

From: [Paul Hamilton](#)
To: [Environment Canterbury](#)
Subject: Annual Plan Submission
Date: Friday, 22 February 2019 10:22:17 a.m.

Paul Hamilton just submitted the survey 'Draft Annual Plan 2019/20 Feedback' with the responses below.

Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan Feedback

The work of Environment Canterbury is reported on under six portfolios as outlined in the draft Annual Plan document 2019/20. Our website outlines many of the areas we work in, in more detail. Please give your feedback on the activity planned in the comments section under each portfolio and tell us what you support/don't support about the planned activity.

I generally support the plan for Regional Leadership

Yes

Please provide any comments below

I notice the inclusion of "evidence-based policy" as a term. I'd ask that this be strongly referred to and enforced. Too much consideration is given to anecdotal claims and protests that have little to no evidence behind them, scientific or statistic. The 'status quo' seems to have been given a strong legitimacy and science unto itself, when in many areas such as freshwater resources, native biodiversity, climate change impacts, transport solutions - the status quo has wreaked considerable damage on the environment. I'm happy for changes to remedy that to be debated, but it needs to be debated based on facts and the greater good for the entire region, not JUST the loudest voices, those with the means to get themselves on the media and those who stand to be negatively impacted.

I generally support the plan for Freshwater Management

No

Please provide any comments below

More needs to be sooner done to address the limited volume of fresh water in the region, and the pollution that is starting to be detected in drinking water supplies such as nitrogen leeching. The externalities of activities in the region like dairy and beef farming have not accounted for the huge damage that is being done to the regions fresh water resources. This needs to be addressed rapidly and again it should not be the loudest voices, parochial and antiquated farmer stereotypes, or those with means to get themselves onto the media that get to direct this debate.

I generally support the plan for Biodiversity and Biosecurity

Yes

Please provide any comments below

But why are there no concrete plans for some extensive native forest restoration and succession in appropriate parks, reserves, areas given that the regions has the least amount of original native forest remaining anywhere in New Zealand. It is a shameful statistic and other than vague rhetoric I do not see clear plans to address this. Why are there not plans to

carpet the port hills with native forest or reserves/parks on the way to the west coast. There are infinite "rural landscapes" or "English style" gardens and parks in the area...it is time that effort was put into having similar native plant assets.

I generally support the plan for Hazards, Risk and Resilience

Yes

Please provide any comments below

No Answer

I generally support the plan for Air Quality

No

Please provide any comments below

More needs to be done to encourage uptake of heating and transport that does not contribute to lower air quality eg electricity from solar/wind power. Why on earth are new homes being built in the region with log burners in them in a developed country!? Last year the region all but ran out firewood in the winter. Incentives and regulations should target and encourage people to use heat pumps, solar energy, electric powered transport (electric or hybrid cars, electric scooters, electric bikes etc).

I generally support the plan for Transport and Urban Development

No

Please provide any comments below

The objectives are vague and there needs to be more of a focus on sustainability and environmental impacts of current transport methods. Public transport should be getting a huge push in the region, sustainable electric powered transport options (electric cars, e-scooters/bikes) should be the priority, where is the ambitious hub and node 10 year commuter rail plan for the city that will set it up to be a city of the future. Look at Auckland's folly at not planning for the future and the huge transport issues (and costs) that now plague them. I implore Canterbury not to follow the same path. In the words of John Key - get some guts on this issue and be inspirational and aspirational as a region in the area of transport.

Overall feedback on the draft Annual Plan 2019/20

I generally support the draft Annual Plan 2019/20

Yes

Please provide any comments below

But for an environmental entity/agency you are drastically lacking in consideration for the actual environment and ambition in how to resolve the serious environmental issues plaguing the region like water resources. Ecan needs to be less focused on the mindset of "how do we get maximum economic value from the enthronement" and more "how do we manage and protect our environment alongside human industry so as to preserve the environment for future generations". You should be the advocate and voice of the environment, not a pimp to its plunder and devastation. That requires standing up to those

causing the most damage to it, regardless of what the status quo is, what family they come from, what school they went to, how angry their voice is when they get themselves in the media as an antiquated stereo-typical "kiwi".

Fees and Charges Policy

I generally support the proposed new charge for non-compliant incident response

Yes

Please provide any comments below

And this should be at the maximum threshold

I generally support the proposed new charge for annual water-use data management

Yes

Please provide any comments below

This is a no-brainer and an absolute minimum that can be done to start improving the appalling management of the regions water resources.

I generally support the changes to the existing schedule of fees and charges

Yes

Please provide any comments below

No Answer

If you have any additional comments on the Fees and Charges Policy please provide them below.

No Answer

Revenue and Financing Policy

I generally support the proposed changes to the Revenue and Financing Policy to amend the land value/land area split for Regional Targeted Pest Management rates

No

Please provide any comments below

How on earth is this a fair user-pays type change? Surely with more land area it requires greater pest management resources, value irrespective.

I generally support the proposed changes to the Revenue and Financing Policy to create a rating area (including the Port Hills) to support the vision for a pest-free Banks Peninsula

Yes

Please provide any comments below

This should have happened a decade or two ago so yes I strongly support this and more

should be done.

If you have any additional comments on the Revenue and Financing Policy please provide them below.

No Answer

Supporting documents

Attach any supporting documents (if applicable)

No Answer

If you are submitting a video submission, please add your Youtube or Dropbox link in the box below

No Answer

Public Hearing

I wish to speak to Council on my submission

No

Public Information

All information contained in a submission under the Local Government Act 2002, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information. Your information is held and administered by Environment Canterbury in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. This means that your information may be disclosed to other people who request it in accordance with the terms of these Acts. All submissions are public documents and copies and/or a summary including your name, address and submission will be published on our website. It is therefore important you let us know if your form includes any information including your name and contact details you consider should not be disclosed. Please let us know in the comments box below.

Please provide comments below

No Answer

How did you find out about this consultation?

Postcard