

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	683
Response Date	9/04/21 3:54 PM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
First name	Ben
Surname	Zmijewski
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?	25-39 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?	<p>Protecting and improving our fresh water is essential and should be #1 rightly. In priority #2 I suggest changing the words "well-utilised" public transport network to "well operated, competitive". ECan is the operator of the network and there is no use aiming for utilisation unless it is competitive against the car.</p>
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	Yes
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
- . Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development
- . Regional and Strategic Leadership

Water and Land portfolio comments:

There are multiple specific developments going through the planning / resource consent process right NOW! i.e Lincoln subdivision and application for irrigation by MHV. These are two test cases where ECan can show leadership in the climate case by stopping these from progressing. Allowing either of these developments (or developments similar to these) to go ahead does NOT fit within your vision or purpose. Commercial ventures need to be told that enough is enough when we know that the adverse effects of these will last for generations and cost ratepayers in the long run. The effects of both of these developments will lead to exorbitant costs to the ratepayer in 10, 20 and 30 years time. We cannot continue to transfer environmental costs to future generations to pay for.

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:

There are multiple specific developments going through the planning / resource consent process right NOW! i.e Lincoln subdivision and application for irrigation by MHV. These are two test cases where ECan can show leadership in the climate case by stopping these from progressing. Allowing either of these developments (or developments similar to these) to go ahead does NOT fit within your vision or purpose. Commercial ventures need to be told that enough is enough when we know that the adverse effects of these will last for generations and cost ratepayers in the long run. The effects of both of these developments will lead to exorbitant costs to the ratepayer in 10, 20 and 30 years time. We cannot continue to transfer environmental costs to future generations to pay for.

Regional and Strategic Leadership portfolio comments:

There are multiple specific developments going through the planning / resource consent process right NOW! i.e Lincoln subdivision and application for irrigation by MHV. These are two test cases where ECan can show leadership in the climate case by stopping these from progressing. Allowing either of these developments (or developments similar to these) to go ahead does NOT fit within your vision or purpose. Commercial ventures need to be told that enough is enough when we know that the adverse effects of these will last for generations and cost ratepayers in the long run. The effects of both of these developments will lead to exorbitant costs to the ratepayer in 10, 20 and 30 years time. We cannot continue to transfer environmental costs to future generations to pay for.

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

There are specific things that can be done to ensure rates are kept low by properly accounting for the costs of developments now and into the future. It is well known that the development of greenfield sites, not connected to a good multi modal transport network will cost MORE than intensification in existing urban areas. I would like to see smarter decisions

being made to help Christchurch become a giant urban sprawl like Melbourne, Sydney, Auckland
(insert other city here)

Do you support the changes we're proposing to how we apply Uniform Annual General Charges? Yes

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?

We should be living within our means. This includes in our financial lives whether it be as an individual or organisation. High cost activity i.e. allowing massive irrigation schemes to go ahead will necessitate the need for borrowing. I fundamentally disagree that schemes of this sort should be avoided. ECan must provide guardianship over our rivers, aquifers, and fresh water ecosystems and acknowledge the damage down by intensive dairy farming over the last 20-30 years and more importantly start to reduce this.

Do you support the rationale and proposed changes in the draft Fees and Charges Policy? Yes

Where do you live in Canterbury? Select your district below: Christchurch city including Banks Peninsula

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

- . On-demand public transport services
- . Using aquifer recharge to manage freshwater quality
- . Other initiative/s (please specify)

Other initiative/s (please specify) Christchurch

While the first two initiatives are good and I support them, there is also the ability to avoid harm by NOT doing some things. Again MAV irrigation scheme and Lincoln subdivision (or any subdivision that is not within the Regional Council growth strategy and will cause even more dependence on car ownership and use.

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 sincerely hope that ECan can start to manage the environment in a sustainable way. Not only will you appease many climate supporters and activists but you will save rate payers money in the long term. You will also contribute to the long term goals of the city which is for it to provide a place where people have equal access and opportunity to jobs, active transport, and most importantly a healthy, happy and quality life.

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? . Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter)

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