

Comments

LTP 2021-31

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Comment ID | 361 |
| Response Date | 3/04/21 2:14 PM |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.18 |
| First name | dion |
| Surname | gordon |
| 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?

ECan should prioritise flood control, land and water resource management, biosecurity and biodiversity protection.

Priority seems to have been given to renewing plans to conform to the EFW, that process replaces our sub regional plans we as rate payers have already spent \$60m on.

ECan should be demanding of central govt that they recognise the plans we already have in place and the investment we have in those plans.

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

The rate rise should be limited to no more than 10%. The programmes should be reduced to fit into a responsible budget. A 25% rate rise is irresponsible and programmes should be rescheduled or dropped. ECan should focus on its core activities

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?

remove renewing subregional plans by 2024 and demand of government that they recognise the \$60m we as ratepayers have already spent in developing plans.
expenditure items such as leading community resilience, investing for the future, enviro schools, youth engagement, climate change resilience and me uru rakau involve spending a lot of rate payers money with no tangible outcomes...all these projects should be scaled back or dropped. priority should be given to land and water, flood protection , biosecurity and priority habitat protection and restoration

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

| | |
|---|-----|
| Water and Land | Yes |
| Biodiversity and Biosecurity | Yes |
| Climate Change and Community Resilience | No |
| 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): | <input type="checkbox"/> Water and Land |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity and Biosecurity |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change and Community Resilience |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Regional and Strategic Leadership |

Water and Land portfolio comments:

don't support having to redo all our plans to align with the EFW. it suggests that Ecan has no confidence in all the work it has done for the last 10 years.
Ecan owes it to its ratepayers to look after our investment in our existing plans until they run out (PC2 in 2035). Ecan risks losing the support of the rural community if it shows a reckless regard for ratepayers past investment.

Biodiversity and Biosecurity portfolio comments:

support biosecurity and parts of the biodiversity plan such as wetland restoration and other at risk habitat protection. support the ZC immediate steps funding. concerned that the braided river and me uru rakau projects are ill conceived in terms of the long term costs of maintaining planting projects and protecting against exotic weed reinfestation
me uru rakau could be delayed a couple of years to ease the rate burden in the first 2 years of this plan.. I note that the EFW puts wetland restoration at risk and Ecan should be pushing back on some of the new rules

Climate Change and Community Resilience portfolio comments:

support leading flood and river resilience.. oppose leading community and climate change resilience..they sound like expensive talk fests.

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:

i note and support that urban transport is for the most part funded by targeted rates paid for by those who can access public transport and as a rural ratepayer with no access to it I would object strongly should we be made to contribute.

I note that Ecan is allowing urban sprawl into rural areas around Rolleston, Lincoln, Kirwee and Halswell with no regard for environmental outcomes especially the resultant pollution that will inevitably make its way into Te Waihora.

I also note that this urban sprawl is against the recommendations of Rod Carr's climate change report, and that the basis of your urban development and public transport policy is to reduce green house gas emissions...you appear to be failing miserably at that

Regional and Strategic Leadership portfolio comments:

A lot of money is being proposed to be spent on projects that shouldn't be the priority or responsibility of Ecan. youth engagement and enviro schools should be responsibility of the MoE.

resourcing runanga so that they can advise on the EFW should be government responsibility not ratepayers

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

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

I note the Chair of Ecan is saying these 2 proposals are easily affordable for urban ratepayers because most of the burden falls on rural ratepayers.

our rate rise is likely to be over \$5k/year. that is not affordable especially when we have the extra costs of paying large amounts of extra money for fees and charges on top of all the costs of complying with and investing in good management practises to ensure compliance with all the new rules. these rate rises are not coming in isolation and impact heavily on rural communities.

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

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

Ecan should reduce its ambition to spend our money until it can produce an affordable budget that reflects a financially responsible governance approach
no sign of that in this plan

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

Any further comments on Uniform Annual General Charges?

judging by Ecan's Chairs comments more of the costs of running Ecan should fall on the people of Chch as she says they can afford it. Support increasing the use of the UAGC to fund all those projects that benefit people as opposed to property. the UAGC should be at least \$100/houshold. this would better reflect where the benefits of many of Ecan's programmes accrue.

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?

if the rate rise is unaffordably large spend less money. borrowing doesn't save money just delays and increases the costs.

Do you support the rationale and proposed changes in the draft Fees and Charges Policy? No

Any further comments on the Fees and Charges Policy?

these changes will cost rural rate payers considerably more. whereas I support the changes in principal, if they are accompanied by huge and excessive rate rises as proposed then I oppose these changes as they end up costing farmers and businesses twice.

Where do you live in Canterbury? Select your district below: Ashburton 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 . Other initiative/s

The Hekeao Hinds Managed Aquifer Recharge is a pilot of environmental infrastructure to address water quality. To continue enhancing this infrastructure, the project would require ongoing targeted rates from the Ashburton district. Find out more [link]. Do you want to see this project continue? Yes

Any further comments on Hekeao Hinds Managed Aquifer Recharge? Yes

this should be up to the people of the Hinds Plains to decide. we recognise it will be very expensive but would rather spend money on projects that will deliver positive outcomes like this MAR project than many of the other projects that Ecan is proposing

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? 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? . Meeting, hui or event

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