

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:
see below

I also want to respond to:

Name: Kerry Mulligan

Organisation:

Daytime Phone: 365 3315

Evening Phone: 365 3315

Email: kjm112@student.canterbury.ac.nz

Address: 1-116 Chester St East, City, Christchurch

Your Submission:

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

refers to pg 9 City Development. Having a targeted rate for the upgrade of city mall is not consistent with implementing a business retention and development programme. The upgrade of the city mall (if done well) will benefit all residents in the CCC area. In addition, some of the money budgeted for cultural and learning services should be transfered to city development projects as vibrant, safe and pleasant urban centres will result in achievements stated for both city development and cultural and learning services. For example, one of the achievements that will show success for cultural and learning services is more visits to the art gallery. Spending money trying to get people to go to the art gallery is treating the symptom not the cause, if there are more people in the central city because it is a pleasant, safe and interesting place to be then the trickle down effect of this will be more visits to places such as the art gallery.

refers to pg 6, Our future direction. Under the environment section it states 'we will know when we are succeeding when - Everybody takes responsibility for their impact on the natural environment'. The council is guilty of not adhering to their own advice as the number of recycling facilities where public rubbish bins are provided is very low and some council service centres do not recycle, eg a while ago I asked if there was a recycling bin at the central library and was told there was only one for paper.

refers to pg 18, Streets and transport. It is unclear what is included in Transport projects. This is concerning particularly given that it is what most of the streets and transport budget is spent on. If the majority of the transport projects are things such as increasing the number of on and off road cycle lanes, bus priority lanes, and other projects that actively encourage sustainable transport methods then the money spent is warranted, however if the majority of the projects are upgrading motorways and building new roads that only encourage more people to use unsustainable transport methods then the money budgeted is unwarranted.

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

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

refers to pg 3, rates increases. Rates shouldnt need to increase becuase of an increase in resident numbers. As the number of residents increases, the cost of all facilities and services can be spread over a greater number of people. However, if green field developments are allowed to continue as they are, without paying for themselves, the money required for sevicees that mainly benefit only the small number of people in these developments will have to continue to come from the rest of the rate payers. I suggest that all new developments have to take into account the cost (not only monetary) of the effect the development has on the surrounding area and actively mitigate these effects, without relying on the fact that the council usually picks up the tab.

refers to pg 14 and pg 20, Parks open spaces and waterways, and water supply. To reduce the demand on the water supply and ensure the water ways improve in health, systems such as onsite retention of rain water and grey water systems should be actively encouraged. A suggestion for this is to enforce all new and renevated houses and buildings to have grey water facilites and storm water retention and all new subdivisions and green field developments to have storm water retention on site, systems as suggested above are implemented in some regions in Australia. Some of these issues should be dealt with in the protocol for surface water management, but I think this protocol needs to be more rapidly integrated into the councils planning. refers to pg 16, refuse minimisation and disposal. While the current recycling scheme is a step in the right direction, re-use should be promoted over and above recycling as this is the true way for refuse minimisation. The council seriously needs to consider the long term effects of waste and what we can do right now to reduce waste in the future. I would rather have my rates spent on waste minimisation than upgrading of motorways. And I would rather pay a bit more now than having to a pay a lot more in the future. Councillors need to look past their own term at the countil and have the courage to do what is right for the future. Most importantly the council needs to ensure we are in line with the New Zealand waste minimisation policies in terms of how much waste is sent to landfill. In addition, business and comercial areas need to be activley encourage to reduce, re-use and recycle.

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

The Strategic Directions given on pg 7 are exacly what the council should be aiming for. These ideas need to be put into place in the activites and services and regularly reviewed to provide direction for the council.