

From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Wednesday, 23 March 2022 10:03 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

tony

Last name

ireland

Email address

Suburb

Edgeware, 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?

I don't have a preference

Any other comments on bus fares?

This costing methodology is flawed. Smart cities price the cost of congestion and price the savings made by the reduction in traffic flows. What is the cost to the city of a car driving from New Brighton to the cbd.? This cost has got include the space the vehicle requires in its travels and its parking. Council demands that business provide parking so the business passes that cost to the consumer making goods expensive. The person who walks or takes PT still has to pay the same price as the vehicle driver but his demand on the cities infrastructure are minimal. I refer you to the recent Price Waterhouse Cooper document that calculates the Economy would benefit by a 20% deduction in vehicle trips that is a massive amount and the amount alone would cover the cost of a free transport system. But your costings reflect another stupidity you can easily afford off peak free transport the bus are usually empty during offpeak the bus still has to be paid for but to encourage patrons you make them free but here again the cost savings are made in the lessened demand on your vehicle infrastructure. And lets make sure you add up all the costs the thousands of hectares of publicly owned space that is the roads and carparks. The rates unpaid on this land, the maintenance of this infrastructure, the cost of mitigating the stormwater that is collected and directed from this space, the costs to the damage to the undergrounding by the continual impact vibration of thousands of vehicles add these costs up and you would find we should be paying people to catch buses in fact I suggest that economic sense would suggest that you pay people a \$1 a km to walk and you would end up giving a rates refund. And have you been told there is a climate crisis Please do your sums again and include a true cost benefit analysis.

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

Yes

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?

Is there not insurances that cover these events.if not why not??

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 people who should be paying is those who have caused the flooding and those who will be most effected by the flooding. Has the system flooded because of upstream events or the bad location of infrustructure? Do the ratepayers of Christchurch bear a cost if roads and rail are cut through floods if so then they should make a contribution to Flood mitigation as it is in there interests to do so. But they should not have to pay for flood mitigation for business and residential -properties that is unfair and where are the insurance funds??

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?

Restoring healthy rivers.Replacing fossil fuel consumption, decarboning the economy,Restoring green space to increase carbon capture

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

You have to consider most of the mass media is funded to deny climate change the profits from the daily consumption of 10 milion barrels of oil make this the reality. The fossil fuel companies have created a completely false narative around climate change as it is in there interests. It is best likened to the falsehoods that came from the tobacco industry millions died and still are dying even 65 years after science had provan that tobacco was a lethal addictive product it is still not a banned substance to this day. The science around climate change gos back 30 years and we still have not taken heed this will affect the ability for humans to exist on this planet like never befor if we are able to survive at all.

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

Please make your conclusions on facts and science

Where did you hear about the consultation?

Environment Canterbury website

Meeting or event
