

From: [ECInfo](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Subject: FW: Long-Term Plan submission form [#81] EMAIL:04932938
Date: Friday, 10 April 2015 4:45:02 p.m.
Importance: Low

Hello Team

This email came in through our Customer Services email. Can you please workflow?

Ngā mihi

Christine

Customer Services

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

From: no-reply@wufoo.com
Received: 10/04/2015 4:26 p.m.
To: ECInfo; Environment Canterbury; Services Customer; Services Customer; Webmaster@ecan.govt.nz
Subject: Long-Term Plan submission form [#81]

Your name * Keith Palmer

Your organisation and role in it (if applicable) House/holder --Ratepayer

Address *

Postcode

Contact phone number *

Email

Date Friday 10 April 2015

Tick the box if you wish to discuss your submission in person Yes

Your submission

Consultation document ---page 5 --We would like to make some changes.

2. Bus transport. There is no indication of how the money would be spent on trying to meet your proposal. How can one make an informed comment when there is no specific detail to consider. Some stability in the bus routes could be helpful.

3. Air pollution

Again what specifically does the Council have in mind where to spend the ratepayers money on. While the document states that there has been "big improvement in air quality in Christchurch" one has to question about the methodology of that statement and more importantly the policy introduced by Ecan in trying to reach its "goal".

On what basis is the proposed rate increase calculated over the 10 year period.

Has consideration been given to the fact that persons under Ecans policy of having to meet the cost of replacing logburners also under the rate increase proposal will be faced with having to

"double-dip funding" to meet your policies. Ecan has failed to formulate a plan for replacement of logburners that would provide some degree of certainty for householders. People who have been required to replace their logburners after the illogical 15 year time frame will have to go through the process again in another 15 years. WHY?

What do you want Environment Canterbury to do?

Air Pollution

Ecan needs to improve its public relations in the way it has dealt with people over the forced changes. It has not exactly been overly sympathetic or even apologetic. Ecan failed to make provision in its budget to make any form of subsidy available to all persons having to undergo replacement. There has been no detail provided as to why some logburners have been rejected. There needs to be considerable thought given to how Ecan goes about introducing changes to the heating requirements of residents in the areas outside of Christchurch as detailed item 3. Referring to page and the graph about what your rates are spent on One has to question the rather steep rise in rating by approx. 33% over 10 years particularly when inflation is very very low. This needs to be revisited.
