

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID 701

Response Date 9/04/21 3:54 PM

Status Processed

Submission Type Web

Version 0.2

First name Susan

Surname Thornley

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?

Urban spread and pollution issues, and public transport systems.

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?

Stick to the core basics of what ECan must deliver, and cut its financial budgets to realistically suit the ability of our area to fund the extreme desires currently out for consultation. Rate payers are not an endless resource of finance to tap into.

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

Water and Land	No
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
☐ Regional and Strategic Leadership

Water and Land portfolio comments:

Canterbury is already far ahead of the rest of NZ with our CWMS and this plan should not take much tweaking to meet Essential Freshwater Package. This seems way over-budgeted to develop new policies.

Regional and Strategic Leadership portfolio comments:

A high cost area that looks like it could be easily trimmed to suit the current financial environment. Several areas have costs that I assume would have been "user pays" such as Delivering Regulatory Services.

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

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

Rural landowners, like many urban dwellers, often are asset rich and cash poor. With a proposed 18 or 24% rate increase, this can have a huge impact on our cashflow. The rates calculator implies an increase of \$1727 for 2021/22 for our property, yet we will not benefit any more than an urban person who may only be paying \$80 more (example from Consultation Document). A house in our local township would only possibly be paying an increased \$69. This is extremely inequitable .

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

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

Many people and businesses are struggling in the current economic environment, whether it be due to Covid job losses, increased cost of living or doing business, such as minimum wage increases and increased cost of compliance needs.

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

Any further comments on Uniform Annual General Charges?

Greater use should be made of UAGC to ensure all households are paying an equal share of a greater proportion of ECan expenditure. Capital and land values are irrelevant when all people have equal access to many of the resources ECan are associated with. Areas like freshwater management, regional parks, civil defence and the general rates benefit everybody in Canterbury. They should be charged equally to all users as a UAGC , irrelevant of land or capital value.

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 should be a last resort, after ECan has reviewed its budgets to suit the current economic environment and our ability to pay. It should not be an option to pursue the apparent gold plated plan of desirable actions in the current environment.

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

Any further comments on the Fees and Charges Policy?

Charge increases should be no more than CPI, nor assumed to increase every year. Cost recovery is a good goal, but profiting from services is not.

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

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? . Newspaper
. 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