

Our Community Plan Submission - Received by Email

Name:	Brian Sandle [bsandle@snap.net.nz]
CC:	
Sent:	Thu 6/05/2004 16:48
Your Submission:	<p>Christchurch City Council</p> <p>Draft Plan Submission from</p> <p>Brian Sandle 150 Marine Pde New Brighton Christchurch 9.</p> <p>Costs to us through taxes and rates may be minimized by better planning.</p> <p>At an Environment Court hearing this week on whether a slow road should go through New Brighton Mall, one Commissioner asked a Council consultant about how the Mall situation might be if the Mall were all under one manager. That is presumably as Eastgate or Palms. He replied that was a very interesting question.</p> <p>I give some of my thoughts: New Brighton Mall open space is owned by the ratepayers who do not get easily quantifiable payback from businesses/rents. (A special rate has been mooted to pay for *part* of cost of any road through the Mall.) Then whose job is it to try to co-ordinate access to the Mall from the car parks? In recent years access to the Beresford St car park has been reduced by building owners.</p> <p>A significant part of the case for a slow road was for convenience shopping with parking nearby. However the Hawke St park is already very close, closer than a lot of (perhaps 10 minute parking) is to shops in other areas of the City. Beresford St parking has been made further away from New Brighton Mall by closure of access.</p> <p>Yesterday afternoon around 3 pm the large Hawke St park was nearly full, further west a good number of cars were in the park of a currently unoccupied supermarket - it was maybe half full as was the large Beresford St car park almost. Beresford St park is close to the south side of the Mall.</p> <p>Perhaps impinging on the democracy and governance area of the plan, how is such a matter of access way to parking dealt with?</p> <p>The parking access consideration in a way impinges upon the area of the Plan, 'policy and partnerships with the private sector'. Though this is not such explicit funding being put into a new project by the City and a developer as public and private partnerships implies, probably. (Maybe we shall see that latter thing happen in New Brighton with the Registration of Interest document for the foreshore. I hope it may be managed well.)</p> <p>Community health costs take a lot of our taxes through central government. Can overlapping management reduce such? I have contacted Mary Richardson of CCC who says, following some discussion with the District Health Board, as I understand, they are not keen to help partner City Council initiatives, initiatives on the grounds that they may keep citizens healthy and reduce the DHB tax needs. DHB do not feel it is their responsibility. I ask that the request process be formalised and extended.</p> <p>'Healthy Christchurch' http://www.healthy.christchurch.org.nz has nearly 200 signatories for co-ordinating policies in Christchurch, and does have two part time workers who are funded by the Ministry of Health. It is currently co-ordinating only 3 projects, Family/Whanau literacy, Maori employment, sustainable livelihoods.</p>

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

Perhaps the Parks budget could tag an amount for canvassing the DHD or Ministry or Health. Keeping people active keeps them healthy and reduces health costs. If central government will not come to the party I ask that local government do more promotion. The private malls are promoted from the fees their businesses pay. Can New Brighton Mall have a bigger promotion budget?

Shopping provides much of the social contact for many people. New Brighton Mall has wonderful partnerships, with the Council space provider, with the several restaurants who have tables out in the sun. There is a very important social function there which of course impacts on psychological well-being. Good sunlight is there, too, is known to help prevent depression in people, reducing tax costs.

A good planning document was prepared in 1999 by the Council's former Environmental Policy and Planning Unit: 'New Brighton by the Sea - Staying Alive'. It encourages housing close to the Mall. That may impact the parking needs now as some New Brighton properties have over doubled beyond Government Valuation and New Brighton has moved ahead.

Now I ask that regulation restricting private freedom to build housing over shops on the north side of the mall be considered. That is as per the philosophy of the Retail Variation matter. Then sunlight can continue to enter the inviting Mall area. The economic benefits of the sunlight there, alleviating depression by enlivening the remarkable social space, may be hard to quantify but they must be there. Depression is a high cost to the health services. So could MOH be canvassed in that matter?

I note that under the Retail Variation considerations it has been mooted to restrict freedom to put shopping centres on cheap industrial land and contest business with established shopping areas designated 'retail parks'. That is a model for restricting freedoms to increase others.

Better quantified is exercise against cardiovascular disease and diabetes. Would MOH help with the publicising such facilities as the semi-sealed undulating dune-top track south of the New Brighton Pier? Or could there be persuasion to help with maintenance of some areas of the dunes for play areas? Of course this is a Council responsibility but I do believe the overlapping economics of the situation should be explored. Then maybe we would retain some of that marvellous play area. What used to be sand 'pozzies' sheltered from the easterly wind are being smoothed and covered with vegetation to reduce costs of maintenance. A good slice of the recreation of many 'baby-boomers' youths has been stopped. So who is looking into the health economics of that? Please canvass it. The dune maintenance costs have benefits.

I think trees impact on psychological health. Councils in many places will tell you the fights over removing trees are very powerful. I believe more money of the Parks budget should be devoted to early maintenance of trees. The positioning of new residential works near established stands of trees so that the trees soon have to be removed seems a tragedy. I ask for research into and exploration of more spending on great majestic trees.

My submission may impact on the following areas of the Draft Plan:

Community Services
City Development
Democracy and Governance
Regulating Services
Partnerships with Private Sector
Policy on Determining Significance

Possible reference:

The Bibliography of Relationships between economics (i.e. economic) and social factors and health / The Public Health Association of New Zealand.