

## Comments

### LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	1140
Response Date	12/04/21 5:38 PM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.2
Files	
First name	Rosalie
Surname	Albrett
Email address	
Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?	No, I'm submitting as an individual
Which age category are you in?	-
Do you have any further comments on the activities proposed in specific portfolio/s (please select all those you wish to comment on):	
Where do you live in Canterbury? Select your district below:	-
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**

**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

**How did you find out about giving feedback?**

*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

**From:**  
**To:**  
**Subject:** LTP submission R. Albrett  
**Date:** Sunday, 11 April 2021 2:21:13 pm  
**Attachments:** [LTP submission R.J. Albrett.pdf](#)

---

To Ecan,  
LTP submission attached.  
R. Albrett

**To: Environment Canterbury Regional Council Long Term Plan 2021-31**

Submitter: Rosalie Albrett

Address:

Date: 11 April 2021

To the Hearing Committee.

Thankyou for the opportunity to provide feedback on the LTP. I am submitting as an individual in the 65yrs plus category.

I support increased rates funding for the following issues that are of the utmost concern:

**Access to clean drinking water.**

ECan has the responsibility for water in the province. Clean drinking water is a fundamental right. A recent NZ study has found that 800,000 New Zealanders are exposed to nitrate levels that put them at risk of colorectal cancer. This is one in six kiwis at risk. The Danish study found a significant risk at 0.87mg/L and a 15% increased risk at 2.5mg/L. The current standard in NZ is 10 times higher (11.3mg/L) and needs to be reduced, urgently.

Nitrate levels will continue to increase because of the time lag. Meanwhile alternative clean drinking water sources should be provided to people whose levels currently exceed the safer limit of 1mg/L, both in community drinking water supplies and individual wells across Canterbury. This should be done now, before the problem worsens and exposes even more people to the risk of nitrate contamination.

The Essential Freshwater reforms will go some way to improving freshwater and these reforms should be adopted by the Council. Plans, objectives, policies and rules for Canterbury should be changed to align with the Government reforms.

**Biodiversity crisis**

I support the Council strategy to revitalise biodiversity in Canterbury, but the timeline appears far too slow: years 1-4 to establish stakeholder groups and commence biodiversity revitalisation, years 4-10 to implement revitalised strategy. The need to protect biodiversity is urgent before more habitat is destroyed. Native biodiversity has been obliterated in the lower catchments in Canterbury, protection of high-country biodiversity is now urgent.

I support the Council's work on animal and plant pest control. I support increased funding to control wallabys, Southern Black-back gulls (SBBG), Canada geese feral cats, wilding pines and Russell lupin eradication.

The Council is to be commended for commissioning the SBBG Strategy, now resources should be provided to reduce the burgeoning numbers in our major braided riverbeds.



Canada geese numbers are out of control across Canterbury. Feral cats are also an increasing problem especially in the back country and in braided riverbeds.

The Pest Management Strategy should be reviewed to upgrade Russell lupins as a serious pest species and include the control of feral cats.

I support funding for planting natives for forests, and to buffer landscapes, and provide habitat for native species. There are some areas stripped of native plants. The Canterbury plains could look so much better with bare fence lines planted with natives. This should be a requirement of all dairy consent conditions.

### **Managed Aquifer Recharge**

Funds for MAR projects should be diverted to control runoff from animal effluent and synthetic fertilisers at source, and not at the receiving end of the pollution eg reduce dairy cow numbers, cap fertiliser inputs. Fence animals from lakes, rivers, streams, and tributaries to reduce sediment/nutrient runoff. Do not use MAR projects as a model to roll out across Canterbury.

### **Uniform Annual Charge**

I oppose flat rates such as the UAC. The activities proposed to be covered by the UAC should be included in the general rate. This is much fairer and equitable.

### **Zone Committees**

Funding for zone committees should be phased out. The collaboration ECan is planning for the next 10 years will not work via a structure that lost public support some time ago. Consider a fresh approach that provides for urgent action to address the public health and biodiversity issues facing Cantabrians.

### **Public participation**

I support more open and transparent processes which involve the public and provides for community knowledge when making decisions. I oppose the non-notified consents granted by ECan where the applications are of strong public interest and likely to adversely affect the public. The MHV application is such a case where the **current** consent has caused more than minor environmental damage, and where the application is unlikely to meet freshwater targets, therefore the renewal should go to a hearing.

### **Climate Change**

In conclusion I support funding for climate change effects including coastal erosion, leakage of contaminants, sedimentation by flooding events and fires from increasing droughts. We need to be prepared for what is to come.

I do not wish to speak this submission.

