



South New Brighton Residents' Association

The Secretary
PO Box 18 764
New Brighton
CHRISTCHURCH

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

April 29, 2006

Tena koutou

The South New Brighton Residents' Association wishes to make the following submissions on 'Our Community Plan 2006 to 16' (LTCCP).

1) Re: Capital works programme

1.1 Further provision for stop-bank protection for South New Brighton

We submit that the LTCCP needs to include financial provision for improved Avon River and Estuary stop-bank protection in South New Brighton from Owles Terrace to Ebbitide Street. We request that the existing stop-banks are maintained and new stop-banks are built, as outlined below. Most of the new protection would be along reserves with only a short section with street frontage (Evans Avenue and Kibblewhite Street where in fact there is already a low stop-bank).

North of Bridge Street there is a stop-bank as far as Evans Avenue and the height of the bank is apparently insufficient because of the elevated floor levels required by Christchurch City Council Town Planning for new dwellings.

South of Bridge Street there is no stop-bank at all along most of the South New Brighton Domain frontage of the estuary with the attendant risk of flooding some residential areas west of Estuary Road and the camping grounds.

Our Association's concern is two-fold, that is:

- a) The Town Planning requirement for elevated new dwelling floor levels will prevent the redevelopment of many of the early holiday dwellings, which are now sub-standard and on narrow frontage sections, permitted by the New Brighton Borough Council.
- b) The Town Planning requirements for the elevation of new dwellings do not protect existing dwellings and streets and cause problems with storm water run-off from filled building sites into existing lower residential properties.

Our Association is aware of some builders not proceeding with the redevelopment of old sub-standard properties because of the Town Planning requirements to meet 50 – 100 year flood levels, particularly because of the costs involved.

The Waimakariri District Council does not require elevated floor levels for new dwellings at Kaiapoi because the past severe flooding from the Waimakariri River has been prevented by stop-banks.

The most likely flooding threat to South New Brighton would be from elevated water levels in the estuary from ocean storm surges and the scientific theories related to rises in sea levels. The remote possibility of a tsunami would also elevate the estuary and Avon River water levels.

In summary it is more logical and sustainable for all residents, to install a one metre high stop-bank than to require new dwelling floor levels to be elevated one metre, especially when a stop-bank would also protect existing properties and streets.

- 1.2 We submit that, in light of the reduced numbers of employees in the Christchurch City Council and the amalgamation with Banks Peninsula there must be a surplus of offices and office fixtures so the \$4.3 million budgeted for a 'Fit out for new Civic Offices' could be substantially reduced.

2) Re: Council's proposed savings

- 2.1 We are totally against all closures of pools, libraries and mobile library services. We know this destroys communities and continues to place barriers for those who have difficulty with mobility, those that have health risks associated with in-door pools (e.g. chlorine fumes inhalation) and those from lower socio-economic groups. Closure of local libraries and pools means that there are further distances to travel to these locations, that is, not only the costs associated with transport but also the admission costs. It also means there is less chance of getting to know and interact with local people and establish better and safer communities because these larger venues cater for a much larger catchment and a less likelihood of meeting your neighbour. We submit that this proposal to close local pools and libraries contradict (and noticeably they have been omitted from this part of the plan) the community outcomes the plan professes to uphold, namely safety, community, health and recreation.
- 2.2 We submit that the City Scene be finished. We believe that information could form part of the local community papers that are delivered free already and that there are a vast number of people with Internet access that can and do already receive this information.
- 2.3 We request that the increase in on and off-street parking does not happen because this will even further remove incentives for people to visit the central city. Unless there is a viable alternative offered (e.g. more free shuttles covering a greater area) people will continue to go to the malls as it's easier to find a park and it's free.

3) Re: Vision for our future Christchurch

'Our future Christchurch is a world-class boutique city, with a first-world lifestyle, first-class environment, diversity of landscapes and a unique economic base. Christchurch will be: a place where people enjoy living; a place with great work opportunities; the most attractive city in New Zealand; a must-see for visitors; and a global investment destination' (Our community plan 2006 to 16 draft p.9)

Our Association submits that the themes as stated above are: unsustainable; do not meet the needs of the elderly, youth, disabled people, infants, the homeless, and anyone unable to work; do not relate to the community outcomes, do not reflect scientific, health-related and global trends, are not socially or culturally located, are not interrelated and are not health promoting.

Starting with 'a global investment destination'. This is economically driven and relies on the dollar, import and export markets and related government policies of which the Council has little influence. People that invest do so to make money and do not (generally) consider social and environmental impacts. There is no obvious link between global investments and it's contribution to the community outcomes particularly safety, community, environment, governance and health. There is also no obvious link to the welfare of those not working or involved in business, that is, the people in Christchurch that deserve our care and concern. Global investment if not properly managed often leads to the rich getting richer and the poor becoming more disadvantaged, that is, there is a strong body of evidence that the developed world has passed a threshold, a point beyond which economic growth ceases to improve quality of life (Eckersly, 1999)

'A must-see for visitors' again does not relate to the people that actually live in Christchurch excepting those involved in tourism. We already have a number of overseas visitors that come to Christchurch and seem to be served largely by overseas-born people. The average Christchurch citizen does not appear to embrace cultural diversity and this surely needs to be addressed first before attracting more overseas visitors. That is, we still have an element of racism in our society and continually pouring money into 'world-class' accommodation and attractions adds further fuel to this fire. It shows something that the average Christchurch citizen cannot afford, can only desire from a distance, until they perhaps decide to take matters into the own hands. This vision shows Christchurch citizens that the Council puts 'outsiders' needs before their own. Again it's all about money and does not contribute to the community outcomes of safety, environment, governance, knowledge and health, particularly for those that are disadvantaged.

We submit also that this vision 'A must-see for visitors' is particularly foolish in the present climate. It does not align with the current global issues of both the health-related epidemics (e.g. bird-flu) and the oil crisis. Global travel may soon be neither wise nor affordable to participate in. The city, as indeed the country as a whole, needs to be thinking locally in this present climate and working towards sustainable options that do not rely on oil or international travel.

We submit that the vision 'The most attractive city in New Zealand' is competitive when there is no need to be within New Zealand, completely unsustainable and unrealistic, as everybody thankfully has a different version of what they find attractive. How can this vision possibly do anything for us as Christchurch citizens? Ultimately, as social people, our wellbeing is about our relationships to one another and ourselves. Placing so much emphasis on 'external attractiveness' we assert should be a very low priority and definitely not a vision statement. This theme will not contribute the community outcomes again.

'A place with great work opportunities' we contend, like the three previous themes does not enhance the lives of the people who need our greatest care and concern, including the elderly, youth, disabled people, infants, the homeless, and anyone else unable to work. Before the Second World War there was much unemployment and little economic growth but life got better for people because public policy initiatives improved education, health, housing and working conditions. (Eckersly, 1999)

Naaku noa na
Sally Unwin
Secretary

p.p. South New Brighton Residents' Association