

From:
To:
Subject: LTP submission on behalf of the Waihao-Wainono Combined Rating District - Signed Submission
Date: Friday, 16 April 2021 2:49:10 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[20210409 SUB Waihao Wainono Committee LTP 2021 35.pdf](#)

Please note our earlier submission today was not signed. **Attached** here is the signed submission.

On behalf of the Waihao-Wainono Combined Rating District, please find **attached** for lodgement the Committee's submission on the proposed Long-Term Plan 2021-2035.

I can confirm that the Committee would like to attend.

Contact details for the Committee are included in the submission, and below.

Kind regards,

Kelley O'Malley

Personal Assistant to Gary Rooney

Rooney Group Ltd



**SUBMISSION
OF THE
WAIHAO-WAINONO COMBINED RATING DISTRICT**



**ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY PROPOSED LONG-TERM PLAN
2021 – 2035**

ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY PROPOSED LONG-TERM PLAN

2021 – 2035

NAME:	POSITION:
Gary Rooney	Chairperson
Alan Gibson	Member
Jack Fox	Member
Peter Hughes	Member
Andrew Rolleston	Member
Roger Small	Member

Address: C/- Kelley O'Malley
Rooney Group Limited

Phone:
Email:

Gary Rooney
Chairman on behalf of the Waihao/Wainono Combined Rating District Committee

Date: 16 April 2021

I **confirm** that the Committee was elected on 9 April 2021 to represent our rating district in accordance with the rules of the Local Electoral Act 2001, that on 9 April 2021 I was duly elected by the Committee as Chairman and authorised to lodge this submission on behalf of the Committee.

We **wish** to discuss our submission in person.

We **do not** wish our contact details to be made public.

Submissions:	Decisions Sought:
<p>1. 2021-31 Financial Strategy Part B, Significant Impacts, Ability to maintain existing levels of service to meet additional demands. <i>Waihao-Wainono:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Stopbank realignment near old Bradshaws Bridge site</i> • <i>Within the next 10-15 years extend the box at landward end</i> • <i>Part replacement of the box</i> <p>See Tables 8.1 and 8.2 for proposed expenditure.</p> <p>The Committee, and the Community, have not been provided with infrastructure assessment information, or financial projections, that would constitute consultation, or a level of information that should be prudently provided while consulting on proposed expenditure totalling \$850,000 in the next 10 years and \$13.8M in the next 11-30 years.</p> <p>It is submitted that, in the absence of the necessary information, that the proposed work programs are unjustified and unnecessary.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the proposed works are removed from the draft LTP. 2. That the information available to support the proposed works and expenditure is insufficient for ECan's statutory obligations to be discharged. 3. That the necessary investigations are carried out in the next financial year to better determine the future needs and requirements of this catchment. 4. That the Committee is engaged with over the next financial year to determine what levels of service are acceptable to the community it represents.
<p>2. Detailed rates Information</p> <p>The Committee is of the view that ECan has not provided adequate details to support a >16% increase in rates for all ratepayers contributing to this rating district.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the proposed >16% increase to the Targeted Differential Catchment Works Rate: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is unjustified. b. Requires further work to be undertaken to produce the necessary level of information to the community to justify the proposed significant increase.
<p>3. Proposed Annual Spend</p> <p>The Committee was appalled to learn that ECan proposes to spend \$20,000 more than the total annual rate take this financial year in the absence of consultation with the Community, the Committee and prudent financial planning based on sound infrastructure management, planning and review.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the proposed 2021/22 work program for this rating district be put on-hold until ECan has undertaken the necessary work to prepare and justify its proposals. 2. That the proposed 2021/22 work program does not go ahead unless a democratic process at the next Committee meeting is followed and is in favour of progressing the same.

The Committee submits that it is satisfied with the current level of service and does not support the proposed 2021/22 work program.

The Committee submits that ECan will not be discharging its obligations and responsibilities to ratepayers if it continues with this work program without first justifying it to the Committee in a prudent and professional manner and assessing the Committee's feedback in accordance with its obligations.