

## Comments

### LTP 2021-31

<b>Comment ID</b>	829
<b>Response Date</b>	11/04/21 7:31 AM
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

**First name**

**Surname**

**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?** No

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

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

Challenges - dairying on the Canterbury plains and associated pollution, climate change, destruction of native ecosystems, population base that doesn't like what Ecan has done in the last 20 years to the landscape

**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?**

Removed -  
Any work involving flood protection. We are in a climate emergency, we should be retreating. You can't on one hand say you want braided river beds, then on the other hand build stop banks, it doesn't make sense. For example, just before the turn off to Geraldine on SH1 there is a bridge you drive over. In my lifetime there used to be water under the bridge, then the river bed became pasture, then a pivot went in, now you drive over a dairy herd. How did ECan let this land grab occur? Then last year the river amazingly came back and the area flooded. Instead of reverting back to a river bed, diggers flattened the river's path and the irrigator went back up. If ECan actually cared for the environment, local ecosystems, waterways, and climate change, I would still be driving over this river.

I don't think city ratepayers should have to pay for any clean up of rural waterways. ECan by allowing intense dairy on the Canterbury plains has ruined our aquifers, thus why should urban dwellers have to pay twice, once, due to poor water quality in the region that we are now exposed to, and then secondly, pay rates to fund clean ups that they had no role in destroying.

Dairy farmers continue to make money from using water for irrigation and it should be a 'user pays' system and all associated pollution caused from dairy, dairying should pay. Fonterra last quarter made \$250M, up \$72M on last year

(<https://www.interest.co.nz/rural-news/108257/fonterra-rises-its-2020-2021-milk-payout-forecast-mid-point-700kgms-also-says>) so its not like they don't have the money.

Ecan needs to walk the talk. I read with great concern that you are considering allowing a 10 year consent for MHV irrigation

(<https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/124768845/water-scheme-opponents-canterbury-plains-environment-ruined-by-farming>).

If you are even considering ecosystems, the environment, peoples health regarding nitrate levels, then such things should be not permitted.

I think ECan should not borrow monies for activities, why should my future children have to pay off debt for things they didn't cause/do. One should live within their means, and that includes ECan.

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

<b>Water and Land</b>	Unsure
<b>Biodiversity and Biosecurity</b>	Yes
<b>Climate Change and Community Resilience</b>	Unsure
<b>Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development</b>	Unsure
<b>Regional and Strategic Leadership</b>	Unsure

**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

**Water and Land portfolio comments:**

No money spent on floor protection. Rivers need to return to being braided rivers and not boxed in with stop banks. Plus we are in a climate emergency and need to retreat.

User pays system. If you pollute the water, then you pay.

Nitrate levels need to drop, there is an accumulating body of evidence that nitrates in water is bad for ones health. ECan needs to work to drop nitrate pollution.

More monies allocated to enforcement.

**Biodiversity and Biosecurity portfolio comments:**

There needs to be more money allocated towards enforcement. There is no point having rules if no one checks on consents, or prosecutes. I think ECan has been incredibly negligent about prosecuting for past breaches in consents.

More money needs to be allocated to protecting wildlife that live within the Canterbury region. For example, it's saddening to know that the common sea gull (black billed and red billed gulls) are dying. Watching riverbeds full up with weeds, humans narrowing the river beds course which then makes spring flooding worse and wash away their chicks, predators eating any remaining chicks, motorbikes/4WD driving over their colonies etc etc. This is just one example of many ecosystems in

Canterbury under threat, Ecan needs to allocate more monies towards making ecosystems habitable for our unique wildlife.

**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?** Don't know

**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

**Any further comments on the use of borrowing for operating expenditure?**

I don't agree we should borrow. If the current rate payers made the mess, then they should pay for it, not the future generations.

**Do you support the rationale and proposed changes in the draft Fees and Charges Policy?** Don't know

**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**

**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?** No

**Would you like to be kept up-to-date with the outcome of this consultation?** No

**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:** Yes

**Tell us which information you do not want disclosed:** My contact details; name, email, phone etc I do not want disclosed.