

## Make Submission

<b>Consultee</b>	Ms Ashley Campbell (77570)
<b>Email Address</b>	ashleycampbell007@gmail.com
<b>Address</b>	149A Tancred St North Linwood Christchurch 8062
<b>Event Name</b>	Long-Term Plan 2018-28 Consultation
<b>Submission by</b>	Ms Ashley Campbell (77570)
<b>Submission ID</b>	2018-28 LTP -1138
<b>Response Date</b>	24/03/18 3:41 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 Support/Oppose</b>	
<b>Please select one of the following:</b>	I generally agree with the activity proposed for the Long-Term Plan.

### Whole Plan Comments

#### Please provide any comments.

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on Environment Canterbury's long-term plan. I wish to submit on several areas of the plan, as they are outlined in your consultation document.

#### **Purpose and community outcomes**

As the basis for everything ECan does, the purpose as stated "Facilitating sustainable development for the Canterbury region" does not align with the organisation's name or with ratepayers' expectations.

The name of your organisation is "Environment Canterbury Regional Council", with environment emphasised. Your stated purpose does not emphasise environment but emphasises development. This is a misalignment.

Development is not a goal and is not, in and of itself, necessarily a good thing. By making development the basis of your purpose, you imply that change for change's sake is important.

To me it seems that PROSPERITY should be the end goal, and development will often be one way to achieve that. However, sometimes prosperity might be achieved by eschewing development and instead acknowledging the benefits of the status quo, or even of restoring what we have lost in previous development drives.

I would also suggest that the concept of prosperity should not be a narrow, economic one, but should include environmental and social prosperity as being just as important as economic prosperity. This then ensures you consider all externalities when making decisions, rather than just focusing on the economic bottom line, at the cost of the environmental and social needs.

*Proposal: That the purpose be changed to “Working to achieve environmental, social, and economic prosperity for Canterbury.”*

### **Priorities**

I applaud the emphasis on freshwater management and indigenous biodiversity. Canterbury has lost so much of its natural environment that it is imperative we hang on to what is left and, where we can, restore what we've lost.

However, I would like to see more resources and effort put in to enforcing environmental standards, including a tougher line on landowners who ignore their environmental responsibilities. While I agree that working with landowners and encouraging them is generally the best way to achieve compliance, this approach should not continue forever. Carrots and sticks are necessary – and there's absolutely no point in having a stick at your disposal if you never use it.

*Proposal: That stronger enforcement measures are taken sooner when landowners continue to ignore environmental responsibilities and consent conditions.*

### **Air quality**

I applaud the introduction of healthier Homes Canterbury, and believe this will have a significantly positive social and environmental benefit.

### **Transport**

While I understand the financial pressures in funding transport, it is clear to me that public transport usage in Christchurch will never grow while ECan continues to cut routes and decrease the services.

Poor reliability, integration, and frequency are major disincentives to using public transport. Until the services are reliable and frequent – and give people options for getting around the city, rather than going to just one or two places – people will not use them.

The proposed route cuts do not affect me, but it is clear they do affect many vulnerable people. Rather than axing them altogether, and leaving people with no transport options, it seems to me that rationalisation to increase patronage and decrease cost is a better option.

For example, one of the routes is an important route for school children – could it not run mainly during the morning and afternoon rush hours, with services at other times being cut back? This would align with the needs of school children and their parents – and would also mean there was still a reduced service available to others who rely on it.

Looking at two of the routes proposed to be axed (150 & 135), they run within a few metres of each other (and close to a retirement village which must be a valuable source of passengers), yet never actually connect. Could they not be made more attractive to more users by connecting and co-ordinating their timetables, so people can travel relatively easily not just from Spencerville to the Palms, but also to New Brighton, and vice-versa?

Pursue other funding options if necessary, but don't continue imposing death by 1000 cuts on the public transport system.

*Proposal: ECan acknowledges that continued cutting of services creates a vicious circle of decreased patronage. Instead, it takes a long-term view and focuses on growing use, rather than cutting costs.*