

Response ID	5632258
Date of Contribution	12/04/2024 08:47:02 PM
First Name	Bruce
Last Name	Conaghan

### Your contact details

Email Address	
Post Code	
Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation, association or community group?	No, it's my personal submission
Name of organisation, association or community group	

### Supporting your submission

Anyone can make a submission. All submissions will be considered by Council in accordance with our submissions policy before they make a decision.

You can upload documents to support your submission. Please make sure each page includes your name. The maximum file size is 200MB	See Upload File 1 section.
You can upload documents to support your submission. Please make sure each page includes your name. The maximum file size is 200MB	See Upload File 2 section.
If you would like to give feedback via a video, add a link to YouTube or Dropbox file below	See Upload File 3 section.
If you wish, you can also come to talk to Council about your submission at public sessions that are known as 'hearings'. Do you want to speak to Council about your submission at the Long-Term Plan hearings?	No
Please provide your phone number so we can contact you to schedule a hearing time	
Which age category are you in?	40-64

### Environmental Regulation and Protection

We are Canterbury's environmental regulator. We are responsible for managing natural resources including air, soil, water and land. We work with mana whenua, stakeholders, and communities to promote the sustainable management of these natural resources, and protect and enhance the health of our natural environment.

Question	Answer
----------	--------

We are proposing three options for funding our Environmental Regulation and Protection services. Please indicate which option you prefer	Option 2: (Council's preferred option) Effective and efficient Environmental Regulation and Protection services with reduced investment towards community funding to manage cost pressures (\$134.9m in 2024/25, Year 1)
Tell us more about the option you chose. What would you support and what would you suggest we change or do differently for Environmental Regulation and Protection?	I would recommend increasing investment in working with communities to protect priority habitats rather than increasing investment in key programmes delivered in partnership with others. In doing so, it would ensure that results are more visible. Not sure of the need for increased investment with the work to collect and share high quality data as this is a basic function of any Council. There doesn't appear to be anything in the consultation document that provides a rationale to support this.

### Targeted rate for Christchurch district biodiversity

We are proposing to fund more work to improve indigenous biodiversity outcomes in Christchurch and Banks Peninsula through a new targeted rate to properties in those areas.

This would be in addition to the work already funded through the existing regional rate. \$1million for this additional work is already included in Council's preferred option for Environmental Regulation and Protection services.

This equates to rates of 72 cents per year per \$100,000 of your property value.

If there is sufficient support for this new targeted rate, Council could decide to include this targeted rate regardless of whether Option 2 is ultimately accepted.

Question	Answer
Do you support this new biodiversity targeted rate?	Don't know
Tell us more about why you support / don't support this biodiversity rate?	Makes sense but there does need to be more visibility and timeframe as to what this will achieve.

### Community Preparedness and Response to Hazards

We support the community to be prepared for, and be able to respond to hazards, and to be prepared for changes in the natural environment.

Question	Answer
We are proposing three options for funding our Community Preparedness and Response to Hazards services. Please indicate which option you prefer	None of the above options
Tell us more about the option you chose. What would you support and what would you suggest we change or do differently for Community Preparedness and Response to Hazards?	Option 2 is the best of the options but does require some changes. There should be no need to increase investment in CDEM as there have been enough learnings to ensure that this is in place. Have not seen any justification as to the need to increase capital investment for harbour master services and navigation safety and nothing to indicate the benefits. Fully support the need for navigation safety but this is Business as Usual (or should be) if there is a good Asset Management Plan?

### Targeted rate for Selwyn district for river resilience

We are proposing a trial in the Selwyn district to carry out additional flood and river resilience activities.



Existing schemes do not change.

The cost for this additional work will be through a targeted rate to all properties in the Selwyn district. \$200,000 for this additional work is already included in Council's preferred option for Community Preparedness and Response to Hazards. This equates to rates of \$7.08 per rate-paying property in Selwyn district in 2024/25 (Year 1).

Question	Answer
Do you support a new river targeted rate in Selwyn?	No
Tell us more about why you support / don't support this river rate	River resilience and flooding events tend to be widespread across the Regional Council area. Any increase in funding should look to support a more resilient transport network to provide for transport links through the region. In that regard, an additional Ashburton Bridge should be a high focus given the lack of alternative routes in the event of a diversion of traffic.

## Public Transport

We provide urban bus services within the Canterbury region, and ferry services in Christchurch.

We do this because public transport increases accessibility, connects communities and contributes to significant environmental benefits such as reduced greenhouse gas emissions, better air quality, and improved travel times across the transport network.

Question	Answer
We are proposing three options to fund Public Transport services. Please indicate which option you prefer	None of the above options
Tell us more about the option you chose. What would you support and what would you suggest we change or do differently for Public Transport?	Agree with the general premise to provide a suitable public transport network. In terms of what is envisaged, this appears to be a strategic programme but the information provided only looks at a three year programme. It is therefore difficult to see whether the initial investment would provide the necessary returns in the sense that there should not be the need for rates increases for this item over the LTP period beyond inflation.

## Fees and Charges schedule

In order to make our consent-related costs more transparent, we are proposing a move towards a fixed-fee approach for some of our consenting work.

There are a number of benefits to this for our community including certainty of invoice amount, more timely invoicing, removing the need for a deposit and standard site visit costs will be built in.

Question	Answer
Do you agree with this new fees and charges proposal?	Yes
Tell us more about why you support / don't support this approach. What would you support and what would you suggest we change or do differently?	A fixed fee works well for customers.

### Uniform Annual General Charge / Uniform Annual Charge (UAGC/UAC)

UAGC/UAC are flat charges that are applied at the same amount for every property, no matter the value of your property. We currently charge ratepayers \$54.49 (in the 2023/24 year) for a range of services funded by UAGC or targeted UAC. This income represents approximately 8% of the total amount of money we collect from rates.

Council's preferred option is to set the UAGC and UAC charges to approximately 8% of total rates each year of the Long-Term Plan. This means as rates rise in the future, the value of the UAGC/UAC component of rates will also rise.

Question	Answer
Which Uniform Annual General Charge/Uniform Annual Charge (UAGC/UAC) rate increase would you support?	(Council's preferred option) 8% of total rates (amounts to \$58.38 in 2024/25, Year 1 of the Long-Term Plan)
Tell us more about the option you chose. What would you suggest we change or do differently?	It is important to ensure that this reflects ratepayers expectations.

### Strategies and policies

Question	Answer
We'd value your feedback on any of these strategies and policies	
Tell us what you think about the Financial Strategy	
Tell us what you think about the Revenue and Financing Policy	
Tell us what you think about the 30-Year Infrastructure Strategy 2024-54	
Tell us what you think about the Engagement, Significance and Māori Participation Policy	

### Upload File 1.

You can upload documents to support your submission. Please make sure each page includes your name. The maximum file size is 200MB. If Image uploaded, will be shown below, if document it will be saved separately to this PDF.



No Image uploaded

**Upload File 2.**

You can upload documents to support your submission. Please make sure each page includes your name. The maximum file size is 200MB. If Image uploaded, will be shown below, if document it will be saved separately to this PDF.



No Image uploaded

**Upload File 3.**

You can upload documents to support your submission. Please make sure each page includes your name. The maximum file size is 200MB. If Image uploaded, will be shown below, if document it will be saved separately to this PDF.



No Image uploaded