

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	556
Response Date	8/04/21 11:43 AM
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.13
First name	James
Surname	Gibson
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?	Yes
Which of the proposed options would you like to see us progress with?	Option 1: statutory work, prior commitments and accelerating key initiatives
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?	
I feel that option 1&2 are almost a 'Hobsons choice' with one costing a lot, and the other an awful lot! So not a lot of choice at all	
Do you generally support the activities proposed in the following portfolios:	
Water and Land	Yes
Biodiversity and Biosecurity	No

Climate Change and Community Resilience Yes

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development Unsure

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:

Please see my comments in the final box, re, new plans to meet Govt. rules and duplication of work. Also marrying up your values with the new essential freshwater policy

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable for your household? Option 1 is affordable

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

This is a very large % age increase for this year, which is concerning in very insecure times. Lack of capital investment over the last 12 months highlights the uncertainties present in the economic world. Yet you propose not a large, but substantially huge jump in rates. I guess that even in uncertain times there are 2 certainties- death and taxes!

What is the point of producing a long term plan if such terrible rate increases come at us with only months to prepare?

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable as a whole for the Canterbury community? Don't know

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

The funding policy needs consideration. I think that the UAGC should cover a whole lot more of the rate bill than it currently does.

Your plan suggests 18% spend on Regional and strategic leadership, and 14% spend on climate change and resilience.(noting your words 'common thread of protection of people')

This totals 32% of council spend, yet UAGC collected is only 8% ChCh city, 1% Ashburton rural, and 5% Temuka.

This is not equitable to the people costs of providing the above services.

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?

Please see above comment.

Could you please paste it in here- your portal won't lets me!

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

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?

The cost of receiving required data being charged back to consent holders is in my opinion, a terrible taxation on compliance monitoring. It seems to ignore the investment made in equipment to meet your requirements and also the fee for compliance monitoring that is already being billed. Again I have to ask, for whose benefit is it to collect this data? Are the costs falling to all beneficiaries of the collected data?

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

Any further comments?

I found this form just Okay to complete, but am concerned that I have added comments that may not get to the right place as they are potentially in the wrong box. Is this a risk?

Other issues/comments

By bowing to the Govt. essential freshwater plans/rules makes me wonder if you believe in the large body of work undertaken, and money spent, in water use regulation and quality objectives framework which we have only just paid for.

Surely it is worth arguing that you were on the right path?

Now we seem set to repeat the work, with associated cost.

Under 'our values' in the consultation document the first value is Manaakitanga- people first.
How does this fit with the essential freshwater plans that clearly say health of the water first?

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? . Environment Canterbury website

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