

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	901
Response Date	11/04/21 1:21 PM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First name	Pubudu
Surname	Senanayake
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?	25-39 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?	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?

As a ratepayer I believe in the reduction of user-pays system in key areas, such as public transport, as well as improved investment in this area. The biggest barriers to uptake of these options in Christchurch and around Canterbury is the poorly planned services, that do not make it easy for commuters et al. I support an even further increase in rates in order to improve these services. I also believe that rates should be far more progressive in terms of property ownership. I.e. The bare minimum is the proposal(s) in option 1. In addition the rates should progressively increase with both the value of the property, but also how many properties one owns.

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

Water and Land	Yes
Biodiversity and Biosecurity	Yes
Climate Change and Community Resilience	Yes
Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development	Yes
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):

☐ Water and Land
☐ Climate Change and Community Resilience

Water and Land portfolio comments:

The proposals (and current actions) around nitrates in the water in and around Canterbury are extremely concerning. There is a large body of emerging evidence suggesting that they are harmful even at relatively low concentrations.

The response to increasing nitrates in the water has so far been to increase the "acceptable limits", rather than actually address the issue directly.

Polluters (who are profiting from the pollution) need to pay directly for the pollution, and in increased capacity. The revenue from this needs to be targetted to nitrate reduction and prevention of future leeching. The acceptable levels in the water need to be set at the levels suggested through the emerging (and established) international research.

ECAN needs to urgently address this, and it should start with strict enforcements, and dealing with infringers of even the current levels. ECAN should also be lobbying central government for action around this. Funding should be set aside for these purposes explicitly within this portfolio.

Climate Change and Community Resilience portfolio comments:

A key determinant of the effectiveness of climate change mitigation is the way we move around. ECAN has a major role to play here in terms of public transport. As mentioned in Q10 public transport needs to both prioritized in its development, and understood as a key level in Canterbury's mitigation response. As such, the current system of pricing, but also quality of service (where quality is assessed among the following dimensions; timeliness, frequency, geographical accessibility, availability through out the day) are key reasons for poor uptake of public transport. The current proposals do not do enough to address this. I acknowledge that is comment relates to both Climate change and the Transport portfolio - however, as with most things they are interconnected.

Additionally, it is a stunning abdication of responsibility, as well as a clear indication of how poorly the challenge and consequences of climate change are understood at ECAN that the Regional and Strategic leadership budget is almost \$10,000,000 greater than the Climate Change and Community resilience budget. This should be addressed immediately.

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable for your household? Option 1 is affordable

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

For most households (as per the examples in consultation document pg 13) this adds less than \$2/week on to the rates.

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable as a whole for the Canterbury community? Yes

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

I believe the proposal in general is affordable to the community, however there are some important details, which will be discussed in the questions below. In addition (as per previous comments) I believe the rates system should be made more progressive (and in some instances aggressive) toward the higher end of property values. In addition the number of properties owned should increase the rates one pays on all the owned properties.

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 reduced to 0, and the shortfall should be made up by increasing the general rates, and in specific instances, targetted rates.

Both general rates, and targetted rates should be made entirely progressive (i.e. not flat rates). In doing this the burden of rates on a poorer household are generally reduces, since a flat rate, as a fraction of total wealth/income disproportionately affects the poorer household more. By making the entirety of the rates system progressive we can ensure that the rates increases are both affordable for the community, and those that can afford it more, and correctly, paying more.

In such a proposal, my rates would go up more, but given my current financial position (as determined by the wealth in my property(s)), I *should* be paying more than others.

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?

The borrowing should be an injection on top of the rates changes proposed to address the urgent matters raised in this submissions, namely:

Reduction/mitigation of nitrates in the water,
Public transport uplift,
Kick starting the climate resilience portfolio.

It should not be used to further subsidize the polluters (e.g. issue of nitrates), nor should it be used to offset progressive rates changes. In addition the sources of borrowing and financial mechanics should be put to the public for consultation directly and specifically.

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 . On-demand public transport services
Other initiative/s (please specify)

Other initiative/s (please specify) Christchurch

The On-demand public transport services should be complementary to (rather than a replacement of) scheduled mainline public transport, and should be used as feeders to the main network to increase uptake.

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?

Thank you to the staff for putting the supporting documentation and information together.

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? . Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter)
Environment Canterbury website
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: Phone number