

Our Community Plan Christchurch O-Tautahi 2004/14 SUBMISSION

Submissions close on 6 May 2004

I do not wish to make a personal submission at the hearings.

Name: Richard Moylan

Organisation:

Daytime Phone: 980 3769

Email:

Address: 24 Frankleigh Street Spreydon

Your Submission: In general it looks good. One area that seems to have an unnecessarily high increase proposed for the budget is pg 27 appendix F Central City Amenity

I'm concerned if this is proposing an increase on top of the increases already proposed in the long term rate projections, ie for this to be acceptable as proposed there needs to be some decreases elsewhere.

Your Submission (2): PROCESS:

1) When I saw the plan was 5 volumes I nearly didn't bother going through it! Even if it was just 3 volumes it is still rather overwhelming. I managed to get through only 4.

1.1) Vol 1, pg 4, comment from Alister James gives an excellent summary of many issues. It would be good next time to see this section in a summary brochure (similar to the way the Asset Management Plans have a summary brochure), and in Star/Press.

1.2) A lot of ratepayers know about the %age rate rise, some know about the issues in Alister's summary, but hardly any know about the fee changes (vol 3, pgs 127 ff). Next time it would be good to have a sentence or two referring to the changes, rather than having them hidden as item 12 in vol 3 in a contents list.

1.3) Sending a summary to rate payer associations would facilitate engaging more of the community.

1.4) Vol 2 pg 14, "What we'll keep doing/what we'll do differently" is an excellent way of presenting this. It's lost part way through volume 2 and needs highlighting in a summary.

1.5) The number of respondents gives an indication of how well the community felt about the process.

VOLUME 1

2.1) pg 26 Outcomes "encourages a diversity of lifestyles" sounds like the right thing to say, but can imply encouraging some inappropriate or undesirable lifestyles. Some groups that give a "sense of social connection, place and identity" cause an increase if police spending! This outcome warrants qualifying/rewording.

2.2) pg 26 Key Indicators "heritage protection": This is not as important as most other rate funded activities and does not warrant a budget increase. Where to find the budget for this is not clear.

**Your Submission (2)
(Cont'd):**

3.1) pg 29 Putrescible Processing & Collection: very pleased to see this proceeding. Very disappointed to see this is limited to Commercial operations only. When consulted about reducing rubbish bag allocation we thought 26 was good because the rest could go into the putrescible collection. If council can change their mind about the putrescible collection, then can we change and have 52 bags in the meantime please?! We'd MUCH prefer to pay the extra to fund the putrescible collection, instead of buying extra bags (not good for sustainability) or composting at home (extra time/effort).

3.2) pg 34 Biodiversity spending. An extra \$7.2 million is too much. To fund increase to essentials (such as the transport strategy) the Biodiversity funding increase needs to be trimmed.

4) pg 40, Art gallery, museum and "our city" shows an increase from 9.8 million to 12.5 million. This seems too much of an increase.

5) pg 71 Good to have this level of detail in the street renewal programme. Although it adds to the bulk to read, without it meaningful feedback would not be possible.

VOLUME 2

6.1) pg 14 Promote urban design and developments that facilitates community cohesiveness sounds great. What the "urban village concept" mean?

6.2) pg 14 Ensuring the City retains its heritage buildings etc - the rate payers cant afford to much for this.

6.3) pg 14 Restoring biodiversity and a citywide planting strategy funding needs trimming (see comment 3.2).

6.4) pg 14 Supporting refugee and new migrant services - where is the cost of this shown?

6.5) pg 15 Healthy lifestyles - all very good points.

7) pg 119 60% - 80% of residents satisfied that rates spent on assisting traffic... When this is such a major part of the spending, you need to be aiming for at least 80% satisfied.

VOLUME 3

8.1) pg 132 Notified consent fee. Why such a large increase from \$1200 to \$3000 minimum?

8.2) pg 134 Building control fees. Why such large increases (some over 50%)?

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN PART 2

9.1) pg 14 Household organic waste reduction. We'd MUCH prefer to pay the extra to fund the putrescible collection, instead of buying extra bags (not good for sustainability) or composting at home (extra time/effort). Please aim to introduce the household organic waste reduction by 2005.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.