

LTCCP 2006-16 SUBMISSION

Submissions close on 5 May 2006

I do NOT wish to present my submission at the hearing, and ask that this submission be considered.

I am completing this submission:
For yourself

Number of people you represent:

My submission refers to:
Summary Version of the LTCCP

Page Number:
4, 8, 14, 17, 20.

I also want to respond to:

Name: peter hempenstall

Organisation:

Daytime Phone: 377 7067

Evening Phone: as above

Email: peter.hempenstall@canterbury.ac.nz

Address: 17 Melrose Street
Christchurch 8001

Your Submission:

Do you have any comments on the major projects in our Draft Community Plan?

As a resident of the east-of-Columbo side of the central city I have watched the revitalization of the inner city with approval and pleasure. But the east side still suffers relative to the western side of central city, despite the increased amenities and tourist flow through here. Discretionary priority projects listed are all worthy, but the Avon River strategy needs to be expanded to exploit good ideas for expanding the leisure and safety facilities on the east side. I refer particularly to the proposals that have emanated from residence groups (Moa leading the way) to close off Cambridge Terrace between Barbadoes and Churchill Streets to create a park cascading down to the river from the old cemetery, plus building a bridge across the Avon at this point in order to facilitate entry to the Avon Loop for tourists and residents. This will create temporary parking difficulties for some commuters but the number is small and parking policy for the inner city is something that urgently needs reform to discourage increased car entry and encourage more walking and public transport use.

One major project which has been scrapped by Council with some secrecy and with no dialogue with or information to those residents of the inner city affected, is the undergrounding budget for small, narrow streets in the inner city. Residents worked hard to get Council to approve a budget for this, arguing relevantly that the narrow streets allow no trees to be planted on the sidewalks and this, plus the effect of a forest of wires, conveys a barren appearance to the small streets that were nominated and conflicts with the details and spirit of inner city revitalization. Several resident groups are affected and have complained at the decision and lack of process (Moa, ALPA and Charlston). I add my protest to theirs and urge the reinstatement of that budget in the 2006/07 year.

Do you have any comments on groups of activities (The activities and services the Council provides?)

1. While accepting that some local libraries need to be rationalized to achieve cost efficiencies as suburbs change shape, I am opposed to the scrapping of the mobile library. As petrol becomes dearer and people become more oriented to their local communities, AND as the population ages with the impending retirement of the first wave of baby boomers, the mobile library will become an even more important facility for city residents and a link between local communities.

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

2. CCC needs to consider the introduction of charges for water usage within the life of this Council. With the possible crisis facing Canterbury as dairy farming reshapes the landscape and utilization of water, the effects of warming and shrinkage of regular water supplies, water charges now which make citizens more responsive to the issue of profligate water usage may well avert more serious measures down the line. This is hardly a progressive step for a progressive Council - we would be acting rationally in line with many other Councils here and overseas where water resources are already stretched to breaking point.

Do you have any other comments or suggestions you want to make?

I reiterate my comments above that the Council badly needs to examine parking policy for commuter traffic into the city. As a resident of a small, narrow inner city street, life is increasingly impossible on weekdays as cars park out the entire street, ignoring set-back rules and regularly making it impossible to extract or insert one's own car into one's own property. Hand in hand with the innovation of a new park below the old cemetery, I would like to see a parking policy which regulates efficiently such parking and penalises infringers consistently in order to educate drivers about parking for residents. 'A park or parking spaces for commuters' is not an either-or proposition. CCC should have an up-to-date inner city parking policy, properly policed, which brings more people into the inner city but not their cars. Look to Europe where this problem has been solved for decades, combining 21st century leisure space with city traffic needs.