

Feedback form

Puka urupare



Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) is the regional council for Waitaha the Canterbury region. We are taking action together to shape a thriving and resilient Canterbury, now and for future generations.

Our Long-Term Plan sets out the activities, priorities and work programmes we propose to deliver over a 10-year period. It also outlines the costs and how they could be funded.

Please review the Consultation Document and Supplementary Information at haveyoursay.ecan.govt.nz/LTP for more details.

OFFICE USE ONLY

COMM/PLAN/2131/3

Consultation closes Sunday 11 April 2021.

Ways to submit this form:

By mail (no stamp required): LTP submission, Freepost 1201, Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140

By email: mailroom@ecan.govt.nz subject line: LTP submission

Online: You can fill out an online version of this form at haveyoursay.ecan.govt.nz/LTP

Tell us what you think

By making a submission you agree that Environment Canterbury may use and publish that feedback, including your name and contact details. If you do not wish for your personal details to be made public, please indicate this in your submission.

Your information is held and administered by Environment Canterbury in accordance with the Privacy Act 2020 and Environment Canterbury's Privacy Policy.

Tell us about you

Name Diana Mackenzie

Address _____

Postcode _____

Phone number _____ Mobile number _____

Email _____

Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?

☐ Yes, I'm submitting on behalf of an organisation

☒ No, I'm submitting as an individual

Which organisation are you submitting on behalf of?

The following questions are optional, but will help us make better decisions and ensure we're hearing from people across the region.

Which age category are you in?

☐ 0–14 ☐ 15–24 ☐ 25–39 ☒ 40–64 ☐ 65+

Do you think we've prioritised the right issues and opportunities?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No
☐ Don't know

Any further comments?

not in this LTP. priorities for Ecan should be flood control, land and water resource management, biosecurity and biodiversity protection.

priority seems to have been given to renewing plans to conform to the EFW. that process replaces our subregional plans we as ratepayers have already spent \$60m on.
Ecan should be demanding of central government that they recognise the plans we already have in place and the investment we have in those plans

Which of the proposed options would you like to see us progress with?

- ☐ Option 1: statutory work, prior commitments and accelerating key initiatives
☐ Option 2: statutory work and prior commitments
☒ Other option (please specify)

the rate rise should be limited to no more than 10%. the programmes should be reduced to fit into a responsible budget.

25% rate rise is irresponsible and programmes should be rescheduled or dropped and Ecan should focus on its core activities

our own rate rise is closer to a 90% increase. that must reflect a council that is incompetent and out of touch with the people that they should be representing.

Tell us what you would like to keep in the plan, what you think should be removed, and anything that you think we have missed?

remove renewing subregional plans by 2024 and demand of government that they recognise the \$60m we as ratepayers have already spent in developing plans.

expenditure items such as leading community resilience, investing for the future, enviro schools, youth engagement, climate change resilience and me uru rakau involve spending a lot of

rate payers money with no tangible outcomes.. all these projects should be scaled back or dropped. there seems to be a lot of money being spent on projects that dont do anything.

priority should be given to land and water, flood protection , biosecurity and priority habitat protection and restoration

Do you generally support the activities proposed in the following portfolios:

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water and Land | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity and Biosecurity | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change and Community Resilience | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional and Strategic Leadership | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure |

Water and Land portfolio comments:

don't support having to redo all our plans to align with the EFW. it suggests that Ecan has no confidence in all the work it has done for the last 10 years.

Ecan owes it to its ratepayers to look after our investment in our existing plans until they run out (PC2 in 2035). Ecan risks losing the support of the rural community if it shows a reckless

regard for ratepayers past investment. . we put a huge investment into those plans in time and money.

Biodiversity and Biosecurity comments:

support biosecurity and parts of the biodiversity plan such as wetland restoration and other at risk habitat protection. support the ZC immediate steps funding. concerned that the braided

river and me uru rakau projects are ill conceived in terms of the long term costs of maintaining planting projects and protecting against exotic weed reinfestation

me uru rakau could be delayed a couple of years to ease the rate burden in the first 2 years of this plan.. I note that the EFW puts wetland restoration at risk and Ecan should be pushing back on some of the new rules

Climate Change and Community Resilience comments:

support leading flood and river resilience.. oppose leading community and climate change resilience..they sound like expensive talk fests.

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development comments:

i note and support that urban transport is for the most part funded by targeted rates paid for by those who can access public transport and as a rural ratepayer with no access to it i would object strongly should we be made to contribute.

I note that Ecan is allowing urban sprawl into rural areas around Rolleston, Lincoln, Kirwee and Halswell with no regard for environmental outcomes especially the resultant pollution that will inevitably make its way into Te Waihora.

I also note that this urban sprawl is against the recommendations of Rod Carr's climate change report, and that the basis of your urban development and public transport policy is to

reduce green house gas emissions...you appear to be failing miserably at that

Regional and Strategic Leadership comments:

A lot of money is being proposed to be spent on projects that shouldn't be the priority or responsibility of Ecan. youth engagement and enviro schools should be responsibility of the MoE.

as a school teacher I can tell you that the ministry of education should be funding this.

resourcing runanga so that they can advise on the EFW should be government responsibility not ratepayers.

Affordability/how we're proposing to pay for these activities

Tell us your view on the affordability of the proposed increase in total rates revenue (under Option 1 or Option 2). Please check our rates calculator ratescalculator.ecan.govt.nz as the increase will be different for different ratepayers, depending on your property and land value and location.

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable for your household?

- ☐ Option 1 is affordable
☐ Option 2 is affordable
☒ Neither option is affordable

Any further comments on affordability?

I note the Chair of Ecan is saying these 2 proposals are easily affordable for urban ratepayers because most of the burden falls on rural ratepayers.

our rate rise is likely to be over \$15k/year. that is not affordable especially when we have the extra costs of paying large amounts of extra money for fees and charges on top of all the

costs of complying with and investing in good management practises to ensure compliance with all the new rules. these rate rises are not coming in isolation and impact heavily on rural communities.

my sons who run the farm will likely have to stop spending money on riparian planting and biodiversity protection to fund this rate rise

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable as a whole for the Canterbury community?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No
☐ Don't know

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

Ecan should reduce its ambition to spend our money until it can produce an affordable budget that reflects a financially responsible governance approach

no sign of that in this plan

Do you support the changes we're proposing to how we apply Uniform Annual General Charges?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No
☐ Don't know

Any further comments on how we apply Uniform Annual General Charges?

judging by Ecan's Chairs comments more of the costs of running Ecan should fall on the people of Chch as she says they can afford it. Support increasing the use of the UAGC to fund all those projects that benefit people as opposed to property. the UAGC should be at least \$100/household. this would better reflect where the benefits of many of Ecan's programmes accrue.

Borrowing

Borrowing can be used to spread the burden of a high-cost activity over several years. We usually consider it appropriate to spread the cost of an activity because the benefit of the activity lasts the same time or longer than the repayment period. With a potential 10-year loan period, repayments would have some impact on rates for 13 years.

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

- ☐ Yes
☒ No
☐ Don't know

Any further comments on borrowing for operating expenditure to offset some of the first year rates?

if the rate rise is unaffordably large spend less money. borrowing doesn't save money just delays and increases the costs.

Fees and Charges

Our Fees and Charges Policy sets out how much users will pay for activities like consents, compliance and monitoring, harbourmaster and navigation safety, and holding events in regional parks and forests.

Do you support the rationale and proposed changes in the draft Fees and Charges Policy?

- ☒ Yes
☒ No
☐ Don't know

Any further comments on the draft Fees and Charges Policy?

these changes will cost rural rate payers considerably more. whereas I support the changes in principal, if they are accompanied by huge and excessive rate rises as proposed then I oppose these changes as they end up costing farmers and businesses twice.

Local projects and new initiatives

We’re also seeking feedback on whether we should continue investing in some of our existing projects that are funded by targeted rates or try these new initiatives in other districts. New projects will not commence until 2024.

Should we continue investing in MyWay by Metro, Timaru’s on-demand public transport service, after the trial period is completed?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Don’t know

Any further comments?

this is up to the people of Timaru to decide

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 to the local Hinds Plains community between the Ashburton and Rangitata Rivers. Do you want to see this project continue?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don’t know

Any further comments?

this should be up to the people of the Hinds Plains to decide. we recognise it will be very expensive but would rather spend money on projects that will deliver positive outcomes

like this MAR project than many of the other projects that Ecan is proposing

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? (please select all those that apply)

- ☐ On-demand public transport services
- ☒ Using aquifer recharge to manage freshwater quality
- ☒ Other initiative/s (please specify)

support investing in sensible catchment interventions such as water storage and water recycling infrastructure especially if they can help with the challenges of climate change.

Supporting documents

Please attach any documents to support your submission.



Public hearings

If you would like to speak to your submission at a hearing with Environment Canterbury's Council let us know. We will be in touch to arrange once submissions have closed. Hearings will be held on 27, 28 April and 4 May 2021.

Do you wish to speak to your submission?

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

There is personal information/contact details in my submission I do not want disclosed

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Tell us which information you do not want disclosed:

Where did you hear about the consultation?

- ☒ Meeting, hui or event ☐ Environment Canterbury website ☐ Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter) ☐ Radio
☐ Postcard ☒ Newspaper ☐ Email ☒ Word of mouth ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Any further comments?

Thank you

Thank you for taking the time to make a submission on the draft Long-Term Plan 2021-31.