

From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Sunday, 6 March 2022 2:04 am
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

John-Dylan

Last name

Heydon

Email address

Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?

No, I'm submitting as an individual

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.

The amount of people I see asking for money for the bus all seem to be between 30-50-ish not to mention, with inflation how it is, and the job market being so difficult for those types of people to get back into (being primarily unskilled) makes it difficult to get to job interviews, medical appointments, harvest markets and butchers, etc. The reduced fare would help those people very much, whereas students often have parental assistance, and those with disabilities often have assistance options to cover transport via winz (though there could be more awareness of those) so option 1 makes less sense. All option one does is encourage people to get a car after they're 25 really, only delaying the emissions, not removing them. A low fare such as that of \$2 would make it a much more long term solution to travel via public transport as opposed to personal vehicles, effectively reducing emissions in the longer term.

Any other comments on bus fares?

They're fine for lower-middle income classes and upwards, but the closer you get to lower income the more you notice the cost, especially with unpredictable work hours that some have, or financial disruption, which is more common now than ever. The proposed lower rate would help the many, while the increased taxes required will affect far more likely the few, who can afford such losses.

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

Yes

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

Fundraising perhaps, or raising awareness for future proofing the affected equipment, facilities, and utilities to reduce possible costs in the long term.

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?

By due diligence firstly. Making sure these damages aren't able to come to any significant extent, reducing long term costs. As they are public assets (things the people use, in this case) it is fair that the council and other associated government bodies manage the financing for them, via taxes, investments, increased export, reduced import to free up already available funds, and rebuilding what they must to last so it doesn't have to be repaired as often.

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?

I suggest implementation of a system to use excess water for other tasks, so that flooding no longer occurs to such an extent, and to make better use of the excess. Like an underground irrigation network, and something to keep the drainage clear, as well as a significant reservoir to hold and filter excess flood water

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?

Air carbon extraction, and the collection of other potentially useful gasses and chemicals otherwise polluting the atmosphere. Taking the bad stuff out, as well as stopping it from going in, should even help reverse the damage done. The technology exists. Use it. Also water scrubbers for the rivers. They are filthy. It doesn't need to be chemically purified, but it should at least be free of rubbish and pollutants.

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

Stopping pollution is only part of the solution. The rest is reversing what we can. Effects, pollutants in the air and water, e-waste (mandates to ensure we aren't buying consumable devices, and instead using devices with greater durability and longevity, or at least using what is expired for other purposes) commercial energy wastage (businesses leaving lights on overnight or when closed, unnecessarily bright street lamps, lights that are there only to make things look nicer, while serving no real purpose) more sustainable, low cost energy production (smaller, more efficient wind turbines. Solar farms, and roof solar panels. Water turbines. Bioreactors.) Basically investment in environmental technology. It's there, it's available, and it can stop climate change, possibly even reverse it.

Where did you hear about the consultation?

Email
