

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	1183
Response Date	14/04/21 5:40 AM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.2
Files	
First name	Ian
Surname	McFarlane
Email address	
Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?	No, I'm submitting as an individual
Which age category are you in?	-
Do you have any further comments on the activities proposed in specific portfolio/s (please select all those you wish to comment on):	
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	

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

How did you find out about giving feedback?

From:
To:
Cc:
Subject: LTP submission
Date: Friday, 9 April 2021 3:09:55 pm

From: Chair Hughey
Sent: Friday, 9 April 2021 2:52 pm
To: Louise McDonald
Cc: Dianne Chester <
Subject: FW: Submission in Response to Proposed Wreck Cost Levy

Hello Louise

Please see email below for the LTP.

Please lodge it as a full submission to the LTP as this citizen had problems with our website in lodging the submission.

Thanks

Jenny

From: Chair Hughey
Sent: Friday, 9 April 2021 2:51 pm
To: Ian McFarlane
Subject: RE: Submission in Response to Proposed Wreck Cost Levy

Good afternoon Ian

Thanks for sending me your submission and I will forward it to the appropriate staff member today.

Apologies for the difficulty you had with our website.

Thanks for taking the time to write into us during our Long Term Plan consultation process.

Kind regards

Jenny Hughey

From: Ian McFarlane ·
Sent: Friday, 9 April 2021 1:38 pm
To: Chair Hughey ·
Subject: Fwd: Submission in Response to Proposed Wreck Cost Levy

Hi Jenny

I am contacting you directly in connection with the proposed wreck levy for swing mooring holders in Canterbury included in ECan's Long Term Plan. I have attempted to lodge my submission via the website HaveYourSay but have had difficulty trying to complete the online form. I understand that citizens can contact Councillors direct which is what I am now doing. I would appreciate if you could please forward this where appropriate.

Thanks, Ian McFarlane

Swing Mooring Owner and Keen Yachtie

This is a personal submission against ECan adding an additional fund on Mooring Holders to cover the removal of sunken boats in the Canterbury region,

8/4/2021

Private Submission from Ian McFarlane, owner of two swing moorings and a keen sailor in Canterbury.

ECan has seen fit to recommend a fee imposed on mooring holders in the event that a vessel may sink at a mooring and needs to be removed on the basis it is a hazard to shipping.

I personally feel this is yet another ECan endeavour to increase their financials without due thought to what they are doing or how best to go about it. The following are numerous aspects I would like answered.

1. ECan has doubled the annual fee for having a mooring in the last 12 months without justification. What is this money spent on?
2. ECan says they have considerable cost in removing vessels that have been abandoned. Can ECan supply evidence that this is a real cost and if so - why has ECan not got the owner of the vessel to be responsible?
3. Why is it that to have a mooring you have to register it with Ecan – if E Can have all the details of mooring owners, why can they not hold those responsible to recover the cost?4. E Can choose to turn a blind eye when a vessel sinks around the Banks Peninsular without making any effort to remove the obstruction, leaving it as a marine pollution.
4. Why is ECan targeting mooring owners? Why not all boaties as boats do tend to sink from time to time. Not just moored boats.
5. Why doesn't ECan consider that all boaties should have insurance to cover the possibility of their vessel sinking. If you put your vessel into a marina this is compulsory. Could that be extended to mooring holders?

Finally, I feel this is yet another attempt to swell the coppers of ECan without consideration and a sensible justification of how to go about it. I feel the proposed levy is targeting a single group which is very unfair. All residents of Canterbury benefit from keeping our waters, roads and land clean and tidy. I believe that all residents through ECan should pay to remove sunk vessels as they currently do with wrecked cars and rubbish left on the side of the road. I see no difference between a boat and a car - they are both vehicles. This cost should be paid out of general rates.

Signed: Ian McFarlane

Email

Louise McDonald
Senior Committee Advisor
Legal Services