

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID 276

Response Date 29/03/21 6:04 AM

Status Processed

Submission Type Web

Version 0.5

First name Nicky

Surname Anderson

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 Yes opportunities?

Which of the proposed options would you like to Option 2: statutory work and prior commitments see us progress with?

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?

GO OPTION TWO: only do statutory stuff, because practically, Ecan will be running hard even to achieve this, given:

WHY DOES IT ALL HAVE TO BE IN YEAR ONE - PRACTICALITIES OF RECRUITING 71-77 FTE'S IN THE CURRENT ENVIRONMENT IS CRAZY. ESP WHEN IT IS MORE IMPT THAN EVER THAT THERE IS ARE GOOD RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ECAN AND ITS RATEPAYERS.

SO, cut the non statutory rural land & water initiatives, and non statutory biodiversity initiatives 2 FTE for helping farmers plant, etc., I think \$ needs to stay with farmers who can provide more bang for buck.

DO support accessing external funding for locally led initiatives

Under option 1, general rates are up 28.6% in year 1- the large portion of this, \$80M (93%) is spread pro rata over capital values of all properties, so unfairly impacts on large holdings. Why are UAGC only 7% of general rate, when can be up to 30%???? Support ECan pushing UAGC up to 30% limit. I challenge ECan to look outside the square to meet the statutory requirements - there must be better, more affordable ways.

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 Yes

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):

Water and Land

Water and Land portfolio comments:

Just using our own farming business as an example, our Ecan rates go up \$4251 under option 1 (26.3%) or \$2,720 (16.9%) under option 2. No brainer for me when I know we are looking after our own land and water, and on farm, we already comply with new FW regs. We also pay a substantial water charge to Amuri Irrigation Company, a decent portion of which goes toward improving catchment Environmental outcomes. THIS NEEDS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable for your household?

Neither option is affordable

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

Just using our own farming business as an example, our Ecan rates go up \$4251 under option 1 (26.3%) or \$2,720 (16.9%) under option 2. No brainer for me when I know we are looking after our own land and water, and on farm, we already comply with new FW regs. We also pay a substantial water charge to Amuri Irrigation Company, a decent portion of which goes toward improving catchment Environmental outcomes.

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

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

We, as a food producing community pay the large proportion of the Ecan rates. UAGCs should be increased to the full allowable amount of 30% to help to at least START to spread the load. We also pay a substantial water charge to Amuri Irrigation Company, a decent portion of which goes toward improving catchment Environmental outcomes.

Do you support the changes we're proposing to No how we apply Uniform Annual General Charges?

Any further comments on Uniform Annual General Charges?

We, as a food producing community pay the large proportion of the Ecan rates. UAGCs should be increased to the full allowable amount of 30% to help to at least START to spread the load. We also pay a substantial water charge to Amuri Irrigation Company, a decent portion of which goes toward improving catchment Environmental outcomes.

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

No

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

Don't know

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

Hurunui 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

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

Do you wish to speak to your submission? Yes

We may use your phone number to contact you to arrange attendance at a hearing. This information will be kept private.

Phone number

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

How did you find out about giving feedback? . Other (please specify)

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 No my submission I do not want disclosed: