

Subject:

FW: apologies for late response to infrastructure response

Kia ora,

my apologies for a late entry.

one criticism of infrastructure expansion is that it is often led by speculative property developers that pass on the responsibility of maintenance to local government once it is signed off. Critics of urban sprawl are telling us that local governments are caught in a spiral of debt chasing developer contributions to pay for maintenance on existing infrastructure. In low population density housing the rates revenue collection per hectare is barely sufficient to cover costs. Whereas the urban centers with a higher density of multi storey housing and commercial and light industry return higher levels of property tax per hectare making the costs of installing and maintaining infrastructure much more affordable. Long story short urban planning and infrastructure roll out go hand in glove.

it is important that the infrastructure commission be involved in council long term plan and strategic plans and policies to make sure infrastructure corridors and easements appear on planning maps. The corridors can align with cycle ways and linear parks that can accommodate recreation, storm water swales doubling up as wetlands, public transport routes, cycleways, high voltage overhead power, underground services arteries. This would have the advantage of minimizing disruption to the public when scheduled or emergency repairs are required. Adelaide in South Australia has a great model of a linear park that doubles up as an infrastructure corridor.

Climate Resilience. The indications are that sea level is accelerating much more rapidly than previously anticipated. This means we will lose the use of coastal roads and infrastructure ahead of time. Again it would be efficient to work with councils to start opening up elevated paper roads and buying up property to link these unformed roads together which can be used as infrastructure corridors once sea level rise kicks in. The sooner these corridors are purchased the less expensive they should be.

Coastal transport infrastructure. Make provision for building embankments and causeways out to existing sea ports and start looking at designs for floating cargo wharves.

Refuse to provide new infrastructure below a designated elevation set at the expected sea level rise at the time of the end of the engineered lifespan of existing infrastructure.

Plan infrastructure provision for managed retreat of coastal suburbs and towns and cities.

Come up with alternative transport corridors around Auckland that takes into account worst case scenarios for sea level rise, because that is the reality.

Many people I have spoken to would like to see a return to a Ministry of Works that is publicly owned, funded and managed to cut out the expenses and rigidity of contracting out planning, construction, maintenance and management of infrastructure. Ironically despite the call for privatization of the functions of government to improve efficiency, private firms are another layer of bureaucracy with

multiple layers of additional costs and additional delays in decision making as everything is done to the letter of the contract. With a Ministry of Works management style decisions can be made lower down in the management chain to account for alterations due to emerging work from unforeseen circumstances. Utilizing modern technology and communications a public sector model could quite easily be more efficient than profit maximizing private sector contractors.

Thank you for your time, I hope this is useful and you can accept this late response.

Facebook :