

From: [ECInfo](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Subject: FW: Long-Term Plan submission form [#110] EMAIL:05270821
Date: Monday, 13 April 2015 10:19:23 a.m.
Importance: Low

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

From: no-reply@wufoo.com
Received: 13/04/2015 10:10 a.m.
To: ECInfo; Environment Canterbury; Services Customer; Services Customer; Webmaster@ecan.govt.nz
Subject: Long-Term Plan submission form [#110]

Your name * Craig Benbow

Address *

Postcode

Contact phone number *

Mobile number

Email

Date Monday 13 April 2015

Your submission

This document appears to be a request to approve an increase in rates to achieve all the things that are set out in the plans associated with the seven portfolios you are charged with. While this approach may make sense from an administration point of view it is extremely poor for ratepayers who are not paid to search out the information contained in these documents. It is also unacceptable that these submissions be called for when the regional air plan is still to be finalised. Does this mean that the expenditure around this has been estimated when submissions have not even been considered?

I have found this document too general, apart from the setting of rates, to be very informative. It makes general statements about what is to occur without any concrete objectives or targets set. I wonder if at the end of the 10 year tenure of this document whether we could measure exactly where we have got too in terms of all the items talked about. Will we have restored our braided rivers to as close to their natural state as possible? Will all the rural waterways be healthy and clean? Will air pollution be reduced to a level where human health is not compromised? Nowhere in this document does a line in the sand get drawn and firm objectives detailed, except where finances are concerned. For an environmental agency this is totally unacceptable.

While I generally support all the initiatives laid out in this document the lack of detail and objectives makes its value doubtful. That is unfortunate and I sincerely hope the detail required is contained within the individual plans.

What do you want Environment Canterbury to do?

Quantify and detail the objectives being sought by the plans this document overlays.
Ensure that those responsible for reduced flows and decreasing water quality are those who contribute most to restoring waterways.
Make sure that consents for new enterprises that do not have a track record of environmental

impact are more widely consulted on before any consent is granted. Intense operations that generate offensive odours have been poorly assessed by ECAN in our experience and that must change. At present consent conditions on odour control are a joke, widely ignored and a source of tension between long term residents and new enterprises.

Weed control in our rivers and beyond need urgent action to stop the spread of invasive weed species. In particular the boundaries with our conservation areas should become boundaries at which weeds are stopped before they infiltrate our significant conservation areas. Significant funding will be needed on an ongoing basis, how can this be achieved with the current budget?

Natural habitats need protection and ECAN has been quite proactive at achieving that however more areas need identifying and protecting. Taking action against those who flout the rules needs to be a higher priority also, whether the law will back that action is a question I would like answered also.

Rules are necessary but making sure those rules are clear and easily accessed and understood is as important as the rules themselves. Streamlining processes and continually reviewing effectiveness and compliance needs to be a component of whatever is implemented. Spot notices issued with educational information for minor events with a "three strikes" to an infringement notice would be a fair system for some more minor items.