

Language used

The "hell" version

Argument

"Each person"?
This is a
generalised
assumption.

In the "hell" version, there will be far more cars, as each person graduates from owning a private car they drive, to owning driverless cars they direct. In this version, children, elderly, and pizza will all be passengers or cargo at different times, along with many deadhead trips to collect these non-driving passengers and cargoes.

Possibly – but what about affordability and unintended consequences??

Similarly, rather than park a vehicle at work, it will be sent to run errands during the day.

A simple law of conditions of use might solve this.

The hell version involves less demand for parking, but big increases in vehicle kilometres travelled and traffic congestion will probably go through the roof.

Yes, probably somewhere in between. How can we influence?

Of course, the eventual reality will be somewhere in between heaven and hell, probably here on earth. The question is, can civil society influence the extent to which the outcome is more heavenly, rather than more hellish? Would we want to?

Who is to blame in case of accidents? What happens in case of a "bad" and "worse" case scenario? E.g., save life of a pedestrian or car passenger?

This imminent arrival of the autonomous car creates a huge challenge for cities and regions. Most metro areas' transportation plans articulate a set of investments they intend to make in roads and public transport over the coming few years. In Auckland it runs to billions of dollars. The plans do not anticipate the disruption the autonomous car might bring.

Good point! But: where has this disruption been successfully argued for?

On the one hand, these investments might turn out to be completely necessary if the hellish outcome eventuates. On the other hand, there is a risk these investments will become "stranded assets" and future debt obligations related to them will not attract the expected revenue streams.

Even if there is a low assigned probability of a heavenly outcome, the size of the potential losses should give transportation decision-makers reason to pause.

Argument not well-established.