

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	531
Response Date	8/04/21 11:42 AM
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.14
First name	Andrea
Surname	Chalmers
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?

Matching ideology with reality. I don't think you have taken Canterbury's economy into factor and the ability of people/businesses to finance the "complete wishlist".

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

A responsible budget be set first and then programmes prioritized to fit into the budget. We personally are looking at an approx 90% rate increase (approx an extra \$300 per week) which is financially damaging to our business as GV value does not reflex on income of business. This rate increase doesn't acknowledge the increases in user pay consent fees, compliance costs etc therefore the financial burden on a farming business is very substantial. Ecan needs to focus on it's core activities/responsibilities.

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?

Subregional plans by 2024. Ecan needs to have central government acknowledge the work and investment already undertaken by the rural community (ie audited farm plans) and allow the money that would be required to "tick box" subregional plans be used in a more productive and effective manner. "Feel good" projects such as enviro schools, youth engagement, climate change resilience etc needs to be scaled back allowing funding to be utilized in the most effective way for environment and communities. Flood protection needs to priority. The future economy of Canterbury needs to be taken into account.

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

Water and Land portfolio comments:

Having attending the first meetings at the Ashburton Event Centre regarding Canterbury Land and Water Plan and working through this process within our farming business for the past 10 years, I am totally disappointed that Ecan has not backed and supported their (Canterbury Ratepayers) investment and the rural community by having central government acknowledge and accept our existing plans until by run out in 2035. To have these plans redone by 2023 is not a practical timeline and not acknowledging the \$60million already spend is totally irresponsible. The money spent redoing what has already been done would be far better spent practically on farm to make improvements rather than spent on a box ticking excise.

Biodiversity and Biosecurity portfolio comments:

In general support biosecurity and some parts of biodiversity. There should be support for wetland restoration but this shouldn't be met with complex rules and conditions with expensive consents processes. It needs to be acknowledged that NZ's population has increased and with that, land use has changed from pre human era. Ideology needs to be matched with reality. Also long term implications need to be factored along with projects therefore projects need to be prioritized to ease the rate burden.

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable for your household?

☐ Neither option is affordable

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

Using the rate calculator our rates will increase from roughly \$17,000 to approx \$32,000 which is nearly \$300 per week. The rates are only one of many farm/business expenses that is increasing with increased compliance and regulations. To have a "thriving and resilient Canterbury , now and for the future generations" all sectors of the community needs to be considered. Three old sayings come to mind - "you can't farm green when you are in the red", farmers are "asset rich, cash poor" and "farmers are the only people who buy at retail, sell at wholesale and pays freight both ways". It is very disappointing

to hear that the Chair of Ecan saying that most of the burden is on the rural ratepayer therefore it is easy affordable for the urban sector.

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

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

Would like to have transparency in how the Council set the budget? Did Ecan look at a maximum 10% increase and how they could prioritize their spending to fit this? This is basic 101 business management. Did the Council look at all sectors of the community and work out what a financial responsible governance approach to an acceptable rate rise would be.

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?

I understand that the Ecan's Chairs comments was that the people of ChCh can afford these increases therefore I support increasing the use of the UAGC to fund all the projects that benefit people rather than property.

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?

Borrowing just delays the payment. Would be better to prioritize spending costs and delaying/downscaling some projects.

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?

Having submitted on the Fees and Charges Policy, I disagree with some of the policy especially when you may need multiple consents for the one activity. There needs to some accountability to fees charged. As farmers/business we are paying multiple times over.

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

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 decision should be left to the people of the Hinds area to decide. While it is expensive and will cost us, the positive outcomes will be beneficial throughout the wider community by lowering nitrate levels, increase water flow and reliable irrigation. A green countryside is much better than a brown one. People tend to forget that this area of the plains was previously covered in borderdykes which was a form of MAR and the move to more efficient forms of irrigation has resulted in the need of this project.

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 outcome of this consultation?

Yes

How did you find out about giving feedback?

- . Word of mouth
- . Newspaper
- . 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