

1<sup>st</sup> May 2004

Freepost 178  
Our Community Plan Christchurch Otautahi  
Christchurch City Council  
CHRISTCHURCH 8003

Submission by: Jim Turpin  
14 Coringa Road, Yaldhurst, 6RD, CHCH.  
Phone: 342-9380; email: jimturpin@xtra.co.nz  
On Rural Definition

I have recently become aware of the Council's intention to reclassify some rural properties as residential.

I am upset and alarmed that the Council has allowed or instructed its officers to embark on a blatantly devious and divisive course of action that at best can only be described as unprofessional and as a money grabbing exercise.

My property is not affected by the current round of 289 properties selected but I am compelled to make this submission against what is the obviously "divide and conquer", "thin edge of the wedge" strategy being adopted,

It is unbecoming for the CHCH City Council, its Councilor's and its Officers all of whom we are led to believe aspire to promote community leadership through effective consultation and by engaging in sound decision making practices!!!

This current grab is far from that!

**My earnest request is that the Council immediately withdraws all the 289 notices.**

**If you still wish to proceed on this ill advised venture later on, I insist all of the rural property ratepayers be advised of the Council's intentions together with details of the extra costs they will incur if it applied to them and that they be given the opportunity to make submissions.**

And the time allowed to make submissions should also be much longer than that I understand was given to present 289. If adequate notice is not given, many of them will find themselves like me, unable to find the time to respond properly to Council.

We have other things to do with our lives other than to stop everything to react to out of the blue edicts from Council!

Because of this lack of notice I can only make limited comments now. I will however at the conclusion of this submission though ask for information be sent to me well in advance of the hearings so that I might consider and then refer to them at the hearing to reinforce the submissions I make now.

These are:

1. There has been inadequate notice to affected and potentially affected ratepayers of the intent to invoke what seems to be an obscure regulation. To this end I recommend as outlined at the beginning of this submission, ie, it all be withdrawn.
2. Accepting that the regulations exist, then they should be changed not enforced.

It is ludicrous and unjust that rural ratepayers, who already pay more than their fair share of rates, should be penalised further.

Attached please find a summary of information extracted from the 2001/2002 City Plan that shows while rural ratepayers represent only 1.3% of total ratepayers, they already contribute in most areas where they are perceived to receive services, more than twice that.

Isn't that enough already?

(I have requested and will have current figures for the hearing)

3. In this respect I don't need to remind you that each citizen of our City has one vote to choose who will help decide how our rates are spent.

And why not, people use services not capital values or how a property is used.

Therefore the number of properties/ratepayers is a fairer indication of the number of people represented than capital value or property use. And in this respect I suspect individual inner city properties are more densely populated than rural ones in which case rural are still overcharged.

So why continue to penalise people who take the trouble to do that little extra to upgrade their property.

4. I have my November 1997 rate demand and my April 2004 rate demand with me. This shows my rates have increased 34.4% whereas my capital value has increased 11.7%. Most other rural ratepayers demands will no doubt be like mine.

Aren't you taking enough already?

5. If you use the argument that such a change is needed to bring similar property use in different areas into similar rate categories, (an argument I don't accept holds up but will discuss anyway) then you must consider the following:

- 5.1. If you are going to rate as residential, then zone as residential so that the ratepayer can enjoy the benefits of the zoning, eg, subdivision rights, improved capital appreciation on a bigger base.
- 5.2. If you are going to rate as residential, then provide the services of residential ratepayers. I am sure everyone would prefer to pay for City supplied water and sewerage services that are a lot, lot cheaper than maintaining and worrying about our individual systems.
- 5.3. If you are going to rate as residential, then remove the inequalities I have outlined in note 2 above, that is, rural paying twice the amount per property than is fair and equitable.
- 5.4. Before you arbitrarily decide a property is residential, consider the effect and consequences of the IRD's policy not to allow business registration because they arbitrarily decide it would result in uneconomic units.

Sometimes things like this are beyond ratepayers control and as a consequence the resultant costs limit the opportunity of following a particular course. It doesn't necessarily mean things aren't done, it just means they aren't done as well as they could have been.

6. As this is a revenue gathering exercise then try cutting costs first!
7. I submit that the current proposal must be seen as a continuation of Council policy to persecute a small (1.3%) minority of its ratepayers.

My analysis confirms this.

It is not neither equitable, just nor in the Community's interest it continues to do so.

I now formally request I be supplied with the following information well in advance of the hearings so that I might be better informed of the Councils position and respond in support of my submission accordingly:

- a) A copy of the precise parts of Council regulations authorizing the action, a note of the date (dates if there have been modifications) these became part of the regulations, and a statement as to the process they went through before becoming part of the regulations and whether or not public submissions were called, and if they were, how, and were affected parties notified directly.
- b) With reference to my attachment, I would like the same figures for the 2004/2005 year.
- c) For the each of the years 1997 to 2005 I would like a summary of the overall percentage increases in rates to each of the three sectors, residential, commercial and rural. Please also provide the number of residential ratepayers each year.

d) An electronic file of all rural ratepayers showing for each individual property:

Capital Value

Land Value

Area

2003/2004 rates payable

and where it is one of the 289, an indicator that it is one

Not having names and addresses, roll numbers etc will maintain privacy and hence this should not be an issue.

In this day of computer records this information should be readily and easily available with no effort required to provide in electronic form.

Being electronic I can arrange the file in any order I want to achieve the results I need to support my submission. It may be my emailed to me.

I wish to be heard at the formal hearings.

Yours sincerely,

Jim Turpin

**Submission by Jim Turpin to CHCH CC  
In relation to Rural Definition**

1/05/2004

Detail from CHCH CC Strategic Statement 2002 Edition  
Extracted from P50 to P68

	<u>Residential</u>	<u>Commercial</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>Institutions</u>	<u>Total</u>
Art Gallery	79.2%	18.5%	2.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Car Parking	75.0%	22.3%	2.7%	0.0%	100.0%
City Streets	56.9%	41.2%	1.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Community Services	75.5%	21.8%	2.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Economic Development	61.8%	36.0%	2.2%	0.0%	100.0%
Environment	73.5%	23.7%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Housing	75.0%	22.3%	2.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Library	77.4%	20.1%	2.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Parks&Waterways	77.9%	19.9%	2.2%	0.0%	100.0%
PublicAccountability	75.0%	22.3%	2.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Sewerage	73.6%	20.8%	0.4%	5.2%	100.0%
Sport and Liesure	77.4%	20.1%	2.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Waste	90.0%	8.5%	1.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Water	74.3%	19.8%	0.7%	5.2%	100.0%
Corporate Revenues	75.0%	22.3%	2.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Corporate Expenses	75.0%	22.3%	2.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Corporate Internal Providers	75.0%	22.3%	2.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Number of Ratepayers	119,104	10,544	1,723		131,371
Percentage of ratepayers to total	90.7%	8.0%	1.3%		100%