

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	756
Response Date	11/04/21 7:30 AM
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4
First name	Graham
Surname	Marr
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? 65+ years old

Do you think we've prioritised the right issues and opportunities? No

What do you feel are the significant challenges and opportunities we face?

Flood control, bio security, water management in general

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

Rate rise proposed is far to high. Suggested maximum should be in the 7-10% rise bracket, 65% is irresponsible and not sustainable. You need to stick with your core objectives

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?

Forget about renewing the sub regional plans by 2024 and demand that the government realise that rate payers have already spent close to \$60 million in developing plans. Don't need any more money spent on plans!!!

You must invest rate payers funds to projects that bring value to those that proving the funds - practical

aspects such as land, water, bio security and habit protection are the critical issues needing investment in.

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

Water and Land	Yes
Biodiversity and Biosecurity	Yes
Climate Change and Community Resilience	Unsure
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):

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

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

I am a rural rate payer and likely cost for us will be very high. The proposed rate hike has to be rewarded in a value equal to the proposed rise in the take. Ask yourself how urban rate payers would react to be told that their rates would be going up by the proposed 25%.
Just not sustainable for us costing thousands of dollars annually.

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

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

You need to take on board that you are spending rate payers money and an affordable budget which brings a financially governance approach with responsibility. Not much of this from what I can see.

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?

Yes - urban rate payers should be able to contribute more in dollar terms than rural ratepayers as lots of your environmental aspects benefit them more than us in the rural sector. Perhaps up to \$150 per household per year would shift the burden a bit more evenly.

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 you need to borrow to offset the likely first year rates, then you need to examine the real reason why - this just delays the increase. Be very careful why you need to borrow and to what for - it has to be paid back at some point!!

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

Don't know

Any further comments on the Fees and Charges Policy?

Not sure here! These costs could cost rural rate payers more but if the changes are accompanied by huge increase in charges then I oppose. Policy could work if care and common sense is used.

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

Up to the people in that area to decide. Could be quite expensive for them but let them make that call. Could have practical benefits which would be a good return on our rateable funds.

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?

My final comment is receiving benefit for the rates I pay each year. This has to be the bottom line for any activity that your organisation is involved in. Very easy to propose a rate rise, not so easy in providing value for that rate increase !

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? . Meeting, hui or event
. 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