

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	663
Response Date	9/04/21 1:43 PM
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
First name	Mark
Surname	Lash
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?

Not in this LTP. Ecan priorities for Ecan should be flood control, water and resource management and Biosecurity protection.

Priorities have been given to conform to the Essential Fresh Water.

That process replaces our subregional plans we as ratepayers have already spent \$60 million on. As you said, page 8, much of that work particularly in fresh water has become a model of others to follow and has put Canterbury in a good position.

To spend another \$40 million at least plus the \$60 million already spent is irresponsible.

Ecan should be demanding Central Government that they recognise the plans we already have in place and the investment we have in these plans.

Why this has not already been done, I do not know? And DO not understand.

Whatever political Persuasion you Ecan counselors have, you are there to represent us as ratepayers after all are we as rate payers, paying your wages!?

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

The rate rise should be limited to NO more that 10%. The program should be reduced to fit into a responsible budget. 25% rate rise is irresponsible and programs should be rescheduled or dropped. ECAN should focus on its core activities.

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?

Remove renewing sub-regional plans by 2024 and demand of government that they recognize the \$60million we as ratepayers have already spent in developing plans.

Expenditure items such as leading community resilience, investing for the future, enviro schools, youth engagement, climate change resilience and me uru rakau involve spending a lot of rate payers money with no tangible outcomes...all these projects should be scaled back or dropped. priority should be given to land and water, flood protection , biosecurity and priority habitat protection and restoration.

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:

I do not support having to redo all our plans to align with the EFW. It suggests that Ecan has no confidence in all the work it has done for the last 10 years.

Ecan owes it to its ratepayers to look after our investment in our existing plans until they run out (PC2 in 2035). Ecan risks losing the support of the rural community if it shows a reckless regard for ratepayers past investment.

Biodiversity and Biosecurity portfolio comments:

Support Biosercurity. Concerned that the braided rivers and the me uru rakau projects are ill conceived in terms of long term cost for maintaining planting projects and protection against weed infestation.

Climate Change and Community Resilience portfolio comments:

Support leading flood and river resilience. Sick of the word "Climate Change", it is just the weather patterns repeating themselves. Another excuse for another tax. Ice shelf has been at its highest in 10 years, go figure! Oppose leading community and climate change resilience, expensive talk fest. 2006 snow storm, worst in 50 years. What about 50 years before that? The Rangitata river broke out in

2019, it also broke in the 1950 and 60's, are you going to put that down as climate change? The answer is NO! Floods will come and go, as will snow storms and droughts.

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:

I note and support that urban transport is for the most part funded by targeted rates paid for by those who can access public transport and as a rural ratepayer with no access to it I would object strongly should we be made to contribute.

I note that Ecan is allowing urban sprawl into rural areas around Rolleston, Lincoln, Kirwee and Halswell with no regard for environmental outcomes especially the resultant pollution that will inevitably make its way into Te Waihora.

I also note that this urban sprawl is against the recommendations of Rod Carr's climate change report, and that the basis of your urban development and public transport policy is to reduce green house gas emissions...you appear to be failing miserably at that

Regional and Strategic Leadership portfolio comments:

A lot of money is being proposed to be spent on projects that shouldn't be the priority or responsibility of Ecan. Youth engagement and enviro schools should be the responsibility of the MoE. Resourcing runanga so that they can advise on the EFW should be government responsibility not ratepayers.

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

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

Ecan should reduce its ambition to spend our money until it can produce an affordable budget that reflects a financially responsible governance approach
no sign of that in this plan

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?

Judging by Ecan's Chairs comments more of the costs of running Ecan should fall on the people of Chch as she says they can afford it. Support increasing the use of the UAGC to fund all those projects that benefit people as opposed to property. the UAGC should be at least \$100/houshold. this would better reflect where the benefits of many of Ecan's programmes accrue.

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?

If the rate rise is unaffordable large, spend less money. Borrowing doesn't save money just delays and increases the costs.

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?

These changes will cost the rate payers considerable more. If they are accompanied by huge and excessive rate rises as proposed. They will end up costing farmers and business twice.

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

This should be up to the people of the Hinds Plains to decide. We recognise it will be very expensive but would rather spend money on projects that will deliver positive outcomes like this MAR project than many of the other projects that Ecan are proposing

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 \$60 million already spent on fresh water, you should be demanding central government acknowledge this. It is a matter of principle, this is why I have put my submission in as it is going to cost another \$40 million to re-write what you have ALL READY done! YOU are there to represent US, I hear biased within Ecan counselor's against the rural community. We pay our rates and deserve a lot better than this!

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

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