LTCCP 2006-16 SUBMISSION

Submissions close on 5 May 2006

I do NOT wish to present my submission at the hearing, and ask that this submission be considered.

I am completing this submission: For yourself	**Number of people you represent:**
My submission refers to: Summary Version of the LTCCP	**Page Number:** 4
I also want to respond to:	

Name:	Paul Christensen
Organisation:	
Daytime Phone:	033139805
Evening Phone:	033667072
Email:	p.christensen33@xtra.co.nz
Address:	4/288 Hereford St Christchurch
Your Submission:	**Do you have any comments on the major projects in our Draft Community Plan?**
	Strategic Land purchases $37.6M There is very little detail about these in the draft plan. Generally it is hard to make a decision on whether to agree or disagree with a proposed project without sufficient details about the project. Strategic land purchases should be made to advance a strategy which the Council has decided upon. There is no indication of what that strategy is, so that I can decide whether I agree with this or not. The draft LTCCP already has a large amount of work planned. Because this will then lead to an increased rates burden I think that discretionary projects should not go ahead. The priority projects are already expensive; this should make the Council decline to take on any non-priority work until all the priority work has been paid for. On principal, the only land purchases which I think the Council should make are those which are needed for another project e.g. land needed for infrastructure assets and I assume that this is included in the costs of those projects already.
	Do you have any comments on groups of activities (The activities and services the Council provides?)
	Cultural and Learning services It is good that you are recognising that the rates burden for Cultural and Learning is high. I think that in principal these activities should have a lower priority than the infrastructure services. It seems wrong a larger percentage of rates income is used for supporting these activities than water, wastewater or roading activities. Your suggestion to reduce the rates burden is to reduce library services. This has generally been viewed negatively by the public. My suggestion is to make the library more user pays. When a book is issued the lender gets a private benefit from reading that book. This could be recognised by a charge to the lender. Say $5 per book, which is still a lot cheaper than purchasing the book.

Your Submission (Cont'd):	This charge could be applied to adult fiction only, with a reduction for people with community services cards. This would mean that adults with the ability to pay would pay for the private benefit they receive. This could achieve the aim of reducing the rates burden from the library services without reducing the services.
	Do you have any other comments or suggestions you want to make?