

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	983
Response Date	11/04/21 7:37 PM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First name	David
Surname	Clark
Email address	

Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation? Yes, I'm submitting on behalf of an organisation

Which organisation are you submitting on behalf of? Valetta Farms Ltd & Valetta Holdings Ltd

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

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

Environment Canterbury appear to have not adequately defended the CLWRP which cost our community \$60m to develop. The Essential Freshwater Legislation now requires an additional \$40m be spent in developing a new plan which will arguably provide no additional benefit to the environment over the course of this LTP.

ECan should have ensured that central government recognized the intent of the CLWRP.

ECan's primary role is Flood Control, Land and Resource Management, Biosecurity and Biodiversity Protection and the Regional Council must stay within these core functions.

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

Rate Rises should be kept to the rate of inflation.

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?

Demand that central government respect the CLWRP and allow time for the targets in that plan to deliver environmental outcomes.

It is the role of the elected Councillors to manage the organisation within its means. In this LTP they have failed to do so.

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

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

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

Water and Land portfolio comments:

I do not support the re-writing of the CLWRP.

It is nothing more than political posturing by a Government and Council who cannot accept the good work that was done by the Commissioners and the huge amount of time and good will invested in the process by our communities in setting environmental goals and limits that are achievable.

Re-writing the Regional Plan will result in limits and restrictions that are simply unachievable and will lose support and co-operation from our rural communities.

The CLWRP should run until the existing plan expires.

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

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

The rate increase impost is over \$6,000 for our arable and sheep farming property, a 50% rise.

We are not able to pass that cost on and will simply have to divert expenditure away from other parts of our business. Most likely we will re-prioritise money that would have been spent on actual environmental projects to paying the additional cost from Environment Canterbury.

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

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

The rate increase is grossly unfair in its weighting to rural communities.

Comments from the Chair that it is only a cup of coffee a week are offensive to families such as ourselves faced with a rate rise in excess of \$6,000.

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?

The UAGC is grossly under utilised in Canterbury and should be used to fund all of the social and people orientated ECan projects.

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?

Any business that borrows money to pay for operation expenses is being very poorly managed and is likely to fail financially. Unfortunately Regional Councils and their governance are protected from such commercial realities.

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?

You can't have it both ways, it is not equitable to increase user pays and then also impose a rates increase of 24%.

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

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

The MAR project is delivering real environmental gains and should be encouraged and celebrated. The project is also providing a good deal of research learning into the way in which aquifers can be supplemented. Decisions on the future of the MAR project and it's funding should be up to the Hinds Zone community to decide. I would much rather see this continue and some of the other projects ECan is proposing be delayed.

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?

The leadership of the Canterbury Regional Council have put their hand out to the community and demanded a 24.5% rate rise on average, which in many cases impacted individual ratepayers to a much higher degree. No commercial business dependent on the support of customers could display contempt and survive. So as organisations such as a Regional Council set the tone of leadership in our society, lets just consider the impact on our society and the whole NZ economy if every business behaved in the same manner as this Regional Council and increased prices for the 2021-22 year by 24.5%. Inflation would be rampant, interest rates would increase significantly and the NZ economy would collapse. Now for each of you who sit around this Council Table, explain to us all why you think the Canterbury Regional Council has the right to impose cost rises that if implemented across society would collapse the NZ economy. It is time for the Canterbury Regional Council to learn to live within it's means like the rest of us are required to do.

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)
- . Word of mouth
- . Newspaper
- . Email

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