

From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Tuesday, 8 March 2022 8:24 pm
To: Have your Say
Subject: Submission on draft Annual Plan 2022/23

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

First name

Coen

Last name

Topp

Email address

Suburb

Templeton, Christchurch

Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?

No, I'm submitting as an individual

Which age category are you in?

15– 24 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.

Having an easily accessible, and more importantly cheap service for the general public would help our change to clean, green methods. It would make the bus service inclusive, not an exclusive privilege for those who can afford it. Furthermore, people such as essential workers (eg. nurses, social workers, etc) who may be heavily dependent on public transport, and on a low wage, do not need excessive fees for transport mounting up to more than they can afford.

Any other comments on bus fares?

Removing fees by which zone you live would be very important, or simply keeping it at a flat rate. The jump in price from \$2.65 for an adult, even with their metro-card, in Zone 1, to \$4.70 (Metro website) is ludicrously high, and unaffordable for many. Our public transport providers should find other ways to obtain funding apart from hiking prices.

Is borrowing and repaying through general rates the right approach for this regionally significant event?

Don't know

How else might we pay for our share of this work?

Rebalancing rates by which people pay for infrastructure, and pressuring government into renewing paying their end of the deal in rural areas, as fundraisers, though effective, can only reach certain targets before needing urgent assistance.

How do you think recovery from flooding of this scale – events that impact state highways, bridges, rail and power for example – should be funded in the future?

Government assistance, and pressure placed on, not all, but only on people using hefty amounts of water infrastructure, or on international companies monopolising on our natural resources without any control or limits.

Which option for distribution of rates in Ashburton River rating district do you support?

Option 1 (preferred): Redistribute rates in the Ashburton River rating district.

Any other comments on flood protection in Ashburton?

Rebalancing who pays how much for what, when, and for how long, can be a challenge. But some rural communities are having to cough up more than they have, and so government assistance, local councils placing taxes on above average higher-earning households, and having more investment in general across our wheezing, barely functional water systems would be welcome.

Would you support a levy to accelerate action in response to climate change?

Don't know

Any other comments on future funding for responding to climate change?

Regarding levies, only if it was reasonably priced, well policed, and being used for their intended ends. Penalising motorists under a blanket levy would not be popular amidst a petrol price boom, and ballooning prices on electric / hybrid vehicles. So having a levy would, in my eyes, not be the best way of provoking people into changing to public transport as it is. Improving our public transport network, increasing research into home-grown improvements to electric / hybrid technology, and building more chargers / networks would make New Zealand a little more inviting to global industries, and our transport networks more flexible, as public transport, and greener cars can work hand in hand in improving ways of getting about New Zealand. In that case, newer green technology can be a little less of an issue, as it is with price most people have issues with EVs.

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

a) Getting more people into the public transport sector's workforce would be very important. Training up people with experience here in Aotearoa would get people out of a job because of COVID-19, or other reasons, into work. The transport industry is short on drivers, mainly because it is so heavily dependent on overseas labour. Training drivers here would reduce the need to wait for lockdowns or

other events shutting out overseas workers, and would make the workforce more durable during times like this. b) Government spending and support for transport, water infrastructure, and employment in both sectors would be very important, as it would maintain the improvement and growth the sectors need to meet today's and tomorrow's needs c) Punishing and deterring farmers with price hikes on environmentally unfriendly vehicles such as pickups seems indiscriminatory. While a key element, it is not the main contributor to New Zealand's emissions. Rail, air, and ships are surely other areas which need to be looked at, with more vehicles, research and development put into alternatives or improvements, so people who have do not have many charging stations for electric or hybrid pickups are not left disadvantaged, or that models which are eco-unfriendly, but have the requirements for the job required of them, are simply developed on by their respective companies based on potential research here, or simply more fuel-efficient, cheaper models.

Where did you hear about the consultation?

Word of mouth
