

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	143
Response Date	15/03/21 1:16 PM
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.6
First name	Peter
Surname	McIlraith
Email address	

Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation? No, I'm submitting as an individual

Are you willing to tell us more about yourself? Yes

Which age category are you in? 65+ years old

Do you think we've prioritised the right issues and opportunities? No

What do you feel are the significant challenges and opportunities we face?

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on ECan's proposed draft 10-year plan. One wonders why Councils go to the expense of producing such plans as researching previous plans of this regional council, exposes no correlation to the present plan. In fact, this plan has a margin of error of 20%. That is, the previous plan predicted a four percent rate rise for the 2021-22 year. This outrageous increase of 24%plus, is a direct transfer of resourcing from tax-payer to rate-payer. Putting aside the efficiencies of ECan's spend, [which is being abundantly charitable], much of your proposed 'LTP' is civic related activities. The notion that this should be funded from a capital value-based rating system is unacceptable. It is just not fair. I acknowledge there is some element of user pays to the rate-take, but much of the civic obligations passed down from 'Central Government' you are now attempting to fund from the General rate. Ecan has joined the hysteria of climate alarmism. This will delight a few job secure academics, who from the comfortable ivory towers, advocating degrowth for climate considerations. But it will lead to tragic outcomes of stagnation, strife and discord for ordinary people. What is missed and is counter intuitive, that is, the higher the cost structure that is placed on farming and primary business, the more burdened our natural resources are put under to meet these costs.

Which of the proposed options would you like to see us progress with? Other option (please specify)

Civic obligation passed down from Central Govt should only be considered if resourcing accompanies such demands

It is important that we hear what you would like to keep in the plan, what you think should be removed, and anything that you think we have missed?

Issues that have a national connotation and are not specific to a region should not be undertaken by Regional Councils nor on their plans

Do you generally support the activities proposed in the following portfolios:

Water and Land	No
Biodiversity and Biosecurity	No
Climate Change and Community Resilience	No
Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development	No
Regional and Strategic Leadership	Yes

Do you have any further comments on the activities proposed in specific portfolio/s (please select all those you wish to comment on):

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable for your household? Neither option is affordable

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

The question of affordability is an over simplification. The question is, or should be;; is land based value a justifiable basis for civic issues?

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable as a whole for the Canterbury community? No

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

One wonders why Councils go to the expense of producing such plans as researching previous plans of this regional council, exposes no correlation to the present plan. In fact, this plan has a margin of error of 20%. That is, the previous plan predicted a four percent rate rise for the 2021-22 year. This outrageous increase of 24%plus, is a direct transfer of resourcing from tax-payer to rate-payer. Putting aside the efficiencies of ECan's spend, [which is being abundantly charitable], much of your proposed 'LTP' is civic related activities. The notion that this should be funded from a capital value-based rating system is unacceptable. It is just not fair. I acknowledge there is some element of user pays to the rate-take, but much of the civic obligations passed down from 'Central Government' you are now attempting to fund from the General rate. Ecan has joined the hysteria of climate alarmism This will delight a few job secure academics, who from the comfortable ivory towers, advocating degrowth for climate considerations. But it will lead to tragic outcomes of stagnation, strife and discord for ordinary people. What is missed and is counter intuitive, that is, the higher the cost structure that

is placed on farming and primary business, the more burdened our natural resources are put under to meet these costs.

Do you support the changes we're proposing to how we apply Uniform Annual General Charges? Yes

Any further comments on Uniform Annual General Charges?

UAGC is an attempt to ameliorate the wrongs of a ham-fisted rating formula. But it does not address the fundamental flaw Council persists with

Would you support the use of borrowing for operating expenditure to offset some of the first year rates? No

Any further comments on the use of borrowing for operating expenditure?

Intergenerational financing is a worthy notion, but it alludes the question of the cost benefit of the expenditure

Do you support the rationale and proposed changes in the draft Fees and Charges Policy? Yes

Any further comments on the Fees and Charges Policy?

User pays is a worthy notion, but it alludes the question of the cost benefit of the expenditure and the efficiency and effectiveness of such charges. Remember this is an uncontestably service. Perhaps private enterprise may do the job better and cheaper?

Where do you live in Canterbury? Select your district below: Waimate district

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Kaikoura

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Hurunui

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waimakariri

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Christchurch

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Selwyn

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Ashburton

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Mackenzie

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Timaru

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waimate . Other initiative/s (please specify)

Other initiative/s (please specify) Waimate

First step funding has been a great initiative, thanks to some excellent field staff and community input. But no I don't want any further input from ECan.

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waitaki

Any further comments?

Please read this

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on ECan's proposed draft 10-year plan.

One wonders why Councils go to the expense of producing such plans as researching previous plans of this regional council, exposes no correlation to the present plan. In fact, this plan has a margin of error of 20%. That is, the previous plan predicted a four percent rate rise for the 2021-22 year.

This outrageous increase of 24%plus, is a direct transfer of resourcing from tax-payer to rate-payer. Putting aside the efficiencies of ECan's spend, [which is being abundantly charitable], much of your proposed 'LTP' is civic related activities.

The notion that this should be funded from a capital value-based rating system is unacceptable. It is just not fair.

I acknowledge there is some element of user pays to the rate-take, but much of the civic obligations passed down from 'Central Government' you are now attempting to fund from the General rate.

Ecan has joined the hysteria of climate alarmism

This will delight a few job secure academics, who from the comfortable ivory towers, advocating degrowth for climate considerations. But it will lead to tragic outcomes of stagnation, strife and discord for ordinary people. What is missed and is counter intuitive, that is, the higher the cost structure that is placed on farming and primary business, the more burdened our natural resources are put under to meet these costs.

Do you wish to speak to your submission? No

Would you like to be kept up-to-date with the outcome of this consultation? Yes

How did you find out about giving feedback? . Email

Your information is held and administered by Environment Canterbury in accordance with the Privacy Act 2020 and Environment Canterbury's Privacy Policy.

There is personal information/contact details in my submission I do not want disclosed: No