

**From:** Environment Canterbury  
**Sent:** Thursday, 3 March 2022 2:37 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**

Diane

---

**Last name**

Caddick

---

**Email address**

---

**Suburb**

Redwood, 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 3: Tertiary student concession

---

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

I have had three children go to school using the Metro bus service. They have metrocards which already have very reasonable subsidies for students, especially using the transfers. Adding tertiary students to the subsidies would be an excellent idea because they will be on lower incomes but also paying fees. My parents are Gold Card users. They use the bus at low peak times and have paid taxes and rates all of their working/home ownership lives. The examples that are given are showing different scenarios of savings. Are they taking in to account how much extra they will be paying if they are rate payers or how much their rent will go up if they are renters?? Obviously not. USER PAYS!! Buses are already reasonably subsidised. There are so many other factors to include when you are trying to tempt people to use buses. I think the main thing is that people need/want flexibility. Most people lead very busy lives. When they go to work they first drop off one child at daycare, another at school. On the way home, before picking up any child, they might go to the supermarket or the gym. Free bus fares is not going to make them want to bus. The council has spent ENOUGH on trying to encourage people to use other forms of transportation, e.g. cycle lanes etc. These incredibly expensive alternatives only cater for a select few. As much as you try and find ways to lower the number of cars on the road it is not going to get the majority to change because they just CAN'T. That is why USER PAYS is the fairest in this situation. I've paid for the bus my kids have used (and still use). Why should I now (through increased rates) have to essentially pay for everyone else to use the bus when it's already a reasonable cost. I am a homeowner and rates are already exorbitant. Putting rates up to cover buses is an unnecessary addition and will put extra pressure on homeowners. We are already looking at possible increases with the addition of water rates this year. When you chose to live further away from the city centre, or where you work, you are likely to be paying less in rates or rent than those closer, and more often the cost of your property will have been cheaper if you are a homeowner. The choice was yours to live further out. It's not up to everyone else to subsidise that choice when it comes to your transportation. You already reap the benefit in other costs. If you live in the city and need to travel then, just as I pay for my petrol because I want to maintain the flexibility I need, you need to pay for bus fare.

---

**Any other comments on bus fares?**

USER PAYS!!!! DON'T RAISE THE RATES ANY MORE. THEY ARE HIGH ENOUGH!!

---

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

Don't know

---

**Where did you hear about the consultation?**

Email

---