

From: [ECInfo](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Subject: FW: Long-Term Plan submission form [#113] EMAIL:05270837
Date: Monday, 13 April 2015 11:49:11 a.m.
Importance: Low

----- Original Message -----

From: no-reply@wufoo.com
Received: 13/04/2015 11:38 a.m.
To: ECInfo; Environment Canterbury; Services Customer; Services Customer;
Webmaster@ecan.govt.nz
Subject: Long-Term Plan submission form [#113]

Your name * John Skipper

Your organisation and role in it (if applicable) Resident

Address *

Postcode

Contact phone number *

Mobile number

Email

Date Monday 13 April 2015

Your submission

1. Rates increases of 4.5%, 5.2% and 4.0% are asked for in the next three years. This is in excess of the rate of inflation as measured by the CPI. ECAN is double dipping. There are increases due to rating valuation increases plus increases in revenues from increasing population.

2. Water management. Water quality is not what it should be. It should not be fixed from general rates. Those that have caused the problem should fix it, as part of good business practices. The \$38 million over the next 10 years is excessive and should be sourced elsewhere. Farmers should not be encouraged but required to have better land use management practices.

3. Public Transport. The aims are laudable. The reality is the population density is far too low to make the service viable or sustainable.

4. Clean Air. The cost of clean air projects should fall in a targeted way on the local community, not across the whole region. ECAN has a history of causing community problems with clean air. The lessons from Christchurch should be applied elsewhere. In particular it will take many years to improve the standard of fires in houses. Stubble burning should be restricted and not allowed to drift onto roads. Industry has low pollution now and is not a problem.

5. Setting the rules. The use of the words "efficient and technically strong" in relation to the

consenting process appears anomalous. While this might be a worthy aim the reality is completely the opposite. The Government is in the process of changing the RMA, to a large extent because Councils are making the process as difficult as possible within the limits of the current law. There is nothing about reviewing and simplifying processes, increasing non-consented activities, reducing costs of the process or speeding up routine consent application processing. The Council is using the consent process as a money grab (consents should, except for large or unusual projects, all be on a fixed fee basis). When looking at the rapid growth of dairy with associated pollution and water allocation problems it is hard to see any evidence of a plan.

What do you want Environment Canterbury to do?

1. Rates increase not to exceed CPI.
 2. Pollution to be on a polluter pays basis, not a charge against general rates.
 3. Happy with what is planned.
 4. Continue as planned by take a long time to get there.
 5. In line with the Governments current thinking, ECAN should demonstrate how it will improve the consenting process by reducing costs, reducing time frames and improving efficiency.
-