

## Comments

### LTP 2021-31

<b>Comment ID</b>	743
<b>Response Date</b>	10/04/21 9:47 AM
<b>Status</b>	Processed
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.21
<b>First name</b>	Nickola
<b>Surname</b>	Murray
<b>Email address</b>	

**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?**

managing flood risk, land & water resource management, supporting increasing biodiversity - at a sensible cost to ratepayers. Covid-19 has left many poorer than they were a year ago; it is simply not tenable to increase rates by an AVERAGE of >24% in the current situation.

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

Firstly, cap ECan rate rises to <10% FOR EVERYONE IN CANTERBURY (or better still to the 5.3 % which has been promised in previous ECan statements.) Prioritise initiatives to meet this first. This may mean that statutory NZ central government requirements are not delivered (E.g. use Canterbury's existing water plan which Cantabrians have already invested in significantly)

**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?**

Focus on environmental outcomes - i.e. keep water management/ water storage, support for biodiversity. ECan's current scope (and LTP) includes many which are NOT required to be undertaken by ECan, e.g. EnviroSchools program which is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education. This should be deleted from ECan's program. You have MISSED the fact that under the new LTP rate increases are heavily skewed to rural Cantabrians, with Christchurch residents paying significantly less than those outside the city.

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

<b>Water and Land</b>	Yes
<b>Biodiversity and Biosecurity</b>	Yes
<b>Climate Change and Community Resilience</b>	No
<b>Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development</b>	No
<b>Regional and Strategic Leadership</b>	No

<b>Do you have any further comments on the activities proposed in specific portfolio/s (please select all those you wish to comment on):</b>	.	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:**

see 11 above

**Biodiversity and Biosecurity portfolio comments:**

Pest control activities are for the benefit of EVERYONE in Canterbury. Many rural landowners already spend a lot on pest control on their own property, this is therefore a double-whammy for them. The costs for pest control should be split across everyone not just rural residents.

**Climate Change and Community Resilience portfolio comments:**

Support flood and river resilience programs in principle - but again note that many landowners by rivers already spend significant \$s on their own river protection - and again are charged a 2nd time by ECan for programs which provide no benefit to them individually. Oppose community and climate change resilience programs.. lots of meetings but little improvement.

**Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:**

I understand that Urban transport is mostly funded by targeted rates paid for by those who can access public transport - do not make rural ratepayers contribute as we really can't use it.

**Regional and Strategic Leadership portfolio comments:**

Expensive waste of money for ratepayers.

<b>Is the proposed increase in rates affordable for your household?</b>	Neither option is affordable
---	------------------------------

**Any further comments on affordability for your household?**

24.5 % as an average rate increase is ridiculously large increase in the current environment when many ratepayers have seen their incomes decrease in real terms significantly in the last year due to Covid-19. In combination with Hurunui rates increases plus additional central government changes to rental property regulations, the government charges inflicted on our household are getting higher and higher.

**Is the proposed increase in rates affordable as a whole for the Canterbury community?**

**Any further comments on affordability for the community?**

Doing a spot check vs ECan's rates calculator, I note that rural ratepayers in our area and our immediate neighbours are facing rate rises of between ~ 30-45%. This has initiated outraged discussions in golf and rugby clubs/ pubs/ cafes/ around dinner tables with suggestions of rural residents taking protest action (e.g. blocking roads/bridges with tractors) and causing disruption to attract publicity to this issue. Councillor Jenny Hughey noted that most Christchurch residents would pay small rate rises - which sounds great for them. The corollary is that those outside Christchurch will pay a lot more when in fact our access to regional facilities is limited due to geography - this is unfair and needs to be addressed. Those on fixed incomes (e.g. pensioners) and those who have moved to a rural location for a better lifestyle will have to miss out on necessities in order to pay their rates - this is likely to cause hardship for many.

Ecan should reduce its overall program to manage within a budget with the increase of 5.3% as promised. Most other businesses have no choice but to spend within their means - ratepayers are not a bottomless pit for \$s.

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

Don't know

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

No

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

No

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

Hurunui 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**

**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

*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