

From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Thursday, 17 March 2022 4:19 pm
To: Have your Say
Subject: Submission on draft Annual Plan 2022/23

Anonymous User just submitted 'Draft Annual Plan 2022/23 submission' with the responses below.

First name

Last name

Email address

Phone number

Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?

No, I'm submitting as an individual

Which age category are you in?

65+ years old

Do you wish to speak to your submission at a Council hearing?

No

Which bus fare structure option would you like to see trialled?

Option 2: \$2 flat fare for adults and \$1.20 for children across bus zones 1, 2 and 3

Tell us more about why you support the selected bus fare option.

Right now people are staying away from Christchurch CBD and Retail Malls due to avoiding exposure to Omicron so the most expensive trial is unwarranted in my opinion.

Is borrowing and repaying through general rates the right approach for this regionally significant event?

Yes

How do you think recovery from flooding of this scale – events that impact state highways, bridges, rail and power for example – should be funded in the future?

Similarly by borrowing after seeking Central Government support and payment first - so that the costs can be spread forward for all peoples to contribute to as beneficiaries of this work.

Which option for distribution of rates in Ashburton River rating district do you support?

Option 1 (preferred): Redistribute rates in the Ashburton River rating district.

Any other comments on flood protection in Ashburton?

Hopefully "Redistribution" amongst those benefiting aligns with a "User Pays" approach.

Would you support a levy to accelerate action in response to climate change?

No

Any other comments on future funding for responding to climate change?

Climate change is not a universally agreed phenomenon and so future funding can be tailored to best suit the current science of the future.

Any other comments on Environment Canterbury's draft Annual Plan or other matters?

I agree with the two members - Claire McKay and Megan Hands - who wisely expressed concern at the size of the proposed 24.1 percent increase. Cost of living concerns are very topical at present and Rate Payers do not need to be burdened unnecessarily with forward funding for perceived ECAN projects and responsibilities. I refer you to my Submission on this area 11/03/2021.

Upload any supporting documents (if applicable)

https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/2f5208549f6b62084a6646edb29a899679b7550a/original/1647487127/f324a766471c8d0e8585b00072084d6e_ECAN_LTP_Submission.docx?1647487127

Where did you hear about the consultation?

Print ad or billboard

To: mailroom@ecan.govt.nz

Subject: LTP SUBMISSION 11/03/2021

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Environment Canterbury's 10-year plan Te Pae Tawhiti 2021-31

I have read online through the ECAN LTP and make the following submission:

There is a great deal of narrative and financial information which obviously is significant and important BUT for the average Rate Payer is particularly daunting and not easily comprehended. Therefore I wish to comment only on the financing approach of ECAN to its LTP.

ECAN is endeavouring to cover most of its first year costs from a huge Rates increase (under either Option) in the first year – even though the benefits extend way into the future – the “Inter-generational” benefits mentioned briefly.

Surely with Interest Rates historically low a better approach would be to greatly borrow most of the required funds which are then serviced and repaid over a longer term so that all generations that benefit from the LTP pay their fair share.

ECAN mentions limited borrowing for “Operational” Expenditure but not for the Capital Expenditures.

By burdening the current Rate Payers for this long-term Capital Expenditure is both unfair and commercially unrealistic. Businesses are unable to finance their Capital Expenditure this way as customers only want to pay the fair costs of the goods/services rendered and any Capital Expenses are term financed and charged to Expenses by way of Depreciation or similar (a “Cost allocation process”).

The ECAN approach smacks of the previous ACC approach of funding the life of any claims (the “Tail”) even though its establishment legislation directed a “Pay-as-you-go” approach to funding. That caused great resentment amongst businesses.

I urge ECAN to reconsider its funding approach so as to spread the burden on Rate Payers more equitably by employing a term financed approach to the first year instead of the full cash up front approach.

I DO NOT wish my name to be made public.

PS: I was unable to email my submission to the above email address shown in the online document (Page 38) so have therefore mailed it to ECAN. I could find no alternative email address for ECAN.