

From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Saturday, 5 March 2022 10:09 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

Wayne

Last name

Thomas

Email address

Suburb

Cashmere, Christchurch

Phone number

Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?

No, I'm submitting as an individual

Which age category are you in?

65+ 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.

IMHO a critical factor in achieving greater patronage along with the associated environmental and social benefits is to make PT an unbeatable proposition for ALL. A flat fee is important part of that. A focus of concessions for students, community card holders, TM users is more about doing Central Governments work in social equity? What Christchurch needs is a massive shift. This will best come from large numbers of vehicle drivers not from the population already reliant on public transport. Travel on the roads of Christchurch is highly congested at certain times, and becoming unacceptably worse (from all points of view) I doubt that students and TM users are the main cause of this

Any other comments on bus fares?

Combine a flat fee fares option with free (smaller) scavenger services eg the hill suburbs moving passengers to flat fee main routes.

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

No

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

The first question is should "we" pay for this work and how to define "our share"? Rating districts are about equity in funding and local benefits/ input. Existing classifications already take of the benefit / payer equation. The wider benefit to the region and the districts is already accounted for in existing funding policies. The work required should be funded accordingly. Any suggestion that the general rating base is somehow responsible is, in my opinion, a misuse of the funding policies. It is important to note

that this is by no means a new concept as there have long been expectations from outside the large urban areas eyeing the large urban rating bases that the general rate should be paying for /subsidising work those communities can't or don't want to pay for .Previous councillors and the interim commissioners have resisted major changes to the formula that has served the community reasonably well until now . None of the above prevents the council from long term borrowing on behalf of the rating districts once reserves are exhausted.The annual cost of borrowing and capital repayments should come from the rating districts.

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?

The functions mentioned as examples are the responsibility of central government agencies or enterprises who should fund the repairs to those assets.The rating districts impacted by collateral damage will need to fund the work in their district utilising the contributions from the general and wider council districts

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?

The flooding damage on the Ashburton River will have heavily impacted the protection work and the numbers quoted in media to undertake repair are enormous.The district requires ,in my opinion, a more strategic look at flood protection as it affects the urban area and the rural occupiers .This may lead to a new classification which apportions benefit /funding in a different way.The increased funding would come from the appropriate contributors ...local ,district and region.

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

Yes

What current or future projects or activities would you like to see funded by such a levy?

Not sufficiently informed about eligible projects which might be best chosen.My desire would be to see whatever is chosen having clear performance measures along with “a hard edge”

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

The preparedness by councillors to look at addressing the difficult issues is certainly reassuring. The funding answer does not lie in tapping the urban rating bases for unjustifiable contributions. It is of course more difficult to stick to proper and established arguments, because the difference in cost is seen by some as "just a cup of coffee" to the urban ratepayers (who already fund a significant percentage of regional activities). However, there needs to be funding integrity across both district and regional ratepayers, who obviously are the one and the same. Thank you for the opportunity to have a say.

Where did you hear about the consultation?

Social media (Facebook, Instagram)
