

5/5/06

Further Submission on the Christchurch City Council Community Plan 2006 - 2016

In addition to Hugh Brown 21 April 2006

From the Englefield Residents Association Ph (03) 981 58 78

P.O. Box 13486

Christchurch 8001

We wish to speak To our Submission

1 - We do not agree with any rate increases unless the council addresses the issue of how are the people on low fixed incomes able to afford payment.

The Council should be thinking good business practice of how to decrease the rates.

2 - Essential Projects

We understand the need for expenditure on **essential projects**. There is debate on whether the total 17.2 million is necessary for tree renewal. We see a lot of waste where trees are pulled out e.g. Thompson Park, but the replanting has done nothing to retain the sought after 'safety' aspect that was touted as one of the main reasons for chopping down the trees. There are examples of unnecessary pulling out of perfectly good plants which are dumped, only to be replaced with just another variety, all over the city.

We believe better management of resources always saves money.

3 - Discretionary Priority Projects

We are pleased to see the Avon River is high priority here. The Icon of the City.

We support the development of a Green Corridor along side the river: with a footpath/cycle way dotted with artworks, seats and fountains, where people can meet and greet, all the way from the City to the Sea.

The only problem piece is that annoying bit right in our Englefield area where traffic is busiest and the bank is at its narrowest.

We say all the more reason not to close Worcester Street at Latimer Square. Worcester Street is a nice wide three kilometer safe road that crosses all the one way streets and as well as busy Fitzgerald Ave Stanmore Rd and Linwood Avenue.

We recommend the Council looks at doing a switch around by turning Worcester Street back into the main thorough fare to and from the Eastern Suburbs and Avonside Drive reverts back to the original intention of Scenic Drive

We call upon the Council to Honour it's "Out of Environment Court Agreement with the Englefield Residents Association, the wording of which was " to look at strategies to reduce traffic on Avonside Drive." We are still waiting for recommendations from the Mike Gadd Report to be actioned as well further agreements in writing with Mike Calvert from City Streets. Documentation can be presented at a meeting which should be had to clarify this agreement and what it means to all of us. This brings us to the point of :

Democracy and Governance pg 7 - Community Outcomes

We the Englefield Residents Association Inc. have participated in the democratic process with council and are at a loss as to why our 'Out of Environment Court Agreement' is

5/5/06

2

being ignored. We need a democratic Status Hearing as to where we are at on our agreement with the CCC. We do not believe the Council should be allowed to ignore such agreements.

If you want the strong communities outcome; the community also must feel that it is being heard and represented. Otherwise they become discouraged and participate less.

Councils Proposals to save money on its services pg 8

1 - We live among a larger ratio of ageing, retired, disabled, unemployed demo graph. We think all library services should be kept.

We have concerns about swimming pools closing. We suggest if a community wishes to retain a swimming pool, perhaps they could jointly manage it, so long as the council continued to maintain it.

2 - We also do not endorse any raising of parking fees as our ageing retired population on fixed low incomes cannot afford it.

3 - This also has the danger of discouraging people from the Central Business District which is currently struggling and in need of people to have easy and not too expensive access.

City Development pg 9

1 - We agree with enhancing streetscapes in keeping with our Garden City Image.

2 - **We recommend** the council develops policies to safeguard our fast disappearing heritage places and areas. We cite the Englefield Area as a special case that deserves protection. The residents have worked hard for years to get recognition for preservation of the unique worker cottages of the area. They need your assistance for this project.

3 - We have concerns about the garden streetscapes disappearing due to developers not given any guidance on protecting this community city asset.

We recommend policies should be developed to protect the Heritage of this Beautiful Garden City that people come from all over the world to enjoy.

Streets and Transport pg 18

1 - We have concerns about the need for a new bus exchange. Money and resources become wasted from the old bus exchange. Will they get the new bus exchange right, or have to trash that a few years down the track.

2 - Will bus fares have to be increased to off set these costs?

3 - The Council should be wary of pricing the buses out of reach. Where it becomes just as costly to take the family on the bus as it does to take the car or a taxi.

We should build things to last. Like the Egyptians philosophy.

4 - Congestion, pollution, safety and expense to the motorist are major community considerations. Currently traffic is all forced down designated roads which are now at

5/5/06

3

unbearable congestion levels. Council needs to rethink how traffic is managed to alleviate the above problems. The Community Outcomes of Safety, Environment, Prosperity and Health are all compromised when traffic is bumper to bumper.

5 - Another good reason we recommend you keep Worcester Street open at Latimer Square.

It will reduce pollution, congestion and expense to the motorist and also save money for the Council for more essential projects.

It will also retain essential access to and from Linwood Village and the CBD as prescribed in the City Plan. This will assist to **achieve the Community Outcome of Economic Development.**

Many of our community depend on Linwood Village, therefore the continued viability of the businesses on Worcester Street is essential for our citizens.

Thankyou for reading our submission

We wish to speak to our submission.

Yours faithfully on behalf of Englefield Residents Association

Irinka Britnell

Irinka Britnell Ph 981 58 78

copy of This Already
Received by CCC

A Submission on the Christchurch City Council Community Plan 2006 to 2016
on behalf of the Englefield Residents Association
by Hugh Bowron 21 April 2006

This submission addresses two themes of the draft community plan.

1. **Community Support** that aims to build strong and inclusive communities by giving advice and support to community groups, and **Democracy and Governance** in which it is desired to find the best ways to inform people and generate feedback by collating and processing submissions and by arranging and providing support for meetings, panel hearings, deputations and petitions.
2. **City Development** that aims to promote good urban design and the protection of our heritage items by providing information, advice and funding for city heritage and its conservation.

1. Community Support and Democracy and Governance

It is good that the city council is encouraging and supportive of neighbourhood groups and residents associations, seeking to inform them about its planning and decision making through a steady stream of consultative documents. However many of these documents are difficult to read, even by educated people, because they are written in a style that is dominated by bizspeak and the language of managerialism. Council officers seem to find it difficult to write clear, lucid prose that communicates simply and effectively.

There is a lot of jargon in these documents. Clichés and platitudes abound so that dead words put readers off. Statements of the obvious are frequent, a case in point from the draft summary document in the "Our future direction" section where it lists the aim of making Christchurch "a place where people enjoy living."

An outstanding example of a difficult to read document would be the "Issues and Options Paper: City Plan Heritage Provisions, December 2005."

The style and nature of this primary method of communicating with community groups is worth mentioning. It takes more time than most community groups have to read the many papers that are sent to them. Not a few of these documents request submissions in relatively tight time deadlines. Those groups that are drawn into this dance often find that it is hard to make submissions that have depth or substance. This may make it hard for Council officers to give much weight to such lightweight submissions.

Consideration could usefully be given to more engaging and attractive methods of communicating with community groups. Briefings by Council Officers, and regular forums with elected representatives spring to mind. Democracy after all as it emerged in the Athenian sense was a face-to-face business.

Another possibility would making an informal agreement with each community group to work on a limited number of issues of particular interest to them. The Council could then make

information, research and briefings available to each group, together with meetings with the appropriate elected representatives, so that each group could work through to a conclusion that gave them the satisfaction of seeing results achieved.

2. City Development

The absence of effective planning controls by local government is a significant factor in continuing urban blight in the inner city east and Englefield areas of interest. Although the Council has created the Special Amenities Area classification, and both the Avon Loop and Englefield groups have benefited from this, there is a widespread perception that SAMS have little legislative teeth. A thorough process of consultation and careful law drafting needs to be undertaken to strengthen the provisions of SAMS.

From the 1960's on developers have flung up ugly dwellings in the inner city east and Englefield areas that have paid no regard to the historic character of the areas they are built in. The poor sound insulation of these dwellings leaves elderly residents at the mercy of their Bogan neighbours. Poor insulation of every kind, and slip shod building standards has created dispiriting structures that have rapidly degenerated into the slums of the future.

Central government and local government have passed responsibility back and forth between each other for doing anything effective about this. The end result has been to leave neighbourhood and residents groups powerless to deal with property developers and slum landlords.

Affordable housing for the urban poor and those of modest means does not have to look awful. Furthermore the current priority of the minister of housing that houses should be properly insulated and be high in energy conservation values creates an opportunity for central and local government to co-operate to create the kind of urban planning controls that have existed in some European societies for a long time.

A partnership between residents and neighbourhood groups and local government in urban regeneration initiatives, starting with the joint development of effective planning controls, would be a useful way to overcome the disempowerment process that I have outlined above. The one way avalanche of bizspeak Council consultative documents could be replaced by an equal exchange of voices, views, position papers, and briefing meetings.

Hugh Bowron
142 Avonside Drive
Ph wk 389 6948 h 389 3024
hugh.bowron@clear.net.nz

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.