

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:

I also want to respond to:

Name:

David Ellison-Smith

Organisation:

Daytime Phone:

9817037

Evening Phone:

Email:

dufaurit@hotmail.com

Address:

405 Armagh Street
Christchurch

Your Submission:

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

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

PARKS, OPEN SPACES AND WATERWAYS:

- . Public access across public land should be signposted and published, especially paper roads in Banks Peninsula.
- . Implementation of the 2004 Draft Biodiversity Strategy which is not mentioned in the LTCCP. CCC should spend on protection, enhancement and promotion of biodiversity since people's enjoyment of reserves is greater the more wildlife they see.

WATER SUPPLY

- . Page 4: The term "maintain the highest grade possible without treatment" allows for degradation of the supply. It should say "maintain water quality at current quality level".
- . Page 5: The plan says nothing about prevention of activities that could damage the water quality in the aquifers e.g. farming or horticulture, whose damaging effects on water quality can take decades to manifest themselves. Water quality could be improved by regulations for fencing of waterways against stock since stock are prone to defecate while in water, and bridging where farm tracks cross waterways.
- . The "option" of water conservation is not credible without water metering, reuse, and rainwater collection by large users since irrigation demand for water in Canterbury is planned to double in the medium term.

CITY DEVELOPMENT

- . Greater protection for architectural heritage - the mayor's vision is "a city that cherishes its heritage". This should be done by making fines for damaging buildings large enough that causing damage to heritage would be uneconomic, rather than the fine being small enough that it could be considered a cost of development.

Your Submission (Cont'd):	<p>. Greater tree protection. There is a current inconsistency in that while the CCC has plans to plant street trees, it allows the felling of trees on private property. A mature tree on private property next to the footpath may contribute as much amenity value to the community as a tree planted just outside the boundary on the street.</p> <p>REFUSE MINIMISATION AND DISPOSAL</p> <p>. User pays for rubbish bags.</p> <p>. Increase waste charges for business since businesses have a lower rate of recycling than householders.</p>
	<p>Do you have any other comments or suggestions you want to make?</p>