

**Mr F.G.Shaw**  
**152 Hamilton Ave, Christchurch 8004.**  
**Phone 351 7149**

  
.....

**I wish to talk to the main points in my written submission at this hearing to be held between Tuesday 7 June 2005 and Friday 10 June 2005.**

## **SUBMISSION TO CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL 2006 DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN.**

I wish to oppose the proposal to charge the residents of Hamilton Avenue with 50% of the cost of undergrounding telephone and electricity lines when the street is reconstructed.

My reasons are :

1. I cannot agree with the Council adopting different approaches according to the Council's classification of a street. All streets should receive the same treatment. In this area Creyke Rd residents were not required to contribute any funds supposedly because the road was classified as being more worthy of reconstruction than Hamilton Ave. It seems illogical to me that residents in the same area should receive different treatment just because of an arbitrary road definition.
2. In the discussions I have heard so far it is very vague as to just how much the Council is expecting each ratepayer to contribute. It seems to me that the Council is expecting ratepayers to effectively sign a blank cheque before making any commitment to the reconstruction. This is totally out of line with normal business practice.
3. I understand from the committee investigating the proposals that only one other Council in New Zealand has claimed any where near the amounts being proposed by this council and then it was with a cap of \$1,500. It makes one wonder if this Council is the only one in step.
4. The Council approach ignores the very substantial contribution by way of rates by the residents (over half a million per year) who after all get no more in the way of services from the Council than any other street no matter what its location is.
5. Suppose the Council goes ahead with its scheme for payment two questions arise :
  - (a) would it be compulsory to contribute and
  - (b) if a resident sold before the work was done would the new owner be liable for the vendor's share. If not then who would be liable.