

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	1043
Response Date	12/04/21 4:59 AM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First name	darryl
Surname	oldham
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

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

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

Getting the new fresh water policies right. I think they been rushed into by Ecan and a few entities are going to suffer with no real gain. Too many Councillors with their own agendas rather than the over all good of the community. This been set out to take a generation (20 - 40 years) but being rushed with no cost to the economy being taken into consideration. I feel Ecan was on the right track prior to all the new rules and should defend their work and costs already carried out. Why should the Government force more cost onto people.

Which of the proposed options would you like to see us progress with? Option 2: statutory work and prior commitments

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	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:

Water use consenting is a shambles has been since first consent granted. Need to be brought into the future. No longer first in first served should apply.

Everyone should be on same playing field. Apparently Ecan doesn't even know what the water use is for particular areas are, which I find absurd as farmers have spent 10 of thousands of dollars putting meters in so Ecan could know what is being used there needs to be more honesty round this. The current attitude of Ecans towards water consenting is appalling and commissioners should be re instated or an independent body.

Farmers are being blamed for high nitrates in water but has there been any work on what all the new lifestyle blocks that are now within Canterbury and a lot above Christchurch, which all have their own septic tank systems which pump into the ground has done for nitrate levels.

Climate Change and Community Resilience portfolio comments:

I think there is some real bull shit flung round on this topic. I'm not denying the climate is not changing. Probably always has and always will but until some of the current councilors actually take stock of the real reason in my opinion of too many people and burn less fossil fuels and stop blaming farmers and their livestock there will be no real gains. The wrong messages are being shoved down young people throats by certain organisations to fund their own needs.

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

Any further comments on affordability for your household?

Personally I think rural property owners have been hit with enough unnecessary extra cost that don't add any real value to the bottom lines no matter what some politicians and local government departments unrealistic ideas dream up. We have spent over \$30000.00 on consultation fees in the past 12 months alone how are we suppose to fund new riparian planting, fencing etc that now needs doing

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

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

If they are shared more equally over the whole area rather than just being lumped onto farmers it would be more affordable.

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?

which includes the environment schools program might be considered a function for the Ministry of

education rather than ECan.

Similarly, some of the proposed expenditure on climate change should be scrutinized as much of this budget has come from political posturing rather than a coherent program of doing stuff.

Where possible rates should be raised from those who benefit from the services derived from those rates. Flood protection is an example where those at risk from being flooded pay river rates according to the risk and the value of property that is protected. UAGC's should be used where the activity is of

benefit to people rather than property. Leadership, youth engagement, parks and recreation, and much of the biodiversity budget are examples where benefits do not accrue to property owners but to the general population.

ECan has one of the lowest UAGC's of all regional councils. In this LTP it is proposed to go from \$25 to \$45 per rating unit. When I went through the various projects that should be funded by a UAGC it came to about \$160 per rating unit. The lower the UAGC the more rates are loaded onto more valuable properties. A \$10m farm will be paying about \$2000 extra a year while a house in Christchurch is likely to be paying only another \$100/year.

A \$60 UAGC increases that rate rise in Christchurch to \$120 but lowers the \$10m farm rate rise to less than \$1000.

It can be argued that larger landowners and businesses are already picking up additional charges around consent costs and monitoring now that the council has moved to full cost recovery on all those activities. Large landowners in general also pay a high proportion of the targeted rates levied for such things as flood protection. Continuously loading costs onto these rate payers because they have higher

capital values especially for benefits that accrue to the general population I consider to be unfair.

Would you support the use of borrowing for operating expenditure to offset some of the first year rates?

Don't know

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?

If going to start charging for everything then your staff need to be fair and reasonable with more knowledgeable especially in different types of farming. We also getting hit twice when using consultants and their fees and then Ecan fees.

Ecan has also making it unnecessarily hard to obtain or renew some consents for stupid picky reasons.

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

If is working then should be carried on with.

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?

I think some councilors and Ecan staff need to open their eyes and mind and be more realistic in their veiws.

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? . 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