

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:

Page Number:
16

I also want to respond to:

Name: Jay Scanlon

Organisation: n/a

Daytime Phone: see below

Evening Phone:

Email: jrs@abannand.co.nz

Address: see below

Your Submission: **Do you have any comments on the major projects in our Draft Community Plan?**

22 April 06

Jay Scanlon
3A Karitane Drive
Cashmere, Christchurch
tel (03)325-6810 office
JRS@abannand.co.nz

Dear Christchurch City Council planners:

Thank you for your community plan draft.
I offer a comment on the solid waste problem and the Council's draft activity statement here. I am acting alone, as a citizen and ratepayer in Christchurch.

RE: Refuse minimisation and disposal, p. 16.

Recycling does not make sense. Except for items for which there is a market - , aluminium, copper wire, scrap steel, cardboard - the cost of collecting, sorting and shipping does not equal the value of the commodity - even valuing your citizens' time as zero - time spent washing containers, storing separate bins, lugging these around, etc. This low commodity value problem is especially true in our small island nation, distant from industrial commodity markets.

We all agree what we want, and you have phrased this correctly: "A healthy community and environment and sustainable use of our natural resources." But surely one tactic ("How are we going to achieve that?") should be the measurement of 'economically sustainable use of natural resources' - an truly economic measure - and not counting as 'income' received from federal or regional government subsidies or programmes.

The cost of disposal is too low - that is the basic problem. Thus landfills are an 'externalised dis-economy': we advance the real cost of consumer packaging onto future generations and to the environment-community around (and on the way to) the active landfill.

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

Absent economic measurement - both present and in the future (estimating the cost to the future environment and community), then recycling is farcical. Recycling as a policy that does bespeak what everyone wants to get - so it is politically hard to resist. But this is an expensive illusion - is costly to run now, and even more costly in the future as liabilities of all sorts are pushed forward to the dates when these illusions finally are seen to be just that. And more sadly, when once-lovely Kate Valley sanitary landfill is too-full, too soon - belching, subsiding and oozing leachate ad infinitum.

The "Achievements" to measure you provide in your draft doc all are perpetuating a failed and very expensive policy - intended to reduce this externalised dis-economy. But the problem is growing faster and larger in spite of all the money spend attempting to 'recycle'.

It is time for different tactics other than the 2 of the 3 that you propose in this draft:

* "...programmes that educate...recycling..."

* "...providing kerbside recycling..."

These two are not "Achievements" to measure at all. I suggest a tactic should be to move to economically-sustainable (read positive or neutral cost) reduction of solid waste.

More:

Black bags should all be paid , and none should be free. Landfill disposal charges should be raised. The money s/b used for reducing solid waste (not make-believe recycling). Waste reduction education - how to reduce and re-use things (the Councils re-use shops seem a good tactic) should be pursued. Composting garden waste - even if subsidised - makes sense. But basically, people want to be free and should be free to figure out for themselves how to reduce the cost of putting things into either Waste Management's bins, or of stuffing the Council's black bags. In addition, diverting the current vast cost of collecting separated glass, steel cans, plastic and newspaper can be saved for more effective tactics. Finally, illegal waste disposal or dumping should carry very high penalties. Public disapproval of dumping is an additional education objective - and now modern forensics can now address this petty crime problem that typically arises when disposal costs are raised. This should not deter.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer this comment. I'll hope this information finds use.

Kind regards;
Jay Scanon

Do you have any comments on groups of activities (The activities and services the Council provides?)

Do you have any other comments or suggestions you want to make?