

Make Submission

Consultee	Mrs Merodie Rose (77754)
Email Address	merodie.rose@gmail.com
Address	153 Major Hornbrook Road Christchurch 8081
Event Name	Long-Term Plan 2018-28 Consultation
Submission by	Mrs Merodie Rose (77754)
Submission ID	2018-28 LTP -1593
Response Date	26/03/18 5:12 PM
Consultation Point	Whole Plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Whole Plan Support/Oppose	
Please select one of the following:	I generally agree with the activity proposed for the Long-Term Plan.

Whole Plan Comments

Please provide any comments.

With regard to Transport:

The smaller buses that are now being used are great - could also consider using electric vehicles.

Would be good to talk to residents about where people want to go so the routes are relevant e.g. West Morland to Eastgate doesn't go to Barrington despite that being where most people in that suburb shop.

Increasing bus fares may mean fewer people use the bus. Increasing the cost of cars relative to buses would mean that the convenience vs. cost trade off would come down more often in favour of public transport and thus more people may use the service. Also if it is often lower socio-economic demographics that rely on buses.

Could you increase the age at which people start getting bus travel for free to reflect the mobility and driver capability? i.e. don't disadvantage elderly that really need it but could have younger retired people still paying.

Some routes could run more at peak times. eg. work and school run hours but reduce during the day rather than abolish completely.

In summary - possible options for reducing loss on public transport:

1. increase usefulness to potential patrons - times and routes
2. Increase benefits of public over private transport.
3. Increase age at which people no longer pay for bus service
4. Increase efficiency of fleet e.g. move to electric over longer term, have smaller vehicles where capacity of large bus not required.

More general comments on document:

When you say that there will be a step up in focus on water management and biodiversity (which I very much approve of and think is a great move) it's not clear how much of a step up that actually is as there is no comparison between what has been done and spent before and the upcoming plan.

Are there broader objectives and targets re outcomes of spending? Hard to judge whether it seems reasonable without a bit more concrete detail.

I really like the Healthier Homes Canterbury initiative to allow ratepayers to borrow money to upgrade heating/insulation.