

Our Community Plan Christchurch O-Tautahi 2004/14 SUBMISSION

Submissions close on 6 May 2004

I wish to talk to the main points in my written submission at the hearings.

Name: C V Currie, Chairman

Organisation: Cracroft Residents' Association Inc

Daytime Phone: 338 8329

Email: calibre@xtra.co.nz

Address: 4 Worsleys Road Christchurch 8002

Your Submission:

Submission to Christchurch City Council on the LTCCP- Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Statement

Rapid Transport

We are concerned that there seems to be little emphasis in the Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Statement on the development of rapid transport systems for the area. While there is mention of bus priority lanes, there seems to be no indication that it is for other than the existing philosophy of mostly radial and some circular routes. While we commend the addition of the 'Orbiter', further radical rapid transport planning is required.

'Backbones' for Network

We consider that planning should be for an integrated network of public transport with rapid transport providing one or more 'backbones' and local transport feeding to and from it/them.

Coordination

There should be free transfer from local to rapid transport and back again and co-ordination of arrival and departure times. Toronto, Ontario, has had such a system for more than 40 years.

Light Rail and existing Rail

The document states (Section 4.2): "Reviews will include consideration of innovative proposals such as light rail." It does not mention any use of existing rail for local public transport. It is our view that light rail is in significant use in progressive overseas cities and is no longer 'innovative'. Planning should ensure that further growth is conditional on provision of rapid transport facilities and light rail should now be included in plans for the future. We wonder what consideration has been given to provision in the future for public transport vehicles which can run on both road and rail, as is in use in some cities.

Sustainability: Fuels

The Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Statement states at least 6 times that transport for the city must be sustainable but apart from encouraging higher occupancy of private motor vehicles, there is no statement of specifics involved. It makes no mention of fuels. They are at present one of the least sustainable aspects of our transport. This is a serious omission since about 50% of New Zealand's energy use is for transportation and most of that energy is produced from imported fuels.

<p>Your Submission (Cont'd):</p>	<p>Sustainability: Vehicle emissions</p> <p>Vehicle emissions receive significant mention in Section 3, The Vision, but receive relatively vague treatment Section 4 What we must do to achieve our vision. Specific plans for emission controls and incentives should be included. Specific planning to make people aware of days when pollution from vehicles is at a high level should be included. Publicity about vehicle pollution could be used to drive more people, especially regular commuters, to higher levels of occupancy per vehicle, and to lower-pollution public transport.</p> <p>Transport Planning to be Proactive re Growth</p> <p>We consider that planning of public transport should reflect overall city growth strategy so that provision of rapid public transportation is used to encourage growth in a strategic way, for example over areas with less fertile soils, rather than being merely a response to growth that has already taken place.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>We consider that in the Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Statement there is far too much emphasis on the "enhancement, maintenance, and completion of arterial road corridors" and too little specific planning for alternatives that make for more desirable growth, liveable communities, and sustainable living.</p>
<p>Your Submission (2):</p>	<p>Submission to Christchurch City Council on the LTCCP</p> <p>1. Parks and Open Spaces</p> <p>The maintenance and addition of parks and open spaces (Volume 1 pages 51-52 Volume 2 pages 80-92) is commendable. However, it is not clear how much of the proposed Capital Expenditure (Vol 1 page 52) is for land, nor how much of it is in addition to the developers' financial contributions. We consider that the plan should include significant funds in addition to the developers' financial contributions to be allocated for appropriate large areas of open space that will provide for the future with the same kind of vision that our city forefathers showed in setting aside Hagley Park. For example, the land near the Dyers Pass/Summit Road at the top of the Cashmere Valley is contiguous with Victoria Park and Mount Vernon Farm Park. It is already used near the Sign of the Kiwi for a mountain bike trail. It would be a scenic, recreational, and nature park of great value to the city. The Plan should have specifically stated aims and financial provision for purchase of such lands.</p> <p>2. Wastewater Collection, Treatment and Disposal</p> <p>The wastewater emphasis seems to be simply on treatment and disposal. We consider that the plan should include funds for feasibility studies for making use of wastewater, especially in new suburbs.</p> <p>For example, it may be desirable and even economic in new developments to keep black wastewater and grey wastewater separate, and to feed the black water to community digesters and gas collectors with the gas being put to good use. It may also be possible to use the remaining product for fertilising land. The Council is commendably putting significant resource into recycling of solid waste. In our view, wastewater is another area where there should be serious investigation of the possibilities for more recycling rather than treatment and disposal.</p> <p>Biogas production is now standard in some places. It is used now to some extent at the treatment station for electricity generation (refer CCC website: Sustainable Cities Success Stories). Christchurch should investigate more efficient production of Biogas from sewage and uses of the remaining product to give a higher degree of useful recycling of this product.</p>

**Your Submission (2)
(Cont'd):**

3. City Expansion

With the passage of the Resource Management Act many of the features of the old Town and Country Planning Act have been lost. In particular the Green Belt concepts have gone. The growth of the city seems to be much more haphazard. There is no Urban Boundary. Our recommendation is that an Urban Boundary should be introduced or the Green Belt reintroduced. We consider that the present tendency to urban sprawl is highly undesirable. It seems to be driven mainly by developers who can afford to hire high-power lawyers and consultants to make apparently strong cases to Resource Management Appeal Court judges. Developers thus may obtain outcomes against the recommendations of the Council's own planning staff. Strengthening the City plan with regard to such planning issues would strengthen the hands of the city planners in such cases.

The council should also give more attention to planning principles associated with expansion to make up for the loss of the planning principles that were contained in the Town and Country Planning Act. For example, as well as setting an urban growth boundary, the following principles could be considered:

3.1. Mix Land Uses. New, clustered development works best if it includes a mix of stores, jobs and homes. Single-use districts make life less convenient and require more driving.

3.2. Take Advantage of Existing Community Assets. From local parks to neighbourhood schools to transit systems, public investments should focus on getting the most out of what we've already built.

3.3. Create a Range of Housing Opportunities and Choices. Not everyone wants the same thing. Communities should offer a range of options: houses, condominiums, affordable homes for low-income families, and "granny flats" for empty nesters.

3.4. Foster "Walkable," Close-knit Neighbourhoods. These places offer not just the opportunity to walk-footpaths are a necessity-but something to walk to, whether it's the corner store, the transit stop or a school. A compact, walkable neighbourhood contributes to people's sense of community because neighbours get to know each other, not just each other's cars.

3.5. Promote Distinctive, Attractive Communities with a Strong Sense of Place, Including the Rehabilitation and Use of Historic Buildings. In every community, there are things that make each place special, from train stations to local businesses. These should be protected and celebrated.

3.6. Preserve Open Space, Farmland, Natural Beauty, and Critical Environmental Areas.

People want to stay connected to nature and are willing to take action to protect farms, waterways, ecosystems and wildlife.

3.7. Strengthen and Encourage Growth in Existing Communities. Before we plough up more forests and farms we should look for opportunities for growth in already built-up areas.

3.8. Provide a Variety of Transportation Choices. People can't get out of their cars unless we provide them with another way to get where they're going. More communities need safe and reliable public transportation, footpaths and bike paths.

3.9. Make Development Decisions Predictable, Fair, and Cost-Effective. Builders wishing to implement smart growth should face no more obstacles than those contributing to sprawl. In fact, communities may choose to provide incentives for smarter development.

**Your Submission (2)
(Cont'd):**

3.10. Encourage Citizen and Stakeholder Participation in Development Decisions. Plans developed without strong citizen involvement don't have staying power. When people feel left out of important decisions, they won't be there to help out when tough choices have to be made.

While the Council does implement some of these principles, it would be helpful if the LTCCP was more specific in bringing together and specifically stating its principles for controlling city growth.