

## Comments

### LTP 2021-31

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Comment ID</b>   | 838  |
| <b>Response Date</b>  | 11/04/21 7:31 AM   |
| <b>Status</b>   | Submitted  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>  | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>  | 0.1  |
| <b>First name</b>   | Thomas   |
| <b>Surname</b>  | Rose   |
| <b>Email address</b>  |  |
| <b>Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?</b>   | No, I'm submitting as an individual  |
| <b>Are you willing to tell us more about yourself?</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>Which age category are you in?</b>   | 40-64 years old  |
| <b>Which suburb or area do you live in?</b>   |  |
| <b>Do you think we've prioritised the right issues and opportunities?</b>   | Yes  |
| <b>Which of the proposed options would you like to see us progress with?</b>  | Option 1: statutory work, prior commitments and accelerating key initiatives |
| <b>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?</b>  |  |
| <p>I would like to keep the majority of the Option 1 plan, with the following small changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* I would prefer for the costs to be more progressively applied, by which I mean no increase in the UAGC but instead a larger increase in the General Rate. This avoids burdening lower income households with the same cost increases as better off households. A cost of a couple of dollars per week is much more significant to some than to others.</li> <li>* I would like to see a way to manage public transport costs for individual households. At present if a typical household of 3-5 people wishes to use the bus to get to school / work, it can cost in the region of \$15-\$20 per say which is high enough that it incentivises use of private vehicles. I would like to see</li> </ul> |  |

something like a "household cap" of say \$10 per day which would remain lower than the petrol costs of a typical commute and school run.

**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>      | Yes |
| <b>Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development</b> | Yes |
| <b>Regional and Strategic Leadership</b>            | Yes |

**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?**      Option 1 is affordable

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

The affordability is fine for my household.

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

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

As mentioned before I think that higher income households ought to bear a larger fraction of the costs than lower income households, by eliminating the increase to the UAGC and instead adding more onto the General Rate. I believe the proposed increase is affordable to Canterbury but would prefer to see it applied more progressively.

**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?**

I don't mind the changes to the mix, but would prefer the total cost to remain lower with more progressive application of General Rates to higher income properties.

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

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

Interest rates are currently very low, and making the cost increases more even across the ten year plan by borrowing in the early years would make sense to me.

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

**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**

On-demand public transport services  
Using aquifer recharge to manage freshwater quality

**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?**

Meeting, hui or event

*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