

From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Wednesday, 16 March 2022 9:08 am
To: Have your Say
Subject: Submission on draft Annual Plan 2022/23

DF just submitted 'Draft Annual Plan 2022/23 submission' with the responses below.

First name

DeidreNorthwood

Last name

Fraser

Email address

Suburb

Northwood, Christchurch

Phone number

Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?

No, I'm submitting as an individual

Which age category are you in?

40-64 years old

Do you wish to speak to your submission at a Council hearing?

No

Which bus fare structure option would you like to see trialled?

Option 2: \$2 flat fare for adults and \$1.20 for children across bus zones 1, 2 and 3

Tell us more about why you support the selected bus fare option.

There is a lot to like about Option 1. I wholeheartedly support Total Mobility card holders and tertiary students having access to free public transport on the metro bus service, however I cannot get behind the inclusion of under 25s, particularly with the added rates burden it creates. After much deliberation, my support is for Option 2 with equitable access for all.

Any other comments on bus fares?

I support the consolidation to one zone. I think this recognises how Christchurch has changed, but I would question whether express buses should be the same fare for a premium service (I need to change buses and wait longer because I live within the current Zone 1). I would support the inclusion of Total Mobility card holders and tertiary students with any fare option that is selected. Option 1 does not state that it is available if using a Metrocard. I cannot see how drivers will manage this, as the formerly 18 and currently 19 cutoff relies on honesty unless a school uniform is worn. I haven't read enough of the literature to discern this but I assume the under 25s is a target growth group based on the current patronage, but as a regular bus user I don't feel compelled to subsidise this group as many of them earn as much as the remaining passengers who are expected to pay a full fare. Option 2 is appealing and will be easily managed by requiring a Metrocard to access it. I would encourage the revisiting of the CBD based shuttle using the same fare structure if Option 2 is adopted. There is the demand for this again and the fare could largely fund this. Option 3 seems shortsighted. I am very supportive of tertiary students having this access, but why have other priority groups like Total Mobility card holders been excluded. As a minimum our disabled community, many of who are on low incomes, should be prioritised.

Any other comments on Environment Canterbury's draft Annual Plan or other matters?

It would seem that the investment required to rebrand the buses could have been better applied to improve the service, reduce the fares or pay the drivers more. I am a committed public transport user

and it really does feel like Ecan planning is a tick-box exercise with limited consideration of what passengers need or want. This contributes to the reduced patronage we have experienced. There is no real interest in listening to passengers ideas and queries outside planned consultation.

Where did you hear about the consultation?

Environment Canterbury website
Social media (Facebook, Instagram)
Print ad or billboard
