

## Make Submission

<b>Consultee</b>	Hon Ruth Dyson (77568)
<b>Email Address</b>	ruth.dyson@parliament.govt.nz
<b>Address</b>	31 Moncks Spur Road Redcliffs Christchurch 8081
<b>Event Name</b>	Long-Term Plan 2018-28 Consultation
<b>Submission by</b>	Hon Ruth Dyson (77568)
<b>Submission ID</b>	2018-28 LTP -1135
<b>Response Date</b>	24/03/18 2:29 PM
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Whole Plan ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1
<b>Whole Plan Comments</b>	

### Please provide any comments.

I support the fact that freshwater management is the highest strategic priorities.

I support the increased focus on biodiversity and biosecurity, the proposal to expand the current Banks Peninsula Community Initiative Programme and the associated targeted rate.

I support the focus on hazards, risk and resilience.

I totally oppose the proposals to cut 6 bus routes, two of which I am very familiar with: the 535 Eastgate Rapaki and the 145 Westmorland Eastgate. It is my view that cutting these services will be very bad for the local residents, particularly school children and older people. For many, the bus services are the only connection with banks and postshops. It is short sighted to focus solely on the financial elements without also balancing up the social connectedness, so important to us in post quake Christchurch. The three options given ALL contain the cutting of these services which shows a limited manner of problem solving. There is a comprehensive transport plan being developed in just a couple of years and it would be much better for Ecan to discard the option of cutting services and look at ensuring that the services that are well used (peak times) are continued and perhaps reducing the frequency of the poorly patronised times. There are no doubt other alternatives as well which are worthy of consideration but I must say that it is unacceptable to have ALL THREE options presented cutting all these services! There should be an investment in marketing and an active programme of engagement with the community to find out WHY the bus services are not patronised in the way that would be satisfactory. I note that at least two of these routes are routes which use the smaller buses which are much more emissions friendly than the bigger buses but that this reduced emissions has not been taken into consideration in the plan.

The rates increase required to operate at the level proposed is minimal in terms of \$ per year and with active promotion and responses to community concerns, we have a chance to have country leading if not world leading public transport provision, fitting into a more comprehensive transport plan to be provided in the near future.

This is tinkering with a system that needs total revision in the context of a transport plan and I strongly oppose it.