

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	1157
Response Date	13/04/21 6:39 AM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.2
Files	
First name	Richard
Surname	Stalker
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?

From:
To:
Subject: LTP Submission
Date: Saturday, 10 April 2021 6:55:59 am

Dear Ecan

I am writing to oppose your planned rates increase. I do not consider your proposed average rate rise of 24.5% is acceptable, nor the alternate option as proposed. We must practice financial restraint and prudence, rather than publish a wish list and expect ratepayers to fund it in its entirety.

I propose that the council undertake a review of the activities it wishes to fund and prioritise. This is a 10year plan. Spread the programmes. Where is the capacity(employees) that would be required to do \$46m extra work coming from? Is this plan even realistic?

The percentage of funds collected by a flat fee, the UAG, is very low compared to my local council and utilising the LGA limit of 30% seems a far fairer mechanism to fund public good works. As a landowner I am already investing substantial amounts in native plantings and protecting biodiversity.

Borrowing to reduce the immediate impost hides the real cost of your year 1 aspirations. I do not support borrowing if it is to pay for everyday expenses.

Regards

Richard Stalker