

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	1074
Response Date	12/04/21 8:12 AM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First name	Larry Burrows
Surname	Burrows
Email address	
Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?	No, I'm submitting as an individual
Are you willing to tell us more about yourself?	Yes
Which age category are you in?	65+ years old
Which suburb or area do you live in?	
Do you think we've prioritised the right issues and opportunities?	Don't know
Which of the proposed options would you like to see us progress with?	Option 1: statutory work, prior commitments and accelerating key initiatives
It is important that we hear what you would like to keep in the plan, what you think should be removed, and anything that you think we have missed?	

I believe you should remove the whole item Pg 268 under Swing Mooring Charges: Swing mooring annual fee towards removal of wrecks/abandoned vessels from swing moorings \$57.50 (per year) Retain the status quo. This charge is a General Rates issue and that is the most appropriate place for that cost to lie. It is TOTALLY FAIR for costs of recovering/disposing of sunk boats to be paid for by firstly, the owner and secondly, the general ratepayer as it is maintaining the state of the regional environment. It is TOTALLY UNFAIR to shift costs such as this to vaguely-related law-abiding specific user groups, and who have no influence and no control over the behavior of other asset owners who also happen to be boat or mooring owners.

Do you have any further comments on the activities proposed in specific portfolio/s (please select all those you wish to comment on):

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable for your household? Option 1 is affordable

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable as a whole for the Canterbury community? Don't know

Do you support the rationale and proposed changes in the draft Fees and Charges Policy? No

Any further comments on the Fees and Charges Policy?

The specific item (Pg 268 Swing Mooring Charges) I have outlined above appears to have been secreted into the LTP. It does not appear or is made discoverable on any Contents pg. or Information on the LTP. It has not been raised or discussed with any boating/mooring groups in the Region. Remove this item and retain the status quo.

Where do you live in Canterbury? Select your district below:

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Kaikoura

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Hurunui

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waimakariri

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Christchurch On-demand public transport services

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Selwyn

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Ashburton

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Mackenzie

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Timaru

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waimate

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waitaki

Do you wish to speak to your submission? No

Would you like to be kept up-to-date with the outcome of this consultation? Yes

How did you find out about giving feedback? . Email

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

There is personal information/contact details in my submission I do not want disclosed: No

Submission on the ECAN Long-Term Plan.

LE Burrows

Dear Sir/Madam,

I strongly object to the proposed levy on all swing mooring owners for *removal of wrecks/abandoned vessels* (LTP - Fees and Charges Section. P268), and recommend this item is removed from the LTP and reverts to the status quo.

Although there appears to be a relationship between wrecks/abandoned vessels and swing moorings it is general, tentative and indirect. Like abandoned car carcasses, abandoned boats can occur almost anywhere.

A wreck or abandoned vessel is an issue for all of us. It poses a general threat and eyesore in the local and regional environment and impacts on us all.

How many of these cases occur? I.e. what is the scale of the issue? Does it occur more or less often in mooring areas that have an active owners' association?

I offer a parallel story: A trailer load of rubbish was recently dumped on the road verge outside my property. It affects me most, but should I be responsible for removing it? It would be good to find the person who dumped it, but that is probably a police task. Or is it the responsibility of the whole street? or my side of the street, or road users who drive walk or ride or ride past, or the manufacturers of materials in the rubbish, or etc... In practise I have no capability for carrying out most of these actions. In practise it was dealt with very efficiently by the City Council refuse team, using general rates, following a phone call.

The Regional Council requires moorings and vessels to be registered, and to display their registration details. Therefore, derelict vessels and their owners are managed and traceable by ECAN. Law-abiding swing mooring owners may not even know the owner of other nearby moorings/vessels and have no ability or authority to influence the behaviour of other swing mooring owners.

Dealing with these cases is rightly the role of the Regional Council as the upholder of the environment on behalf of us all. That's why we pay rates. In this case ECAN is the agency with the knowledge, capability and authority to act on behalf of rate-payers.

General Rates IS the most appropriate place for that cost to lie. I am comfortable paying for my share of this valued service as a rate-payer, but not as a targeted boat or mooring holder.

It is TOTALLY FAIR for costs of recovering/disposing of wrecked boats to be paid for by the general ratepayer as it helps maintain the regional environment.

It is TOTALLY UNFAIR to shift costs such as this to only vaguely-related law-abiding specific user groups, who have no control over other asset owners.

Sincerely,

Larry Burrows