

LTCCP 2006-16 SUBMISSION

Submissions close on 5 May 2006

I wish to talk to the main points in my submission at the hearings to be held between Thursday 25 May and Wednesday 7 June 2006.**I am completing this submission:**
For yourself**Number of people you represent:****My submission refers to:**
Summary Version of the LTCCP**Page Number:**
4,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20.**I also want to respond to:**

Name:	Ainslie Talbot
Organisation:	
Daytime Phone:	364 1199
Evening Phone:	355 4409
Email:	talbotjones@clear.net.nz
Address:	84 Mays Road St Albans
Your Submission:	Do you have any comments on the major projects in our Draft Community Plan?
	<p>This section is confusing and badly written, It is not clear the difference between 'base projects' and 'essential projects' and whether the spending for the latter is going to be over 10 years.</p> <p>New Bus Exchange: I do not understand why we have to have a new bus exchange at a cost of \$60m so soon after the construction of the existing one. This spending should be reduced or postponed; unless spread over 10 years.</p> <p>Art Gallery air conditioning. I do not support this added cost. This should be made up from cost cutting or increased charges. The Gallery is already running well over its capital and operating budget.</p> <p>Tree renewal \$17.2m: This is an incredible expense and needs to be 'severely pruned'. Many people I have spoken to simply can't believe this cost.</p> <p>Civil Defence Building \$3.6m. Cut this completely. There is already one at Ecan</p> <p>Discretionary Projects:</p> <p>All of these need to be reduced or postponed, especially:</p> <p>Streets and transport improvements \$187.3m Botanic Gardens Project \$11.1m. People I have spoken to just cannot believe this cost for the upgrade. Totally excessive! City Mall Renovation \$10.3m I do not believe that only retailers will pay for this through special rate. Strategic Land Purchases \$37.6m</p>

	Do you have any comments on groups of activities (The activities and services the Council provides?)
	<p>Library rationalisation: I definitely do not support the closures of the three libraries in the plan. This is anti-democratic and bad politics for the City. There is huge opposition to this in the community.</p> <p>Swimming pools. Support rationalisation, but some may need to be looked at again.</p> <p>Support other reductions in services, fees rises and sale of Papanui Pool land.</p> <p>Lyttelton Port Company. Not sure which section this comes under, but I am completely against the current plans to sell the operation offshore.</p> <p>This will result in short terms gains and long term loss of control of this strategic infractural facility for Canterbury and New Zealand. This proposal is more of the same stupid policy that we have seen over the last 20 years which has cost New Zealanders billions in lost revenue.</p> <p>There are alternatives.It is up to Councillors to investigate those, and carry out the will of the electorate. 90% of people I have spoken to are against the current proposals. This will have major electoral fallout if it goes ahead.</p> <p>Other Activities: City Development: Defer City Mall renovation. Hold costs at 04/05 level Cultural and learning services: Hold expenditure at 04/05 level for three years Economic Development: Hold expenditure at 04/05 level for three years Democracy and Government Hold expenditure at 04/05 level for three years. Reduce community board expenditure. Parks, open spaces and waterways Reduce Botanic Gardens expenditure Severely reduce Tree Renewal Cancel Avon River upgrade Reduce strategic land purchases</p> <p>Also stop using Round-Up around trees in parks and halve the number of times lawns are mown. Why are we so obsessed about both these things??? NZ Male lawn mowing fetish. Truly psychotic...!</p> <p>Recreation and leisure: Hold at 06/07 level for three years</p> <p>Refuse Minisaton and disposal: Hold expenditure at 06/07 level for three years</p> <p>Streets and transport Hold at 04/05 level for three years. Too much money is spent in this area for sole purpose of cars. Rational cities focus on alternatives to dangerous and unhealthy car transport.</p> <p>Wastewater collection and treatment Support expenditure here for next three years.</p> <p>Water supply Generally support expenditure in this vital area. Consider metering of commercial and industrial users who can then write cost off against government tax. Domestic users can not do this</p>

	Do you have any other comments or suggestions you want to make?
	<p>The rate increase of 10% is exorbitant in the current climate and considering the Council's assets. It is an example of monopoly pricing and is an excessive tax on the citizenry. Cost cutting (but not libraries!) cannot be avoided. If a poll were taken 90% of people would consider 10% an excessive rate increase (particularly when added to Ecan's incredible 18%) and would question council priorities. Councillors must do something to show they are serious about reducing this proposed increase and their re-election.</p> <p>I also have concerns about removal of Red Bus/City Care from strategic assets. I would suggest that privatisation of bus services under Stagecoach in Auckland and Wellington has not been a success for the public.</p>