

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:

I also want to respond to:

Name:	Dave Kelly
Organisation:	
Daytime Phone:	3642 782
Evening Phone:	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>I am a member of the Victoria Neighbourhood Group and the VNG has made a submission about transport and inner city redevelopment issues which I also strongly support.</p> <p>Here I wish to comment on other items not part of the neighbourhood group submission.</p> <p>I wish to support the proposal for a revised Developments Contributions Policy (summary p 4). It seems inherently unfair to ask current residents to bear the cost of infrastructure which must be created for new developments. This is fuelling the current wasteful trend for residents to move out of the established Christchurch suburbs to new developments on the city fringe or further afield (in Waimakariri District, etc). This involves not only the loss of green space but also the cost of supplying new services to such areas, while existing suburbs already have such services. The pricing signals will be much more transparent if developments have to pay for the costs they create in this way.</p> <p>Secondly I ask that Biodiversity be given a higher priority than in the Draft LTCCP, perhaps not to the tune of the \$25M listed on p 4, but certainly there are many important biodiversity projects that would protect and enhance our natural landscape. If these are not done in the medium term, the underlying natural systems may well be lost or suffer irreversible degradation. The Council has shown excellent results with some of its past projects (the Styx river is an excellent example) and I request that this be given a higher priority.</p>
	<p>Do you have any comments on groups of activities (The activities and services the Council provides?)</p> <p>I support the Council's provision of rental housing (p 10), this is an important social function.</p> <p>I also support the Council's contributions to the Canterbury Museum, a world-class facility that I visit probably a dozen times a year. Well done!</p>

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

In respect of waste disposal, I think the targets of reducing waste are very good and very important (p 16), but the proposed actions will not meet these targets. I call for there to be no "free" rubbish bags given out at all. Even with three in our household including a young child (currently 4 years old) we have never filled a rubbish bag a week; it is usually one every 3 weeks or less. (Eg we used washable nappies not disposables.) We still have a backlog of bags from about 4 years ago that we have not used yet. It would really focus the attention of ratepayers on the cost of waste disposal if they had to pay for each rubbish bag. This also has the secondary benefit of a small saving on rates, but the most important benefit is that of education and extending the life of the landfill.

Do you have any other comments or suggestions you want to make?