

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:
On behalf of a group or organisation

Number of people you represent:
20

My submission refers to:
Summary Version of the LTCCP

Page Number:

I also want to respond to:

Name:	Dave Kelly
Organisation:	Victoria Neighbourhood Group
Daytime Phone:	03 3642 782
Evening Phone:	03 3656 276
Email:	dave.kelly@canterbury.ac.nz
Address:	6 Beveridge St, Chch 8001
Your Submission:	<p>Do you have any comments on the major projects in our Draft Community Plan?</p> <p>Our residents group is in the inner city and our comments below are guided by a belief in the importance of planning for a livable city, with people living close to where they work and shop. We are within 10 minutes walking distance of the Square and tend to walk, cycle and bus more, and drive less, than most residents. The VNG has long supported policies for improving public transport and cycling and walking, for reducing the impact of commuter traffic (especially noise and parking), and for increasing amenity in the central city (eg new small parks). We also believe a long term plan like this has to take account of Peak Oil and the likely increase in cost of transport fuels, which mean that moving to the kinds of policies listed above will become even more important.</p> <p>We have also been concerned for years about the decline of the inner city while the Council has fiddled. This is increasingly urgent and we consider that preventing the core of Chch from dying is a city-wide priority. The inner city contributes hugely to Chch as a tourist destination and the entire city benefits from that, and from the rates that would be largely lost if the inner city loses value greatly. All this means there is good justification for measures funded from general rates to protect the central city as a shopping destination. In particular we are concerned about the proposal to charge a targeted rate on these already stressed businesses to pay for part of the redevelopment of the inner city (summary p 9) and to increase parking charges in that area by \$1.5 M (page 8). While we are no lovers of car traffic (see above), increasing charges for inner city car parking is likely to reduce the viability of inner city shops even more. It would be far better to introduce a targeted levy on suburban malls per car park provided there, and use this to fund the inner city, as it is the "free" (cross-subsidised) parking at malls that are part of the problem.</p>

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

Specifically also our vision of the importance of local communities and a decreased reliance on motor transport means that we do not support the expensive centralisation of facilities like libraries and swimming pools, on the apparent assumption that folk will drive across town to visit the few flash new facilities. The amounts saved by closing local pools and libraries is very small (eg \$130,000 for four suburban pools, p 8) while the cost of redevelopments is very large (\$11.6 M at Jellie Park alone). We argue on both financial, and community cohesion, grounds for the retention of the redwood, bishopdale, spreynon and mobile libraries, and the edgeware, belfast, templeton and Woolston pools. We are not totally against redevelopment of some pools but feel sure that the budget for these could be reduced, or the redevelopment done in stages to spread the cost, thus reducing rates and also allowing the small older local facilities to be preserved.

Another large-ticket item which we are sure could provide some savings is the streets and transport budget (\$187M provided, see p4). Within this there are sure to be some projects of lower priority which could be delayed or abandoned to reduce the rates increase. The Council must be careful not to build a whole lot of expensive new roads just as petrol becomes so expensive that transport patterns change to make the roads redundant. Focusing on higher density development and on public transport, cycling and walking are more strategically important, and also cheaper.

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?

The VNG has been very disappointed recently to see less heed taken by the City Council of public consultation for example on issues like waste minimisation and implementation of the Cycle Strategy. It is very discouraging to make comments and think they may well just be disregarded. We urge the Council to take very serious note of the views expressed by the weight of submissions on the LTCCP (whether they agree with our particular submission or not), and do its best to give effect to them.