

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	855
Response Date	11/04/21 8:52 AM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First name	Vic
Surname	Allen
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
Which suburb or area do you live in?	
Do you think we've prioritised the right issues and opportunities?	Yes
Which of the proposed options would you like to see us progress with?	Other option (please specify)

Cut back expenditure to bring rates rises down to 5% each year over the 10 yr period.

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

Water and Land	Yes
Biodiversity and Biosecurity	No
Climate Change and Community Resilience	No
Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development	No

Regional and Strategic Leadership Yes

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

- . Biodiversity and Biosecurity
- . Climate Change and Community Resilience
- . Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development

Biodiversity and Biosecurity portfolio comments:

Is lower priority than other portfolios. Reduce cost to ratepayers.

Climate Change and Community Resilience portfolio comments:

Climate change actions are necessary, but not as urgent as other portfolios at this stage. Leave the heavy lifting to the Govt. The extra costs of electric buses and other vehicles is a waste of money at this time - better to wait until prices come down and Govt subsidy available.

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:

Too much being spent on public transport. It's a worthwhile programme but need to reduce the cost to ratepayers.

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

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

Chch city residential rates increase of 18% option 1 or 12% for option 2 is unacceptable. It should be no more than 5%.
A weekly increase of \$2 per week per property sounds low, but anything can be made to seem low if split into very small increments. Reducing each portfolio by 7% to get the rates down to an acceptable level also seems a relatively minor adjustment.

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

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

The option of borrowing for operational expenditure should definitely be used to help spread out the front-loaded rates budget over the 10 years.

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

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?

A way must be found to spread the rates burden over the full 10 years. Borrowing is one method. Also need others.
I do not accept the need for such a high front- loaded rates burden. If a certain activity is to be given priority, than other activities must be prioritised down to compensate. Or efficiency cost savings must be found somewhere.

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

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

Any further comments?

If Ecan proceeds with 20-24% rates increases in year 1 it risks being perceived as an inefficient unprofessional organisation where fiscal responsibility means nothing.
The proposed front loading of the 10 year rates burden indicates a lack of capability in financial planning.

Overall the draft LTP seems like a wish- list which has yet to go through a proper review process. Furthermore, the document released for submission does not include comparison of current year expenditure with proposed year 1 on a comparable portfolio basis. Hence submitters cannot consider the relative merits of the programmes which are to be given increased or decreased support.

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? . Newspaper

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