

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	567
Response Date	8/04/21 11:43 AM
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.21
First name	Sue
Surname	Wragg
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?	No
Which age category are you 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 2: statutory work and prior commitments

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?

Public transport should be the responsibility of regional councils not ECAN. Certainly not partially paid for by General rates other than UAGC. This activity has no relevance to land value, benefits people not the land

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

Water and Land	Yes
Biodiversity and Biosecurity	Yes
Climate Change and Community Resilience	Yes

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development No

Regional and Strategic Leadership Unsure

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:

ECAN has already spent \$60m of ratepayers money in developing the plans that the EFW package replaces, the govt must allow recognition of these.

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

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

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?

Under Option 2 (applies in a similar way to option 1) the total percentage of costs paid for by General Rates is 57% while UGAC is only 7% . A large percentage of the activities funded under either option potentially benefit all people regardless of the value of the land they own eg. education, youth engagement, air quality, clean water, biodiversity. Certainly urban development and public transport should not be paid for by the farming community.

Ecan has one of the lowest UAGC's of all regional councils. In this LTP it is proposed to go from \$25 to \$45 per rating unit. The lower the UAGC the more rates are loaded onto more valuable properties. A \$10m farm will be paying about \$2000 extra a year while a house in Chch is likely to be paying only another \$100/year. Totally inequitable.

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 is a temporary fix, if funds are insufficient then costs need to be reduced, some projects shelved.

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

Where do you live in Canterbury? Select your district below: Selwyn 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 . Using aquifer recharge to manage freshwater quality

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 do not think the LTP consultation has been advertised sufficiently and the time frame for consultation was too short.

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? . 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