: I am writing to forward my concerns about the present transport draft plan. We are down here in Tuakau and need a train service/ bus service between Tuakau, Pukekohe and so on into town.</p> <p>The area is Expanding, I myself have added to it as I am an ex-Aucklander that could not afford to buy in Auckland, so I have moved here and I know of loads more that are moving south to beat the house prices. To not to look 30 years to the future is madness because haven't we learned from our previous mistakes 30 years ago when it came to transport. Franklin and North Waikato are going to increase in population and would it be better to have people catching trains from Tuakau/ Pukekohe into Auckland for work or down to Hamilton then have them driving on the roads?</p> <p>Just remember Dove Myer Robinson when looking over this plan, these services will get used as I and my partner will be one of them.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral [no comments provided]</p>
696	Carmen Chatfield	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
391	Carol Green	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: I think the frequent service proposed along the North-Western motorway needs to provide a stop/interchange at the top of Rosebank Peninsula. Looking at the various maps, it seems like that area has a lack or service. Since it is a place of high employment it would make sense to have a stop there.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p>
221	Carol Han	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: The integrated traffic system looks great, and I expect this system will work more efficiently than the current transport system.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral Comments: The current fare and ticketing system is not just complex, it is extremely expensive to certain extend. There is no indication of reducing fare scheme in the new plan.</p> <p>Other Comments: From my point of view, instead of splitting Auckland into different zone and charge differently between two zones, the fare should be charged more sensible. Traveling just one stage beyond the zone boundary automatically being charged for additional fee is not rational. The fare should be charged on the exact number of stages the commuter has travelled.</p> <p>For example, traveling from Britomart to New Lynn on train is 3 stage, and one stage farther is 4 stage; that is acceptable since there are total number of 10 stations. But if a person traveling from Mt Eden to New Lynn is still charged 3 stage, even though he/she is only going across of 8 stations.</p> <p>The new fare charging system should be wiser, charging on exact number of station on traveling, not just simply count on the zone boundary. So instead of charging the person from Mt Eden to New Lynn as 3 stages, he/she could be charged as 2 stages.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Carol Han (#221)	This fare system is widely adopted overseas, where at the fare is calculated based upon the traveling stations across the network, using current station as the New Starting Point. The zonal charging system should be phased out.
763	Carole Chambers	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
631	Caroline Dobbs	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
160	Carolione Tahu	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: My house hold strongly support for a train from Tuakau as we have 2 separate cars going to Middlemore hospital & Penrose & would find a huge stress free finance if we were able to use this service daily for work & also for a other family of mine that lives with us who is in her 70's and does not drive would have use of this transport to go into Pukekohe to attend elderly groups & visit her family members & she would also be independent instead of waiting for someone to take her into Pukekohe which is not offend due to our own traveling for work.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p>
629	Carolyn Edwards	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
593	Carolyn Payne	<p>RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE TO TUAKAU (Contains EXTRA note below from Submitter) Can Auckland Transport please support the MAXX trains service being extended to Tuakau. We need a commuter train service to Tuakau. * We are a growing township and we need a train service to Auckland. * We sent a petition of 3500 signatures to Parliament last year in support of a commuter rail service. * We have university students who would like to live at home and commute to uni by train. * We have upwards of 200 commuters who have to travel to Pukekohe to catch the commuter train service and would appreciate being able to catch the train in Tuakau. * We have the resources to upgrade our rail platform ourselves if need be.</p> <p>BUS SERVICE - TUAKAU to PUKEKOHE Can Auckland Transport please support the continuation of our bus service from Tuakau to Pukekohe. * The major supermarkets are in Pukekohe along with other large retailers. * We also need to catch the bus for education, work and leisure purposes in Pukekohe.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my submission.</p> <p>EXTRA NOTE: We run a holiday programme in Tuakau, would love the train for trips out of town.</p>
728	Cass Young	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
204	Catherine Bryant	<p>Q1 - Neutral Comments: I do not like to use the public transport system as it takes so long to get anywhere at the moment unless you live on a major route, plus it is relatively expensive to use the buses. I prefer the trains.</p> <p>Connections could work to improve but these would need to be much more frequent than the current timetables and the overall journey length shouldn't take any longer (so will need reliable and timely connection services meeting these services).</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: Although I am concerned that his will increase the cost of train fares, which are currently fairly priced, unlike the buses</p> <p>Other Comments Would be good to enable pets to travel on services like in London.</p>
414	Catherine Gilhooly	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: It is important that a more integrated network is developed, and, as a frequent public transport user, I support the shift to allow more options to get to more destinations. This is particularly important for those sections of our community that are dependent on public transport.</p> <p>My one concern is that a journey that requires a trip to an intermediate destination and then a change of bus/train does not take too much longer than a direct trip (eg. rapid journey and good connections) and is not more</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Catherine Gilhooly (#414)</p>	<p>expensive than a direct trip. For example, if I travel from my home in Te Atatu Peninsula and wish to go to the CBD, I would not find it acceptable if the journey via Henderson took significantly longer and was more expensive than my current direct journey to the CBD.</p> <p>It will also be important to ensure that there is an adequate connecting system for the motorway based trips (eg. the NW bus way option) from local areas.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Although I am supportive of the general idea of a simplified ticketing policy and zone based fare system, I submit that the zones as indicated on page 34 are disadvantageous to residents in the south and west of the city, and give unfair advantage to those on the North Shore. As the North Shore has a comparatively high socio-economic demographic, this has real equity issues. Poorer people in the South and West should not be subsidising the comparatively wealthy citizens of Albany and the East Coast Bays.</p> <p>In allowing for a single ticket for travel within a zone, it is also important to note that large numbers of people need to travel between zones, particularly to the CBD.</p> <p>I strongly support the use of an integrated ticketing system and the efficiencies (and faster journeys) that this offers. I would also support the marketing of options for visitors and tourists, as the ability of visitors to explore the region more easily is beneficial to local businesses and communities.</p> <p>Other Comments page 28: 2.1 - Peak hours need to be long enough to reflect actual peak hours - for example they should run from 6.30am-9.00am and 4.30pm-7pm.</p> <p>page 30: 6.3 It is good to see the plan linking to other goals such as those around public health and sustainability. Good public transport has a big impact on these.</p> <p>page 33: 6.4 I support the move to put a daily cap on charges.</p> <p>page 40 6.1. Auckland Council's People's Panel is a useful and accessible way of getting regular feedback from individuals across the region. Linking into this or having a similar tool at Auckland Transport could be useful.</p> <p>7.2 p54-55 The proposed future network should ensure that there are bus links to interchanges (for example the NW motorway peak service routes). It is unclear if this is the case.</p>
<p>572</p>	<p>Catherine Harland</p>	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>My comments relate to the effect that the network structure and the policies proposed will have on specific areas of service.</p> <p>I was advised by Mathew Stewart email (Mon 8 Oct 2012, 2:17pm) that you "are seeking feedback on the proposed public transport network structure as a whole, rather than on specific services and local routes. We want your views on the high level principle of a simple, frequent, connective public transport network. Public consultation on local routes will be carried out prior to any services changing".</p> <p>While I acknowledge this response, what it means is that once the whole network structure gains approval through this process, then specific services will be designed to meet this and people will then be advised that any services impacted are as a result of the prior approval of the overall approach, so service changes that don't fit this 'principled approach' will be eliminated regardless of localised impacts. This approach can be likened to "selling the salami once slice at a time". For this reason I would like specific examples of localised impacts examined to ensure that the policy / network pathway being proposed does not result in substantial adverse impacts for specific communities.</p> <p>The example I raise is set out below and illustrates the need for community / town centre connections to be maintained, along with the needs of lower socio-economic and elderly people with limited transport options who live in the area affected.</p> <p>From the information in the Regional Public Transport Plan I can't quite identify what is happening with the bus services that currently operate along Tawa Road in Onehunga and also service the Oranga area – providing links into Onehunga town centre and also in the Auckland CBD. What I think is happening is that bus services like the 312 / 315 or 31F that provide services into Auckland CBD or down to Onehunga town centre are being eliminated. It appears to me that in future the services will only be feeding Ellerslie train station (ie have to transfer, which also means going backwards from Tawa Road) or by going to Royal Oak and having to transfer to another bus. If this is the situation what is the rationale for this and what will be the impact on overall times to get into the city and for waiting times for people (elderly and school children especially) having to transfer? Also how will people get to Onehunga by bus from the Oranga area? Given that the population south of Campbell Road is of a lower socio-economic profile than other parts of the city, why are the services being diminished?</p> <p>I may have the wrong information but it is extremely difficult to identify from the Plan what exactly is going on. It would have been very useful to have had a list which showed which of the current services are likely to be deleted based on this new network structure rather than listing the current ones without any identifying tag. I realise the service changes will be subject to later consultation (mid-late 2014) but as noted earlier once an overall 'principled' based structure is set in place, then variations that meet local needs will be hard to argue for.</p> <p>In my view, testing an overall network policy change as suggested, needs to involve evaluation of samples of different areas (such as the Oranga / Onehunga) in different parts of the region which have a lower socio-economic profile and related transport disadvantages. This will reveal whether the on-the-ground application of the policy will have a neutral, positive or adverse impact.</p> <p>I am not sure whether this type of analysis work has been done. If not, it could be a case of not understanding what the substantial network structure change / policies will do when implemented. If it has been done and the financials also considered when rebalancing services between areas that 'win' and those that 'lose', when the specific on-the-ground service changes are set out at a later time, it will be very difficult for locally impacted communities to push back and seek different outcomes.</p> <p>My suggestion: (a) That the Oranga / Onehunga area is investigated as an example of the impacts of applying the new network / service structure to determine the extent of changes and impacts that will occur at a local level for people, and (b) That a sample of other lower socio-economic areas be also investigated, and (c) The findings of the above evaluation then be used influence the wording of the outcomes and measures of the network policies. [end]</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
194	Cathy Milligan	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: I favour an integrated network but feel that the underground rail network loop is a huge waste of resources and a waste of funding and opportunity. We already have a good bus network that serves this limited area and I feel rail is expensive and remembering the fiasco on the rugby world cup, with one incident on the line the whole system freezes for hours.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Single ticket system is the way to go.</p> <p>Other Comments: No just get rid of the city rail loop</p>
760	Chad Keven	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
540	Chantelle Philip	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>Thank you for inviting public submissions. Public transport in Auckland currently fails to meet the needs of the population leading to unnecessary use of thousands of cars daily. This is a golden opportunity to make real changes that impact the city and the environment for decades to come.</p> <p>I support the concepts outlined in the draft plan. However I have grave concerns that we are failing to start with the ideal design for the future and modifying it to fit constraints and are instead modifying what we already have in an attempt to get to the ideal. This restricts our view and cannot give us the best possible outcome. We risk investing a large amount of time and resources only to have yet another system that is not supported by the people of Auckland and its visitors.</p> <p>The new system needs to be based on how people live and move now and how we anticipate this to be in the future. Current bus routes are almost identical to how they were 25 years ago. Yet lifestyles are significantly different.</p> <p>Concepts: We should be aiming to have only the vehicles we need on the roads. We want an integrated system where buses feed into trains rather than compete with them. Ideally public transport will run pollution free. Features need to facilitate use by people with disabilities. We should be prepared to use buses of differing sizes. Transport needs to be reliable as to time and quality of service. Using public transport has to be as easy as taking the car. Ideally we will analyse how people travel routinely or for a short time we'll have a system to phone in and book the travel we need to catch this data. We need to embrace the most recent technology and tie public transport into that. We need to include the travel of children to school as part of the overall plan as this is the most predictable guaranteed movement and is intrinsically linked to the movements of the parents. We need to ask people for all the reasons they have for not using public transport rather than guessing.</p> <p>Details: Many families I know with children at primary school have one parent take the children to school who then continues on his/her way to his/her own work. Often the same or the other parent reverses this route on the way home. If this is widespread then we should be designing routes that start in residential areas, go directly to local schools then feed into transport centres.</p> <p>Many parents and children won't use public transport because of the bullying that happens on the buses. Whether this bullying is within a school population or school versus school there will be a significant reduction if there is a high parent to child ratio on the buses which could be achieved by route redesign.</p> <p>There should be extra buses during school and university terms and fewer or smaller buses in school holidays. Buses should have priority over cars while dropping children off at school so that they are quicker and closer to the school gate than a car. Bus timetables should be designed to get school children to their local school ahead of the time they have to be there to make provision for any unexpected delays in the trip such as road accidents or road works.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to include water protective bus shelters for all stops and seating that meets the needs of the elderly and infirm.</p> <p>Bus routes should pick up from residential areas and feed quickly into shopping malls to bring staff to work and customers to the shops.</p> <p>The proposed zone fare system seems complicated. In Paris, France, the whole city is divided into 4 zones based on circles. You can buy a pass for the number of zones that you will frequently move in then use this pass on buses or trains or subways to move anywhere, anytime within these zones on the days covered by the pass.</p> <p>I believe that the proposed zone system does not relate to how people are moving around Auckland and that a simple circular zone system would be fairer. Although it may seem that fares will be higher I believe that it will be more equitable overall. In my experience people are currently choosing to pay considerably more to take their car in lieu of using public transport due to the difficulties in using it. Low cost fares alone are not motivating people to switch to public transport so fare increases will not be a disincentive to using public transport if the system is made sufficiently easy to use.</p> <p>Passes and tickets for public transport should be able to be purchased online or via mobile 'phones. We should be assuming that residents of Auckland will be using public transport so regularly that concession passes for weekends, weeks or months will be the norm. This helps the cash management of public transport providers as they are prepurchased.</p> <p>Every website I've seen for a tourist attraction in Paris also shows: the nearest metro station, the train lines and bus route numbers to use to get there. Copying this example would encourage locals and visitors to use public transport.</p> <p>I would like to see public transport providers and event organisers exchanging information so that every event advertisement includes the details of public transport provided to get to that event. Public transport should be adjusted to provide extra services for all major events based on ticket sales data from event organisers. Currently when I go to a performance in the Civic or the Aotea Centre I have no choice but to take the car. I live in New Lynn, only 2.3km from the Transport Centre. I'm on a bus route but I can't take this bus to the train, train to Britomart and bus to Aotea Square without setting aside half a day. Ideally public transport should be feeding from</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Chantelle Philip (#540)	<p>residential areas into transport centres for the popular nights for outings: Friday and Saturday nights. If we could get public transport working for Friday and Saturday nights we'd reduce the drunk driving incidence considerably and make our streets safer for all users.</p> <p>Event organisers such as Ticket Direct and The Edge, should have imbedded links in their websites that show how to get to the venues via public transport.</p> <p>Features to support public transport use by the disabled must be as thorough as possible. This may include signs and announcements plus seating for the elderly. More straps to hold or some seats with seatbelts may add to the comfort of the mildly physically disabled.</p> <p>The professionalism and reliability of the public transport operators must be improved. My children have told me of their driver stopping at the shops for an ice-block which the driver then consumed while driving and drivers using mobile phones, drinking from cans and cups while driving. There should be incentives to motivate drivers to be the best in the world. Good drivers should be rewarded and there should be a system to encourage feedback from the public. Parents are deterred from having their children use public transport when drivers put their passengers' lives at risk.</p> <p>Bus reliability must be improved. This can be achieved not only with more investment in regular maintenance but also with shorter routes with short time buffers between runs so that time lost on one run doesn't impact other runs on the same day.</p> <p>The website for public transport information must be accurate and updated frequently. I live on a bus route but still the road I live on is unrecognised by the Maxx website so I have to know the bus route number before looking up the bus that passes my house.</p> <p>Public transport should make provision for the changes in travel around holiday weekends. We should provide services to get people home from work earlier and off to their holiday homes to reduce the congestion and accidents on the roads. These services will likely be specialised to enable people to carry the extra luggage they usually take with them.</p> <p>Facilitating communication between the public transport providers and either the end user or an intermediary institute will assist in providing vehicles with sufficient capacity for the number of users. E.g. High schools can ask parents to indicate intended means of transport in enrolment forms. This data can be given to service providers to plan sufficient train carriages and sizes and numbers of buses avoiding students being left behind on station platforms at the start of their year at a new school as happened to students of St Peter's College this year.</p> <p>Thank you for considering the concepts and details of this submission. Redesigning Auckland's public transport system within constraints of current infrastructure and finances is an extremely difficult task bound to draw criticism. However it is essential and long overdue. Your efforts are appreciated. Thank you all for your time and energy input to date and I wish you well with what lies ahead.</p> <p>[end]</p>
777	Char Te Ao	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view**</p>
425	Charles Johnston	<p>Q1 - Support Comments:</p> <p>In Figure 6.1, the map of the "zones" is better than what we have now but not good enough. What you want is for people who live in "zone 2" to take the bus. This includes people in the top of the Shore, includes West Harbour and Manukau, and halfway through old Manukau. If you get those people on board then you'll get cars off the streets. Charging them for two stages means they'll keep driving. The people in "zone 1" already take the bus. Think outside the "concentric circles" about this. Stop thinking about having a cool looking diagram and focus on where people actually live. What you've drawn is "geometric fetishism."</p> <p>In the Forward, you note "the success of the Northern Busway." I live on the Shore. This busway is a joke. Did it really cost \$100 million? I drive in and out of the city every day. For years, the modal (most frequently observed) number of buses I would see each way was ZERO. In the last couple of years it has gone up to two each way. If the busway carried ten times as many people as it does now it would be a success. As it is, all I can say is you people have a really low standard for measuring success. If you really want to call it a success, you'll put in six times as much parking at each of the main stops. If you want to call it a success you'll let people pay one price to take a local bus that allows them to get on the express buses that run on the busway. Where I live, I can't even take a local bus to the busway because there's no service up Browns Bay Road.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments:</p> <p>I have numerous comments on this.</p> <p>The section "Policy framework" starting on p. ix is laudable. I hope you can do it. The key will be pricing, about which I have many doubts. Auckland's current pricing regime is extortionate to lower and lower-middle income groups. These are likely the main income groups who you can reach. There is nothing in this report that spells out in any detail that your goal is to provide affordable public transport. Instead, the following is listed as an objective:</p> <p>"Fares and Ticketing - a fares and ticketing system that attracts and retains customers, while balancing user contributions against public funding"</p> <p>This is bureau-speak for "charging too much." Auckland's public transport is wildly overpriced now. Sydney's costs half as much. I note policy 4.3 (p. x) is "maintain fares at a level that will achieve a farebox recovery ratio of approximately 50 per cent." I believe this is a "top down" policy you got from the for-profit bus companies. I notice there is no policy of charging prices that relate to social goals. The upshot, as I read it: the bus companies continue to make a lot of profits and the national and city governments get to say they're subsidising half the cost. Not good enough. If you don't charge lower prices you won't get the rider numbers you want.</p> <p>As an example of a city that has always had a bus pricing policy based on serving the public, look to Honolulu. The entire island of O`ahu can be traversed for one price – US \$2.50! When buying a ticket, a rider gets one free transfer to another price.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Charles Johnston (#425)</p>	<p>On p. 10 (and in more detail on p. 37), in policy 4.8, you want to provide discounts for “off-peak.” Please think outside the box. If you charge people full price for peak times, they’ll drive their cars. Peak times exist because people have to begin working at specific times. How many people have the option to arrive at work at 11 AM so they can get cheaper bus fare? You should give people DISCOUNTS to ride at peak times so that you’ll get them out of their cars. You ramble on about balancing demand. This is the bus companies talking. There’s always going to be a morning and evening rush hour. Your goal, as a government agency, is to get people who must travel during those times onto public transport.</p> <p>On p. 35 it is noted that: NZTA has sought a review of the evening peak senior concession with a view to its removal, on the grounds that it is nationally inconsistent and unaffordable. “Nationally inconsistent?” Are we worried about Invercargill and Te Awamutu now? This is a policy for AUCKLAND only. Auckland’s the only city you should be concerned with. This is the big shots putting in what they want first. “Unaffordable? That means you want seniors to drive their cars during these times, right?”</p> <p>On p. 36, in 4.3 you appear to exclude ferries from the integrated fares. I guess that means people drive their cars, instead of combining a boat ride with a bus ride.</p> <p>Other Comments: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment. My wife and I drive from the Shore into the CBD every day. In spite of this plan, it is likely we will continue to do so, primarily because of convenience. I applaud your goals of making public transport more competitive with car travel in terms of time but think it unlikely you will succeed sufficiently with us. However, you might possibly succeed with others and that will help us out by reducing traffic on the motorway.</p> <p>Most of my comments above have been written to sound cynical. The reason behind this is your method of putting this plan together. Maybe you did it the way the law requires you too. However, IMO, your method isn’t sufficiently bottom-up to get the public behind it. What did you do? You state you first surveyed “stakeholders” but they were the big shots. AFTER they told you what they want, you’ve put this report together and now are asking the public for feedback. It’s the usual top-down approach. You should have started by interviewing the public, integrating the responses, then taking the public’s ideas to the “stakeholders.” After getting their feedback, you should have produced a draft plan and taken this back to some of the public you surveyed initially to determine whether they have been convinced your plan will do the job. The method you’ve chosen is likely a waste of public money because you’ve likely made all the decisions and now you’re just going through the legal requirements to say you consulted with the public.</p> <p>This is a picky point. On p. 9, you have an unnumbered figure that, in the left column, states “service layers.” Anyone can see the four-coloured boxes to the right are not in any sort of layered arrangement. They’re in a row. Please fix this.</p> <p>I want to end with a story. My wife and I just got back from academic sabbaticals in Europe. We noticed in several countries (Greece, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Slovenia, Hungary, and Romania) that the buses are designed to carry babies in strollers. Hence, they have large doors in the middle of the bus. (People pushing babies in strollers took the bus – that’s good public transport social policy!) Interestingly, though there was some sort of ticketing machine in the middle, few people appeared to use it. The driver, obviously at the front and usually behind a glass window, did nothing. We were embarrassed at this apparent cheating. We entered at the front, bought a single ticket, then rode the bus. We realised the locals might have had monthly passes, etc. but what was so strange was that the driver didn’t seem to care whether they did or not. We both thought this would be unimaginable in market-driven NZ. It’s unimaginable in a plan spouting “50 per cent fare box recovery ratio.” I am not suggesting people should ride for free. I provide this story to show that when government is truly serious about wanting people to ride public transport, government is willing to overlook the fact that some people will cheat. Your plan does not communicate anywhere near this level of social concern. I believe you’ll make a few improvements based on this consulting exercise but mostly your concern will be that the private bus companies should continue to make profits and government doesn’t have to spend too much money on the public. Good luck!</p>
<p>389</p>	<p>Charlie Inggs</p>	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: I believe an integrated network is essential with local services feeding rapid and frequent trans regional services, as proposed in the plan. This increases the usefulness of the network beyond single journey commuting for which it appears it is currently designed.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: Integrated ticketing and fares facilitate the most time effective use of public transport.</p> <p>Other Comments: Refreshing to see a truly integrated approach to Auckland public transport.</p>
<p>351</p>	<p>Charlotte Reed</p>	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: In order for this model to be effective careful timetabling will be required. For example, currently the 813 bus meets the Devonport ferry and leaves once passengers have disembarked. This is ideal. In contrast, the western train line arrives at Britomart at the time the ferry service leaves, meaning passengers have a long wait. Ideally a service every 15 minutes means that passengers should not have to wait that full period at an interchange.</p> <p>The integrated ticketing proposal is also imperative to this plan. At present the cost of a trip from Britomart to Newmarket depends on which bus company you travel with and is different again for the train. Based on experience of living in London, a single connection, at most 2, is all that you can reasonably expect people to make for an expedient journey. Do not plan a network requiring multiple changes for popular journeys. It will not be used!</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Opposed Comments: Whilst I support the intention of a single fares and ticketing policy I strongly oppose the omission of ferry services from this integrated system. This is against the stated vision of the plan 'our vision is an integrated, efficient, and effective public transport network (buses, trains AND FERRIES)' etc etc. The reason given for omitting ferries from the integrated ticketing system is their higher cost. Whilst port and terminal infrastructure can be expensive, it is difficult to conceive that it is more expensive per journey than the rail network or Northern Busway when full capital depreciation costs are taken into account. Perhaps this is as some funding is provided by</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Charlotte Reed (#351)	<p>Central Government for those projects whereas ferries are not? Further, it is a case of 'all public transport modes being equal but some being more equal than others'. It certainly disadvantages all North Shore commuters who choose not to use the Harbour Bridge (whether by bus or car) to travel, which should be taken into account. Finally, ferries are the only means for cyclists to travel across the Harbour and the easiest means for passengers with prams to travel across the Harbour, and facilitating their travel meets the other stated objectives of AT in relation to modal transport for walking and cycling. I reiterate that I strongly oppose the omission of ferries from the integrated fare system. Section 6.4 Policy 4.3 should therefore be revised to refer also to ferries.</p> <p>A single ticketing system is welcomed.</p>
475	Cheryl Calvert	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I was alerted by a colleague to the fact that the Auckland Transport service is proposing changes to or the cessation of the 007 bus route.</p> <p>I wish to submit my concerns regarding proposed changes as I rely on the 0650am 007 service Monday to Friday to get to work at Greenlane Clinical Centre and the 1600pm 007 service to get home to St. Heliers in the evening.</p> <p>I have relied on this service for 3 years and do so because it is the only service available which gets me to work for 0730 and home again in time to collect children from after school day care by 1700hrs. I do not have any other means of transport to get to and from work.</p> <p>I have always been a strong advocate of the public transport system and have actively encouraged, with success other colleagues to use this bus route because of its affordability and current route.</p>
794	Chris Betty	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
677	Chris Laumahina	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
369	Chris Walden	<p>Q1 - Opposed Comments: I would like to express my concern that there is no mention of any proposed train services to and from Tuakau in the proposed plan. As a Tuakau resident & ratepayer, I strongly feel that the residents of Tuakau need a dedicated train service to and from Britomart and I would like to strongly express my support for the MAXX train service to be extended to Tuakau.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral [no comments provided]</p>
807	Christina Poutai	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
272	Christine Obbeek	<p>Q1 - Neutral [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - NA [no comments provided]</p>
390	Christine Smith	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: I think the proposed network system is a good idea if it will give more people easier access to public transport that will get them. Currently many people use cars because they cannot get from one part of town to another in a simple, timely, economic way, or because they live too far from a bus stop.</p> <p>In a well built up urban area, nobody should be further than 400 to 500m from a bus stop and where I live in Howick area there are huge old established areas with a big population catchment that have never had a bus route anywhere near them. And there are no decent park and ride facilities at Howick, Botany, Pakuranga, or Highland Park.</p> <p>However, there should be some really serious consultation before specific service proposals are put in place, because, quite frankly, AT's record on consulting and effecting changes on Howick and Eastern Bus timetables this year has been quite dismal and I'm sure a lot of passengers reverted to cars as a result.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: It can only get better and can't happen soon enough. It is so frustrating to be a dedicated public transport user (on Howick and Eastern buses) but not able to travel the same or a different route on another bus with my monthly pass, or get discounts such as the free inner City Circuit bus for Hop card users.</p> <p>Other Comments: Policy Area 6.6, Customer Interface is something that can be actioned immediately. "Simple, visible, and intuitive customer information and service".</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Christine Smith #390	Somebody can get stuck into this while the rest of the plan is worked on. Early buses, grumpy, arrogant and rude drivers who forget that they are supposed to be providing a customer service, out of date timetables, ineffective communication (the internet should not be the primary source of information - many people do not have internet access and fewer have smartphones).
229	Christine Thompson	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: I like the general idea of what you are planning to do, particularly in terms of frequency of key routes & simplification. The general plan of buses in my area (hibiscus coast) looks sensible incorporating new developments</p> <p>Q2 - Support [no comments provided]</p>
237	Christine Thorpe	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: Ensure that timetables LINK ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES on the network.</p> <p>eg. Bus to rail station - allowing one to catch the next train in a timely fashion, and not have to wait 30 minutes.</p> <p>Make it work so people WANT to use public trans[port] for ease, cost, efficient times.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Ensure that zones ARE EQUAL. eg. same km distance throughout Auckland North - South - East - West.</p> <p>Make sure that the PEOPLE WHO DRIVE the transport KNOW how the TICKETING works. Communicate! clearly to all passengers.</p> <p>Check and RECHECK that the system works, BEFORE GO LIVE.</p> <p>Other Comments: AK Transport - I wonder how many of the planners, project managers and management are regular passengers. It pays to UNDERSTAND the system at GRASSROOTS LEVEL. This means catching public transport day in day out for years.</p> <p>Consider ticketing outlets - does AK Transport "test" them - horrific stories abound.</p>
819	Christine Tilyard	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
73	Christopher McArthur	<p>Q1 - Support [no comments provided]:</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Opposed Comments: The fares are too high to encourage people to use public transport. The fares are a lot more than driving a similar distance.</p> <p>Other Comments: The plan talks about modern fit for purpose vehicles but makes no mention of the environmental impact of the vehicle. Hamilton and Sydney both successfully run buses on CNG. This could significantly improve Auckland's horrific air quality. Electric buses are now cost effective as well. The emissions of the buses should be a consideration when procuring the vehicles. Regular emissions testing should also take place.</p> <p>Bus drivers should receive regular training on safe driving, customer service, driving efficiently, and driving for the comfort of the passengers. This should be monitored remotely and linked to remuneration.</p> <p>All Auckland Transport and Auckland Council staff should be required to use public transport to get to work. If the decision makers had to suffer the same frustrations that the passengers do, there would be a lot fewer problems with Auckland's public transport.</p>
461	Christopher Norman Grove	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: Section 6.5 of the plan includes reference to the provision of Cycle Paths. Some indication of what, if anything, is envisaged would be constructive. Cycles should be specifically included in Park & Ride proposals i.e.. Secure storage areas will be needed. Figure 5.3 to 5.6 why no connection to Birkenhead wharf indicated? Even in the all-day service network 2022 nothing is shown.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments:</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
		<p>Auckland Transport need to think a lot harder about incorporating ferry services into the zonal fare system - not acceptable to exclude.</p> <p>Other Comments: To what extent is the plan supporting the park & ride concept, particularly with respect to rail and ferry services? Details are required.</p> <p>There are large areas in the city not within easy walking distance of frequent service network. The Plan does not offer any detail of the local supplementary services and hence the Plan cannot be evaluated. It is suggested that many minor services will be eliminated. If travellers have to use private vehicles to go part of the journey they will probably not use public services. Frequency of local services is critical.</p>
737	Cindy Conroy	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
778	CJ Telford	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
874	Clint Hotson	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
771	Clinton Pellow	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
666	Clive Wilson	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
148	Clyde Peter Johnson	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: Pleased that feeder buses will take passengers to connection hubs for faster travel (?) from Manukau City Centre / Papatoetoe / vice versa to / from downtown Auckland. More user friendly timetables, reliable bus arrival news, composite fares schemes should be much needed improvements.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: I like the innovation of promotional discounted fares.</p> <p>Oppose ferries being exempt from qualifying for composite ticketing policy.</p> <p>Other Comments: Oppose 'all day frequent services' restricted to 7am - 7pm window. Days of work 8.30am - 5.30pm.</p> <p>Twenty years ago, 'All day' means 24 hours but, nobody expects 24/7 public transport.</p> <p>Definitely special events bus travel necessary for sports fans eg counties v Southland game at Pukekohe Oct 20 - had to catch train Papatoetoe - Papakura. Bus Papakura - Papatoetoe, bus - Pukekohe, bus back to Papakura. Bus Papakura - Papatoetoe failed to arrive (typical of Saturdays) - had to catch train to Papatoetoe 30 minutes LATER. Big challenge to A/Transport to take a serious attitude about delivering promised customer services.</p>
823	Cody Gaskell	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
460	Colleen Crampton	<p>Q1 - Opposed Comments: While in principle I do not oppose the proposed frequent service network (2016) in figure 5.2, I am opposed to the deferral of frequent service to Orewa. I request that the Orewa proposal on Figure 5.4 for 2022 be brought forward.</p> <p>I support the Albany to Orewa connection via motorway for 2016 as shown on Figure 5.5. This is a significant improvement for the 10am to 3.30pm period and for late afternoon/early evening trips into the CBD from Orewa.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: I support a single ticket to replace the present system which requires a new ticket for each bus when using a gold card. In policy 4.7 I am concerned about the social effects of removing free off peak travel for seniors, particularly for those living 1 1/2 hours by bus (eg Orewa) from the CBD.</p> <p>Other Comments: My particular interest is the proposed future service Network (eg Appendix 1A) for the North end of Orewa. At present there is no bus service. I am one of several hundred new residents in Kensington Park which is west and north of the corner of Puriri Road and Centreway Road. We need a bus stop near this intersection which is programmed to be upgraded with a roundabout (there are only school buses at present). Kensington Park is approved for 700 dwelling units. Many occupants are elderly, a number (including myself) have car driving limitations and need bus services. Some women are scared to walk at night from the bus drop-off at Westhoe Road/ Centreway Road.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
706	Colleen Smith	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
625	Connie Aitken	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
636	Connie Birch	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
508	Constance Williams	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>After reading a notification from greypower, I was dismayed about the possible future negative impact that Seniors will experience using public transport. I am opposed to any changes that may curtail senior citizens from enjoying what is at present a wonderful and helpful concession to assist their mobility and sense of independence.</p>
788	Coralie Thompson	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
550	Corinne Wichmann GFG Group Limited (note, this is a personal submission)	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>Just wanting to get my feedback to you regarding the proposed changes to the Auckland CBD <-> Takapuna bus route.</p> <p>This route is well used – I travel to work and back daily, as does my husband, and every bus I am on is close to capacity. I usually travel between 7:30 and 8:30, but on the rare occasions I am either later or earlier than this, the busses also run quite full – the latest I’ve taken the bus is 9:40 am from Takapuna. The route is perfect, with a door to door journey time of approx. 15 minutes. Please consider that a change in the route would inconvenience a large number of people and increase the likelihood of these hundreds if not thousands of people considering bringing their cars into the city.</p> <p>The only improvement I could suggest is having more frequent busses – I sometimes have to wait around 10 minutes for a bus, and as mentioned before, these are usually full to capacity.</p> <p>Corinne Wichmann Project Manager / Business Analyst</p>
411	Craig Conner	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: We appreciate you seek feedback on the system as a whole, but the devil is often in the detail.</p> <p>We generally support concept of Proposed Frequent Service Network. We have used London & Paris metro networks, which have similar concept (although much higher frequency), involving one or more transfers to cross town. We have used bus transfer in Auckland too.</p> <p>Frequent Service Networks advantages are: - higher frequency on main routes - more interconnection giving more choices of route</p> <p>disadvantages are: any additions to travel time caused by having to interconnect will discourages users from using the service, especially on longer/slower routes, e.g. Lynfield. If the Lynfield route has to go via existing Waikowhai terminal this would add several minutes, losing the advantage gained by present busway extension proposal. We suggest that the Waikowhai terminal be relocated either to end of Dominion Rd extension or all the way to Lynfield.</p> <p>Reduction in service frequency The FSN diagram shows some routes as "reduced frequency services" between Beach Haven, Birkdale and Verrans Corner, and also out to Howick. Does this mean that the routes will no longer have high frequency services? These areas need frequent transport for the commuters there to get to employment and some contain areas of social deprivation for whom the social impact could be severe. Some people will not realise the reduction is proposed, but only see the routes on the map, which is not clear enough that services will be lost. It should have had an explanatory note so those communities can protest. The lack of services will increase congestion on the limited routes in and out of these areas, especially as population grows due to the Auckland Plan's intention to increase densities across the board.</p> <p>Franklin routes are not shown- why has the service to Waiuku been axed and what is intended for the future for that area?</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Funding Believe the NZTA National Farebox recovery target of 50% is unrealistic and the resulting higher fares will be a discouragement to potential users. We believe NZTA should rather postpone some of the roading projects with low cost- benefit ratios eg the Holiday highway.</p> <p>Other Comments: The Lynfield route suffers frequent delays due to congestion, partly along Hillsborough Road, but mainly on Dominion Road from Roskill South to Mt Albert road. The bus lane extension proposed from Mt Albert Rd to SH 20, which can't come soon enough, will help, but the holdup at Denbigh Ave / Dominion Road roundabout is a major factor, as is hold ups between Roskill South and SH 20. The city- bound bus lane should be extended as far as Roskill South to be totally effective. The inconsistent ride time due to hold up of the Lynfield buses means connecting to other bus routes will continue to be difficult.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
459	Craig Darren Henderson	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: It is neat to see all (changes) to bus and train services / schedules. Why did Veolia Transport Ltd and Kiwi Rail change all suburban rail schedules service times southern, western, eastern, Manukau, and Onehunga lines with no more limited stops. Also Britomart buses and ferries.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: About time we had something a combined ticketing system like in most many cities internationally (Us, Holland, Aussie, Sydney, Brisbane, and Perth.</p> <p>British (English) Birmingham, London, Manchester, Leeds, Cardiff, Newport, Edinburgh, Glasgow</p> <p>Other Comments: I Craig didn't come to and attend the displays which the Council had on public transport back in March. Let's retrial the Helensville rail / train service as the old and division Helensville and Waimauku Community Boards of the old Rodney District Council didn't promote the Helensville train/rail service.</p>
694	Craig Lozell	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
3	Craig Richards	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: It is good to see emphasis on improvement to the confusing and inconvenient existing service. Particularly improvements to service frequencies. The current hourly schedule on the western line during weekends is so inconvenient it may as well be shut. I would have liked to see a connection between Mt Eden, Kingsland and Ponsonby. I don't believe the outer loop should be removed but rather diverted through Kingsland to Ponsonby so it connects these 3 central villages.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral Comments: Support integrated fares and electronic ticketing.</p>
699	Cypris Teau-Harris	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
615	Damon Eaton	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
700	Damon Skellams	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
689	Daniel Preston	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
343	Daniel Taumihau	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: I think that such a network is a more in the right direction. However, I think that there will be issues with transferring to other routes such as at night time although this could be address by having security guards/Maori wardens at the major interchanges (New Lynn, Onehunga, Panmure etc). I would also add that in order to decrease the amount of annoyance that many people will have to transfer to other services that the 'transfer penalty' (which really should be renamed as it sounds as if one should not be transferring at all as they will incur a bad consequence) should be removed upon the introduction of the new routes if at all possible as this will give people no incentive to use other transport namely private cars. I would also be concerned that there is no indicative timetables similar to the current ones. Whilst the electronic signs are good and will even be better with real time GPS, I am concerned that many stops will not have them nor will people know the approximate time of arrival to where they are going.</p> <p>Such a timetable need not be exhaustive but demonstrates the times outside the 7am -7pm and during the 7am - 7pm would only need to show something like</p> <p>7.00 7.15 7.30 7.45 8.00 8.15 7.15 7.30 7.45 8.00 8.15 8.30 7.30 7.45 8.00 8.15 8.30 8.45 7.45 8.00 8.15 8.30 8.45 9.00</p> <p>All buses continue like this until 7pm 6.30 6.45 7.00 7.15 7.30 7.45 6.45 7.00 7.15 7.30 7.45 8.00</p> <p>I also think that there should be a creation of a mid-town, downtown and possibly a university bus stations, similar to the ones along the Northern Busway. Such bus stations would not need to be large as many buses would not originate from there except at peak times. A university bus station could be built between Auckland and AUT universities on Wellesley street East and sprawl over onto Symonds street for the buses that will continue to run straight down it. This would mean that Wellesley Street East would need to be blocked off from the motorway off ramp, although these vehicles could be directed to Allen or Grafton Roads and the tunnel underneath Symonds Street linking to Wellesley street be filled in to create the bus way. For Downtown, as it seems few buses will originate there the station could go on Queens Street where services would either be peak time only or</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Daniel Taumihau (#343)</p>	<p>drop off/pick up with the other buses that originate from downtown using the bus stops on Tyler, Gore and Commerce St.</p> <p>The Midtown bus station could either be on Mayoral drive with buses using Wellesley street turning onto Mayoral drive and running the full length of it before turning back onto Wellesley street or using one side of Mayoral Drive and then turning into Queen Street before returning to Wellesley Street. The Midtown station would not only continue to give easy access to the central city but also allow passengers on the city link to transfer onto buses. This would also decrease the number of bus stops in the central city (either one on either side of Wellesley street for each direction or one on Wellesley street and one on Queen St for each direction). For such a Midtown station though there would need to be bus lanes, possibly two in each direction.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments:</p> <p>In general the need for the AT hop (which people should be encourage to say at rather than A.T.) is essential for transferring between routes especially if they are run by different operators to get a fair deal. As already mentioned the "transfer penalty" should go when the routes are introduced as even by giving a fifty cent discount people may pay more than they would otherwise need to and therefore use other means of transport. I would also add that the transfer time should be extended to at least thirty minutes and not the next timetabled service as living in Mangere as I do, it is rare that the 334 for example ever meets up with the 348 in Onehunga to transfer and this would be likely to occur if for example the bus to New Lynn is every 15 minutes but the connecting bus to Westgate is still an hour as those services have not yet changed over onto the new plan.</p> <p>The second point to make is about the zones themselves. I think that the model shown in figure 6.1 is good and should be applied to the local connector routes. This makes sense as these buses are short and connect up to either trains or the frequent services. It would also encourage people to use the service rather than use their cars for local services possibly convincing them to use public transport for other things. From this I think that to be fair to everyone, all of the frequent routes should run to a similar layout as they currently do with the central city as shown on figure 6.1 being a fare stage for all services. For example the new link services would be one stage, whilst the service from Half moon bay to Manukau would be 2 stages. The route between Mt Albert and Glenn Innes might be 3 or four stages whilst the service from Onehunga to Takapuna be four.</p> <p>In terms of concessions it would be nice if things like the super gold card or the community services card allowed people to continue to have free/ cheaper bus rides. In terms of super gold card holders they should have free services all day and night on the local connector services and in terms of the frequent services be charged the child fare during the peak hours of 6-9am and 3-6pm. The concession should remain during the day for gold card holders to fill up seats and the fact that they are less likely to be able to afford the adult rate if they use public transport often. The same should be said about child and tertiary students where the concession should remain all day as these are the people that public transport should target as if a person grows up on public transport and sees the benefit of it, then they are less likely to use other means of transport and therefore lower the costs on things like making new roads and environmental costs.</p> <p>I would also be careful of using enforcement officers to collect fares. I think that this should only be done when a person who has been caught not paying continues to refuse to pay and does not leave the bus/train/ferry or is a repeat offender of not paying. Advertisement and continual checks would be a good way of scaring people off doing this especially on trains. I think that in terms of failing to tag off there should be a about a month delay before applying a penalty in terms of when the card is first bought for people to get used to it and then it should be based on the route that someone was on with the penalty being the last stage possible plus another. For example if I was going from Britomart to Pukekohe and I failed to tag off at Manurewa the penalty should be from Britomart to Pukekohe plus one more stage, so that no matter what station I got off at I would still receive a lost for not tagging off.</p> <p>Other Comments: I think that this is a great step forward for transport in Auckland however, there needs to be two things done in order for it to be effective.</p> <p>The first is to have an attitude that Public Transport comes first private comes last. By having such a frequent and well covered public transport system people should be discouraged from using their own private vehicles unless they really have to. This may mean reducing roads such as Khyber Pass to one lane either side for normal traffic at all times whilst introducing permanent bus lanes. Making roads into one way services for normal traffic such as on park road. Such mechanisms will not only encourage people to use the PT system but will help it grow and meet the costs whilst decreasing the costs in building new roads, maintaining the motorways and the environmental hazards of private transport. (It should be noted though that emergency services should be able use these lanes even if not in an emergency and possibly even trucks where appropriate, such as the lanes on the on ramp at Onehunga for SH 20.</p> <p>The second is that not only should the customer service representatives need to be trained to a higher standard than they are now but they need to use the PT system to understand what its users deal with. The many people I talk to tell me that my experience of customer service reps who seem to know nothing and cannot find someone who does is not a small problem. These reps must know everything and be prepared for most of the obvious questions that people will have with the new system. If AT needs people who know how the system works and can relate to other PT users then it should hirer Uni students not only are they cheap but most of them would of had experienced with the PT system and understand where the user is coming from. On a similar point, Auckland Transport should take all complaints about any part of the system seriously whether or not it was one of their representatives or an issue with one of the operators. It is a public body who is the face of transport for Auckland and as such should be able to discipline those who repeatedly cause problems or to monitor issues to ensure that they do not become systematic.</p>
<p>551</p>	<p>Daniel Wichmann</p>	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I reside in Takapuna and use the bus to travel into the CBD for work. I get on at the Esmonde Rd bus stop (corner Eldon St) and even though it is serviced frequently, the number of people getting on at this bus stop is huge. It is not uncommon for buses to fill up to capacity, leaving behind a number of people that have to wait for another bus.</p> <p>From my observations, the buses don't fill up to capacity due to people getting on along the East Coast Bays but due to people in Takapuna. There are many that drive to Takapuna who live on the peninsula (Hauraki, Belmont, Narrow Neck... Devonport even). It's clear to see by the number of cars parking near the bus stops. This will not change when the new plan is executed. It will continue to be quicker, cheaper and convenient to drive to Takapuna and catch the bus into town than to get a feeder bus to Takapuna.</p> <p>I think it is absolutely vital that the interval between buses from Takapuna into town continue at a higher rate than 15mins at peak times.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
334	Danielle Boven	<p>Q1 - Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Other Comments: Yes. First, I offer praise and appreciation for changes I have observed and enjoyed of late in Auckland. Public transport is becoming a credible and pleasant alternative and I credit the relevant agencies with the change. As a CBD resident I am pleased to see so many bikes in use, but I believe that is more the result of persistent determined individual's enthusiasm, in spite of insufficient support from our transport planners. / / I have concerns that the recent progress will stall because the potential of cycling within the overall network is not recognised. I was initially excited to read in your executive summary that</p> <p>A major focus of the draft Plan is on making the best use of available resources, and improving the frequency and range of travel options offered by public transport.</p> <p>Across Auckland there is roadway that holds a small number of parked cars that would be better used to enable safe transit for many cyclists. Integrating cycle segments into the network is an effective way to improve frequency as it can be done at any time the cyclist chooses. Range is improved as a bike can greatly extend the distance an individual would consider undertaking, particularly as routes that enable bikes also allow scooters, roller blades, skate boards, and all the many recent electric adaptations of these. I turned to the full report in anticipation.</p> <p>Unfortunately I found very little mention of cycling in the plan, less than I expected given the statement quoted above. Granted I have not read every page of the entire plan, but what I have found related to cycling is vague and not encouraging: policies like 5.6 where cyclist and walker needs will be "recognised" in design, Connection points will be "visible" and "convenient," and the services will "improve."</p> <p>It is clear that cycling is not considered a relevant aspect of the overall network. Why? I suspect it is excluded from your designed vision of a successful network, and I suspect that is because you have not defined your success metric properly. The plan is focused on delivering more passenger trips on public transport - are cycle trips counted in that? They should be.</p> <p>We want to get people to different places in the best manner possible, let's not get hung up on the definition of public transport because a bike is privately owned. Most would agree increased cycling trips would improve how we get people about - all the city has to provide is roadway, everyone brings their own bike so bike trips must be cheap relative to options for the city. Throw in the social health benefits and it is clear that a bike trip is just as valuable as a bus or train trip, so include it in your measure, please. Set your target properly and I expect you will have a better plan designed in pursuit of that target. This plan is pursuing bus and train rides because that is what you are measuring. But we don't want just bus and train rides, we want better transport options.</p>
6	Daphne Lawless	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: An excellent plan to make Auckland public transport truly useable at no extra cost. If the details are worked out correctly, it should make it possible to live a full life as an Auckland without needing to own a car.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Not sure about zone boundaries, but the zone concept is great. Just remember to provide peak-time bus services to the industrial eras such as East Tamaki. Many workplaces start at 7:30 or 8 am in these areas and current buses are therefore useless to workers, forcing them to own cars.</p>
225	Darrell Farley	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: A very good proposal and well overdue in Auckland. The proposed network of connected, reliable, and frequent services looks very good. Good that it builds on existing infrastructure and will use integrated ticketing. Main questions are: are the services from the international airport frequent enough - should they be every 15 minutes as well, and should Albany be a major interchange as in reality it will serve the northern park of Auckland (upper North Shore, Hibiscus and Bays, and Rodney)</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: Definitely yes for a single integrated ticket and a zone-based fare system. Large international cities have been doing this for a number of years already - we need to catch up. It will also make more sense for visitors to Auckland, particularly from overseas No. Looks very good and is well overdue. The regional approach makes a big difference, and the proposed implementation by 2016 (over stages) is also good.</p>
651	Dave Cadwallader	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
63	Dave Wellings	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: Looks good on paper and hopefully it will work in practice; an extension of the rail service to Tuakau is very much required.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Excellent</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Dave Wellings (#63)	<p>Other Comments: As mentioned before, an extension of the rail service to Tuakau is needed</p>
462	David (Cam) Cameron Gulland	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: Good thinking. Buses and trains should not be competing! More frequent services are very welcome. Transferring from bus to train is OK providing there is easy access, without getting wet.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: The HOP card system has already speeded up the time buses spend at each stop.</p> <p>As a superannuitant, I hope the Government continue to support and subsidise the gold card system for off peak free travel</p> <p>Other Comments: Yes. You haven't given any thought to improving services to the Glendowie, St Heliers - Kohimarama areas. The route along Tamaki Drive is not wide enough for a bus lane. Mission Bay is a bottle neck which can only get worse!</p> <p>Why not build a new train station just North of the tunnel under St. Johns Road? And feed it with buses from the above mentioned areas. This would reduce congestion on Tamaki Drive and improve travelling time to Britomart.</p>
645	David Cameron	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
399	David Clemow	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: The proposed network zoning bus services is very good.</p> <p>Paralleling bus services with trains like the 472 Redhill to Britomart aren't needed. However, places Hunters Corner & Otahuhu Town Centre, where there are no nearby rail stations, need good bus connecting services.</p> <p>When integrated ticketing is fully implemented I understand this will happen. Later when specific service proposals are made public then I wish to comment on those.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p>
325	David Cooper (Deputy Chair, Hibiscus and Bays Local Board - Personal Submission)	<p>Q1 - Opposed Comments: The draft RPTP is contrary to local communities connectivity and to "well-connected quality towns, villages, and neighbourhoods" as prescribed in the Auckland Plan.</p> <p>The absence of a direct north south coastal linkage (eg Beach Road) would detract from community connectivity, forcing one to travel by car. Local businesses could be adversely affected by the absence of a direct route. The proposed plan concentrates mainly on connecting to the motorway busway, which is great for commuters wanting to get to the CBD, but not good for local area commuting between towns/villages/neighbourhoods along the East Coast Bays.</p> <p>Bus travel between our Bays coastal communities would mean either a trip via the motorway busway for a frequent service, and would entail transfers to other buses at route connection points.</p> <p>Taking a direct north/south coastal route would entail several bus changes, eg Torbay to Mairangi Bay = 2 bus changes, Torbay to Milford = 3 bus changes, Torbay to Takapuna = 4 bus change. This would certainly not encourage local bus travel within the Bays.</p> <p>There is a need for a direct (one bus) route linking Torbay, Browns Bay, Mairangi Bay, Milford, and Takapuna. We had envisaged that the loops to the motorway/busway would be supplementary to the existing routes rather than cutting up the well evolved current routes.</p> <p>Q2 - Don't Know Comments: No comment</p> <p>Other Comments: We are very concerned at the physical and safety impacts that buses cause on our communities, having had to resolve many issues caused by the size of the vehicles and inappropriate and inconsiderate behaviour by some drivers. We envisaged that greater frequency would mean more and smaller buses which would create less physical and detrimental impact on our communities.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
488	David G Vaughan	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I write with concern that there is no mention of the MAXX train service in the RPTP.</p> <p>I live in Tuakau and travel to Auckland a lot. I use my Car to travel to the city, including Manukau, Silverpark and Newmarket. If there was a train service from Tuakau you would find there would be hundreds of people a week like me use this service from Tuakau.</p> <p>Please [may] I ask that you would consider a Train service (MAXX) from Tuakau to Auckland? It's only a few kms further south from Pukekohe on the main trunk line.</p>
321	David Garrett	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments:</p> <p>Under policy 4.6,I believe the HOP card stored value discount should be increased to greater than 20% to further drive behaviour away from cash fares. I'd also like to see weekly, as well as monthly passes offered. I'd like to see the pricing of weekly/monthly passes at a level such that they provide a real incentive for people to purchase as additional travel essentially then becomes "free" for the rider, thus further increasing public transport use.</p> <p>Re: Figure 6-1: Although it may appear disproportionate, the provision of a single "North" zone is critical as splitting the zone along the lines of the current Northern pass boundaries would compromise the effectiveness of the zone system due to the large number of journeys within the North Shore that would then become 2 zone trips. The North zone itself actually isn't any larger than the Isthmus zone but is just orientated differently in relation to the City Zone. Therefore I would like to submit that the proposed North Zone is implemented as proposed.</p>
364	David MacClement	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · I am happy with the proposed network system as a whole - it's five or ten years later than it should have been. · I walk most places, and take the bus for further destinations (we have no train on the North Shore). · Electrification, as the rail system is becoming and as trolley-buses used to be, plus recharges (battery or hydrogen), is essential for maintaining our quality of life after fossil fuels (with their climate change waste products) become too high-priced or otherwise unavailable, which I believe will happen in the next ten years well within the lifetime of vehicles and infrastructure paid-for today. <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Good on you for ensuring that all operators conform to this policy, in a reasonable time-frame. <p>In case you don't give me a chance to say this later:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · All destinations served during weekdays should have at least a single late-evening bus out from the centre of town, perhaps 10:00-to-10:30 pm departure (no later than 11:30 pm), even if regular service is stopped in early evening. · This could have a special fare, like \$5, that everyone pays even if they normally have a concession.} <p>Other Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · I am so very pleased that Auckland is finally becoming a modern sustainable city, resilient against the shocks that we'll get soon, possibly in less than ten years. · However, if New York City can have its subways flooded with seawater during high-tide plus storm surge, I do wonder how Britomart station can be kept running (including when the electric power fails). A metre of raised sea level lasting more than an hour is not easily protected against. <p>More immediately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · All destinations served during weekdays should have at least a single late-evening bus out from the centre of town, perhaps 10:00-to-10:30 pm departure (no later than 11:30 pm), even if regular service is stopped in early evening. · This could have a special fare, like \$5, that everyone pays even if they normally have a concession. <p>There are many suburbs with no evening service, including mine: Greenhithe.</p>
328	David Talmage	<p>Q1 - Neutral Comments:</p> <p>I support the principle of the proposed network but I feel that in some areas the design is highly theoretical, based on most efficient resource allocation and maximising the population living near the high frequency network, and does not pay sufficient attention to most users actual patterns of travel, particularly in local areas. As I live in the East Coast Bays area I will use this to illustrate my points</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Currently most off peak local travel in the East Coast Bays area is between Browns Bay and Milford/Takapuna. I do not believe it will be acceptable to most passengers to introduce transfers over what is a relatively short journey and believe that direct connections via the Beach Rd and East Coast Rd/Forrest Hill Rd spine routes should be retained, with cross North Shore connections via the busway stations. I believe that introducing transfers on these local routes will be unpopular and lead to reduced patronage. Similar situations are likely to occur around local travel in other areas. 2. Current direct trips e.g. Browns Bay to Midtown will now require 2 transfers; with relatively low off peak frequencies on some routes this is unlikely to be acceptable to passengers. I believe that transfers of up to 15 minutes will be less acceptable than is assumed in the new plan.

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	David Talmage (#328)	<p>3. The improved peak busway connector frequencies are welcome but may require more capacity on the busway services than is shown on the proposed NEX timetable.</p> <p>4. Some cross town high frequency services eg Takapuna to Onehunga are unlikely to run to time due to traffic congestion and are likely to experience bunching and unreliability. It may be better to terminate these long routes in the CBD and extend the North Shore services over the bridge, possibly to the University.</p> <p>5. There has been some discussion regarding the North Shore fare zone and the possibility of splitting it into upper and lower zones. I strongly oppose this as it will discourage local trips within the North Shore and may lead to increased car usage for short trips which is obviously undesirable. The current situation of a "virtual" zone/stage at the Harbour Bridge would, whilst not ideal, probably be acceptable to the majority of passengers. / Another option would be to abolish the City zone entirely, as the new network has been designed to allow cross city travel, whereas the fare zones still seem to assume that most travel will be to the CBD and effectively penalise relatively short journeys via the CBD to and from areas just outside it.</p> <p>In conclusion, I would like to thank Auckland Transport for taking the initiative to improve bus services and hope that my comments will be considered in order to provide the best of the new interconnected network while still retaining popular direct local services.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral Comments: I support the principle of the proposed network but I feel that in some areas the design is highly theoretical, based on most efficient resource allocation and maximising the population living near the high frequency network, and does not pay sufficient attention to most users actual patterns of travel, particularly in local areas. As I live in the East Coast Bays area I will use this to illustrate my points</p> <p>1. Currently most off peak local travel in the East Coast Bays area is between Browns Bay and Milford/Takapuna. I do not believe it will be acceptable to most passengers to introduce transfers over what is a relatively short journey and believe that direct connections via the Beach Rd and East Coast Rd/Forrest Hill Rd spine routes should be retained, with cross North Shore connections via the busway stations. I believe that introducing transfers on these local routes will be unpopular and lead to reduced patronage. Similar situations are likely to occur around local travel in other areas.</p> <p>2. Current direct trips e.g. Browns Bay to Midtown will now require 2 transfers; with relatively low off peak frequencies on some routes this is unlikely to be acceptable to passengers. I believe that transfers of up to 15 minutes will be less acceptable than is assumed in the new plan.</p> <p>3. The improved peak busway connector frequencies are welcome but may require more capacity on the busway services than is shown on the proposed NEX timetable.</p> <p>4. Some cross town high frequency services eg Takapuna to Onehunga are unlikely to run to time due to traffic congestion and are likely to experience bunching and unreliability. It may be better to terminate these long routes in the CBD and extend the North Shore services over the bridge, possibly to the University.</p> <p>5. There has been some discussion regarding the North Shore fare zone and the possibility of splitting it into upper and lower zones. I strongly oppose this as it will discourage local trips within the North Shore and may lead to increased car usage for short trips which is obviously undesirable. The current situation of a "virtual" zone/stage at the Harbour Bridge would, whilst not ideal, probably be acceptable to the majority of passengers. / Another option would be to abolish the City zone entirely, as the new network has been designed to allow cross city travel, whereas the fare zones still seem to assume that most travel will be to the CBD and effectively penalise relatively short journeys via the CBD to and from areas just outside it.</p> <p>In conclusion, I would like to thank Auckland Transport for taking the initiative to improve bus services and hope that my comments will be considered in order to provide the best of the new interconnected network while still retaining popular direct local services.</p>
688	David Thompson	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
573	David Tyler	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>The proposal is to increase the farebox recovery ratio.</p> <p>I suggest that Auckland Transport promote vigorously to the funder of the system the desirability of reducing the farebox recovery ratio, not increasing it. The purpose to be served is to get people out of private and into public transport Henry Ford increased sales by reducing costs, not increasing them System costs still need to be rigorously assed and reviewed.</p> <p>The real and valuable need is to get more people onto public transport. Fares need to be progressively reduced so that people can afford to live in cities.</p> <p>Funding should come from these types of sources (a holistic view needs to be taken)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *extra charges on users of private transport *Savings on eventual costs of cleaning exhaust pollution *savings to the health system costs by switching from private to public transport. ***less injuries per traveller. ***less sufferers from sicknesses caused by air pollution (refer to death figures available) *savings due to the reduction of the " road improvement for more traffic ", budget *taxes, rates, tolls.

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	David Tyler (#573)	<p>This is a brief list which could be extended with appropriate consideration.</p> <p>In summary, to promote the attitude for the greater good, that funding sources, move away from "user pays" model, and toward "a non-user pays." system I would be prepared to speak to this submission if considered useful.</p>
165	Dawn Sheldrake	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: I am disappointed that proposed plan does not include North Auckland. I would use feeder buses to link up with the service from Silverdale and frequently used buses when living in Whangaparaoa. How long do residents north of Orewa have to wait for an improvement in our transport system? How about opening up the train service again to passengers?</p> <p>Q2 - Support [no comments provided]</p>
881	Daya Ram	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I think commuter ferry service for Te Atatu and a Busway on the North western Motorway similar to North Shore Busway as suggested by Hon.Phil Twyford is a great idea. Instead of spending heaps of money on Te Atatu interchange improvements, like the Lincoln Rd. motorway interchange part of that money could be used towards the commuter ferry service and the separate busway.</p> <p>The instalment of bus station on the Te Atatu and Lincoln Rd motorway interchange which the Auckland Council is planning will be a good start, and to roll out new bus routes with high-frequency service will encourage the single passenger car commuters to & fro. to work or any other business to use public service instead will save lot of time money and petrol.</p> <p>Regarding the commuter ferry service for Te Atatu, I am not sure how feasible if may be to find the right location for the ferry jetty to be built. The location for the jetty should be such, where there is safe and ample car parking space.</p>
655	Debbie Ewe	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
484	Debbie Pascoe	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>Submission re Franklin District Bus and commuter services I refer to an article on the fate of the Tuakau to Pukekohe service for commuters via train and/or bus. In all seriousness what kind of future based planning are you engaging in? <i>[note: a portion of this email referred to an incident that was irrelevant to the RPTP, we have forwarded that portion to the relevant team to address, and deleted from this submission]</i></p> <p>We have a likely scenario where fossil based fuels will be under threat of escalating prices and diminishing availability in our lifetimes. We have unprecedented hardship where large sections of our populations (and the Southern Auckland region is particularly affected in this) in that these folks cannot afford a car, let alone petrol in many instances. What is needed is an efficient, reliable, and conveniently timed public transportation service.</p> <p>We have our roads cluttered with long haul trucks because we've failed to invest in the rail system. We have little or no public transportation of any note outside urban Auckland, putting pressure again on our roads.</p> <p>Can we please think about the future when making these decisions, and maybe take a look at other countries who 'get it right'. Reducing the public transport options is not the answer. Making them efficient and effective so the public can trust them to get them from 'A to B' and ensuring that fact is communicated is a better answer. Then you will get the usage that you need to make the services viable</p> <p>(PS we had to call friends on a Sunday to pick us up by car because your bus service was so inadequate and we ended up transporting out of kindness several other needy passengers. NOT ON Auckland Transport! You are in the business of getting people to their destinations NOT driving buses for the sake of it!!)</p>
478	Deborah Duncan	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>Would just like to register a concern about the potential loss of the MetroLink 007 service under the new plan proposals. I travel from Strong St, St Johns to my workplace @ Greenlane hospital - the bus route meets my needs perfectly.</p> <p>Under the new proposal it looks as though this same, relatively short journey will require at least two bus trips, or even worse, a bus, then train, then bus. At which point of course I start looking at my car again...</p> <p>Could some consideration be given to maintaining at least some kind of cross-town service, even if it were shortened to say Glen Innes to St Lukes?</p>
710	Debra Leith	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
545	Dee Bond	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>As a resident of Pukekohe, and business owner/operator in Pukekohe, Tuakau, and Mercer, and Board Member of the Tuakau and Districts Development Association I have been lobbying local and central government for the past five years to support a passenger rail link between Auckland and Hamilton, and/or to extend the Maxx service beyond Pukekohe to Tuakau.</p> <p>PUBLIC SUP[ORT]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The 2009 Hamilton City Council Residents Survey of 702 people recorded that 85% of respondents thought that the city should have a Hamilton-Auckland commuter train service operating In 2010 a petition of 11,500 Waikato people was presented to Parliament calling for the Government and related transport agencies to establish a passenger rail service between Hamilton and Auckland In 2010 an Environment Waikato Survey of 1155 Waikato residents sampled public opinion about a daily passenger rail service to Auckland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 81% of respondents supported the proposal - 85% of respondents would accept an annual rates increase of \$15-20 to pay for the service - 68% of respondents would accept an annual rates increase of \$21-24 to pay for the service In 2011 a petition of 3,500 signatures from the town of Tuakau was presented to Parliament asking that the Government supports Kiwirail in re-establishing a regular passenger rail commuter service between Auckland and Hamilton that services Tuakau. <p>After the Waikato Regional Council Rail Working Party made a recommendation to the five Councils affected to commence a Hamilton to Auckland passenger rail service last year, the various Councils, including Auckland, voted to place the proposal onto their LTPs. It is worth noting here that at no time were the Auckland residents surveyed about whether they would be interested in or use a Passenger Rail service to Hamilton – this work has yet to be undertaken, but there was sufficient support from the Waikato to justify a recommendation by the Rail Working Party (which was made up of representatives from all five Councils – ACC, HCC, WDC, Waipa, and WRC) to commence a Passenger Rail service from Hamilton. Neither service has been addressed in any form by this new Transport Plan.</p> <p>It is also noted that in your document “Summary of the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan 2021”, there is a diagram that is titled “Auckland Frequent Service Network 2016 (proposed)” which does not even show Pukekohe, a town of 25,000+ expected to double by 2030, with a public transport connection. While I assume this is an oversight in the printing, it is indicative of the lack of interest shown towards the public transport needs of the rural support communities that feed Auckland.</p> <p>Pukekohe needs a rail service that is as regular as the Paraparaumu service is to Wellington. These towns are equidistant from their respective cities and are of the same population base, and yet the Paraparaumu service runs every 30mins during the week and every hour on the weekends until the early hours to support people wanting to work and play in the Capital city. Pukekohe also needs a weekend rail service. A robust public transport system to the fringes of Auckland and its neighbouring border towns would assist greatly in its ability to house its growing population.</p> <p>Another existing service that has not been addressed by this Draft Plan is the bus service that currently connects Tuakau and Port Waikato to Pukekohe. Are these towns to be cut off from Public Transport just because a politician decided that Franklin should be cut in half? This plan should address the inter-regional public transport needs of the future.</p> <p>Please advise whether you require another copy of the supporting documents previously supplied to the Council in support of Trains. Thank you.</p>
604	Deklan Pompallier	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
674	Del Elliot	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
362	Denise Wellm	<p>Q1 - Opposed Comments:</p> <p>6.6 Customer interface, and 6.7 Assisting the transport disadvantaged, Policy 7.1 'Identify target groups and areas where service planning can help the transport disadvantaged, particularly vulnerable users such as children, senior citizens and people with disabilities'. I would also identify parents/caregivers with very young children. These groups will be disadvantaged with the need to change buses from the proposed frequent service network to 'local service' routes. Time consuming, with probable longer waiting times for connecting buses - not pleasant for the commuters who make up these groups. Will frequent bus services wait to connect with 'local service' buses? Current services which do not require frequent changes must be retained, rather than expecting the 'transport disadvantaged' to change buses several times over short distances.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments:</p> <p>I support the use of a single ticket across different operators. However, SuperGold Card holders must be offered the equivalent of 'choice of time-based 2-hour fares when travelling within one or more zones on bus and rail'. Currently SuperGold Card commuters cannot obtain a transfer when changing buses within the same fare stage (eg Howick and Eastern Services to/from Botany), whereas fare-paying passengers can. This surely results in additional charges to taxpayers/ratepayers.</p> <p>Other Comments:</p> <p>Concession fares for target groups: Current existing fare concessions should be retained for target groups (children under 5, free; discounted fares for full time school and tertiary students; legally blind members of RNZ Foundation for the Blind; Total Mobility cardholders and SuperGold Card holders.)</p> <p>For SuperGold Card holders, travelling by public transport in Auckland to appointments (medical, hospital, etc) is very time-consuming across the largest city in New Zealand, and a 3pm cut-off (probably with several bus changes if the new policy proceeds) would not allow the elderly to complete their journey within that time. If Auckland Transport insists on any changes to the timing, then at least consider 4pm-6pm as peak journey times (rather than 3pm).</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
876	Deon Strydom	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
186	Des Leader	<p>Q1 - Strongly Opposed [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral [no comments provided]</p>
206	Detlev Jackson	<p>Q1 - Neutral Comments: I would make decisions about getting from A to B based on how long the overall journey would take and how many times I would have to get off and wait and how long the wait would take. I am concerned that rather than getting from C to D, I would need to go from C to F to D. This would possibly take the same amount of time, but my concern would be that anything running out of timetable, or any cuts to service would make this a very unattractive prospect. At this stage there isn't really enough information about what such a system would look like on the ground to comment further.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: I have lived in cities with this system and found it very efficient.</p> <p>Other Comments: Perhaps I didn't read this in enough detail but was there a focus on local transport hubs and how these would work in neighbourhoods? Also, how does this plan link with other key initiatives in the Auckland Plan - transport is core infrastructure from which so many community benefits can be leveraged, I would like to see more detail about this. [sic]</p>
667	Diane Vaioleti	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
483	Dion Lynch	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>The Draft Regional Public Transport Plan is a big step in the right direction for public transport in Auckland and I particularly support the proposals for bus routes connecting and feeding into train stations and ferry terminals. The rail system needs to become the backbone of Auckland's transport system, with buses being used to provide local service routes, feeding into the nearest train station. There needs to be more train service routes introduced across Auckland using all existing rail lines to support this.</p> <p>With reference to the frequent service route map, there are some new train service routes which need to be added.</p> <p>In Summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Southern train services between Manukau and Pukekohe needed. 2. Saturday train services to Pukekohe needed. 3. Train services to Waiuku needed. 4. Train services to Huapai needed. 5. Inter-regional train services needed between Auckland-Hamilton-Tauranga. 6. New train station at Drury needed. 7. New train station at Walters Road (Takanini) needed. 8. Service frequency on all routes and modes needs to be minimum of hourly 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Saturday. 9. Incentive needed for public transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff to use public transport with a staff privilege AT HOP card. <p>In Detail:</p> <p>1. Southern train services between Manukau and Pukekohe needed. A frequent running direct train service needs to [be] introduced between Manukau and Pukekohe, operating Monday to Saturday. The new Manukau train station is poorly used at present due to the lack of a direct train service from the south into Manukau. When the new electric train services start operating, the proposed diesel shuttle train services south of Papakura to Pukekohe, should instead run between Manukau and Pukekohe. Manukau is the main shopping, employment and education hub in South Auckland and a train service running direct from Pukekohe into Manukau would be very popular and well used. When the new MIT complex opens above the Manukau station, the majority of students will come from the south and a direct train service will be needed.</p> <p>If Aucklanders are to be enticed out of their cars and onto public transport, the services need to be simple, direct and frequent. The proposal to have diesel shuttle train services between Papakura and Pukekohe makes train services unnecessarily complicated with transfers at Papakura. The public in South Auckland would be much better served with a direct train service between Manukau and Pukekohe. A Manukau-Pukekohe service using diesel trains would not impede with electric train services in the short distance that they would operate in the electrified area between Papakura and Wiri, and would provide the people of Pukekohe (as well as Drury when a new station is built there), and all areas in between through to Manukau, with an attractive train service. A direct southern train service operating between Manukau and Pukekohe needs to be introduced as part of the RPTP.</p> <p>2. Saturday train services to Pukekohe needed. Saturday train services need to be started to Pukekohe, operating initially hourly from 7.00am to 7.00pm. Pukekohe is a growing part of Auckland and existing weekday train services from Pukekohe are well supported. There are many people in Pukekohe who work on Saturdays and should have access to train services. There are a great many people, particularly teenagers who cannot drive or do not have cars, who like to go into the</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Dion Lynch (#483)	<p>shopping malls and entertainment centres on Saturdays, such as Manukau, Sylvia Park, Newmarket and the central city, but there is no train service from Pukekohe on Saturdays. There are also many people who like to travel out to Pukekohe for shopping and a day out when they are free on Saturdays, but presently cannot do so on a train. It is unacceptable and poor that in 2012 there are still no train services to Pukekohe on Saturdays. This needs to change. Saturday train services to Pukekohe need be introduced as part of the RPTP.</p> <p>3. Train services to Waiuku needed. A train service needs to be introduced between Papakura and Waiuku, during peak periods on weekdays. The Glenbrook Vintage Railway has recently been extended into the Waiuku township and this railway could be used as part of a new train service to entice commuters out of their cars and onto trains. Trains have far greater appeal than buses and this has been proven with the continuous record patronage levels seen on Auckland's train system in the past 10 years. If traffic congestion on Auckland's roads is to be seriously addressed, it needs to come in the form of providing train services across the region on all rail routes. A peak period train service to Waiuku operating between 6.00am and 9.00am and 3.00pm to 7.00pm on weekdays would be attractive to commuters and students from Waiuku, and would help reduce number of cars travelling on the busy State Highway 22 during peak periods. Such a service would not require many trains, maybe just one or two diesel units. The hours in which such a commuter service would operate would not interfere with the Glenbrook Vintage Railway's operation which normally only operates on weekends or occasionally during the middle of the day on weekdays. A Papakura-Waiuku train service would be popular and attractive, and would be making use of the under-utilised rail route between Papakura and Waiuku. A train service between Papakura and Waiuku needs to be added to the RPTP.</p> <p>4. Train services to Huapai needed. Frequent running train services to Huapai are needed with an extension of the Western Line train route to Huapai. A regular half hourly shuttle operating 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Saturday needs to be introduced between Swanson and Huapai, together with a new station and park and ride at Huapai, to serve this large area and entice commuters on State Highway 16 out of their cars and onto trains. A station and park and ride in a good visible and accessible location alongside SH16 midway between Huapai and Kumeu would be ideal. Bus services could easily connect with a train services with a station located here, together with a 'Kiss and Ride' drop off facility. Commuters from Huapai, Kumeu, Riverhead, Waimauku, Helensville and surrounding districts could make good use of a train service and park and ride strategically located at Huapai, rather than crawling in traffic on the congested SH16 north western motorway. The fact the a train service between Swanson and Huapai is missing on the maps in the Draft RPTP is shocking, as this rail route has so much potential for commuter passenger train services, and is not being used. This needs to change. A frequent running train service needs to be introduced to Huapai as part of the RPTP.</p> <p>5. Inter-regional train services needed between Auckland-Hamilton-Tauranga. A passenger train service needs to be introduced running between Hamilton and Auckland during the morning and evening peak periods, and between Auckland and Tauranga during the middle of the day. While the Waikato and the Bay of Plenty are not Auckland Transport's responsibility, a large proportion of traffic on the congested roads leading in and out of Auckland, originate from Hamilton and Tauranga. Tauranga and Mount Maunganui are both popular holiday and weekend away destinations for Aucklanders. Tauranga is rapidly growing and is now New Zealand's fifth largest city, while Auckland is by far New Zealand's largest city and is rapidly growing. With the high price of housing in Auckland, many people are now having to live further afield in the Waikato and commute into Auckland by driving. In order to reduce the number of cars on Auckland's congested roads, particularly during peak periods, a passenger train service needs to be introduced between Auckland-Hamilton-Tauranga to provide an attractive alternative to driving and to make use of the under-utilised rail routes between Auckland, Hamilton and Tauranga. A passenger service between these centres could be established initially using two of KiwiRail's recently refurbished Silver Fern railcars which are not presently being used. A morning commuter service could run from Hamilton, departing around 6.30am, arriving in Newmarket and the Strand stations around 8.30am. The train could then run from the Strand station through to Tauranga and Mount Maunganui, departing around 9.15am, arriving at Mount Maunganui around 12.45pm. The return service could depart Mount Maunganui at 1.30pm and arrive at the Strand around 5.00pm. It could then depart the Strand and Newmarket stations for Hamilton around 5.45pm, arriving in Hamilton at around 7.45pm. Intermediate stops for all services in both directions could be made at The Base at Te Rapa, Ngaruawahia, Huntly, Te Kauwhata, Tuakau, Pukekohe (for transfers onto Auckland's suburban train services) and Newmarket. As the service picks up in popularity, which it quickly will, additional train services could be put on between Hamilton and Auckland, as well as a service originating in the morning from Tauranga through to Auckland, before returning to Tauranga in the evening. These train services could perhaps utilise some of Auckland's current SA class diesel trains, or else the six former Silver Star carriages from A & G Price at Thames. Either of these carriages would make attractive and comfortable services, which would be popular, and would entice people out of their cars and onto trains.</p> <p>6. New train station at Drury needed. A new train station and park and ride is needed at Drury. Drury is well placed strategically for a large park and ride, serving a large surrounding district, as well as being close to the SH1 southern motorway, and SH22 which would enable commuters from outlying areas, to park at Drury and commute into the central city and Manukau (if a direct Manukau-Pukekohe train service is provided). A train station at Drury would also provide locals in Drury access to frequent running train services, which would be within an easy walk. Trains have greater appeal than buses, and access to train services would act as a real enticement for Drury locals to get out of their cars and onto public transport. A new train station and large park and ride needs to be made part of the RPTP.</p> <p>7. New train station at Walters Road (Takanini) needed. The surrounding area around Walters Road at Takanini is in the process of being developed with many large scale developments in recent years such as the Addison housing estate, the Southgate shopping centre, the Longford Park subdivision and retirement complex. Most recently, Housing New Zealand have announced a large scale affordable housing project to be built on the former Papakura Army Camp land on Walters Road. This project, together with a proposed new high school on the same land, will result in a significant increase in the number of people living in this area and needing to travel in and out of the area. The roads in this area such as Great South Road and Porchester Road are already heavily congested during peak periods. The new residents and students in this area need access to the frequent train services running along the Southern Line through this area, with a new train station within walking distance at Walters Road. A station here would be in a strategic location, providing a practical and attractive alternative to driving, and would provide fast, direct transport options to the central city, Manukau (if a direct southern train service is provided), Papakura and Pukekohe. A new train station needs to be built at Walters Road now as part of the RPTP, to enable new residents moving into this area to get into the habit of commuting from day one, rather than having to rely on driving. Bus services in this area have little appeal as they are slow and get stuck on the same congested roads as cars. A new train station within easy walking distance with frequent running train services to all over Auckland, would be much more appealing and would result in good use.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Dion Lynch (#483)	<p>8. Service frequency on all routes and modes needs to be minimum of hourly 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Saturday. If a greater uptake of public transport is to be achieved, there needs to be a uniform consistency of service provision on all routes and modes (bus, train and ferry) across the region. The very minimum service level needs to be hourly services operating from 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Saturday on all routes and modes. Aucklanders need to be provided with at least this service frequency, including Saturdays, in order to make public transport an option for travelling around the region.</p> <p>9. Incentive needed for public transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff to use public transport with a staff privilege AT HOP card. There are many people involved in the running of Auckland's public transport, but the great irony is most use a private car to get to work or for travelling around Auckland. If Auckland Transport and Auckland Council wish to get more Aucklanders out of their cars and onto public transport, providing incentives for public transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff to use public transport, would be a great start. The introduction of an integrated ticketing system across all modes of transport in Auckland provides an ideal opportunity for such an incentive to be introduced. With Auckland's transport system being integrated with one ticketing system, it would make perfect sense for a staff privilege AT HOP card to be made available so that all public transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff can make use of all modes of public transport provided by Auckland Transport, eg train staff being able to use buses, ferry staff being able to use trains and so on. Providing this privilege would be easy enough to load onto a AT HOP card and would encourage transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff to use public transport.</p> <p>A staff privilege AT HOP needs to be created by Auckland Transport and made available for all public transport staff in Auckland who operate public transport services for Auckland Transport, as well as for Auckland Transport staff, which can be used on all modes of transport - bus, train and ferry in Auckland. The staff privilege HOP card could be jointly funded and subsidised by Auckland Transport and all operating companies who provide services for Auckland Transport.</p> <p>Such an initiative would be very popular and would be well received and used, encouraging more people to use public transport in Auckland, which in turn will help to reduce the number of cars on Auckland's roads. There would also be an advantage with the people who operate Auckland's transport system using public transport and seeing things from the point of view of a passenger, which could help with making improvements to public transport services.</p> <p>If Auckland Transport wishes to create a public transport system which is practical and Aucklanders will seriously start to use, then the above changes need to be introduced to the RPTP.</p>
238	Don Robertson	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: It has taken a very very long time to get the planning to concentrate on an actual network rather than dressing up an irrational conglomeration of point to point services with needless and expensive branding bs and similar irrelevant peripherals. The proposed network will not be perfect but is a quantum leap on the existing.</p> <p>I submit then that all resources should be deployed to implement it as proposed urgently, rather than delay any implementation seeking any further refinement. Once operational any required refinement can be made based on actual operating experience. / I submit that the simple zoning fare structure proposed should be adopted as being the "bestfit" accepting that any fare structure will have inherent anomalies that will disadvantage some journeys and conversely make others an absolute bargain. Please Do it and quickly.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: Zonal System is easy to understand. / Fare box recovery targets are over ambitious but reflective of government policy that irrationally favours car travel in the face of economic evidence that in Auckland the Public transport initiatives such as the North Shore Busway have given better economic returns then motorway construction projects.</p>
820	Doug Millynn	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
487	Douglas and Barbara Pitfield	Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below To whom it may concern. My wife and myself both N.Z. superannuitants have recently moved to Tuakau from Auckland. We are now residing in Amberly Park lifestyle village and wish to submit our support for a bus link to Pukekohe and a rail link to Auckland. If these links are discontinued or abandoned we are faced with continuing to use our own transport. As we are both in our early seventies this is a bleak outlook. We trust that you give due consideration to our submission
639	Douglas Fursdon	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
157	Dylan Snow	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: Electrify all buses by 2025, as Montreal in Canada is doing. Everything else looks good, but this is missing.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: Sooner that the single ticketing system for all types of PT can be implemented the better. Would be a great improvement to include the weekly bus passes like the Lower to CBD as being registered on the HOP card also.</p> <p>Other Comments: Electrify all buses by 2025. Would be a massive decrease in expenditure on bus maintenance and running costs, and reduction in emissions, noise pollution and the instant maximum torque provided by electric motors would reduce travel time as the time to get from 0 km/h to speed is reduced. Weight of buses would decrease meaning lesser stopping distances and better manoeuvrability [sic] in all driving conditions. Montreal in Canada, Newport in South Wales and Vienna in Austria all have begun electrifying their public transport buses. Be an early adopter Auckland!</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
617	E J Geraghty	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
749	E M Young	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
19	E Wrench	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: The proposed network is a good idea. It will need to be supported by improved transfer facilities - currently the interchanges are very weather dependent and should not have buses and pedestrians interacting as they currently do. The network should be extended to include Torbay/Long Bay this would reflect the same coverage as is shown in the south The network should also provide the ability to express to areas other than the CBD ie to move from Long Bay to Takapuna in a efficient manner without going through the squiggles of the 858 839 routes. The network should also deal with the north buses going south and vice a versa at Milford 858 / Northcross 879 / Torbay881</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Opposed Comments: The fare zones penalise users of the system in the outer zones. It shows the predisposition of planning of the public transport system to only being used for commuter activities. The bus service is subsidised by people who choose to live in the areas furthest from the city centre. Despite the fact that the service they pay for is poorer - outer buses are slower to reach inner destinations, and services are not provided to leapfrog the internal zones.</p> <p>The zones also punish journeys across zone boundaries - 2 zones for instance to go from Murrays Bay to Campbells Bay. Best alternative - do away with the zones - same cash fare for all / Second best - combine rings 1 & 2, and 3&4 to create 2 zones only - City and rural</p> <p>Other Comments: Get rid of the HOP brand - it is tainted by the original HOP stuff up</p>
805	Eddie Preston	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
416	Edward Exton Fletcher	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: More emphasis on bicycle community. Greater provision of cycle parking</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Greater subsidy of fares initially to encourage patronage</p> <p>Other Comments: Greater emphasis on bicycle community. Easier mixing of types of traffic - pedestrians are priority one. Bicycle (commuter) - 2 / Buses - 3 / Trucks (delivery) - 4 / cars - five / / Route through Auckland South to North toll free for travellers.</p>
869	Edward James	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
839	Edwin Judd	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
384	Edwina Pio	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: The plan is commendable regarding the frequency of buses that will be available.</p> <p>However it is important to note that as the number of passengers increase, there has to be a quicker way of paying for the ticket, particularly for those who do not have a AT Hop card - as a bus passenger I have frequently noted that a number of such passengers who do not have a card, take approximately two to five minutes at a stop to get their money out etc - this is a tremendous cost in terms of time (which is money) particularly if you calculate the cost per person on the bus and multiply this by the time spent waiting at numerous stops for such passengers. / In some countries and cities, (e.g. Boston in the USA) this is a fixed fare or tokens that can be purchased which makes life easier for all - the driver, the passenger who is travelling, as well as all the passengers who are on the bus</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Suggest a fixed fare for many more routes than is currently available.</p> <p>Also suggest that the 'powers that be' think long and hard and have a long term plan which they implement, rather than plans which change (e.g. HOP card) which are a cost to tax payers like me, who work very hard to earn their pennies.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
383	Elaine Beryl Read	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: Figure 5-2 shows no provision for Rapid Transport from the eastern suburbs of Howick and/or Botany.</p> <p>Figure 5-5 shows limited services proposed within the area bounded by Botany Town Centre, Pakuranga Plaza and Highland Park, similarly within the area bounded by Botany Town Centre, Otara and Otahuhu Town Centre.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Off-peak discounts and a daily cap on fares should encourage more public transport trips.</p>
552	<p>Elisabeth Alkemade (Personal) Convenor, Community and Social Issues Project Team of Auckland Grey Power Association</p>	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>note, this is a personal submission, Elizabeth Alkemade has also submitted under Grey Power (please refer to the Organisations' Submissions)</p> <p>I am a member of the Auckland Central Grey Power Committee. and agree totally with the submission Grey Power has already put in.</p> <p>I have the following additional comments: In Auckland with our bus routes the problem has been lack of convenient east to west routes or west to east routes. It should not take two buses from say Royal Oak to get to St Luke's or from Onehunga in the same direction.</p> <p>I also note that the 007 bus from Pt Chevalier is no longer there. This is a great bus which has taken the wonderful route along the foreshore to St Heliers. It has been particularly popular with tourists and offers a great way to get acquainted with the Auckland environment, even for us locals.</p> <p>I was at the Newmarket railway station two days ago and wanted to use the toilets there and was very surprised indeed to find that the toilets could only be accessed for train passengers. I happened to be there to meet someone and could not find a toilet in my carpark building so I needed to use whatever space I could find to stop me from wetting in the car. Senior people often need the toilets more frequently than others. I am also partly disabled so not able to walk significant distances to find other conveniences. !!! Please sort out this irrational lack of availability of the toilets promptly. Few other stations in Ak have toilet facilities!!!!!!And will need them when the public use of our trains and buses increases.</p> <p>I have never heard of toilets on stations not being available to the public, as they are in all civilised countries whether you are on the train or not. The installation of the ticketing gates has the effect of barring the toilets and there is an opportunity for the barriers to be placed so that the toilets can still be used by the public, which is so in London and other places where the toilets are always accessible also for those who do other business at the station or are meeting train passengers.</p> <p>In terms of the use of public transport people will only use it if it is frequent and reasonably priced. We need to make sure people will use P.T. instead of their car.</p> <p>In terms of routing buses it may be a good idea to route some of the daily bus traffic away from busy centres where stations are to facilitate the progress of buses to outlying areas which would only be held up going through busy traffic hubs as a matter of course.</p> <p>I am a public transport fan and realise that as we get older handy public transport at a reasonable cost is needed for all of us.</p> <p>Auckland has had so long to wait to even get the trains back on, we deserve an integrated public transport service now which is easy to use and affordable. Thank you for your attention. (Special attention needs to be paid for easy access to all services by those who have mobility issues).</p> <p>Elisabeth van Alkemade Convenor, Community and Social Issues Project Team of Auckland Grey Power Assn.</p> <p>I am happy to speak to my submission as and when such an opportunity arises for Grey Power Submitters.</p>
419	Elisabeth Laird	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: I support a connection-based public transport network, which reduces unnecessary duplication of routes and replaces them with an extensive frequent service network and local connector services.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: I strongly support the use of a single ticket and the development of a fair zone-based fare system. I think that the following measures are necessary to make this happen:</p> <p>With regards to section 6.4 FARES AND TICKETING, I think that the North zone (shown in Figure 6-1: Indicative fare zone boundaries) should be split into two sections. The lower part (including Takapuna, Devonport, Birkenhead, etc) should be the same as the Isthmus zone. The upper part (including Albany, Greenhithe, Browns Bay, etc) should be the same as the West or South zone. The boundary could be similar to the current</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
		<p>Northern Pass Upper/Lower Zone boundary, but I think that the Greenhithe peninsula should be in the upper part.</p> <p>Also, ferries should be included within the zone-based system. Leaving them as point-to-point undermines the integrated fare system and disadvantages those who are dependent on ferries (e.g. residents of Waiheke island).</p>
439	Elizabeth	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: I support the proposed network but not the exclusion of ferry services from the fare zones. Contrary to the opening sentiments about fair fares, excluding one particular mode from the pricing structure that serves the other two modes is blatantly unfair. It currently costs \$1.80 for a bus or train journey of several kilometers around the city isthmus but a shorter journey to Devonport by ferry costs \$6. The new fares structure should address this inequality. For reasons of history the Devonport ferry services is unsubsidised whereas the majority of bus and train services are subsidised. For people who live in Devonport and have no option to use the train to the CBD and for whom the bus isn't a sensible option due to the number of connections required and time taken it is unfair to charge more for a shorter journey just because it is by ferry. If there was a road or rail tunnel there would be no reason to charge more for simply going under the harbour therefore there should be no reason to charge more for going over it.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Opposed Comments: See above</p> <p>Other Comments: See above</p>
786	Elizabeth Hill	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
250	Elizabeth May Appleby	<p>Q1 - Neutral Comments: My concern is the delay happening concerning a link with Tuakau to travel north. At present I rely completely on the bus (pathetic) service and would hope that a train connection would improve my chances of arriving at work in Pukekohe at a convenient hour. For anyone without a car, or without a license, needing transport from Tuakau has no real options whatsoever. With the plan having nothing firm for this far south is very disappointing.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral [no comments provided]</p>
757	Elliot Hira	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
722	Elroy D Muller	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
318	Emma Joyce	<p>Q1 - Opposed Comments: Public transport will be less convenient if people have to make transfers all the time. Running the risk of a missed connection is not fun. This would only work if feeder services are at frequent intervals but I doubt that would be possible in an area such as Laingholm where demand is low. There needs to be more free park n ride available at interchanges for those of us who live further away.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: The fares and ticketing policy all seems sensible and is a model used well internationally. However, I can't understand why the whole of the North Shore is in zone 2 yet anywhere beyond New Lynn is a different zone. This seems very unfair to those of us in west Auckland but extremely advantageous to those on the North Shore. The distances are similar? The rationale for this options needs to be explained a bit better before I could strongly support the scheme.</p> <p>Other Comments: We need to recognise that car transport has to be an option and provide park and ride for use by people who live in areas where it is not economically feasible to increase public transport services. I am prohibited from using public transport on weekends as there is no bus service, but would be happy to park my car in New Lynn if travelling further afield. However, there is nowhere to park. This means I end up driving into the CBD or Newmarket - something that this plan is aiming to discourage. / / Many thanks for the opportunity to submit.</p>
775	Erin Todd	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
108	Eva Cadario	<p>Q1 - Neutral [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Support</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Eva Cadario (#108)	<p>[no comments provided]</p> <p>Other Comments: The transport plan aims to increase the use of public transport and meet customer needs. There is an increasing number of dog owners in Auckland, who are being excluded from use of public transport. Major cities in Europe and the UK could easily be used as a model of how to change this and thus have a whole new customer cohort that is currently forced to use their car.</p> <p>For example, the Transport for London website (tfl.govt.uk) states that "You can also travel with any other dog or domestic animal, unless there is a good reason for us to refuse it (such as if the animal seems dangerous or is likely to upset other customers). You must keep it under control on a lead or in a suitable container, and must not allow it on a seat. Staff can't take charge of any animal. You must carry animals on moving escalators or through automatic ticket gates."</p> <p>Similar rules apply for other large UK cities e.g. Glasgow. In Germany, dogs require to be muzzled, but are then allowed on buses and trains.</p> <p>I would like to propose that consideration is given to allow dogs on public transport in Auckland - hoping that other parts of NZ might follow suit. [end]</p>
10	Evan Keating	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: As per the comment above, having read the document, I strongly support the proposed changes to the network and agree that this change is the best way forward and long overdue. I have a number of points to make regarding specific points in the plan which are as follows, with page numbers where relevant:</p> <p>Page 15. Need stronger alignment with land use planning, current performance (14% of households within 500m of rapid/frequent links) is very low, 2040 target is still less than half. Need to increase this if Auckland Plan shifts are to be feasible. Would be helpful to know what proportion are within 800m to 1000m as well and have a target for this too. As noted on page 13, development will follow permanent public transport, difficult to convince development to follow temporary bus routes. Therefore, some certainty must be provided that the proposed network is permanent;</p> <p>Page vii, definition of 'route variation' would be helpful, does this equate to a route number? E.g. 500 or 017;</p> <p>Page 14 and 36 faster boarding times would be encouraged if there was a greater price differential between cash fares and hop card as is the case in London (flat cash fare is £2.25 but Oyster is £1.35);</p> <p>Page 19, an outline of what good 'interchange facilities' are would help or a minimum standard. This is relatively easy to picture when a rail station is involved but what about where two bus routes cross on district arterials? E.g. where Mt Eden Road meets Balmoral Road, would a new structure and crossing be constructed or would it simply involve a greater number of bus shelters;</p> <p>Pages 30 and 53. actual time monitoring of travel times is essential for timetable design and monitoring of service but should be undertaken by AT directly, not the operator to ensure an independent result is achieved (the current bus operators report extremely high levels of punctuality which are not credible);</p> <p>Page 34 and 35. Zone structure appears logical and 2 hour fares would significantly increase convenience;</p> <p>Page 36. Unclear why point to point fares would be retained for ferries. This appears to discourage transfers between modes and assumes that ferry journeys are to the CBD only;</p> <p>Page 42 and appendix 5. I suggest that Multiple Birth Clubs are consulted on this issue due to their particular transport needs and difficulties in access public transport services;</p> <p>There appears to be very little mention of integration with cycling. This should be achieved in a number of ways: illustrate the proposed regional cycling network on the maps in a draft plan map and plan for interchanges with it; this would require cycle storage facilities at public transport interchanges. This should be a priority in the draft plan require bike racks on buses as part of operator contracts, encourage their use once installed and ensure there is no cost to the customer for them. Experience could be gained from such bike racks in Christchurch and overseas; ensuring that cyclist groups are consulted early in the draft plan process.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: see previous comments</p>
291	Faith Read	<p>Q1 - Opposed Comments: You have set yourselves a huge task. If it suits most people you will have done well. Me? No. I live near the Takapuna CBD and use the buses regularly (no car). When instigated almost every place I often visit will need 2 - 3 buses to reach. (Longest one - bus ride would be to Onehunga - useful maybe every 2 - 3 years!) Even to get to the city i will have to walk 4 blocks to bus, and get as far as mid? Queen Street (Mayoral Drive is more useful to me) a misconception - I hope. From Takapuna, city buses will no longer go via Esmonde Road but via Akoranga Station both to and from Auckland city. Is that so?</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral Comments: Not applicable - unless Government cancels the Gold Card!</p> <p>Other Comments: I find the bus system as it is now so much improved from what it was, it suits me pretty well. Worst fault is buses out of kilter and two arriving almost together, creating a long gap if you miss both. I would be happy to [speak at one of the public hearings], if of any use, but am not on the email [also subjective as to where they are being held].</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
679	Fay Ivey	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
566	Fay R Greer	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I would like to see the buses stay at Tuakau as there are a lot of older people [who] live here in Tuakau. How do you think these people are going to do their shopping once a week[?] I know we have a corner store but there is other shopping one has to [do]. It amazes me how the town people don't care about us country folk at all, so please stop and think about how older people are going to get out and home again if the buses stop. It would be nice also to see the trains run from here to Auckland (it would be a lovely day out) and back to Tuakau. If the train ran you could see a lot more people in Auckland.</p> <p>So please stop and think what you are going to do before you do it.</p>
690	Fe Day	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
824	Fiona Proctor	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
431	Fran Allen	<p>Q1 - Neutral Comments: This submission is specific to the services that terminate (i.e. turn-around) and access the extension to Jervois Road (particularly numbers 282 to 294 and 213 to 233 Jervois Road).</p> <p>The street is over serviced with multiple routes being diverted into the road via a complex and until recently dangerous intersection with West End Road (the danger having been mitigated by the construction of a roundabout).</p> <p>Use of the services is minimal before 7.00am and after 6.30pm weekdays and during weekends.</p> <p>The operation of turning at the intersection with Herne Bay Road is both complex and dangerous with the noise and environmental pollution inherent in the use of diesel buses being significantly increased during the acceleration of the buses making the turns.</p> <p>There are alternative options in close proximity for example buses could stop near the Bayfield School area (providing better service without increasing disruption or risk) and bus turning at the carpark area of Cox's Bay in West End Road.</p> <p>There are frequently 3 or 4 buses in this stretch of road at the same time (especially at weekends) which points to conflicts in scheduling and significant unnecessary cost.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral [no comments provided]</p>
842	Fran McArthur	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
776	Fraser Deans	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
816	Gail Cook	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
582	Garry & Aileen Seal	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>My husband and I wish to state the need for transportation to Tuakau. Trains especially and also the bus service. We have lived in Tuakau for seven years now. We have found that a train service would be a great advantage, as we have to travel to Middlemore and Auckland Hospitals at regular intervals. So please support the MAXX train's service to Tuakau.</p>
245	Garry Venus	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: It all seems generally positive – and the map looks a great piece of design art. We need to encourage people out of their cars - but we also need to try to make it as convenient as possible for people to use public transport.</p> <p>Sadly with the devil in the detail I'm not sure it will work on all routes as intended. For example looking at indicative route from Takapuna to the CBD – as shown in the pink line in frequent-network-map 2016 - there seems to be an indication that Takapuna buses will not go to near the Britomart Transport Centre - rather they appear to head inland, ending up at Onehunga or is it New Lynn? From the perspective of someone using the buses twice a day to and from the CBD near Britomart, the proposed route doesn't look too flash.</p> <p>I am aware this is supposed to be a high level overview and that detail is to come later - but I think it is important to point out at this stage that such a route would be counterproductive. Surely the point of the public transport system is to make it attractive to the most number of users. Now, I agree there must be someone who wants to travel from Takapuna to Onehunga or New Lynn but I bet there are</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Garry Venus (#245)	<p>plenty more who want to just catch the bus to the Britomart and CBD.</p> <p>Of major worry in respect of passenger safety is that the route apparently involves buses crossing three lanes on Esmonde road to go the Akoranga bus station - this will be a massive adventure for the poor old bus drivers and is sure to result in delays and likely collisions with cars in close packed formation every day. Once it has overcome this hurdle it ends up in the middle of Auckland somewhere well away from the Britomart. This will add a huge amount of time to people intending to just catch the bus into downtown.</p> <p>The evening return has the potential to be even more of a shambles. We will be expected to catch a bus which will have travelled in from Onehunga or New Lynn – is there any way of ensuring it will be remotely on time – are there intended to be busways from Onehunga and or New Lynn? THIS ROUTE AINT BROKE – SO WHY ARE YOU TRYING TO FIX IT? The pink lines on your lovely map could snake around Fanshaw and up Albert as at present, and still keep the beautiful symmetry of your map. /</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: the fare zoning is a great idea - but should be based on distance travelled - not just reflecting some archaic local body boundary concept.[sic]</p> <p>Other Comments: Look forward to discussing the detail of the Takapuna CBD route issues as above.</p>
561	Dr Garth Harris	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>Gold Card Transport Concessions I hereby state my strong opposition to a proposal in the transport plan to change the time at which Super Gold Card holders can travel for free on public transport. In particular the impact on Waiheke residents would be severe. For these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Waiheke Island is part of Auckland City but is separated from it by a considerable stretch of water. The ferry is an essential part of the connection to Metropolitan Auckland. (There is no comparable situation in any of the major metropolitan areas.) 2. Residents of Waiheke are strongly dependent on various mainland services such as medical, hospital, commercial services etc and therefore use the ferry service regularly. 3. Many residents of Waiheke are Super Gold card holders and make great use of the ferry for a variety of reasons. To deprive them of this concession would create considerable financial hardship, especially those who made the move to Waiheke in recent years to take advantage of the cheaper land and house prices. 4. I understand that the cost of the ferry service to Waiheke for super Gold card holders is a substantial portion of the total cost to the government of this facility. I suggest that the cost could be considerably reduced through negotiation with the company Fullers. The marginal cost to Fullers of this service must be very low whereas the current revenue from it is substantial. Renegotiation would undoubtedly save money. <p>I look forward to hearing from you.</p>
434	Garth Wayne Macleod	<p>Q1 - Neutral Comments:</p> <p>Please refer to Attachment 5, Page 10 – 29 of the Attachments to Submissions Document http://www.aucklandtransport.govt.nz/submissions</p> <p>The proposal overall does seem a good idea. I just feel the area of Torbay/Browns Bay will have a worse service due to the changes – particularly at peak times.</p> <p>Needs to remember the goals are the important result and the method is simply a way of reaching the goal In particular "Increasing the proportion of all vehicular trips made by public transport into the city centre during the morning peak from 47 to 70 per cent by 2040"- will require a good service from the North Shore.</p> <p>Current problem is "Many of these route variations are infrequent, long, and indirect" This is true.</p> <p>However I feel that the buses from Northern East Coast Bays at peak times are frequent, quick, and for the majority of the trip very direct.</p> <p>I feel the changes being made will make it more difficult for people to travel - especially in the morning peak. I feel the value of buses which do the feeder work THEN travel via the busway to the CBD are not well understood. The benefits of these are - they do the work feeder bus - when arriving at a Park and ride bus stop they are much more efficient than a feeder. Very few people get off. Also there the bus already has people aboard there are less to get on. This makes for quicker loading. Currently buses can be queuing at Park and ride stops in the morning waiting for a place to stop as it is full of other buses. Buses that arrive already half full do better for this.</p> <p>A bus in particular that has done very well is the 881. This was not increase in 2009 as it was not thought necessary however it has since been increased from 400 users per day to 2,000 and has a Facebook site asking for a better service so more people can catch this. This works as a feeder (both in the Morning and the afternoon and provides transport across the CBD. Many people use this service to get to destination s part the main university –such as Symonds Street and Auckland hospital.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Garth Wayne Macleod (#434)	<p>This is not a slow, infrequent poorly used service yet it is being removed. If people have to link to other buses this slows down the service for other people- something which makes it harder to achieve policy 3.2"Improve travel speeds to provide a service that is competitive with car travel".</p> <p>Reports on park and ride refer to the link and ride concept where-by buses travel through to carry people to the CBD, / I think there is over emphasis on the Northern Express. Policy 10.1 refers to reporting "Patronage growth on the Northern Express busway" The Northern Express is one of the services using the Northern Busway> Ideally busway numbers would include the Northern Express as part so people realise what number the NEX and the Busway are carrying.</p> <p>Q2 - Support [no comments provided]</p>
809	Gary Lennox	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
480	Gary McGuire	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>Submission of Gary McGuire: Key Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APPROXIMATELY 200 OF THE 1,000 DAILY PARK AND RIDE PATRONS AT PUKEKOHE RAIL STATION COME FROM TUAKAU. • THE 20 MAX TRAINS THAT STOP AT PUKEKOHE HAVE TO CHANGE TRACKS IN ORDER TO RETURN TO AUCKLAND. CURRENTLY THEY TRAVEL HALF WAY TO BUCKLAND WAITS 20 MINUTES FOR THE TRACKS TO CHANGE THEN RETURN TO PUKEKOHE BEFORE PROCEEDING ON THE NORTH LINE TO AUCKLAND. • THE DISTANCE FROM PUKEKOHE TO TUAKAU VIA THE RAILWAY LINE IS ONLY 4.9 KILOMETERS. • IN THE SAME 20 MINUTES THE SAME 20 MAX TRAINS COULD TRAVEL TO TUAKAU AND PROVIDED A MUCH NEEDED SERVICE TO OUR RESIDENTS AT NO EXTRA COST. • CURRENTLY SEVERAL OF THE 200 TUAKAU COMMUTERS LEAVE THEIR CARS IN PUKEKOHE PARKING SPACES THAT HAS CLOGGED THE AREA AND NOW YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO PROVIDE MORE PARKING INFRASTRUCTURE. THIS IS UNNESSESSARY. • I SUPPORT THE ELECTRIFICATION OF THE RAIL TO PAPAURA AND EVENTUALLY THROUGH TO HAMILTON. THE CURRENT MAX TRAINS THAT WILL SERVICE THE PAPAURA TO PUKEKOHE RUN WILL BE MORE EFFICIENTLY OPERATED WITH BETTER PATRONAGE BY INCLUDING TUAKAU AND LATER THE SETTLEMENTS FURTHER TO THE SOUTH. THE PASSENGERS WOULD SIMPLY CHANGE TRAINS AT PAPAURA ON TO THE ELECTRIC TRAINS. <p>The benefits are huge, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced congestion and road wear on the roading network. • People without personal vehicles can then commute to work and leisure. • Fewer drunk drivers on the roads. • Reduced road accidents. • Rail access for potential new employees at the newly rezoned 90 hectares of industrial land at Tuakau. It is good for the national economy. • There are businesses that are ready to reserve blocks of seats to service their staff requirements already in South Auckland. • A significant number of the park and ride users at Pukekohe rail station are from Tuakau each day and growing. They currently have to travel to Pukekohe first by car. • A new town with in excess of 3,000 houses is soon to be built from the ground up at Pokeno, over the next ten years. They will soon further clog your roads with more cars. • Access to Auckland & Waikato Universities and Polytechs would be within reach of families that currently the young ones have to leave home to further their education. • Access to shopping and commerce in Auckland for out of towners, it's good for the Auckland economy. • Elderly people who cannot drive are able to get out for trips and receive visitors. <p>The Campaign For Better Transport have submitted an 11,500 signature petition to Parliament supporting the reinstatement of passenger rail in the Waikato District. The Tuakau & Districts Development Association have submitted 3,500 signatures to Parliament on the Tuakau Trains petition requesting that their rail service be re-instated.</p> <p>All that is needed is the upgrading of the railway station at Tuakau and a track changer. Half a million dollars has already been set aside for the upgrade of the rail station by Waikato District Council. The double tracks are already in place.</p> <p>We are a strong and determined community and offers of help are forth coming to make this a reality.</p> <p>Tuakau and the districts surrounding it are home to thousands of Auckland's work force. Transport on your clogged roads is crippling Auckland's roading infrastructure.</p> <p>This proposal is simple common sense and needs to be done.</p> <p>Please do not turn your back on Tuakau, we were once part of you and are still integrally involved in your prosperity.</p> <p>We request that the passenger rail link to Auckland be re-instated as soon as possible.</p>
837	Gary Orrell	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
491	Gay Richards	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I wish to speak in support of my submission at a public hearing</p> <p>Question 1: Response and comments on Chapter 5 I support with reservations the general direction of the proposed Public Transport Network plan outlined in Chapter 5. My concerns are outlined below.</p> <p>I support the concept of introducing high frequency routes; however I believe these will only be truly effective on the dedicated transport networks (rail and Northern bus way). On other routes they will be subject to traffic congestion and delays leading to bunching and minimising the benefit of a high frequency service.</p> <p>I believe there is a major problem with this concept for those who will be reliant on connector and local routes to connect to the high frequency network. A transport route, particularly for time constrained commuters is only as good as the least frequent connection. For example, under the current proposal, there will be a 15 minute service on the Takapuna – Devonport route, however people living in Bayswater (pop.2,307 – 2006 census) wishing to use this network rely on a 30 minute connector service. (A small portion of this population would be within 400 m of the network).</p> <p>For public transport users on the North Shore, particularly those in the southern suburbs of Northcote, Birkenhead, Takapuna, Milford and Bayswater, the proposed network will not deliver a significantly improved service, as some routes appear to be poorly designed or fail to link to key destinations. The Northern Busway does not serve this population well. I understand that issues relating to specific routes will not be addressed at this time however I wish to put on record my concerns about some of the North Shore routes, and formally ask to have the opportunity to discuss these issues with those planning specific North Shore routes in the future.</p> <p>My main concerns are: There needs to be a direct high frequency service from Takapuna to the Auckland CBD with a stop close to Britomart. Takapuna is designated a metropolitan growth area and this will be enhanced by its close proximity to the CBD. A high frequency route direct to the CBD, (without diversion to the Northern Busway at Akoranga) will make Takapuna a more desirable centre for employment and residential development. This route must have a set down point close to Britomart to facilitate connection to the rail network and other inner city bus services. The current use of Albert St provides such a connection to the rail network within easy walking distance. Continuation to the education precinct via Wellesley St and Grafton would be beneficial. The purpose of continuation of this route to Onehunga, also served by rail, is unclear and will not necessarily be beneficial as it will result in a very long route, subject to considerable traffic delays. Provision of high frequency routes east – west across the North Shore from Birkenhead / Northcote and Glenfield to the Northern Busway and Takapuna needs to be implemented in the first stage of the plan (by 2016). These communities need to be well connected to their closest metropolitan centre for work and leisure opportunities as well as having good connections to the CBD.</p> <p>It is good to see the Devonport ferry service recognised as part of the high frequency network. However this will only conceivably benefit the population from Narrow Neck to Devonport. This would not be the desired route to the CBD for Takapuna or Milford residents (despite the provision of a high frequency connecting bus service) as a direct Takapuna to CBD route would be far more time (and under the current proposals) cost effective. I believe the Bayswater and Birkenhead / Northcote Point ferry services should also be designated high frequency routes. These ferry services provide the shortest route to the Auckland CBD and connection to the rail network for people in the surrounding suburbs. This would encourage people in this catchment area to use the ferry network, thus avoiding the heavily used cross harbour road network.</p> <p>Part of the trade-off for higher frequency on selected routes is the requirement for more connections. I believe this has two major disadvantages.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commuters, particularly those with the option of continued private car use, will be unwilling to make bus to bus connections where there is little guarantee of timely connections. This would only be an attractive option where ultra-high frequency (5 minutes or less) is available. 2. People with disabilities are best served by routes with fewer connections and where their service is reliable in terms of time and access. Those with learning disabilities will struggle with complex route transfers. The mobility impaired rely on connections which are barrier free and generally of short distance. The vision impaired prefer connections where departure and alighting points are fixed, well lit and provide safe road crossing points. Selecting the correct bus from a line of buses at an interchange point is particularly problematic for the vision impaired. Often an alternative transport mode will be chosen if this provides a better connection, emphasising the need for a fare system which is flexible and free of penalties for transfers. The fare proposals are further discussed in the next section. <p>Question 2: Response and comments on Fares and Ticketing I oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing plan as outlined in 6.4. My objections and comment on this section are outlined below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ferry services must be included in the fare zone plan. Otherwise this proposal makes no sense and continues to disadvantage North Shore public transport users, whose quickest and more convenient route to the CBD is by ferry. 2. I oppose the concept of dividing the Auckland region into fare zones largely based on the “old” territorial boundaries of the former cities of the Auckland area. I believe that the new Auckland Council structure should be encouraging greater integration of these formerly “separate” communities and this could be achieved by fare zoning based on geographic distance rather than old arbitrary boundaries. <p>The map (figure 6.1) highlights the inequity of the proposed fare zoning. It appears those travelling from New Lynn to Glen Innes will pay just one fare zone, while those travelling north to south from Takapuna to Glen Innes will pay at least 3 fare zones (possibly plus a separate ferry zone), despite this being a slightly shorter distance (which could be completed on the frequent network using bus, ferry and train).</p> <p>I believe a better, and fairer zoning system could be developed based on distance from the centre (based approximately at Britomart) The innermost concentric circle shown on the map encompasses Milford, Glen Innes, Onehunga and New Lynn, with Otahuhu only just outside this circle. A zone which encompasses all of these centres would greatly enhance the transport choices of those who live within this area (a considerable portion of the Auckland population). There could still be an inner city zone for those who only travel within that small area (though it could be argued that Devonport and Bayswater ferry routes should be included in such a zone due to their real proximity to the CBD. This would greatly encourage public transport use from those locations to the CBD and beyond. This would contribute to reduced congestion at peak times. It should be recognised that those living within the “innermost circle” described above pay a premium in accommodation costs (rents or rates) to live in relative proximity to the CBD (whether on the Auckland isthmus or the lower North Shore) and should benefit from lower public transport costs as a result.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Gay Richards (#491)</p>	<p>3. I support some aspects of this proposal, especially simplifying the number of products. Monthly passes are attractive to regular commuters reducing the frequency of “top-ups”. There needs to be provision for having stored value and monthly passes on one card. This is particularly important for those who rely on public transport for all travel and need the flexibility to pay for both regular commuter and casual trips with one card. There must be provision of a daily cap on fares. This would enable people to use the best available route without concerns that one route may cost more than another. Ferry services must be included in such a capped system. It should be noted that current users of Northern bus passes and MAXX passes will face fare increases, particularly if they have been relying on the inclusion of two stage rail travel in these fare options.</p> <p>Other matters Policy 4.7 (p.36) I note that concession fares are to be retained in the transition period but that it is proposed to review these at some time in the future.</p> <p>I believe concession fares for children, the disabled and elderly are essential to ensure equitable access to transport for those unable to drive due to age or impairment.</p> <p>I believe Supergold card travel should continue to be free after 9am for the rest of the day in the Auckland area. This is because Supergold card users may need to cover considerable distances in Auckland to connect with family or friends or to reach desired destinations for health services or social activities. Constraining this free travel by requiring travel to be completed by 3pm is unrealistic in the Auckland context due to the region’s wide geographic spread. Travel after 6pm is generally unsuitable for the elderly who prefer to complete their travel before dark. There is little evidence that allowing these card holders to travel during the evening peak impacts on commuters. Most elderly people will do their best to avoid the high peak period and are likely to help to maintain service patronage in the shoulder period after 3pm but just before the busiest evening peak.</p> <p>Policy 5.3 (p.39) Creating and maintaining accessible vehicles and transport interchanges and other infrastructure is essential to ensure public transport meets the needs of people with disabilities. This should include good lighting at interchanges, audible and visible signage at interchanges and onboard all services (as is being implemented on the rail network). Signage and announcements must also be simple and easily understood by those with learning disabilities. Organisations and service users with an understanding of specific disabilities must be consulted at all stages of services and infrastructure planning and implementation.</p> <p>Conclusion This submission focuses on the concerns of a North Shore resident, a regular public transport user who crosses Auckland for work and has a vision impairment. I would welcome the opportunity to expand on the issues raised here at a public hearing. I would also like the opportunity to participate in the detailed planning and implementation of the network plan on the North Shore.</p>
752	Gay Rowe	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
611	Gemma Dorotich	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
603	Geordan Tararo	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
151	George Douglas Lowe	<p>Q1 - Neutral Comments: We need a train and please support the MAXX trains service to Tuakau.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral [no comments provided]</p>
277	George Gibbs	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: I do NOT see mention of bicycles anywhere in this proposal. Bicycle use should be encouraged by the plan. The benefits are many - fewer cars on the road, less fossil fuel used and then all of the health benefits. I want to see public transport that will enable me to have my bicycle along for the ride. It's done elsewhere in NZ and around the world. Why not in Auckland?</p> <p>To explain. I might bicycle to work in the morning, but in the afternoon it's raining and awful. Can I put my bike on the train or bus? OR Cycling to work is all uphill, but the return trip is much more gentle. If I can carry the bike on the bus or train I can then bike home. Another issue for me is the lack of a rail connection to the airport. It is embarrassing and shameful that a city the size of Auckland lacks this feature. Very third world !!</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: Great. Don't give NZ Bus any money for their failed Snapper system. They don't deserve it.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
218	Dr George Uhe	<p>Q1 - Neutral Comments: I believe it would be better to emulate the Paris Metro rather than the London Underground. The former's point to point system, connecting the extremities of Paris with each other, would better suit Auckland. This is particularly true with connecting points on the Shore with points in South, East and West Auckland. / (Submitter has attached a map - the map and submission form is filed in the RPTP Submissions "Forms to Web" folder - RPTP admin)</p> <p>Please refer to Attachment 2, Page 2 of the Attachments to Submissions Document http://www.aucklandtransport.govt.nz/submissions</p> <p>Q2 - Don't Know [no comments provided]</p>
25	Georgia Stillwell	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p>
345	Gillian Mary Jeavons	<p>Q1 - Neutral Comments: Buses are too unreliable for connections to work properly. Methods for assessing running times need to be changed. (See my comment in the Other Comments section of this submission.)</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral Comments: This is an improvement on the current system but stage and zone systems are unfair to people travelling near the boundaries, even if there are 'zone overlaps.' A fairer system is used in Japan, where people pay for the distance travelled. For cash fares on buses a ticket is issued at the start of the trip and the fare is calculated by a machine at the end of the trip.</p> <p>Other Comments: Section 6.3 Service Quality One of the aims of the RPTP is to 'develop realistic, achievable timetables that are reliable and dependable,' and it states that reliability is the most important consideration for public transport users. The proposed new routes involve a lot of transfers so it will be even more important that the buses run on time. At the moment passengers are reluctant to do transfers because Auckland buses are very unreliable. The main reason for the unreliability is unrealistic timetables. Auckland Transport and the bus companies need better methods for assessing the running times for the routes. It is not enough to use trip records or GPS data and people standing at the side of the road with clipboards. When running times of routes are being assessed, there needs to be an assessor on the bus to ensure that trips where drivers are engaging in unsafe or irresponsible practices to finish more quickly are not included in the statistics.</p> <p>There are currently routes all over Auckland which don't have enough time in the schedules but the buses are sometimes on time and sometimes late. This is very frustrating for passengers. As a passenger, I have noticed that about half of drivers engage in dangerous driving in order to stay on time or to get to their terminus early to give themselves a little break; they drive too fast, run amber or red lights, overtake on no passing lines, go through pedestrian crossings without giving way to pedestrians, pull out into traffic without waiting for an appropriate gap etc, and also go past bus stops without checking properly for passengers if there is another bus blocking their view of the stop. This means that some drivers finish their trips with time to spare while other drivers, who drive safely and carefully, run late. Presumably, as a result the statistics show that the trips can be done on time so the timetables are not adjusted to make them more realistic. If all timetables are designed so that safe and careful drivers with good customer service can do them on time, then there would be more reliability and consistency.</p> <p>I am also a bus driver.</p>
412	Glen McCabe	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: I strongly support this programme overall.</p> <p>I particularly support the frequent service network concept, be it trains or buses. The convenience of being able to 'turn up and go' is critical, and minimum 15-minutes frequencies achieve this level of convenience. It is vital that AT and the Council go ahead with it despite the inevitable objections from moaners. Public transport use in Auckland is still too low for a critical, capacity-boosting redesign like this to be held hostage the objections of the few.</p> <p>My only reservation is the fare zones. The North Shore zone in particular seems a little large, and as a result areas equal distance from the city centre require more zones to get to the city, an unfair outcome. A more balanced approach to fare zone sizes would be preferable (I do however like the 'overlap areas' at the likes of Panmure and New Lynn)</p> <p>As an aside, I further support City Rail Link project INCLUDING the Eastern Link (triangle junction allowing trains to run directly from Newton to Grafton).</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments:</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Glen McCabe (#412)	<p>Very much support the concept, especially the ability to change services/modes without penalty. / / However as previously noted the fare zones are uneven throughout the city with regard to distance to city centre. A more equitable zone layout would make a great proposal perfect.</p> <p>Other Comments: Make it happen! Then make the City Rail Link happen! This programme and AT's direction are overall very positive for Auckland.</p>
815	Glenys Tabrum	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
768	Grace van den Brink	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
9	Graeme Dudley Knox	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: Hopefully this plan will make the Auckland Transport System like the transport system in Melbourne</p> <p>Q2 - Opposed Comments: Removal of the free off peak SuperGold concession is not a good idea as it will mean these users use their cars not public transport. Furthermore many of these people will forced to stay at home and will not be able to enjoy themselves.</p>
84	Graeme MacRae	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: The proposed network looks fine in principle, but its usefulness depends on how you make it work: The network is only as good as: 1. the connections between its components. 2. legibility (to passengers) of its routes and connections 3. reliability, regularity, frequency of services</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: Affordability is important, but more important is ease of operation and reliability. Adequate training of drivers is also probably necessary for the proposals to work [ends]</p>
529	Graeme Milligan	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I wish to put forward the following feedback on the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan:</p> <p>The Draft Regional Public Transport Plan is a big step in the right direction for public transport in Auckland and I particularly support the proposals for bus routes connecting and feeding into train stations and ferry terminals.</p> <p>The rail system needs to become the backbone of Auckland's transport system, with buses being used to provide local service routes, feeding into the nearest train station. There needs to be more train service routes introduced across Auckland using all existing rail lines to support this.</p> <p>Greater investment needs to be made in using electric transport, such as electric trains and trams, with modern light rail trams along key important routes, together with an electrified heavy rail system and central city underground loop, to provide Auckland with a sustainable transport system into the future which is cleaner, quieter, more attractive to use, and not reliant on oil.</p> <p>With reference to the frequent service route map, there are some proposed bus routes which need changing or adding to, together with the need for new train service routes, ferry service improvements, and the need for light rail to be introduced in central Auckland.</p> <p>SUMMARY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Southern train services between Manukau and Pukekohe needed. 2. Saturday train services to Pukekohe needed. 3. Train services to Waiuku needed. 4. Train services to Huapai needed. 5. Inter-regional train services needed between Auckland-Hamilton-Tauranga. 6. New train station at Walters Road (Takanini) needed. 7. New train station at Drury needed. 8. Light rail tram routes needed to St Heliers Bay, Lynfield & Western Springs. 9. East Auckland 'Eastern Link' frequent service bus loop route needed. 10. South Auckland 'Southern Link' frequent service bus loop route needed.

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Graeme Milligan (#529)</p>	<p>11. Direct bus route between Manukau and Beachlands/Maraetai needed. 12. Pine Harbour Ferry Service needs to run hourly, later in the evenings, and on Saturdays. 13. Service frequency on all routes and modes needs to be minimum of hourly 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Saturday. 14. Incentive needed for public transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff to use public transport with a staff privilege AT HOP card.</p> <p>1. SOUTHERN TRAIN SERVICES BETWEEN MANUKAU AND PUKEKOHE NEEDED. A frequent running train service needs to be introduced between Manukau and Pukekohe, operating Monday to Saturday. The new Manukau train station is poorly used at present due to the lack of a direct train service from the south into Manukau. When the new electric train services start operating, the proposed diesel shuttle train services south of Papakura to Pukekohe, should instead run between Manukau and Pukekohe. Manukau is the main shopping, employment and education hub in South Auckland and a train service running direct from Pukekohe into Manukau would be very popular and well used. When the new MIT complex opens above the Manukau station, the majority of students will come from the south and a direct train service will be needed.</p> <p>If Aucklanders are to be enticed out of their cars and onto public transport, the services need to be simple, direct and frequent. The proposal to have diesel shuttle train services between Papakura and Pukekohe makes train services unnecessarily complicated with transfers at Papakura. The public in South Auckland would be much better served with a direct train service between Manukau and Pukekohe. A Manukau-Pukekohe service using diesel trains would not impede with electric train services in the short distance that they would operate in the electrified area between Papakura and Wiri, and would provide the people of Pukekohe (as well as Drury when a new station is built there), and all areas in between through to Manukau, with an attractive train service.</p> <p>A direct southern train service operating between Manukau and Pukekohe needs to be introduced as part of the RPTP.</p> <p>2. SATURDAY TRAIN SERVICES TO PUKEKOHE NEEDED. Saturday train services need to be started to Pukekohe, operating initially hourly from 7.00am to 7.00pm. Pukekohe is a growing part of Auckland and existing weekday train services from Pukekohe are well supported. There are many people in Pukekohe who work on Saturdays and should have access to train services. There are a great many people, particularly teenagers who cannot drive or do not have cars, who like to go into the shopping malls and entertainment centres on Saturdays, such as Manukau, Sylvia Park, Newmarket and the central city, but there is no train service from Pukekohe on Saturdays. There are also many people who like to travel out to Pukekohe for shopping and a day out when they are free on Saturdays, but presently cannot do so on a train. It is unacceptable and poor that in 2012 there are still no train services to Pukekohe on Saturdays. This needs to change.</p> <p>Saturday train services to Pukekohe need be introduced as part of the RPTP.</p> <p>3. TRAIN SERVICES TO WAIUKU NEEDED. A train service needs to be introduced between Papakura and Waiuku, during peak periods on weekdays. The Glenbrook Vintage Railway has recently been extended into the Waiuku township and this railway could be used as part of a new train service to entice commuters out of their cars and onto trains. Trains have far greater appeal than buses and this has been proven with the continuous record patronage levels seen on Auckland's train system in the past 10 years. If traffic congestion on Auckland's roads is to be seriously addressed, it needs to come in the form of providing train services across the region on all rail routes. A peak period train service to Waiuku operating between 6.00am and 9.00am and 3.00pm to 7.00pm on weekdays would be attractive to commuters and students from Waiuku, and would help reduce number of cars travelling on the busy and dangerous State Highway 22 during peak periods. A train service would be a much safer option for people travelling to and from Waiuku rather than driving on the dangerous State Highway 22 and Glenbrook Road.</p> <p>Such a service would not require many trains, maybe just one or two diesel units. The hours in which such a commuter service would operate would not interfere with the Glenbrook Vintage Railway's operation which normally only operates on weekends or occasionally during the middle of the day on weekdays. A Papakura-Waiuku train service would be popular and attractive, and would be making use of the under-utilised rail route between Papakura and Waiuku. A train service between Papakura and Waiuku needs to be added to the RPTP.</p> <p>4. TRAIN SERVICES TO HUAPAI NEEDED. Frequent running train services to Huapai are needed with an extension of the Western Line train route to Huapai. A regular half hourly shuttle operating 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Saturday needs to be introduced between Swanson and Huapai, together with a new station and park and ride at Huapai, to serve this large area and entice commuters on State Highway 16 out of their cars and onto trains. A station and park and ride in a good visible and accessible location alongside the Carriages Cafe on SH16 midway between Huapai and Kumeu would be ideal. Bus services could easily connect with a train services with a station located here, together with a 'Kiss and Ride' drop off facility. Commuters from Huapai, Kumeu, Riverhead, Waimauku, Helensville and surrounding districts could make good use of a train service and park and ride strategically located at Huapai, rather than crawling in traffic on the congested SH16 North Western motorway.</p> <p>The fact the a train service between Swanson and Huapai is missing on the maps in the Draft RPTP is shocking, as this rail route has so much potential for commuter passenger train services, and is not being used. This needs to change. A frequent running train service needs to be introduced to Huapai as part of the RPTP.</p> <p>5. INTER-REGIONAL TRAIN SERVICES NEEDED BETWEEN AUCKLAND-HAMILTON-TAURANGA. A passenger train service needs to be introduced running between Hamilton and Auckland during the morning and evening peak periods, and between Auckland and Tauranga during the middle of the day.</p> <p>While the Waikato and the Bay of Plenty are not Auckland Transport's responsibility, a large proportion of traffic on the congested roads leading in and out of Auckland, originate from Hamilton and Tauranga. Tauranga and Mount Maunganui are both popular holiday and weekend away destinations for Aucklanders. Tauranga is rapidly growing and is now New Zealand's fifth largest city, while Auckland is by far New Zealand's largest city and is rapidly growing. With the high price of housing in Auckland, many people are now having to live further afield in the Waikato and commute into Auckland by driving.</p> <p>In order to reduce the number of cars on Auckland's congested roads, particularly during peak periods, a passenger train service needs to be introduced between Auckland-Hamilton-Tauranga to provide an attractive alternative to driving and to make use of the under-utilised rail routes between Auckland, Hamilton and Tauranga.</p> <p>A passenger service between these centres could be established initially using two of KiwiRail's recently refurbished Silver Fern railcars which are not presently being used. A morning commuter service could run from Hamilton, departing around 6.30am, arriving in Newmarket and the Strand stations around 8.30am. The train could then run from the Strand station through to Tauranga and Mount Maunganui, departing around 9.15am,</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Graeme Milligan (#529)</p>	<p>arriving at Mount Maunganui around 12.45pm. The return service could depart Mount Maunganui at 1.30pm and arrive at the Strand around 5.00pm. It could then depart the Strand and Newmarket stations for Hamilton around 5.45pm, arriving in Hamilton at around 7.45pm. Intermediate stops for all services in both directions could be made at The Base at Te Rapa, Ngaruawahia, Huntly, Te Kauwhata, Tuakau, Pukekohe (for transfers onto Auckland's suburban train services) and Newmarket.</p> <p>As the service picks up in popularity, which it quickly will, additional train services could be put on between Hamilton and Auckland, as well as a service originating in the morning from Tauranga through to Auckland, before returning to Tauranga in the evening. These train services could perhaps utilise some of Auckland's current SA class diesel trains, which could be upgraded for long distance services, or else the six former Silver Star carriages from A & G Price at Thames. Either of these carriages would make attractive and comfortable services, which would be popular, and would entice people out of their cars and onto trains.</p> <p>The service could be jointly funded and promoted by Auckland Transport, Waikato Regional Council, Environment Bay of Plenty and NZ Transport Agency.</p> <p>6. NEW TRAIN STATION AT WALTERS ROAD (TAKANINI) NEEDED. The surrounding area around Walters Road at Takanini is in the process of being developed with many large scale developments in recent years such as the Addison housing estate, the Southgate shopping centre, the Longford Park subdivision and retirement complex. Most recently, Housing New Zealand have announced a large scale affordable housing project to be built on the former Papakura Army Camp land on Walters Road. This project, together with a proposed new high school on the same land, will result in a significant increase in the number of people living in this area and needing to travel in and out of the area. The roads in this area such as Great South Road and Porchester Road are already heavily congested during peak periods.</p> <p>The new residents and students in this area need access to the frequent train services running along the Southern Line through this area, with a new train station within walking distance at Walters Road. A station here would be in a strategic location, providing a practical and attractive alternative to driving, and would provide fast, direct transport options to the central city, Manukau (if a direct southern train service is provided), Papakura and Pukekohe.</p> <p>A new train station needs to be built at Walters Road now as part of the RPTP, to enable new residents moving into this area to get into the habit of commuting from day one, rather than having to rely on driving. Bus services in this area have little appeal as they are slow and get stuck on the same congested roads as cars. A new train station within easy walking distance with frequent running train services to all over Auckland, would be much more appealing and would result in good use.</p> <p>7. NEW TRAIN STATION AT DRURY NEEDED. A new train station and park and ride is needed at Drury. Drury is well placed strategically for a large park and ride, serving a large surrounding district, as well as being close to the SH1 Southern motorway, and SH22 which would enable commuters from outlying areas, to park at Drury and commute into the central city and Manukau (if a direct Manukau-Pukekohe train service is provided). A train station at Drury would also provide locals in Drury access to frequent running train services, which would be within an easy walk. Trains have greater appeal than buses, and access to train services would act as a real enticement for Drury locals to get out of their cars and onto public transport. A new train station and large park and ride needs to be made part of the RPTP.</p> <p>8. LIGHT RAIL TRAM ROUTES NEEDED TO ST HELIERS BAY, LYNFIELD & WESTERN SPRINGS. In order for Auckland to realise its aim of becoming one of the world's most liveable cities and to reduce the city's chronic traffic congestion, it needs to change the way it views transport options for central city streets. Cars should not be the priority. The city needs to have an appealing alternative which compliments the 'shared street' concept, and is environmentally friendly and sustainable.</p> <p>New light rail routes with modern trams need to be introduced on three strategic routes across central Auckland as part of the RPTP. These include:</p> <p>Quay Street and Tamaki Drive to St Heliers Bay Queen Street, Ian McKinnon Drive, Dominion Road, Dominion Road Extension, Hillsborough Road and The Avenue to Lynfield Beaumont Street, College Hill, Ponsonby Road, Williamson Avenue and Great North Road to MOTAT at Western Springs.</p> <p>The Wynyard Quarter tramway needs to be extended into a modern tram network running in all three directions across central Auckland. Modern trams need to be introduced as they are cleaner, quieter, and have greater capacity than diesel buses. Trams will entice people out of their cars and will be more popular than buses. Dominion Road is already reaching saturation point with the number of noisy, smelly diesel buses running along it. The time has come for new modern electric trams to be introduced. Trams will make the street environment much more appealing and will make suburbs around their routes popular and sought after. With being powered by electricity, trams are not reliant on expensive and diminishing oil resources, and Auckland will have a future-proofed transport system built around electric trains and trams.</p> <p>Trams will also have a tourist appeal, particularly with operating along Auckland's beautiful waterfront from the Wynyard Quarter to Mission Bay and St Heliers Bay, as well as to Ponsonby, MOTAT and the Zoo at Western Springs. Heritage trams could operate along with modern trams during the middle of the day and on weekends for the benefit of tourists, as well as being public transport in themselves.</p> <p>All three routes will run through some of the most dense population centres through the heart of central Auckland, serving large areas of the city's population along simple and straight forward strategic routes. All three routes will provide a very attractive form of public transport which people will use.</p> <p>If Auckland Transport wishes to get people out of cars and onto public transport, trains and trams is the way to quickly make that happen. Trains and trams have much greater appeal than buses, and will act as a real enticement to get Aucklanders out of their cars.</p> <p>New modern light rail tram routes need to be introduced between Britomart and St Heliers, Lynfield and Western Springs as part of the RPTP. The St Heliers Bay route could be built as part of the redevelopment of Quay Street.</p> <p>9. EAST AUCKLAND 'EASTERN LINK' FREQUENT SERVICE BUS LOOP ROUTE NEEDED. With the new busways being developed in East Auckland and the new bus/train interchange being developed at Panmure train station, a bus route linking all the main hubs along all the main travel routes in East Auckland needs to be created. In order to make bus services a practical and attractive transport option, a new simple loop service needs to be created running frequently in both directions linking Panmure train station, Panmure town</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Graeme Milligan (#529)</p>	<p>centre, Pakuranga Plaza, Half Moon Bay ferry terminal, Highland Park shopping centre, Howick town centre, Meadowlands shopping centre, and Botany town centre together with a loop service running in both directions.</p> <p>The Eastern link bus route needs to run east from Panmure train station along Queens Road, Church Crescent, Pakuranga Bridge, Pakuranga Road, Fortunes Road, Prince Regent Drive, Ara-Tai Road, Sunderlands Road, Bucklands Beach Road, Pakuranga Road, Ridge Road, Cook Street, Whitford Road, Millhouse Drive, Botany Road, Ti Rakau Drive, Pakuranga Road, Pakuranga Bridge, Church Crescent, Queens Road to Panmure train station.</p> <p>10. SOUTH AUCKLAND 'SOUTHERN LINK' FREQUENT SERVICE BUS LOOP ROUTE NEEDED. A bus route linking all the main hubs along the main travel routes in South Auckland needs to be created. In order to make bus services a practical and attractive transport option, a new simple loop service needs to be created running frequently in both directions linking Onehunga train station/Onehunga town centre, Mangere Bridge town centre, Mangere town centre, Auckland Airport, Papatoetoe train station/Old Papatoetoe town centre, Manukau train station/Manukau shopping centre, Otara town centre, Otahuhu town centre, Otahuhu train station, Mangere East, Favona and Onehunga train station/Onehunga town centre.</p> <p>The Southern Link bus route needs to run south from Onehunga train station on Onehunga Mall, Neilson Street, State Highway 20, Coronation Road, McKenzie Road, Bader Drive, Mascot Avenue, Massey Road, Richard Pearce Drive, Airpark Drive, George Bolt Memorial Drive, Tom Pearce Drive, George Bolt Memorial Drive, Andrew Mckee Avenue, Lawrence Stevens Drive, Puhinui Road, Wyllie Road, Saint George Street, Carruth Road, Lambie Drive, Ronwood Avenue, Davies Avenue, Manukau Station Road, Great South Road, Reagan Road, Preston Road, Bairds Road, Great South Road, Station Road, Walmsley Road, Mangere Road, Massey Road, Buckland Road, Robertson Road, Walmsley Road, Mahunga Drive, State Highway 20, Onehunga Harbour Road, to Onehunga train station on Onehunga Mall.</p> <p>11. DIRECT BUS ROUTE NEEDED BETWEEN MANUKAU AND BEACHLANDS/MARAETAI. A new direct bus route running hourly between Manukau train station and Beachlands/Maraetai via Flat Bush and Whitford needs to be introduced as part of the RPTP. The proposed new bus route as shown in the Draft RPTP running only between Flat Bush and Beachlands/Maraetai, will not be popular or attractive to people living in the Whitford/Beachlands/Maraetai areas, with requiring the need to change buses at Flat Bush to head into other parts of Auckland. If public transport is to be made truly practical and attractive to use, it needs to be simple and direct, and in this case run direct to the main shopping, employment, education and transport hub in Manukau central. A bus route running direct to Manukau will provide students with direct access to the new MIT complex, as well as to the large shopping and entertainment facilities at Manukau.</p> <p>A direct bus service between Manukau train station and Beachlands/Maraetai will provide easy connections between train services across Auckland (particularly if a direct Manukau-Pukekohe southern train service is introduced) and bus services across South Auckland.</p> <p>A direct bus service between Manukau and Beachlands/Maraetai will also provide people living in Manukau with a good public transport service to the popular Maraetai beach, which is very popular with Manukau and South Auckland residents during the summer months. There is no direct bus service to Maraetai from Manukau at present. Such a service would provide this.</p> <p>A direct bus service running hourly between Manukau train station and Beachlands/Maraetai needs to be provided as part of the RPTP, to provide the best and most attractive public transport option for residents in Maraetai, Beachlands, Whitford and Manukau.</p> <p>12. PINE HARBOUR FERRY SERVICE NEEDS TO RUN HOURLY, LATER IN THE EVENINGS, AND ON SATURDAYS. The Pine Harbour ferry service between Beachlands and the city is popular and well used, and has become so popular that during periods of high fuel prices, not all commuters waiting at the ferry terminals, can board services during peak periods. The service is being limited by the number of services provided and by the hours and days of operation.</p> <p>For public transport to be a truly practical and attractive option for people in Beachlands and Maraetai, there needs to be at least an hourly service operating throughout the day until 8.00pm in the evenings, and needs to operate on Saturdays as well. Bus services from Maraetai and Beachlands need to connect with the ferry services at Pine Harbour Marina. Increased service frequency on the Pine Harbour Ferry Service needs to be made part of the RPTP.</p> <p>13. SERVICE FREQUENCY ON ALL ROUTES AND MODES NEEDS TO BE MINIMUM OF HOURLY 7.00AM TO 7.00PM MONDAY TO SATURDAY. If a greater uptake of public transport is to be achieved, there needs to be a uniform consistency of service provision on all routes and modes (bus, train and ferry) across the region. The very minimum service level needs to be hourly services operating from 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Saturday on all routes and modes. Aucklanders need to be provided with at least this service frequency, including Saturdays, in order to make public transport an option for travelling around the region.</p> <p>14. INCENTIVE NEEDED FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT OPERATOR STAFF AND AUCKLAND TRANSPORT STAFF TO USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT WITH A STAFF PRIVILEGE AT HOP CARD. There are many people involved in the running of Auckland's public transport, but the great irony is most use a private car to get to work or for travelling around Auckland. If Auckland Transport and Auckland Council wish to get more Aucklanders out of their cars and onto public transport, providing incentives for public transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff to use public transport, would be a great start. The introduction of an integrated ticketing system across all modes of transport in Auckland provides an ideal opportunity for such an incentive to be introduced. With Auckland's transport system being intergrated with one ticketing system, it would make perfect sense for a staff privilege AT HOP card to be made available so that all public transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff can make use of all modes of public transport provided by Auckland Transport, eg train staff being able to use buses, ferry staff being able to use trains and so on. Providing this privilege would be easy enough to load onto a AT HOP card and would encourage transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff to use public transport.</p> <p>A staff privilege AT HOP needs to be created by Auckland Transport and made available for all public transport staff in Auckland who operate public transport services for Auckland Transport, as well as for Auckland Transport staff, which can be used on all modes of transport - bus, train and ferry in Auckland. The staff privilege HOP card could be jointly funded and subsidised by Auckland Transport and all operating companies who provide services for Auckland Transport.</p> <p>Such an initiative would be very popular and would be well received and used, encouraging more people to use public transport in Auckland, which in turn will help to reduce the number of cars on Auckland's roads. There would also be an advantage with the people who operate Auckland's transport system using public transport and seeing things from the point of view of a passenger, which could help with making improvements to public transport services. If Auckland Transport wishes to create a public transport system which is practical and Aucklanders will seriously start to use, then the above changes need to be introduced to the RPTP.</p> <p>Graeme Milligan</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
106	Grant Drabble	<p>Q1 - Strongly Opposed Comments: I am strongly opposed to the sole focus of this transport plan being the Central Rail Link which even remotely will not be here in the next 10 years. This plan should focus on plans up to its arrival; all it talks about is electric train in 2015.</p> <p>what about 2015 till 2022???</p> <p>The people of south Auckland and Franklin who YES are now part of this super city, only / want 100m of rail track at Wiri junction, but this is not even mentioned. The folk out this way don't ever want to go anywhere near downtown Auckland.</p> <p>The centre of shopping, work, and soon education is Manukau City. We urgently need a direct rail link from Manukau to the south. Now, not after 2022!!!!</p> <p>This plan urgently needs alternatives to pre-CRL included, and not just downtown Auckland.</p> <p>Q2 - Neutral Comments: I think the plan of only barriers and ticket checks at "key" stations is a joke. Your key locations would be lucky to cover 60% of traffic. On behalf of the 40% travelling free THANK YOU.</p> <p>You can only do 2 things 1.) collect revenue on train 2.) barrier man 85%+of stations</p> <p>you cannot do half and half</p> <p>Expect your revenue stream to take a MASSIVE hit!!!!</p>
502	H M Hungerford	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I believe strongly that a rail link from downtown Auckland (Britomart) should connect Devonport, Takapuna, Silverdale, Whangaparaoa, Orewa and then join existing rail line to Whangarei. Economic studies as to profitability should be based on national interest based on decreased fuel imports; roading costs; decreased reliance on buses etc.-not just on ticket sales for train services.</p> <p>H.M. Hungerford</p>
216	Haami Toi	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: This is heading in the right direction. To make connections work, passengers need to have trust that the connecting service is reliable, the waiting interchange is clean and safe and that overall you don't lose reasonable time making the connection. I do it all the time at Homai wanting to get to Manukau or east. Mind you some bus drivers are very accommodating and have been known to wait for the connection before moving off. To make the new frequent service this courtesy probably will become a thing of the past.</p> <p>I suggest that the interchanges are brought up to standard or even built like the proposed Otahuhu point before making changes to routes and introducing connections. Procurement of services: Where will bus companies be held accountable for their tardiness, late running and at times behaviour of their drivers. This has got to be written into their contracts. With the advent of real time now Auckland Transport has a mechanism to monitor and penalise if need be. If you want reliability it begins with service providers and for too long they've been able to shrug it off without any improvement or change.</p> <p>I support Saturday train services to Pukekohe. This is missing from the plan and there are many people from Pukekohe that work or want to go out on the Saturday. It is unacceptable and poor service. This should come before the possible idea of electrification. While I'm on Pukekohe, the V8s, what is Auckland Transport doing to provide public transport options to get people to the V8s. Suddenly it will become possible to run trains on the weekend, and the old station will get an overdue facelift.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: Fares: I support the ticketing policy of an integrated ticket. One ticket between services, without penalty of transferring between services to complete your trip.</p> <p>I would like to see SuperGold discounts/concessions reduced. It's a cost that is getting larger and we can't afford to subsidise older folk. It's a political vote but Aucklanders are paying more than we should be. If there was a timed schedule to reduce discounts I vote for removing the evening peak.</p> <p>The evening peak is exactly that peak, meaning crowds. Free people should not be travelling during this time.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
64	Hamada Eleleimy	<p>Q1 - Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 – NA [no comments provided]</p>
438	Hamish O'Neill	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: The zones should be altered with a new zone boundary along constellation drive, and the southern zone stopped at Manukau. I also believe the fares system should be distance based but with 2-hour, daily, weekly, fortnightly and monthly fare caps for each zone/zone combination.</p>
534	Hamme Paterson	<p>Individual emailed their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>We need a train to Tuakau and please support the MAXX trains service to Tuakau.</p>
11	Hanno Schoonraad	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: A simplified system that moves more people more quickly is clearly needed.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support [no comments provided]</p>
506	Hans Versluys	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>SUBMISSION TO THE AUCKLAND REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT PLAN 2012 I wish to make this submission to the draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan as a resident of Waiheke Island who has had 12 years' experience of daily commuting to the city on Fullers Ferries, using the bus services on the mainland and on the island. As an Auckland ratepayer I contribute to the subsidies doled out to the various current public transport operators under the PTMA/PTOM scheme. I have been a member of "Fullerswatch" [1], a public watchdog covering public transport and monopoly issues on the Hauraki Gulf and will use its past research and postings to illustrate issues in this submission. But overall this submission is my personal opinion.</p> <p>ISSUE 1: WAIHEKE ISLAND'S CURRENT PUBLIC TRANSPORT PLIGHT Waiheke Island is unique in Auckland's transport system in that it is served by two private monopoly providers, Fullers Ferries and Sea Link. Both companies are the lifelines for the island's well-being and economic development, including a valuable source of rates revenue for Auckland Council. Waiheke is a nationally important tourist destination for Aucklanders, New Zealanders and many international visitors. Those two companies allow islanders to live locally and commute to town for work and play. Many Aucklanders come to Waiheke for day trips, weekends and summer holidays. In all, about 1,000 commuters a day are kept off Auckland roads by being able to commute by ferry.</p> <p>The island bus service, owned and operated by Fullers, is a feeder service for its ferries, but doesn't really function well as a convenient local public transport service for islanders. It gets subsidised by Auckland Transport, while the ferry route is a fully commercial, unsubsidised and "exempted service".</p> <p>Fullers Ferries (and Sea Link) isn't really a public transport company. It is a private transport provider mainly aimed at tourists. Its commuter service is incidental, although highly valuable in the off-season for Fullers' cash flow. But it is not its priority service as vessels get taken out of commuter service when they are hired by private functions and groups. Fullers' monopoly on the Hauraki Gulf has been long established after it saw off its last competition late last century. The company has enjoyed this happy position for over a decade, unchallenged by any viable competition or regulatory intervention in fares and service delivery. It also enjoys priority berthing rights at the Downtown Ferry Terminal.</p> <p>The outlook for the next ten years for the Waiheke ferry service is grim. The Draft Plan envisages a "doubling of passenger numbers" but, as far as I know, there are no plans by Fullers to invest in any new low emissions vessels, despite the "youngest" boat being 16 years old. I would love to know what the Fullers' reaction is to the draft Plan's "Ferry Standard for New Ferries used in Urban Passenger Service for modern, low emission ferries, and will ensure that vessels used on future contracts for ferry services conform with this standard". (My guess: a snigger)</p> <p>The current fleet will still be ageing, suffer even more regular breakdowns [2], mishaps [3] and fires [4] than we have been experiencing lately. Vessel survey [5] periods will become lengthier, causing smaller replacement service vessels to be continually overcrowded [6]. The only thing we can be certain of is that fares will rise, no matter what happens to economic conditions, fuel prices, labour and other operating costs. We can look forward in the coming 10 years to monthly pass fares in the \$600+ range, extrapolating from the 75% rise over the past 12 years (from \$199 in 2000 to \$355 in 2012).</p> <p>ISSUE 2: "EXEMPTED SERVICES" Nowhere in the Draft Plan is this concept rationalised. Why are these services exempted? Who decreed this and on which economic or social advantageous grounds? What purpose do they serve being outside the Auckland Transport public transport remit? Why will they remain exempt in the next 10 or 20 years from the integrated system envisaged by the Plan? Why do you think it is rational to keep their fares systems in place when the general desire is to have integrated fares and transport modes? This exempted services concept needs to be abolished. There is no rational, nor economic reason to maintain balkanised public transport services across Auckland with separate and mutually incompatible fare structures.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Hans Versluys (#506)</p>	<p>London's Oyster and Hong Kong's Octopus cards, on which Hop mirrors itself, offer passengers travel across all transport modes: underground, buses, trams and ferries. There are no sane reasons why the Auckland Hop card should not offer this same interoperability across transport modes in Auckland: buses, trains, all ferries and Airport bus.</p> <p>Not having this integration has a baffling effect on the tourist arriving at Auckland Airport, who is faced with an Airport bus to downtown and to Manukau. One of which he can buy a Hop card for, enabling him to use it later during his visit on other buses and trains. If he wants to visit Waiheke, there is another separate fare to be paid to Fullers - and if he's lucky, his Hop card may be acceptable on the Waiheke Bus (since that is an AT subsidised service and thus not "exempt").</p> <p>In this RPT Plan there is no mention of how the damning comments [7] in international guides such as Lonely Planet on the poor state of PT in Auckland is going to be tackled. Certainly not by maintaining the exempt service status of the first two transport modes an international tourist comes face to face with after a long haul flight.</p> <p>Crucially, this same problem, of course, confronts Waiheke Islanders, Aucklanders and New Zealanders as well. Why set up a whole infrastructure of integrated fares and transport modes while at the same time exempting pretty important parts of it? Why keep on this confusion and inconvenience for seasoned and on-off travellers alike?</p> <p>Exempt status means the companies can set fares, timetables and conditions at will. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>Sailings get delayed, cancelled or have to return to base due to technical failure on a regular basis [8] with few apologies and little compensation for missed connections, flights or appointments. There are no commercial consequences for the company so it has no incentive to improve its service delivery.</p> <p>Fullers has basically proven itself to be incapable of providing a quality service in terms of punctuality, reliability and passenger comfort, at a reasonable fare for the past 12 years, ever since the competition on the run was seen off in the last century.</p> <p>It acts as a typical monopolistic private provider only interested in its bottom line and adopting a cost-plus-plus mentality in its fare policy. Fare box recovery is already 102% on the Waiheke route: we pay a full unsubsidised fare plus wharf tax (i.e. fares could be halved and still meet your 50% target?).</p> <p>This has resulted in Fullers commuter fares consistently being the highest in the world [9] among commuter ferry operators, and fares over the past 12 years have risen higher than the CPI inflation figure - which includes business cost price factors like fuel and labour - would justify.</p> <p>You only need to compare this price evolution to the commercial domestic aviation market: 10 years ago a flight from Auckland to Wellington cost the equivalent of a Fullers Waiheke monthly pass. Now airfares are the equivalent of one return ticket. There is never any chance of \$7 Air New Zealand promotional fares - let alone current 1c JetStar offers on the Hauraki Gulf.</p> <p>Auckland Transport should monitor service delivery for operators outside contracted services as well as all other PT providers.</p> <p>ISSUE 3: PTOM Fullers (and Sea Link) must be brought under this regime with the abolition of the "exempted service" category as soon as possible and certainly by the time all public transport in Auckland is regulated, planned and implemented under one umbrella, zone- and fares-wise.</p> <p>I have no illusions that the ferry companies will fight – as a Flemish proverb has it “like the Devil in a bath tub of Holy Water” – this inclusion from ever happening. But that doesn't mean you, as the public transport regulator, cannot do that.</p> <p>The Plan PTOM definition states: "Grow confidence that services are priced efficiently and that competitors have access to public transport markets". This should mean that Auckland Transport should ensure a level playing field on Hauraki Gulf and adopt as its main task being a PT regulator and monopoly buster – something which has been sorely lacking in the past.</p> <p>ISSUE 4: SUPER GOLDCARD An overhaul of the Super Gold Card system is needed, especially by linking card IDs with public transport tickets issued to prevent opportunities for fraud [10] by operating companies and protect the taxpayer. The Super Gold Card must be replaced by Hop card allowing discounts/free travel in predetermined time periods. This would allow for proper surveillance and audit.</p> <p>ISSUE 5: FARES AND ZONES INTEGRATION TO INCLUDE WAIHEKE ISLAND // The Waiheke ferry service should be included on equitable basis in any fare structures and zone geography that are proposed. Octopus card in Hong Kong includes the Airport service, underground, bus, trams and ferries. Hop card should mirror this integration. Fullers Waiheke must be brought into this system with stored value discounts, monthly passes and daily caps.</p> <p>All ferry services need to be integrated in the zone system, not point to point (Point 4.3.c. (p36)).</p> <p>Regards Figure 6-1 (fare zone boundaries): Waiheke should be 4 zones from the CBD, like Manurewa and Papakura are, as they are a similar distance away. Pine Harbour ferry is same distance too from CBD and there is no rational reason not to have a similar fare structure for Waiheke ferry (in comparison, currently a 40-ride ticket is \$355 on Pine Harbour [11] and \$469 on Fullers [12])</p> <p>ISSUE 6: INFRASTRUCTURE Abolish the wharf tax [13]. Waihekeans in effect pay, due to their sheer numbers using the wharves, for the investment and maintenance of all other wharves in the region, but we don't get to own them despite our investment. Bus users don't pay a separate "bus shelter tax", nor train passengers a "station tax", thus ferry passengers should not be charged a wharf tax.</p> <p>END NOTES Waiheke Islanders are a feisty and hardy lot, and a politically active and aware community [14]. We care about our island, its future and its environmental, social conditions and well-being for our diverse inhabitants, most of which are not well off.</p> <p>While we are not always happy campers within the Auckland City set up [15], we have a legitimate grievance against what we perceive as inaction and neglect [16] of our transport links within AT's regulatory framework. We want this remedied within the Draft Plan and the ability to travel by islanders and visitors alike to be seamless and on an equal footing with other areas in the city.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Hans Versluys (#506)	<p>FOOTNOTES</p> <p>i [1] http://fullerswatch.blogspot.co.nz/</p> <p>ii [2] http://fullerswatch.blogspot.co.nz/search/label/breakdown</p> <p>iii [3] http://fullerswatch.blogspot.co.nz/2012/09/when-sheep-dont-disembark-fast-enough.html</p> <p>iv [4] http://fullerswatch.blogspot.co.nz/2011/08/jet-raider-evacuation.html</p> <p>v [5] http://fullerswatch.blogspot.co.nz/2009/09/quickcat-on-survey.html</p> <p>vi [6] http://fullerswatch.blogspot.co.nz/2012/09/how-sheep-feel-on-shipment-to-dubai.html</p> <p>vii [7] http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10835917</p> <p>viii [8] http://fullerswatch.blogspot.co.nz/search/label/breakdown</p> <p>ix [9] http://fullerswatch.blogspot.co.nz/2011/09/normal-0-microsoftinternetexplorer4.html</p> <p>x [10] http://fullerswatch.blogspot.co.nz/2011/03/waiheke-bus-company-and-super-gold-card.html</p> <p>xi [11] http://www.pineharbour.co.nz/assets/Ferries/TimetablesApril-2012-web.pdf</p> <p>xii [12] http://www.fullers.co.nz/tickets-fares/timetables/waiheke-island.php#faresAuckland</p> <p>xiii [13] http://fullerswatch.blogspot.co.nz/2011/06/local-board-meeting-9-june-2011.html</p> <p>xiv [14] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RNmPAHnrjil&feature=plcp</p> <p>xv [15] http://fullerswatch.blogspot.co.nz/2009/07/tv-one-news-coverage.html</p> <p>xvi [16] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2ZTUtThMOjl&feature=plcp</p>
408	Harda Waite	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: Rejet parallel services from Avondale alongside rail link to Downtown should be fed into rail at Avondale. North Shore service from Birkenhead & Northcote and Milford still cross Harbour Bridge alongside Northern Busway.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Support Comments: About time a clear zonal boundary structure for clear information for users.</p> <p>Other Comments: A lot of off peak services just empty on late night Sundays & public holidays just burning rate payers money should be feeders into main train lines North Shore busway empty at weekend bus stations deserted</p>
628	Harold Thompson	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
563	Haroon Bhatti	<p>Individual emailed their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I have following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Auckland it is cheaper to use car for travel if you have more than one person travelling. The solution for this is make travel cheaper. Look at Sydney transport system 2. Some bus stops in Auckland are far apart and some are very near. There should be some standard to keep inter - bus stops distance. 3. There should be cheaper fare if you travel between two bus stops next to one another (like 50 cents) which will encourage bus usage. 4. One fare should be charged if you take combination of bus - train - ferry within some period of time. Like if from Lynfield to Auckland City CBD is 3 Stages. I should be charged 3 stages if I take combination of buses. Like If you alight on Mt Eden Station from Bus and take train to go to CBD. Finally I should be charged total fare equal to 3 Stages. Not 3 + 1 stages.
762	Hayley Graham	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
406	Heather Barker	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: It is essential for Auckland Transport to provide a network which can and does reach all areas of Auckland. The service has to be affordable, efficient and flexible.</p> <p>Q2 - Support Comments: My major concern is the potential loss of family tickets as it appears they will be phased out. As it is I think we would have to travel into Newmarket to buy the family ticket. This means we don't travel as a family anymore.</p> <p>Other Comments: There has to be a City Rail Link, Ferry and Bus service which meets the needs of community. We are an aging population, many of who have difficulty with accessibility so any service provided by Auckland Transport should bear that in mind. Some travel by car will always be essential but to keep down pollution and get cars off the roads we need a public transport system we can be proud of.</p>
779	Heather Glover	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
698	Helen Duyvestyn	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
712	Helen Elley	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
642	Helen Fitchett	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
192	Helen Moore	<p>Q1 - Strongly Opposed Comments: It's a joke. One train set to go round in circles in the CBD. As for buses and trains elsewhere, it's ridiculous. I worked 8am to 7:30pm weekdays and 8am to 5:30pm weekends. It was not possible to get a bus or train home as there weren't any. This from Albany. Nor would I catch a bus anyway as the route involved 3 separate buses, a total walk of a kilometer (something I can't do as I have arthritis) and a cost for 4 days of \$96, and a travel time of between 1 1/2 hrs to 2hrs 20 mins each way. Driving took me 25 minutes at worst. People do not all work 9 to 5. People do not all go into the CBD either, in fact I never go there at all. I do not look for jobs there either due to the incredibly expensive parking and incredibly expensive, slow and sporadic public transport.</p> <p>Additionally, note the perfect driving we get during school holidays. It's not workers causing the congestion; it's the mothers of apparently legless children driving to and from schools. Ban it, that would fix it all at no cost at all.</p> <p>Q2 - Strongly Opposed Comments: Overpriced.</p>
649	Hemokai Kani	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
826	Hilary Harry	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
532	Hollenstein Family (Linda, Peter, Ben, Matt)	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>Hello, thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide feedback on you proposed items, particularly the main 5 features such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rapid and frequent service - Peak only service - Connector services - Local Services - Targeted services <p>Our family supports all the above, particularly as they relate to the Bus and Ferry services. Our fundamental thinking is that, right now we have the bulk of the infrastructure in place for these modes of transport, namely the water ways and roads. And for little extra monetary investment, we can extend these two service modes by providing add. bus shelters and ferry landing-pontoons. These modes also provide wonderful opportunities to amend routes and schedules and provide flexibility. The above is not so easy with trains or trams.</p>
661	Huia Flavell-De Thierry	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
672	Ian Elliot	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
680	Ian Henderson	Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view. **
420	Ian Mohan	<p>Q1 - Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Q2 - Support [no comments provided]</p> <p>Other Comments: Please consider the Rail Station @ Tuakau. This will serve an awful lot of people and reduce vehicle use on southern motorway. Why oh why do the trains stop at Pukekohe early evening and totally on Friday evening until Monday morning ???</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
211	Ian Munro	<p>Q1 - Support Comments: Smaller buses - more frequent services</p> <p>Q2 - Don't Know Comments: Super Gold Card Holder</p>
734	Ian Wilson	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
877	Ineke Dirkzwager	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view.**</p>
473	Isaac Broome	<p>Individual emailed or posted their submission, entire submission contained below</p> <p>I wish to put forward the following feedback on the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan:</p> <p>The Draft Regional Public Transport Plan is a big step in the right direction for public transport in Auckland and I particularly support the proposals for bus routes connecting and feeding into train stations and ferry terminals.</p> <p>The rail system needs to become the backbone of Auckland's transport system, with buses being used to provide local service routes, feeding into the nearest train station. There needs to be more train service routes introduced across Auckland using all existing rail lines to support this.</p> <p>Greater investment needs to be made in using electric transport, such as electric trains and trams, with modern light rail trams along key important routes, together with an electrified heavy rail system and central city underground loop, to provide Auckland with a sustainable transport system into the future which is cleaner, quieter, more attractive to use, and not reliant on oil.</p> <p>With reference to the frequent service route map, there are some proposed bus routes which need changing or adding to, together with the need for new train service routes, ferry service improvements, and the need for light rail to be introduced in central Auckland.</p> <p>In Summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. South Auckland 'Southern Link' frequent service bus loop route needed. 2. East Auckland 'Eastern Link' frequent service bus loop route needed. 3. Train services to Huapai needed. 4. Train services to Waiuku needed. 5. Southern train services between Manukau and Pukekohe needed. 6. Saturday train services to Pukekohe needed. 7. Inter-regional train services needed between Auckland-Hamilton-Tauranga. 8. New train station at Walters Road (Takanini) needed. 9. New train station at Drury needed. 10. Direct bus route between Manukau and Beachlands/Maraetai needed. 11. Pine Harbour Ferry Service needs to run hourly, later in the evenings, and on Saturdays. 12. Light rail tram routes needed to St Heliers Bay, Lynfield & Western Springs. 13. Service frequency on all routes and modes needs to be minimum of hourly 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Saturday. 14. Incentive needed for public transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff to use public transport with a staff privilege AT HOP card. <p>In Detail:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. South Auckland 'Southern Link' frequent service bus loop route needed. A bus route linking all the main hubs along the main travel routes in South Auckland needs to be created. In order to make bus services a practical and attractive transport option, a new simple loop service needs to be created running frequently in both directions linking Onehunga train station/Onehunga town centre, Mangere Bridge town centre, Mangere town centre, Auckland Airport, Papatoetoe train station/Old Papatoetoe town centre, Manukau train station/Manukau shopping centre, Otara town centre, Otahuhu town centre, Otahuhu train station, Favona and Onehunga train station/Onehunga town centre. <p>The Southern Link bus route needs to run south from Onehunga train station on Onehunga Mall, Neilson Street, State Highway 20, Coronation Road, McKenzie Road, Bader Drive, Mascot Avenue, Massey Road, Richard Pearce Drive, Airpark Drive, George Bolt Memorial Drive, Tom Pearce Drive, George Bolt Memorial Drive, Andrew Mckee Avenue, Lawrence Stevens Drive, Puhinui Road, Wyllie Road, Saint George Street, Carruth Road, Lambie Drive, Ronwood Avenue, Davies Avenue, Manukau Station Road, Great South Road, Reagan Road, Bairds Road, Great South Road, Station Road, Walmsley Road, Kaka Street, James Fletcher Drive, Favona Road, Mahunga Drive, State Highway 20, Onehunga Harbour Road, to Onehunga train station on Onehunga Mall.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. East Auckland 'Eastern Link' frequent service bus loop route needed. With the new busways being developed in East Auckland and the new bus/train interchange being developed at Panmure railway station, a bus route linking all the main hubs along all the main travel routes in East Auckland needs to be created. In order to make bus services a practical and attractive transport option, a new simple loop service needs to be created running frequently in both directions linking Panmure train station, Panmure town centre, Pakuranga Plaza, Half Moon Bay ferry terminal, Highland Park shopping centre, Howick town centre, Meadowlands shopping centre, and Botany town centre together with a loop service running in both directions.

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Isaac Broome (#473)</p>	<p>The Eastern link bus route needs to run east from Panmure train station along Queens Road, Church Crescent, Pakuranga Bridge, Pakuranga Road, Fortunes Road, Prince Regent Drive, Ara-Tai Road, Sunderlands Road, Bucklands Beach Road, Pakuranga Road, Ridge Road, Cook Street, Whitford Road, Millhouse Drive, Botany Road, Ti Rakau Drive, Pakuranga Road, Pakuranga Bridge, Church Crescent, Queens Road to Panmure train station.</p> <p>3. Train services to Huapai needed. Frequent running train services to Huapai are needed with an extension of the Western Line train route to Huapai. A regular half hourly shuttle operating 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Saturday needs to be introduced between Swanson and Huapai, together with a new station and park and ride at Huapai, to serve this large area and entice commuters on State Highway 16 out of their cars and onto trains. A station and park and ride in a good visible and accessible location alongside SH16 midway between Huapai and Kumeu would be ideal. Bus services could easily connect with a train services with a station located here, together with a 'Kiss and Ride' drop off facility. Commuters from Huapai, Kumeu, Riverhead, Waimauku, Helensville and surrounding districts could make good use of a train service and park and ride strategically located at Huapai, rather than crawling in traffic on the congested SH16 north western motorway.</p> <p>The fact the a train service between Swanson and Huapai is missing on the maps in the Draft RPTP is shocking, as this rail route has so much potential for commuter passenger train services, and is not being used. This needs to change. A frequent running train service needs to be introduced to Huapai as part of the RPTP.</p> <p>4. Train services to Waiuku needed. A train service needs to be introduced between Papakura and Waiuku, during peak periods on weekdays. The Glenbrook Vintage Railway has recently been extended into the Waiuku township and this railway could be used as part of a new train service to entice commuters out of their cars and onto trains. Trains have far greater appeal than buses and this has been proven with the continuous record patronage levels seem on Auckland's train system in the past 10 years. If traffic congestion on Auckland's roads is to be seriously addressed, it needs to come in the form of providing train services across the region on all rail routes. A peak period train service to Waiuku operating between 6.00am and 9.00am and 3.00pm to 7.00pm on weekdays would be attractive to commuters and students from Waiuku, and would help reduce number of cars travelling on the busy State Highway 22 during peak periods. Such a service would not require many trains, maybe just one or two diesel units. The hours in which such a commuter service would operate would not interfere with the Glenbrook Vintage Railway's operation which normally only operates on weekends or occasionally during the middle of the day on weekdays. A Papakura-Waiuku train service would be popular and attractive, and would be making use of the under-utilised rail route between Papakura and Waiuku.</p> <p>A train service between Papakura and Waiuku needs to be added to the RPTP.</p> <p>5. Southern train services between Manukau and Pukekohe needed. A frequent running train service needs to be introduced between Manukau and Pukekohe, operating Monday to Saturday. The new Manukau train station is poorly used at present due to the lack of a direct train service from the south into Manukau. When the new electric train services start operating, the proposed diesel shuttle train services south of Papakura to Pukekohe, should instead run between Manukau and Pukekohe. Manukau is the main shopping, employment and education hub in South Auckland and a train service running direct from Pukekohe into Manukau would be very popular and well used. When the new MIT complex opens above the Manukau station, the majority of students will come from the south and a direct train service will be needed.</p> <p>If Aucklanders are to be enticed out of their cars and onto public transport, the services need to be simple, direct and frequent. The proposal to have diesel shuttle train services between Papakura and Pukekohe makes train services unnecessarily complicated with transfers at Papakura. The public in South Auckland would be much better served with a direct train service between Manukau and Pukekohe. A Manukau-Pukekohe service using diesel trains would not impede with electric train services in the short distance that they would operate in the electrified area between Papakura and Wiri, and would provide the people of Pukekohe (as well as Drury when a new station is built there), and all areas in between through to Manukau, with an attractive train service.</p> <p>A direct southern train service operating between Manukau and Pukekohe needs to be introduced as part of the RPTP.</p> <p>6. Saturday train services to Pukekohe needed. Saturday train services need to be started to Pukekohe, operating initially hourly from 7.00am to 7.00pm. Pukekohe is a growing part of Auckland and existing weekday train services from Pukekohe are well supported. There are many people in Pukekohe who work on Saturdays and should have access to train services. There are a great many people, particularly teenagers who cannot drive or do not have cars, who like to go into the shopping malls and entertainment centres on Saturdays, such as Manukau, Sylvia Park, Newmarket and the central city, but there is no train service from Pukekohe on Saturdays. There are also many people who like to travel out to Pukekohe for shopping and a day out when they are free on Saturdays, but presently cannot do so on a train. It is unacceptable and poor that in 2012 there are still no train services to Pukekohe on Saturdays. This needs to change.</p> <p>Saturday train services to Pukekohe need be introduced as part of the RPTP.</p> <p>7. Inter-regional train services needed between Auckland-Hamilton-Tauranga. A passenger train service needs to be introduced running between Hamilton and Auckland during the morning and evening peak periods, and between Auckland and Tauranga during the middle of the day.</p> <p>While the Waikato and the Bay of Plenty are not Auckland Transport's responsibility, a large proportion of traffic on the congested roads leading in and out of Auckland, originate from Hamilton and Tauranga. Tauranga and Mount Maunganui are both popular holiday and weekend away destinations for Aucklanders. Tauranga is rapidly growing and is now New Zealand's fifth largest city, while Auckland is by far New Zealand's largest city and is rapidly growing. With the high price of housing in Auckland, many people are now having to live further afield in the Waikato and commute into Auckland by driving.</p> <p>In order to reduce the number of cars on Auckland's congested roads, particularly during peak periods, a passenger train service needs to be introduced between Auckland-Hamilton-Tauranga to provide an attractive alternative to driving and to make use of the under-utilised rail routes between Auckland, Hamilton and Tauranga.</p> <p>A passenger service between these centres could be established initially using two of KiwiRail's recently refurbished Silver Fern railcars which are not presently being used. A morning commuter service could run from Hamilton, departing around 6.30am, arriving in Newmarket and the Strand stations around 8.30am. The train could then run from the Strand station through to Tauranga and Mount Maunganui, departing around 9.15am, arriving at Mount Maunganui around 12.45pm. The return service could depart Mount Maunganui at 1.30pm and arrive at the Strand around 5.00pm. It could then depart the Strand and Newmarket stations for Hamilton around 5.45pm, arriving in Hamilton at around 7.45pm. Intermediate stops for all services in both directions could be made at The Base at Te Rapa, Ngaruawahia, Huntly, Te Kauwhata, Tuakau, Pukekohe (for transfers onto</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	<p>Isaac Broome (#473)</p>	<p>Auckland's suburban train services) and Newmarket.</p> <p>As the service picks up in popularity, which it quickly will, additional train services could be put on between Hamilton and Auckland, as well as a service originating in the morning from Tauranga through to Auckland, before returning to Tauranga in the evening. These train services could perhaps utilise some of Auckland's current SA class diesel trains, which could be upgraded for long distance services, or else the six former Silver Star carriages from A & G Price at Thames. Either of these carriages would make attractive and comfortable services, which would be popular, and would entice people out of their cars and onto trains.</p> <p>8. New train station at Walters Road (Takanini) needed. The surrounding area around Walters Road at Takanini is in the process of being developed with many large scale developments in recent years such as the Addison housing estate, the Southgate shopping centre, the Longford Park subdivision and retirement complex. Most recently, Housing New Zealand have announced a large scale affordable housing project to be built on the former Papakura Army Camp land on Walters Road. This project, together with a proposed new high school on the same land, will result in a significant increase in the number of people living in this area and needing to travel in and out of the area. The roads in this area such as Great South Road and Porchester Road are already heavily congested during peak periods.</p> <p>The new residents and students in this area need access to the frequent train services running along the Southern Line through this area, with a new train station within walking distance at Walters Road. A station here would be in a strategic location, providing a practical and attractive alternative to driving, and would provide fast, direct transport options to the central city, Manukau (if a direct southern train service is provided), Papakura and Pukekohe.</p> <p>A new train station needs to be built at Walters Road now as part of the RPTP, to enable new residents moving into this area to get into the habit of commuting from day one, rather than having to rely on driving. Bus services in this area have little appeal as they are slow and get stuck on the same congested roads as cars. A new train station within easy walking distance with frequent running train services to all over Auckland, would be much more appealing and would result in good use.</p> <p>9. New train station at Drury needed. A new train station and park and ride is needed at Drury. Drury is well placed strategically for a large park and ride, serving a large surrounding district, as well as being close to the SH1 southern motorway, and SH22 which would enable commuters from outlying areas, to park at Drury and commute into the central city and Manukau (if a direct Manukau-Pukekohe train service is provided). A train station at Drury would also provide locals in Drury access to frequent running train services, which would be within an easy walk. Trains have greater appeal than buses, and access to train services would act as a real enticement for Drury locals to get out of their cars and onto public transport.</p> <p>A new train station and large park and ride needs to be made part of the RPTP.</p> <p>10. Direct bus route needed between Manukau and Beachlands/Maraetai. A new direct bus route running hourly between Manukau train station and Beachlands/Maraetai via Flat Bush and Whitford needs to be introduced as part of the RPTP. The proposed new bus route as shown in the Draft RPTP running only between Flat Bush and Beachlands/Maraetai, will not be popular or attractive to people living in the Whitford/Beachlands/Maraetai areas, with requiring the need to change buses at Flat Bush to head into other parts of Auckland. If public transport is to be made truly practical and attractive to use, it needs to be simple and direct, and in this case run direct to the main shopping, employment, education and transport hub in Manukau central. A bus route running direct to Manukau will provide students with direct access to the new MIT complex, as well as to the large shopping and entertainment facilities at Manukau.</p> <p>A direct bus service between Manukau train station and Beachlands/Maraetai will provide easy connections between train services across Auckland (particularly if a direct Manukau-Pukekohe southern train service is introduced) and bus services across South Auckland.</p> <p>A direct bus service between Manukau and Beachlands/Maraetai will also provide people living in Manukau with a good public transport service to the popular Maraetai beach, which is very popular with Manukau and South Auckland residents during the summer months. There is no direct bus service to Maraetai from Manukau at present. Such a service would provide this.</p> <p>A direct bus service running hourly between Manukau train station and Beachlands/Maraetai needs to be provided as part of the RPTP, to provide the best and most attractive public transport option for residents in Maraetai, Beachlands, Whitford and Manukau.</p> <p>11. Pine Harbour Ferry Service needs to run hourly, later in the evenings, and on Saturdays. The Pine Harbour ferry service between Beachlands and the city is popular and well used, and has become so popular that during periods of high fuel prices, not all commuters waiting at the ferry terminals, can board services during peak periods. The service is being limited by the number of services provided and by the hours and days of operation.</p> <p>For public transport to be a truly practical and attractive option for people in Beachlands and Maraetai, there needs to be at least an hourly service operating throughout the day until 8.00pm in the evenings, and needs to operate on Saturdays as well. Bus services from Maraetai and Beachlands need to connect with the ferry services at Pine Harbour Marina.</p> <p>Increased service frequency on the Pine Harbour Ferry Service needs to be made part of the RPTP.</p> <p>12. Light rail tram routes needed to St Heliers Bay, Lynfield & Western Springs. In order for Auckland to realise its aim of becoming one of the world's most liveable cities and to reduce the city's chronic traffic congestion, it needs to change the way it views transport options for central city streets. Cars should not be the priority. The city needs to have an appealing alternative which compliments the 'shared street' concept, and is environmentally friendly and sustainable.</p> <p>New light rail routes with modern trams need to be introduced on three strategic routes across central Auckland as part of the RPTP. These include:</p> <p>Quay Street and Tamaki Drive to St Heliers Bay</p> <p>Queen Street, Ian McKinnon Drive, Dominion Road, Dominion Road Extension, Hillsborough Road and The Avenue to Lynfield</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Isaac Broome (#473)	<p>Beaumont Street, College Hill, Ponsonby Road, Williamson Avenue and Great North Road to MOTAT.</p> <p>The Wynyard Quarter tramway needs to be extended into a modern tram network running in all three directions across central Auckland. Modern trams need to be introduced as they are cleaner, quieter, and have greater capacity than diesel buses. Trams will entice people out of their cars and will be more popular than buses. Dominion Road is already reaching saturation point with the number of noisy, smelly diesel buses running along it. The time has come for new modern electric trams to be introduced. Trams will make the street environment much more appealing and will make suburbs around their routes popular and sought after. With being powered by electricity, trams are not reliant on expensive and diminishing oil resources, and Auckland will have a future-proofed transport system built around electric trains and trams.</p> <p>Trams will also have a tourist appeal, particularly with operating along Auckland's beautiful waterfront from the Wynyard Quarter to Mission Bay and St Heliers Bay, as well as to Ponsonby, MOTAT and the Zoo at Western Springs. Heritage trams could operate along with modern trams during the middle of the day and on weekends for the benefit of tourists, as well as being public transport in themselves.</p> <p>All three routes will run through some of the most dense population centres through the heart of central Auckland, serving large areas of the city's population along simple and straight forward strategic routes. All three routes will provide a very attractive form of public transport which people will use.</p> <p>If Auckland Transport wishes to get people out of cars and onto public transport, trains and trams is the way to quickly make that happen. Trains and trams have much greater appeal than buses, and will act as a real enticement to get Aucklanders out of their cars.</p> <p>New modern light rail tram routes need to be introduced between Britomart and St Heliers, Lynfield and Western Springs as part of the RPTP. The St Heliers Bay route could be built as part of the redevelopment of Quay Street.</p> <p>13. Service frequency on all routes and modes needs to be minimum of hourly 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Saturday. If a greater uptake of public transport is to be achieved, there needs to be a uniform consistency of service provision on all routes and modes (bus, train and ferry) across the region. The very minimum service level needs to be hourly services operating from 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Saturday on all routes and modes. Aucklanders need to be provided with at least this service frequency, including Saturdays, in order to make public transport an option for travelling around the region.</p> <p>14. Incentive needed for public transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff to use public transport with a staff privilege AT HOP card. There are many people involved in the running of Auckland's public transport, but the great irony is most use a private car to get to work or for travelling around Auckland. If Auckland Transport and Auckland Council wish to get more Aucklanders out of their cars and onto public transport, providing incentives for public transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff to use public transport, would be a great start. The introduction of an integrated ticketing system across all modes of transport in Auckland provides an ideal opportunity for such an incentive to be introduced. With Auckland's transport system being integrated with one ticketing system, it would make perfect sense for a staff privilege AT HOP card to be made available so that all public transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff can make use of all modes of public transport provided by Auckland Transport, eg train staff being able to use buses, ferry staff being able to use trains and so on. Providing this privilege would be easy enough to load onto a AT HOP card and would encourage transport operator staff and Auckland Transport staff to use public transport.</p> <p>A staff privilege AT HOP needs to be created by Auckland Transport and made available for all public transport staff in Auckland who operate public transport services for Auckland Transport, as well as for Auckland Transport staff, which can be used on all modes of transport - bus, train and ferry in Auckland. The staff privilege HOP card could be jointly funded and subsidised by Auckland Transport and all operating companies who provide services for Auckland Transport.</p> <p>Such an initiative would be very popular and would be well received and used, encouraging more people to use public transport in Auckland, which in turn will help to reduce the number of cars on Auckland's roads.</p> <p>There would also be an advantage with the people who operate Auckland's transport system using public transport and seeing things from the point of view of a passenger, which could help with making improvements to public transport services.</p> <p>If Auckland Transport wishes to create a public transport system which is practical and Aucklanders will seriously start to use, then the above changes need to be introduced to the RPTP.</p> <p>Thank you. Isaac Broome</p>
314	Italia Toelieu	<p>Q1 - Strongly Support Comments: While I support a connected more frequent service that can be compared to London, Berlin and Paris, I don't yet have that confidence that Auckland Transport can rein in the disparate companies to provide a regular, efficient, reasonable fares, on time service.</p> <p>I read for September 2012, 99.61% of contracted service trips were operated and reached their destination (reliability measure). Service punctuality for September 2012 was 98.91%. This is not my experience and it's also laughable because it's self-reported. There's a review in how self-reporting is measured, yes apparently, since the beginning of AT.</p> <p>You have to ensure services run on time and are regular to give people the confidence to make connections. To help buses run on time we need more bus lanes and T3 lanes. I note on Remuera Road it was proposed to be a T3 but got turned into a T2 to accommodate locals and taking their kids to school.</p> <p>What is happening with Real Time for buses? It's not reliable, you can read a service should be coming to find out its already gone, then info/services disappear. This doesn't help with the confidence.</p>

Sub #	Name	<p>Q1: To what extent do you support or oppose the direction of the proposed Public Transport Network outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 5)? This proposes a shift towards a simpler, more connected network, with expanded frequent services, but is dependent on some passengers making connections to access more destinations.</p> <p>Q2: To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Fares and Ticketing Policy outlined in the Summary Document and draft Plan (chapter 6.4)? This would enable the use of a single ticket across different operators and public transport services and a shift towards a zone-based fare system.</p>
	Italia Toelieu (#314)	<p>Q2 - Support Comments: I support the removal of the free travel for SuperGold holders. It is not a human right but a political decision to fund it. It is not fair as other parts of New Zealand is not paying as much as Aucklanders are to subsidise the card. Aucklanders cannot afford to subsidise this group. / Instead I support the introduction of a concession for those eligible for the card. A small fare is fair.</p> <p>Other Comments: Why are you removing the MAXX brand? It works, it has a legacy, money has been spent on it, but it's being replaced by another customer brand. I agree with policy 8.4 – G, H</p> <p>On a good note, I like the Manukau station, and look forward to it becoming a bus interchange for south services.</p>
813	Ivan Hoete	<p>Individual submitted on a special Tuakau form regarding Rail Passenger Service to Tuakau and Bus Service to Tuakau and Pukekohe - To view entire submission: Click here to view**</p>