

Submission on Christchurch draft Annual Plan

Group Moa Neighbourhood Committee
Name c/o Axel Wilke
Address 18 Melrose St, Christchurch
Contact phone 941 6418 (day) and 366 9493 (evening)
E-mail axel.wilke@ccc.govt.nz

We wish to talk to our main points at the hearing.

The Moa Neighbourhood Committee represents the area bounded by Fitzgerald Avenue, Bealey Avenue, Colombo Street, and the Avon River. According to the 2001 census, some 1,596 residents live in our area.

We are pleased to make this submission on the draft Annual Plan. If any of the points raised needs further clarification, please do not hesitate to contact the author.

Page 10 – Sustainable Natural Environment

We would like to offer two additional key indicators for the ‘Sustainable Natural Environment’ outcome: **sealed land area** and **air quality**.

Page 13 – A of Healthy and Active People

We would like to offer an additional key indicator for the ‘City of Healthy and Active People’ outcome: **participation in active forms of transport** (i.e. walking and cycling).

Page 45 – Media Relations and External Communications

Most of our area does not receive the community newsletter ‘**City Scene**’. We suspect that we pay for this service through our rates (as opposed to our area being specifically excluded from the distribution) and we simply do not receive what we pay for.

Page 55ff – Parks and Open Spaces

The Moa Neighbourhood Committee regards the **Avon River** as the prime environmental asset in the inner city. All day parking along the river side is detrimental to the enjoyment of the Avon. All parking should be banned adjacent to the Avon River in our area.

Page 75 – Traffic Management

We appreciate the usually very quick response to complaints regarding parking violations. We are, however, dissatisfied with the very low level of routine parking enforcement (i.e. not acting on a complaint). It would appear that the enforcement officers are kept busy by responding to complaints and controlling metered areas or areas where time parking restrictions exist.

After hours, parking enforcement is the responsibility of the Police service. Clearly, Police have not got the resources or the inclination to carry out routine parking enforcement, and they will only ever act on a complaint.

The lack of routine parking enforcement results in poor parking behaviour, with footpaths blocked and trees suffering due to illegally parked vehicles compacting their root system.

We would like to see **parking enforcement** to be carried out on a 24/7 basis by the City Council. More staff should be employed for routine enforcement.

Moa Neighbourhood Committee

We understand that parking wardens are net earners for the Council. This proposal should therefore be of financial advantage to the City Council.

Page 74 – Shuttle Buses

Our group is not convinced that the existing **Shuttle route** (mainly north-south) is the best possible for the city. For example, servicing the cultural precinct would have many benefits. We therefore wonder whether it is useful to have the existing Shuttle route listed as a performance measure.

Page 74 – Underground Wiring Conversion

In last year's LTCCP process, Council agreed to fund underground wiring conversion in narrow streets. \$200,000 has been budgeted annually, beginning in 2005/06. The funding has been specifically agreed to for narrow streets, as no opportunities exist for disguising the unsightly wires with trees, as narrow legal road corridors are sealed from boundary to boundary. It was specifically agreed that this narrow streets underground wiring conversion was independent to street renewal projects.

We could not find any reference to the above in this year's draft annual plan. The details listed on page 74 all refer to different types of underground wiring conversion. Our group would be grateful if the underground wiring conversion of narrow streets could be specifically mentioned in the final annual plan.

Page 75 – Vehicle Ways

Our members are very dissatisfied with the declining cleanliness of our roads. Sweeping of channels is rather infrequent. This service declined when the sweeping contract last changed several years ago.

Other issues

In our group's opinion, the 'hands off' approach of the district plan does not achieve good urban design. Numerous examples of **poor housing developments** in the inner city and elsewhere are testimony to this.

Our group believes that **building standards** (in terms of insulation requirements) are too low, and that increased requirements would contribute to an improved outcome for 'Healthy and Active People'. It is for example inconceivable why single-glazing is still allowable. Unfortunately, many buildings are constructed in a cheap way by developers for a competitive market, favouring the short-term savings of building cheaply over the long-term gains of having energy-efficient, comfortable and healthy houses.

Previous annual plans showed the **capital works programme for the next five years**, with a breakdown of all the individual programmes. This type of information is exactly what is desired by community groups such as ours. The latest annual plan shows only the programme for one financial year, and individual programmes are not necessarily listed any longer (e.g. the kerb and channel replacement programme is shown as one line only). This is a regrettable backwards step and should be corrected.

Regards,

(Axel Wilke)

Chair of Moa Neighbourhood Committee