

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:
10,14

I also want to respond to: Other

Name:	Barry Lee
Organisation:	
Daytime Phone:	0274375600
Evening Phone:	3221977
Email:	barry@helimaintenance.com
Address:	139 Old Tai Tapu road Christchurch
Your Submission:	<p>Do you have any comments on the major projects in our Draft Community Plan?</p> <p>The proposed Botanic Gardens project, what justifies the need for this how do the rate payers benefit from this, have alternatives been explored fully. If this is for the visitor centre why cannot an existing building somewhere else be used.</p> <p>Tree renewal of \$17.2 appears excessive, this needs reviewed. If the council is planting large trees, maybe they need to consider smaller cheaper plants. Natives in root trainers or pots are available commercially for \$5 each. At \$17.2m this will plant 1.7m trees reserving 50% for planting costs.</p> <p>If council purchases land it needs to look to sell surplus property to fund those purchases. Sell property that is not being utilised fully or giving a rateable return.</p>
	<p>Do you have any comments on groups of activities (The activities and services the Council provides?)</p> <p>Council is in the business of providing welfare activities with its provision of 2600 housing units.</p> <p>This is the role of the state, with their provision of welfare housing supplements or state houses.</p> <p>These housing units should be sold to the state or private landlords.</p> <p>I expect there is no rates return on these housing units and according to the Draft plan, no return on capital.</p> <p>Another landlord private or state would be paying rates and the council would recoup say \$260 million in capital at \$100 000 per unit.</p> <p>The opportunity cost on \$260 million and lost rates revenue is significant and will go some way to reduce future rates if the capital is used wisely.</p> <p>The council should not be in the business of running and subsidising pre-schools.</p>

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

These should be sold and the capital used in the same way as housing capital. The buildings leased back to the new owners.

The state has introduced pre-school payments to families. This is where the welfare funding should come from. Not the rate payer.

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

Council should insist that CCHL sell poor performing assets. Priority should be The Red Bus Company (NATP 3% return 2005) \$21.3 million capital, City Care (NATP 1.5% return 2005) \$15.2 million capital. Selwyn plantation has already been mooted as a possible sale and on current valuation would return approximately \$28.8 million, a laudable idea from CCHL.

The idea from CCHL that this capital be used for some other risky business venture is abhorrent, and the capital needs to be repatriated to council to use for its core activities and any capital works associated with these.

The capital from the sale of housing units, pre-schools and company sales in the CCHL should be used for funding capital works only.

In Conclusion

Council needs to lead the way and provide rate increases under the rate of inflation and if possible some years a nil rate increase.

This will be achieved by returning the role of housing welfare to where it rightfully belongs, to the state.

Exiting poorly performing businesses and being prudent on expenditure.