

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	513
Response Date	8/04/21 5:25 AM
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.14
First name	Michael
Surname	Salvesen
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

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

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

The council should be concentrating on its core responsibilities, flood control, biodiversity and biosecurity. The council shouldn't have to redo sub regional plans recently completed. This is a waste of money and they should have made representations to this effect to the Environment Ministry. These plans are due for an update in the near term future anyway, so little will be accomplished by redoing them. The council on behalf of the ratepayer has already invested millions in these plans.

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

In the current post Covid recovery period, it is irresponsible of the council to even consider such a large increase in expenditure. The increase in proposed expenditure of around 25% hides an unpalatable fact that this rise is not distributed evenly across most ratepayers.

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?

given the recovery period we are in, the council should be concentrating on core activities, and leave the frippery for later. A 'wish list' is all well and good, but should have been gone through carefully to ensure that key outcomes were met.

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):	.	Water and Land
	.	Biodiversity and Biosecurity
	.	Climate Change and Community Resilience
	.	Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development

Water and Land portfolio comments:

See above re. Hinds plan change 2. Given that we are above the RDR, i struggle to see why our rates are forecast to go from \$9742 to \$21035, an increase of 215%!! The plan already inn place will serve the Upper Hinds area for many years to come. The rates calculator, of course, doesn't f=go into the detail of which rates are to increased the most, or indeed the least.

Biodiversity and Biosecurity portfolio comments:

I have been a strong supporter of both these portfolios, am a past finalist and water quality award winner in the Ballance farm environment awards. I also sit on the central district Biosecurity group. We have been fencing and planting for many years but with this cash removed from our budget, will find it difficult to continue beyond the legal minimum required.

Climate Change and Community Resilience portfolio comments:

We need to be aware of future forecast changes to our climate and what they may mean for ourselves and the wider community. We need to concentrate on the vulnerable areas in the first instance. This should be targeted rate from the ares affected. I oppose many of the community leading scenarios, beyond what the council is required to do. Re above, with plans, don't do too much too early, the government of the day may change the requirements.

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:

Air quality is a localised issue mostly and should be treated as such, via targeted rates, daily in towns and cities. transport and urban development, or encroachment are big issues. The council is actively discourage development in rural areas, but at the same time, positively encouraging development, daily in Selwyn. This will affect our access to Christchurch, by increased travel times. There are also water quality issues associated with these new subdivisions, that feed into the same water bodies as much restricted farmland usage. The outward movement of Christchurch doesn't make sense for public transport patronage, or efficient of service.

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

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

As mentioned earlier, an increase of more than double the current rate will undoubtedly lead to negative changes in our own environmental expenditure.

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable as a whole for the Canterbury community?

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

In the current covid recovery times, the council should be aware of the pressures the community is under, and not add to this pressure, by taking many millions extra away from household and business discretionary spending.

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

Any further comments on Uniform Annual General Charges?

Urban ratepayers, and christchurch ones in particular should bear the burden of a more equitable spend. This could have been done via an increase in the UAGC, to at least \$100 as proposed by ECan's chair.

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

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

Borrowing should be used only for capital projects, and not for covering normal expenditure. This will cause further unnecessary increase in rate s in the future, specially once interest rates start to rise again.

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

Any further comments on the Fees and Charges Policy?

Full cost recovery for duties that should be covered by council functions is unreasonable, however i do support a base level of fees for consents and some monitoring. On full cost recovery, we, as customers, would have no influence on the council's efficiency and ability to deliver on a list effective basis.

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 . On-demand public transport services
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

Whilst this is a partnership between the council and the community, it should be left for the community to decide. So far, it has delivered a positive outcome, and with further investment should continue to do so. I don't think the Upper plains group should be contributing much, as we stand to benefit little later on. None of the MAR sites are proposed to be west of the RDR.

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 comments from ECan's chair last week that some rural ratepayers may have to pay a bit more is fine to an extent, but made no mention of the proposed magnitude of some of the increases proposed. the assumption that all farmers can afford whatever the council proposes is just plain wrong. We produce venison as a major part of our farm business. This market has been it hard by Covid internationally. Our price have fallen from \$450 per head last year to \$250 this year. This has resulted in a drop of gross income in the region of \$300,000. This proposed increase is unreasonable and irresponsible of the council and its councillors.

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

How did you find out about giving feedback?

- . Environment Canterbury website
- . Word of mouth
- . 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