

From: Environment Canterbury
Sent: Sunday, 3 April 2022 3:51 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

Nick

Last name

Davies

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?

25-39 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?

I don't have a preference

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

No Answer

Any other comments on bus fares?

Buses should be able to make their own revenue other wise should be abandoned. There is no need for rate payers who never use them to subsidise inner city busses. The current bus services are usually late, have poor customer service and have a reputation for poor driving from both passengers and other road users, especially cyclists.

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

Yes

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

Reduce costs in other areas such as the rate payer subsidisation of public transport, ecan governance, general expenditure, and compliance costs of creating and enforcing regulations.

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?

General rates should be used because to keep up with maintenance within the flood protection system. While some targeted rates could remain, the owners of the land have heavily restricted use of areas on which flood protection infrastructure exists, then have extra targeted rates applied to that their land. Given the flood protection framework is in place to protect infrastructure that all residence of the area use, such as power and internet connections, the majority of the benefit of the system goes to all rate payers, rather than just those who are currently paying targeted rates. Further Ecan should be pressuring central government to fund a significant portion of the flood control systems and their

maintenance. SH1 along with power and other national infrastructure which benefit from local flood control systems benefits substantial portions of New Zealand and without it people outside of Canterbury would face significantly greater costs, for example if SH1 can not be used for the transport of goods to Auckland.

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?

Same comment as above

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 can be handled through central government, the ETS and the Climate Change Commission. Other than what is required by central government regulation, there is no need for Ecan to do more. While I don't think Ecan has much input into this (my understanding is it would be mainly the district councils), making it easier and cheaper for people to make themselves more energy efficient and use renewable through a reduction in bureaucracy and compliance costs in order to, for example add solar panels to one's house, or a small hydro unit into a stream would provide environmental benefit at no cost to rate payers.

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

The current regulatory and compliance costs are causing substantial productivity loss within the rural sector. Reducing some of the burden of audits and reporting of compliance will go a long way to increasing productivity of small rural businesses.

Where did you hear about the consultation?

Word of mouth
