

**From:** [ECInfo](#)  
**To:** [Mailroom Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Long-Term Plan submission form [#78] EMAIL:04932928  
**Date:** Friday, 10 April 2015 3:57:36 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 3:24 p.m.  
**To:** ECInfo; Environment Canterbury; Services Customer; Services Customer; Webmaster@ecan.govt.nz  
**Subject:** Long-Term Plan submission form [#78]

Your name \* Hermann Frank

Address \*

Postcode

Contact phone number \*

Date Thursday 9 April 2015

Contact details  I do not wish my contact details to be made public

Your submission

Dear Sir/Madam

I would like to focus on some aspects of the Long-term Plan which I consider important and which require some improvement/changes.

I support the goal "to improve water management and look after natural habitat". However, if Ecan does this in the same way it has done over the last 10 years, then this is not going to help much. The water quality in our rivers has deteriorated and loss of biodiversity happens on a regular basis i.e. environmental sustainability has been compromised. The regional council needs to step up to limit the effects of changing farming practices especially. However, water allocations, especially permits for irrigation schemes, have increased pressure on water ways and remaining natural habitats. At times, lack of communications within Ecan have contributed to decisions which had negative environmental outcomes.

Also, it is my understanding that funding for biodiversity is going to be substantially cut in the new long-term plan. This stands in plain contradiction to the stated goal "to protect and enhance the region's biodiversity".

What do you want Environment Canterbury to do?

I fully agree with the proposal to spend more on improving water quality over the next ten years, but funding for biodiversity projects needs to be maintained or increased. The graph on page 9 demonstrates the small percentage spent on biodiversity.

The goal should be to have all rivers back to swimmable water quality. This cannot be achieved by encouragement only (that has been tried many years now), but by setting clear standards and monitoring/enforcing them. Too much time has passed without actions.

Also, monitoring large irrigation and water storage schemes to ensure they stay within the limits set for water takes is supported, but processes for consents need to be more stringent and need to assess more carefully the effects of those schemes, especially new ones, on water quality and biodiversity values in the affected areas.

Re air quality: I support the proposal to improve air quality in South Canterbury over the next ten years, but I do not see the need to spend the proposed amount for this project (on advertising?).

---