

## Comments

### LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	896
Response Date	11/04/21 1:20 PM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	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? 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?

Ecan priorities should be biodiversity, biosecurity, flood defence and habitat protection programmes rather than renewing plans to meet the EFW. \$60m has already been spent by ratepayers on the current plan through to 2035. Ecan need to emphasise this to government so that it is recognised and not dismissed.

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

A rise of 25% is completely unsustainable and irresponsible! No more than a 10% rise should be considered if Ecan focus on the core issues and streamline the proposal to eliminate or reduce the wider areas of concern.

**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?**

Ecan should NOT renew the subregional plans already in place. The \$60m already spent by ratepayers should be recognised by government.

Issues around enviro schools, leading community resilience, youth engagement, climate control, investing for the future and Me Uru Rakau are big areas of spending and should be reduced, dropped or delayed until we see the main focus is achieved.

Core areas such as biosecurity, biodiversity, flood defence, habitat protection/ restoration and Land and water management should be the focus for Ecan in the long term.

**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>	No
--	----

<b>Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development</b>	No
---	----

<b>Regional and Strategic Leadership</b>	No
--	----

<b>Do you have any further comments on the activities proposed in specific portfolio/s (please select all those you wish to comment on):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>. Water and Land</li><li>. Biodiversity and Biosecurity</li><li>. Climate Change and Community Resilience</li><li>. Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development</li><li>. Regional and Strategic Leadership</li></ul>
--	--

**Water and Land portfolio comments:**

Ecan may risk a revolt of ratepayers backing if they ignore the importance of \$60m already spent over the last 10years and dismiss the plan already assigned through to 2035.

**Biodiversity and Biosecurity portfolio comments:**

Biosecurity is obviously an integral area of spending to protect the farming industry. Also some areas of biodiversity such as protecting wetlands and other at risk habitats are very important. However long term costs for maintaining planting projects and protection from exotic weed reinfestation with regard to braided rivers and Me Uru Rakau seem grossly exaggerated. I do agree with the zone committee immediate steps funding.

**Climate Change and Community Resilience portfolio comments:**

I support the river and flood resilience but oppose the climate change and leading community resilience as this is a hugely broad area which could soak up a lot of costs.

**Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:**

Ecan seem to be allowing the environmental effects which comes with urban development yet rural businesses next door in the same catchment area are under a different regime!

As a rural ratepayer who doesn't have a regular need for urban transport, it is unfair for us to have to pay for it proportionately in the rate rise.

**Regional and Strategic Leadership portfolio comments:**

A fairer way to fund regional and strategic leadership programmes such as youth engagement and enviro schools as well as resourcing Runanga should be the responsibility of other Government departments such as ministry of Education and not the job of Ecan.



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

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

There is a disproportionate level of affordability between urban and rural ratepayers. It may be affordable for urban ratepayers due to a large contribution coming from the rural sector. A rise of 8-10% would be more affordable.

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

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

Ecan needs to prove it has an affordable budget plan before it decides to spend ratepayers money with a cart blanche attitude.

**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?**

Uniform Annual General Charges should be higher than proposed in the urban sector seeing as it's easily affordable for them! Our rate rise would see figures of over \$6,500/year compared to \$40/household in Christchurch. I do agree with increasing the use of the UAGC to fund all those projects that benefit people rather than properties.

**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?**

Borrowing just pushes the payments out further and ultimately increases overall costs long term. If it's an unsustainable budget it's unsustainable!

**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?**

Rural ratepayers are bearing the brunt of this extortionate rate rise!

**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 of the Hinds District. I'm assuming that there is direct benefit to them from investing in this project.

**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?** . Word of mouth  
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:** Yes

**Tell us which information you do not want disclosed:**

Name and address.