

Summary submission form

Instructions

You may send us your submission...

Please read before completing your submission

It will help us process your submission if you clearly state the issue you want the Council to consider, what specific action you think the Council should take, and why that should be done.

If you wish, you can present your submission at a hearing. (If that is the case, please tick the box). The hearings will be held between Thursday 25 May and Wednesday 7 June 2006. Generally, 10 minutes are allocated for hearing each submission, including time for questions.

It will help us if your submission also refers to the page of either the full version or the summary version.

Please note: we are legally required to make all written or electronic submissions available to Councillors and to the public. This includes the name and address of the submitter. All submissions will be published on the Council's website from 10 May 2006.

No anonymous submissions will be accepted.

By mail

Please mail your submission (no stamp is required) to:

Freepost 178
Our Community Plan
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 237
Christchurch 8003

By email

Please email your submission to:
ccc-plan@ccc.govt.nz
Please make sure that your full name and address is included with your submission.

On the internet

You may enter your submission using the form provided on the Council's web site at:
<http://www.ccc.govt.nz>
Please follow all the instructions on the web site.

Please remember to indicate if you wish to present your submission in person at one of the hearings.

Please ensure your submission arrives no later than Friday 5 May 2006.

Your submission

You may use this form for your submission on the draft Our Community Plan if you wish. Whether you use this form or not, please include your name, address and contact telephone number with your submission.

Tick one

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

☒ I wish to talk to the main points in my written submission at the hearings to be held between Thursday 25 May and Wednesday 7 June 2006

Are you completing this submission: ☐ For yourself ☒ On behalf of a group or organisation

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?

My submission refers to: ☐ Full version ☐ Page No. ☒ Summary version ☐ Page No.

Do you also want to respond to: ☐ Development Contributions ☐ Aquatic Facilities ☐ Other

Contact Name

GEOFF FRIEND

Organisation name (if applicable)

RICCARTON BUSH-KILMARNOCK RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

Contact Address

P.O. Box 8550, Riccarton

Christchurch

Phone No. (day)

348 5533

Phone No. (evening)

348 5533

Email (if applicable)

geoff.friend@xtra.co.nz

Signature

[Signature]

Date

4 May 2006

RICCARTON BUSH-KILMARNOCK RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 8550,
Riccarton,
Christchurch,
4 May 2006

Our Community Plan,
Christchurch City Council,
P.O. Box 237,
CHRISTCHURCH.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Our Community Plan 2006

Thank you for the opportunity of expressing our views on the proposed long term plan for the city.

Considering each of the major issues in turn, we comment as follows:-

City Development (summary page 9)- 2006/7 cost \$13m

We agree that the council should be concerned with the creation and improvement of public spaces in the city, and some assistance should be afforded to assist in the preservation of historic buildings. Whilst it may be appropriate for the council to "provide information and advice," we seriously question its involvement in "marketing the central city and implementing a business retention and development programme." That surely is a function of the business community.

Community Support (page 10)- \$19.6m

Civil defence is certainly a matter for council involvement. But the other items listed in the report - early learning centres, rental housing and support of community groups (including this association)! - are not matters in which the city should be involved. Education and housing are matters for central government.

Cultural and Learning Services (page 11) - \$38.3m

We support the expenditure in this area. The Art Gallery, Museum and libraries are an essential aspect of the city.

Democracy and Government (page 12) - \$12.1m

The organisation of triennial elections and arranging meetings, panel hearings etc is a necessary function of local government. But if candidates for local office need "policy guidance and information to support sound decision-making" they should really consider whether they should be standing for office! That's not the council's job. We are unsure of the reason to involve ethnic minorities in decision-making. They need to be express interest in city affairs and join the relevant organisations. Unless one is elected to council, how can you be involved in the decision-making?

Economic Development (page 13)- \$10.2m

This is not a function of the city council. The people who are capable of performing these tasks will not waste their time working for the city! Our view is - save \$10.2m and let the businesses who will benefit from such programmes provide the funding.

Parks, open spaces and waterways (page 14)- \$23.5m

There is no question that these are a proper function of the council. Our only query is: do we need a visitor centre at the Botanical Gardens? Or do people not go to the gardens to inspect the flowers, plants and trees?

Recreation and Leisure (page 14) - \$15.6m

We agree that we want healthy and active lifestyles. The city should assist where necessary in providing the venues, but there it should stop. It is not the council's function to "deliver events and festivals, host sporting events and support bidding and hosting." That is properly the role of sports bodies and sponsors.

The excellent concerts and events in Hagley Park (Classical Sparks for example) would not suffer if a nominal entrance fee was charged. Our overseas visitors must pinch themselves at the free concerts in the park!

The Clearwater golf classic should not be sponsored by the city. That is the responsibility of the golf authorities and their collective sponsors.

Refuse minimisation and disposal (page 15) - \$10.9m

Again, this is a core activity of the council, although we question the need for the council to provide education on waste management.

Regulatory Services (page 16) - \$7.4m

No comment

Streets and Transport (page 17) -, \$23.8m

It is agreed that the tasks listed are a core activity, but we have serious doubts about spending \$59.5m on a new bus exchange. We trust that the advocates of a new building are not the same people who - a relatively short time ago - convinced the council to build the existing exchange in Lichfield Street. Whilst the price of petrol may yet have an advantageous effect on bus passenger usage current evidence suggests that Christchurch citizens are not public-transport minded when it comes to commuting.

Waste water collection and treatment and Water supply (pages 19-20) - \$21.3m

These are clearly core activities for the council.

Summary

The plan certainly focuses attention on the projects and proposals which will affect all residents of Christchurch and deserves the closest attention. As with all financial planning, the bottom line to the plan is: who pays? The plan summary states (page 3) that "Christchurch is not able to limit rates rises to the level of the CPI without

significantly reducing services." This begs the question: how many of the existing (or proposed) services could be eliminated without any serious consequences for the citizens?

In every enterprise (except Government it seems) the level of expenditure is governed by the amount of revenue which can be generated. This philosophy does not appear to apply to the council, where the view seems to be: if more revenue is required, the ratepayer will provide it.

We earnestly recommend to the decision makers that they take a hard look at the budget and the services they expect to supply, or think the ratepayers need (as opposed to "want").

The draft plan proposes consecutive rate increases of 8.55%, 7.03% and 10.75% in each of the next three years. **If you care to do the arithmetic, you will note that by the year 2008-9 your rates will be 28.7% higher than the current levy. You cannot be serious!**

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'G.K. Friend', written over a circular stamp or mark.

G.K. Friend
Chairman