

From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Tuesday, 22 March 2022 12:57 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

Jean

Last name

Rath

Email address

Suburb

Heathcote Valley, 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 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.

I think all the options presented are flawed. Option 1 has laudable social justice motivations; however, it risks associating public transport as a service for low-income people. Thereby potentially stigmatising its use and enhancing the car as a status symbol culture. Overseas research suggests Gen Z are concerned about climate change yet tend not to take that into account when making transport choices. Also, the cost is high for ratepayers, many of whom will see little benefit (your presentation of the modelling of the options seems to suggest money rather than the environment is people's primary concern when making transport choices). Option 2 may be an insufficient financial motivation for hardened car drivers to switch. It does have the benefits of simplicity, equality and a lesser cost than Option 1 for ratepayers. As with Option 1, I'm sceptical about the modelling of reduced car use. To encourage and sustain the switch from car-based commuting, drivers need incentives related to convenience and not simply cost, e.g., a park and ride system, selected free, frequent services to key destinations (such as the UC and Ara campuses). On balance, I prefer this option as the most palatable to ratepayers and the option that avoids stigmatising bus travel. Option 3 is good for students yet provides little in the way of incentive for meaningful change. My ideal option is free, high-quality public transport for all with disincentives for car drivers and exceptions for drivers with genuine mobility issues. I see option two as a step toward removing fares for everyone – which I believe should be a national rather than regional policy decision (with requisite funding from general taxation).

Any other comments on bus fares?

Overseas research suggests that while reduced fare promotions and other habit-interrupting policy measures can encourage car users to try public transport services initially, often, there is a retreat to old habits for convenience. I believe the quality of service needs significant investment rather than fiddling with fare structures. There seems to be an assumption that free fares automatically increase ridership and decrease car use. However, research suggests that a significant proportion of the increase in ridership is due to pedestrians and cyclists using the service. Personal note: I walk, cycle or bus around the city. Those are the most convenient options for me (and are already cheaper than taking the car).

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

Yes

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

I don't have a preference

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?

Smarter public transport integrated across the whole region, water security enhancement, emergency planning and preparation, projects to reduce transport emissions and enforcement of emissions rules for local businesses,

Where did you hear about the consultation?

Email
