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: Full Version of the LTCCP	**Page Number:** 300
I also want to respond to: Aquatic Facilities	

Name:	Stephen Luke
Organisation:	
Daytime Phone:	03 9810589
Evening Phone:	
Email:	slook@es.co.nz
Address:	28 Wairoa St, Bexley.
Your Submission:	**Do you have any comments on the major projects in our Draft Community Plan?**

Comments on the Draft Christchurch City Aquatic Facilities Strategy. I am referring to the PDF document

Much of what I mention below is stated in the draft as discussed in Appendices. However there are no appendices in this document. Nor are any appendices listed as downloadable in the CCC website where I downloaded this Draft PDF. Nor are they in the Table of Contents or final pages of the full draft document . This critical information seems to have been kept from Christchurch residents, with no explanation. If the appendices which the aquatic resources document clearly mentions, and uses to justify its lack of supporting detail in the main text, are missing, how much of other critical details may be missing?

In this draft PDF, the degree of informed consent and consultation with residents over the prioritisation of different types of aquatic facilities is quite inadequate. It is impossible to tell if more consultation than mentioned has been done, or if only the very small survey of 400 people in 2005 (p8) has been used.

I am aware that previous to, and during, community meetings over the so-called 'revitalisation' of New Brighton (2000-2004), a need was expressed by local residents, and acknowledged by Council, for warm salt water bathing pools.

However, there is no mention of this in the draft. This leads me to conclude that no genuine consultation may have taken place, or, that various community needs that have previously been identified have been removed from the draft in a way that makes invisible their previous presence, as well as the process of removal.

Furthermore, there seems too few and too restricted a range of types of aquatic facilities planned for the east and south-east of Christchurch. Because of the lack of detail in this document (and lack of appendices) I cannot be more explicit, at this stage, and this is a major problem with the document.

Your Submission (Cont'd):	Being a sociologist by training, I am aware of the importance of selecting appropriate boundaries when beginning statistical treatment of geographic and demographic data. I do not see any reference to the methods and assumptions and directions that must have preceded the generation of the maps and conclusions presented in the draft. Without such information, the draft is a mockery of a consultation process. Respondents cannot offer informed opinions because they have not been provided with the necessary information. Indeed, a seminar at the geography department at Canterbury University on Tuesday (2 May) focused on this very issue. Professor Robin Flowerdew (University of St Andrews) presented on 'Scales of Process and Scales of Data: The Modifiable Areal Unit Problem in Health Geography'. He emphasised the potential hazards of working with a single homogenous type of unit of distribution across heterogenous area boundaries, such as the differing socio-economic zones of Christchurch. He clearly considered many existing studies to be misleading at best, and that any accurate and relevant analysis would firstly provide a range of boundaries for comparison of the resulting maps, and secondly provide the raw data for people to generate their own maps for comparison. Given the behaviour and performance of the Christchurch City Council over the last two years, and especially over the last months, I do not think any resident can be expected to take the unbiased professionalism of Council planning on faith, especially planning that emphasises funding through public/private partnerships. There has been too much neo-liberal ideology looking for excuses to cut services unless they can be affordable through 'for-profit' arrangements, such as selling off ownership of what are public assets. The frequent mention of public/private arrangements in the draft are worrying because such arrangements might entail a loss of strategic control and ownership in the longer-term In general, bearing the New Brighton warm salt water pools in mind, it is not good enough to apparently reject some consultation options and privilege others on such an apparent paucity of data. It is unacceptable to not provide alternatives for community choice. What this draft does is simply say, 'believe us, we know what we're doing'. That is not genuine consultation. Genuine consultation involves providing alternatives, and showing how and why such alternatives were placed on a short list while other possibilities were not.
	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?