79A Hackthorne Rd Christchurch 8002
30 April 2004

Annual Plan Submissions
Christchurch City Council
Beckenham Service Centre
P O Box 12-033
CHRISTCHURCH

SUBMISSION TO ANNUAL PLAN

This Association has just one submission to make regarding the Annual Plan. I refer you to item 5.2.33 'Greenspace capital outputs', where the Cashmere Green Stone Shelter is listed under capital outputs for the 2006–7 year.

I remind you of the increasingly sorry history of this long-awaited amenity, which was originally to have been part of the refurbishment of the Green completed some years ago. The Council's failure to complete the shelter has been the subject of extensive previous representations to the Council by this Association. Most recently we reminded you of the unsatisfactory situation in our submission on the 2003/4 Annual Plan, when yet again the work was not commenced.. In response to this, on 1 September 2003 Clare Sullivan wrote:

> The stone shelter will be placed back on the programme in the next Annual Plan round. Funding initially earmarked for this work was diverted to the more urgently needed upgrade of the Cracroft Reserve (Sign of the Takahe) toilets.

We were dismayed by this, to say the least. I subsequently wrote by email to Clare Sullivan on 6 October, saying, *inter alia*:

> ... regarding the stone shelter. We were pleased to learn that this has been placed back on the programme for 2004, but astonished to learn that the money for this project had been 'diverted to the more urgently needed upgrade of the Cracroft Reserve toilets'. We understood that the basic idea of a consultative process was to make considered decisions and to stick to them. It seems to us unprecedented, even high-handed, for committed public expenditure to be diverted in this fashion. Who made this decision and on what authority? Do they intend in the future to depart again from what has been previously agreed? What explanation do they have to offer for their behaviour? We would expect to see interested parties properly consulted in future whenever any such departure from the normal process is proposed.

I never received any reply to that letter.

It is deplorably evident that Council has repeatedly procrastinated on completing this work within a reasonable timeframe, and repeatedly failed to consult properly with interested parties.

We submit, accordingly, that the proposal to postpone this work a further two years is completely unsatisfactory and insist that the stone shelter be moved to the 2004–5 programme.

Yours sincerely,

Mike Bradstock
Hon. Secretary