

Summary submission form

Instructions

You may send us your submission...

Please read before completing your submission

It will help us process your submission if you clearly state the issue you want the Council to consider, what specific action you think the Council should take, and why that should be done.

If you wish, you can present your submission at a hearing. (If that is the case, please tick the box). The hearings will be held between Thursday 25 May and Wednesday 7 June 2006. Generally, 10 minutes are allocated for hearing each submission, including time for questions.

It will help us if your submission also refers to the page of either the full version or the summary version.

Please note: we are legally required to make all written or electronic submissions available to Councillors and to the public. This includes the name and address of the submitter. All submissions will be published on the Council's website from 10 May 2006.

No anonymous submissions will be accepted.

By mail

Please mail your submission (no stamp is required) to:

Freepost 178
Our Community Plan
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 237
Christchurch 8003

By email

Please email your submission to:
ccc-plan@ccc.govt.nz
Please make sure that your full name and address is included with your submission.

On the internet

You may enter your submission using the form provided on the Council's web site at:
<http://www.ccc.govt.nz>
Please follow all the instructions on the web site.

Please remember to indicate if you wish to present your submission in person at one of the hearings.

Please ensure your submission arrives no later than Friday 5 May 2006.

Your submission

You may use this form for your submission on the draft Our Community Plan if you wish. Whether you use this form or not, please include your name, address and contact telephone number with your submission.

Tick one I do NOT wish to present my submission at the hearing, and ask that this written submission be considered
OR
 I wish to talk to the main points in my written submission at the hearings to be held between Thursday 25 May and Wednesday 7 June 2006

Are you completing this submission: For yourself On behalf of a group or organisation

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent? _____

My submission refers to: Full version Page No. Summary version 4, Page Nos, 16, 18.

Do you also want to respond to: Development Contributions Aquatic Facilities Other

Contact Name Alison J Powell.

Organisation name (if applicable) _____

Contact Address 101c main Rd, Redcliffs, Christchurch 8008

Phone No. (day) (03) 384 0055 Phone No. (evening) (03) 384 0055

Email (if applicable) _____

Signature APowell Date 5.5.06



Summary submission form

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views

See list of major projects in the summary document

Questions

1 Do you have any comments on the major projects in our draft Our Community Plan? page number 4

Bus Exchange - we have already spent millions on the current one why was it not thought out properly the first time. For goodness sake take time to get it right next time - NOT a top priority.

Civic Offices Outfit - Spending money on 'Posh' offices should NOT be a priority when the basics in our city still need attention - bursting waterpipes, bursting sewerage pipes, civil defence tsunami warning system, ferryhead bridge

Civil Defence matters are urgent - A crisis can occur any time, we need to be prepared - and we are not!!

2 Do you have any comments on groups of activities (the activities and services that Council provides)? page number 8

Swimming Pools & Libraries - It is a disgrace to be closing these services to the public and at the same time spending \$500,000 on lighting the cathedral.

Mobile Library - agree it should be withdrawn.

City Scene - Why not reduce to 6 times/year - should be enough.

WATER SUPPLY (Page 20) - Should be an ESSENTIAL PROJECT

[P.8] Raising on/off street parking charges will push people out of the city centre and encourage them to shop at suburban malls.

3 Do you have any other comments or suggestions you want to make? page number P16

Minimisation of Waste - Needed, but if ratepayers to bear the cost it should be charged as a FLAT Rate per household and NOT as a % of the rates, since all citizens benefit equally.

"Peoples Republic" suggests Communism/Dictatorship - not a nice name for christchurch, although we do seem to be moving that way. The Council are still not listening to what the citizens of Christchurch are saying regarding many matters.

Streets and Transport - [P18] "traffic signals"
Badly needed in Redcliffs, but requests not being heeded. Is it going to take a serious accident before something is done?

For office use only	
Submission #:	<input type="text"/>
Referred to:	<input type="text"/>
Date referred:	<input type="text"/>
Date required:	<input type="text"/>
Heard:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

You may add more pages if you wish. Thank you for your submission.

A.J. Powell.

(Continuation of Submission to Draft of
Community Plan 2006-16.)

Ref. P17f Regulatory Services.

"ensure compliance with Building Act, Council by-laws and the City Plan"

The City plan at present is a USELESS document when it comes to building regulation.

Developers seem to be able to do what they like and get around every regulation, regardless of the wishes of others and regardless of what is written in the City Plan.

The average citizen is forced to comply but the "big boys" with money to keep fighting can flout the rules and get away with it.

What is the use of a plan if those with money and influence can always find a way around the rules?

We need a plan that is "watertight" and developers should be made to stick to the rules.

Ref P.5 Financial Overview

I note that once again those who already pay higher rates are being burdened with a greater increase than those who pay lower rates - (both percentage wise and dollar wise).

This is unfair - Everyone receives the same services from the council.

e.g. Why should a ratepayer whose property is valued at \$500,000 be expected to pay \$104 for "Refuse minimisation & Disposal" (4.8% of \$2172), while someone whose property is valued at \$200,000 pays only \$45 (4.8% of 938) and a property of \$100,000 is levied at \$25 (4.8% of 526) - ALL FOR THE SAME SERVICE.

And when the rates are raised disproportionately again in subsequent years, the difference becomes even greater.

A Powell.