

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	241
Response Date	24/03/21 1:14 PM
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.9

First name

Surname

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? 40-64 years old

Which suburb or area do you live in?

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

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

Biodiversity, water quality, climate change.

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

Most organisations these days are doing more with less, working smarter with much less waste. ECan need to embrace this and come up with options that will claw back the effects of years of failure, and won't put excess burden on ratepayers. Option 1's acceleration could be done by becoming more efficient without such a big increase in rates.

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?

Keep everything in it but re-proportion the funding allocations.

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

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

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

- . Water and Land
- . Biodiversity and Biosecurity
- . Climate Change and Community Resilience
- . Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development
- . Regional and Strategic Leadership

Water and Land portfolio comments:

Needs bigger proportion of funding and cracking down on polluters.

Biodiversity and Biosecurity portfolio comments:

Needs bigger proportion of funding.

Climate Change and Community Resilience portfolio comments:

Climate change needs more of a focus, it appears to get too little of the pie (\$0.98 million).

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:

\$89 million for "Transforming public transport" is a ludicrous proportion of funding (how many buses will that paint?) when Water and Biodiversity get less than half that each! Smaller more efficient buses less often (Orbiters often follow each other empty) and put the money to fix the vital things that have been screwed up over the last decade or more (water for example).

Regional and Strategic Leadership portfolio comments:

This is murky, is water quality compliance enforcement and prosecution under this "Leading regional planning, consenting and compliance"? If so then great. However, the \$8.7 million for "Engagement and influence" seems laughable given ECan's level of influence is legislated. Engagement is all well and good but what has been done in the past is clearly not working as it appears every article and letter to the editor is not favorable to ECan. A change of strategy might be needed there.

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable for your household? Option 1 is affordable

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

Thankfully my household does not have to worry about an extra couple of hundred dollars a year, however everyone (bar none) I have spoken to including me is opposed to the percentage increases proposed in both options.

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

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

The community are constantly being asked in their workplaces and clubs to do more with less. Many in the community will struggle to afford this level of hike, and animosity towards ECan will increase. Most everyone I have spoken to regard ECan as a bloated, ineffective failure. A rates hike of these proportions will simply reinforce that view among the populace. Very few know what ECan actually does, and most all publicity regarding ECan is negative. It should be well noted that this is not a comment on individuals and their competence within the organisation, rather the effectiveness of the organisation as a whole. ECan need to build bridges with the community they serve by being seen to actually do their job with less or similar funding (then once confidence is returned and effectiveness demonstrated, then start to increase rates at rational percentages). Ratepayers are well tired of paying for an organisation that is seen to be failing in its fundamentals, prove you can get it right, and this sentiment may change.

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

Would you support the use of borrowing for operating expenditure to offset some of the first year rates? Yes

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

Get some while interest rates are low and lock those in.

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?

I would hope that ECan are continuing work to find more areas where user-pays fees are appropriate (services over and above what rates should cover), and that the fees charged (such as resource consents and diary discharge etc.) reflect what it actually costs to process these!

Where do you live in Canterbury? Select your district below: Christchurch city including Banks Peninsula

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 . On-demand public transport services
Other initiative/s (please specify)

Other initiative/s (please specify) Christchurch

On-demand public transport should only be invested in if it improves efficiency and reduces costs.

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

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

Any further comments?

The work ECan will do in the future is vital to the environment and our mitigation efforts of emissions and our response to climate change. The community needs to see that ECan are capable of doing a good job of this without being too much of a burden that does not add value or achieve objectives. Please make use of all the talented people there to get it done without further alienation of the community you serve.

Do you wish to speak to your submission? No

Would you like to be kept up-to-date with the outcome of this consultation? No

How did you find out about giving feedback? . Postcard

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: Yes

Tell us which information you do not want disclosed: My name and suburb.