

From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Monday, 28 March 2022 12:12 am
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

Richard

Last name

Shaw

Email address

Suburb

No Answer

Phone number

Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?

No, I'm submitting as an individual

Which age category are you in?

Prefer not to say

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

Yes

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

This is a consultation where the rate payers get to provide you with feedback not an option whereby you provide a limited number of responses and we are forced to pick one. In line with Council policy of full cost recovery, those who use public transport should pay for it just like Council insists for other services - especially those provided (or not provided) to rural rate payers - no public transport options out here. So my response is none of the above - full cost recovery, user pays

Any other comments on bus fares?

I believe that I have expressed my perspective fully in my response to question number 10 thank you

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

No

How else might we pay for our share of this work?

By cost cutting exercises within the regional council, like almost everybody else you will need to find ways to reduce expenditure in some areas so that you can pay for situations like this - time to dispense with the non-essential items, it may be painful but this might include head count reductions or moving to lower cost premises.

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?

I didn't notice any offer from the regional council to assist with our flood damage, we had to pay for it ourselves. Roads are the responsibility of NZ transport agency (maybe if they spent less on name changes and rebranding they would have funds available for road repairs), rail is Kiwi Rails responsibility and power, in our case is Mainpower, they have increased daily charges by an outrageous 100% as well

as increasing electricity costs so I cannot perceive why ECAN thinks they need to be concerned about where funding will come from for anything related to electricity. More so why would people who have made the investment to be energy efficient with regard to investing in solar or off grid be making any contributions to weather impacts on electricity supply?

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

I don't have a preference

Any other comments on flood protection in Ashburton?

Surely a decision for Ashburton rate payers and NZ Transport depending upon whether non Ashburton ratepayers want to be able to travel South on SH 1 or not.

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?

This is an alternative way of increasing rates and calling it something else, you are already proposing an excessive and unjustifiable increase so absolutely no to the levy. This is a central government issue ECAN needs to stick to its core responsibilities. Rural communities are about to be hit with additional levies under He Waka Eke Noa which will reduce the viability of many non intensive farming operations. The likely impact of this will be conversion to Radiata plantations and collapse of rural communities with an associated decrease in rate payers - it is totally inappropriate for ECAN to add a double whammy on top of central government charges.

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

There was significant pushback from many submitters to the proposed rate increase last year - especially from rural communities - feedback which ECAN chose to ignore. While ECAN Councillors and employees have been able to receive their full pay packets every month, with no need to claim 80% wage subsidies from the government, all underwritten by the rate payers; it may have escaped your notice that many have been very adversely impacted by . The ability Covid both from a business and health perspective. While initially reluctant, even the prime minister has accepted that we are facing a cost of living crisis - yet ECAN proposes to increase rates not just beyond inflation, not just beyond its

ridiculous increase to which so many objected to in the last round of consultation but it has decided that it needs even more, plus a levy which is an excuse for even more but lets put it into a separate pot of money and not include it in our overall percentage increase. Can I ask what planet you are living on? Have you all been working from home for so long that you've lost touch with reality? Maybe you are busy working out what to spend your full pay packets on while others try to work out how to make ends meet and cover the cost of their grocery bills? Or perhaps so engrossed in deciding just how much you could increase rates by One request; on next years election ballot can we have an option to bring back the commissioners so we have a chance of having some rational, sensible and affordable decisions makers in place? You are totally out of touch, detached from reality and part of the inflationary/affordability crisis rather than what one would hope for, part of the solution to the problem - maybe you can think about that, sometimes less is more. I'm not sure that people of Canterbury can afford ECAN.

Where did you hear about the consultation?

Postcard
