

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	1024
Response Date	12/04/21 4:59 AM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First name	John
Surname	OConnell
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?

We as rate payers have spent approximately \$60 million on sub regional plans it seems a waste to renew plans to conform with the EFP, surely ECAN can demand Central government recognise and work with the plans in place

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

The 25% rise is too excessive, the programs should be prioritized to keep the increase to a more sustainable level of less than 10%

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?

I would like to see priority given to activities that will have a real and measurable benefit to the environment especially land and water, flood protection, biosecurity other projects that dont have such tangible outcomes should be scaled back.

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):

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

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

When I see the graphs showing small increases to an urban dwelling of \$50-\$80 and a Rural property worth \$5 million will be charged an additional \$600-\$735 I was fairly relaxed but when I typed our rural property address into rate increase calculator it appears we would be up for an extra \$3526 under option 1 and \$3168 under option 2. The calculator tool is in place to help us a rate payers understand what impact these increases will have on us as individuals, but is indicating a huge difference from the example on the colorful pies charts on your website.

This is unacceptable and misleading particularly to rural rate payers such as ourselves who are currently paying many fees and charges towards local government compliance, consultancy fees to meet compliance and investing capital on farm to ensure best management practices are met.

While we are experiencing strong commodity values and hence high on farm product prices at present, this may not last and there is every chance in the future the current low interest rates will increase, these factors combined with a multitude of increasing costs for no productivity gain will put pressure on future profitability and therefore sustainability.

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

Do you support the changes we're proposing to how we apply Uniform Annual General Charges? Don't know

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 for operational expenditure is not sustainable, I would suggest a smaller rate rise prioritize the spending areas and spend less

Do you support the rationale and proposed changes in the draft Fees and Charges Policy? Don't know

Any further comments on the Fees and Charges Policy?

While I support the changes in the fees and Charges policy I don't support it in conjunction with large rate rises and also increased costs we have on farm due to compliance which are not allowed for in fees and charges, this is a double up of costs to rural rate payers

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 while it is expensive is already starting to show beneficial results that will potentially increase water quality standards in our area, it ultimately should be up to the people of the hinds catchment to decide I would like to see it continue

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

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