

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	769
Response Date	11/04/21 7:30 AM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First name	Richard
Surname	Bourke
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?

I think Ecan should be trying to protect the \$60m that has already been spent on its sub-regional plans rather than committing to spend a further \$30m on re-drafting the plan to meet essential fresh water proposal. Flood control and land and water management, bio-security protection should be main focus.

Which of the proposed options would you like to see us progress with?

Other option (please specify)

a 25% rate rise for rural rate payers is excessive and Ecan should trim its budget and focus core activities and be like the rest of us and live with moderate expenditure expectations.

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 the sub-regional plans by 2024 and demand that the government acknowledge the \$60m already spent developing the existing plans and let them run to their maturity. Some of the expenditure items such as community resilience, investing for the future and enviro-skills, youth engagement, climate change resilience are proposed to take a lot of rate payers money with dubious outcomes. Core priorities should be given to land and water management, flood protection and bio-security, habitat protection and rehabilitation.

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 think re-doing our plans to align with the EFW says that Ecan's existing work from the last ten years is not suitable but given the money invested and huge progress made Ecan should try to protect what they have done and the money already spent.

Biodiversity and Biosecurity portfolio comments:

Support biosecurity and biodiversity, think the wet land restoration and at risk habitat protection are worthy causes. Support zone committee funding proposals think the braided river projects are good in theory but long term maintenance costs to maintain the plantings and control exotic species may prove very difficult.

Climate Change and Community Resilience portfolio comments:

In favour of continuing to create flood and river resilience but see very little value in leading community and climate change resilience as they have ill defined outcomes.

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:

Support urban transport being funded by targeted rates in areas of use but strongly object to rural rate payers being expected to contribute as they are of no benefit to us. Disappointed to see that urban development into rural areas is allowed with out any regard to any environmental outcomes, especially run off water which ultimately ends up in Lake Ellesmere. Urban sprawl does not give the best outcome when trying to reduce GHG emissions, Ecan should be trying to encourage in-fill housing.

Regional and Strategic Leadership portfolio comments:

A lot of money is proposed on expenditure that does not come under Ecans brief. Educating youth and resourcing runanga on EFW should be for central government to fund.

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

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

The chair of Ecan is on record as saying the rate rise is affordable for the urban rate payers. This is certainly NOT the case for the rural rate payers who are already paying increasing costs for compliance and monitoring of their farming practices

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 be creating a budget that delivers value and outcomes from its expenditure not just a lot of expensive dreams. Also remembering the large amounts of money already extracted from hard working rural communities over the years, \$60m walked away from is sickening. Central government has a responsibility to assist.

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?

UAGC should be increased to \$100 at least so this would then spread the cost to the beneficiaries of a lot of the long term plan proposals.

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 can't afford it borrowing for it does not make it any cheaper, re-do your budget and tell David Parker to give us at least \$60m in compensation for money spent.

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?

In principal yes but one would expect charges to be accurate, fair and only encompass the actual costs involved. If Ecan makes a mistake the should pay not the consent holder. For example if consent conditions are misread and an apology is issued the consent holder should not have to pay for issuing the apology.

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

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

We acknowledge that this is of benefit to us and are prepared to pay our share.

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? . Other (please specify)

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