

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	539
Response Date	8/04/21 11:42 AM
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.16
First name	Jeanette
Surname	Maxwell
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?

Priority should be given to Biosecurity, Biodiversity, Flood control and water resource management across the board be it from irrigation to small streams and waterways. A large amount of money has already been spent on sub regional plans and this should be progressed and let go to completion before starting a new very costly plan.

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

This two options are very costly and are not affordable for rural rate payers as the increase is loaded towards rural. Rate rises should be no greater than 10%. Many changes and costs are coming at farming, consideration of fairness (urban costs put on rural), technology changes and tools should all be considered and give time for these to be developed and adopted.

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?

The plan in place now is a good one and should be left to run its course, remove renewing the sub regional plan by 2024. Expenditure for things like investing in the future, climate change resilience, leading the community , resilience investing in the future, youth engagement and envir in schools should be scaled back or dropped as the outcomes would be difficult to measure and are nice to have not essential spending.
Priority should be given to bio security, biodiversity, food control and water management as stated earlier.

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
	.	Regional and Strategic Leadership

Water and Land portfolio comments:

So much time and effort has been put into the sub regional plan it should be left to runs its course. ECan should push back the Govt EFW as this regions is an example of what working together can achieve. ECan needs to back itself and stick to the plan. Changing now looks like there has been little confidence in the last 10 years of work, so much has been done ECan has to push back.

Biodiversity and Biosecurity portfolio comments:

Support bio security and biodiversity plan, support zone committee immediate funding steps. Some projects could be stagger started so the costs are spread more evenly over the term of the plan if it has to go ahead.

Climate Change and Community Resilience portfolio comments:

Support river and flood resilience, all others I do not too costly for little to no measurable outcome.

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:

I support air quality and transport and some urban development so long as the costs are directly attributed to the user. Urban development should be carefully considered so as not to cause problems and poor outcomes for waterways and water bodies, we do not want to see degradation due to these expansions.
Expansion should also be carefully considered so as not to increase carbon emissions etc.

Regional and Strategic Leadership portfolio comments:

I do not support these options as they can be funded through other pathways for example envir in schools should be funded by Ministry for Education.

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

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

While the rate rise for the first year is 24.5% it is much higher for rural and with claw backs for costs as well the total costs will increase significantly. Across the 10 year the proposed total rate rise would be 56.6% if this number in the plan were to be kept to and that is for urban not rural.

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

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

The spending is too great we have to be able to afford all the changes coming to farming from all compliance areas and this plan has too many nice to have costs with little tangible outcomes to the bottom line.

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 support projects that benefit people but not property. The UAGC should be loaded to the people who benefit from this charge.

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 for operating expenditure reflects that the nice to have list is too long and projects need to be dropped. The long run cost of borrowing that it still has to be paid for at some point. Cutting the costs must be a priority.

Do you support the rationale and proposed changes in the draft Fees and Charges Policy? Don't know

Any further comments on the Fees and Charges Policy?

While I support charging for some things in principal they need to be fair and reasonable. On top of the proposed rate rises it is too costly and we will have paid twice for some things.

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

I don't live in this area so I am not affected by this project, however it is a good example of what can be achieved.

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? . Word of mouth
 . Meeting, hui or event
 . 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