

**SUBMISSION TO:** Christchurch City Council  
**ON:** Long Term Council Community Plan 2006-2016  
**BY:** Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board  
**CONTACT:** **BOB TODD**  
Chairperson, Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board  
Ph 389-6338 or 027-243-9277

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board (the Board) welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on the Long Term Council Community Plan 2006-16 (LTCCP).

The submission addresses a range of issues, including some projects already programmed and some proposals of a long-term nature. Page references for items in the LTCCP document are detailed in brackets where relevant.

The Board **would** like to speak in support of this submission.

## 2. GENERAL

2.1 The Board is disappointed at being unable to respond to specific items due to the absence of line items (in particular capital works) in the draft LTCCP. While the Board is appreciative of the effort that went into producing the capital works programme map and associated legend of works, the Board considers that this something that should have been included in the document itself. It was difficult for the Board to put substitutions forward on the information provided.

### 2.2 Governance and Management

There should be photographs included in the document of **all** elected representatives (Councillors and Community Board members) and these should be shown under Governance in the front pages of the LTCCP (brought forward from p299-300 – after the Mayor's introduction and before the Chief Executive's introduction. Photographs of management could follow.

### 2.3 Council Vision/Community Outcomes (p9-10 and p43-49)

The Board questions why the community outcomes, on which there has been a consultation process to find out what the community want for Christchurch, now follow the Council vision which appears to be given more prominence. The Board questions where and how the vision aligns with the community outcomes. The vision is not included in the planning cycle - by comparison the community outcomes are used to guide planning done by the Council. Further, the Board notes that there is no mention of Maori in the vision, nor was there any involvement with Community Boards in the development of the vision. There should be more recognition of Maori in the Vision for our future Christchurch.

The document should acknowledge and mention respective communities, their achievements and challenges.

#### 2.4 Availability of Full Draft LTCCP Document

The city scene edition for the draft ltccp included a photograph of a member of the public obtaining a copy of the full draft document from the Tuam Street customer services counter. However, when a member of the public from this ward saw that photo they went to pick a copy of the full document from Tuam Street and they were not able to get one. They were told they had to ring for a copy. More copies of the full document should have been available at Service Centres and Libraries.

#### 2.5 Overview (p19)

Some members of the Board consider that there are inappropriate assumptions regarding rate levels (eg rate levels for the next few years will be challenging), rather than facts expressed.

#### 2.6 Development of Maori Capacity to Contribute to Decision-making Process (p289)

This is a disappointingly brief reference to Maori and should not appear towards the end of the LTCCP. Under the Local Government Act 2002 Section 14(1)(d) provides that Councils "...should provide opportunities for Maori to contribute to its decision-making processes". Further, Section 81 requires "...a local authority **must** establish and maintain processes to provide opportunities to contribute to the decision-making processes... and consider ways in which it may foster the development of Maori capacity to contribute to the decision-making processes". Page 289 fails to set out any steps as to how this will be implemented. There is also no recognition of the Memorandum of Understanding that the Hagley/Ferrymead Board has with local runaka (Te Runaka Ki Otautahi O Kai Tahu). One Board member noted that some Maori found it insulting to be hidden at the back of the document. The board would be happy to assist in similar understandings involving other areas of the city.

At the commencement of each electoral term, Councillors and Board members, should, as part of their induction into Council matters, undergo a programme of developing relationships with Maori and foster development of Maori capacity to contribute to decision-making. This will go a long way in understanding the Maori contribution to the decision-making process of the Council. Further, elected members and staff need to maintain an awareness of the effect of certain decisions with particular emphasis on historical/sacred/archaeological sites in order for effective decision-making.

#### 2.7 Rates Remissions (p19 and p249)

The Board would like the Council to increase the promotion of the Government rate rebate scheme and suggests that the Council highlight the fact that remission applies to all ratepayers, although with different criteria and increase the publicity on the availability of remissions.

#### 2.8 Summary Document – Policy on Significance

The Board wishes to express its concern that there was no mention in the summary document of the changes signalled to the policy on determining significance and removing City Care and Red Bus Ltd from the list of strategic assets. Nor is there mention of the Development Contributions Strategy. While the Aquatic Facilities Plan is noted in the summary (p15) there was no reference to it being available for consultation. Therefore, the Board considers that there will be a significant sector of the community who are not aware of these proposed changes may not have taken the opportunity to comment.

### 3. STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

#### 3.1 Strong Communities (p49)

The Board queries how the proposal to rationalise community libraries fits with the goal of increasing involvement in lifelong learning by providing resources and information through libraries.

#### 3.2 “Who we need to work with” (p51)

The statement - “The Council needs to work with iwi and other Maori groups, as well as with other organisations representing the many cultures in Christchurch” should be highlighted, given more importance and placed in the same paragraph as government agencies.

#### 3.3 Prosperous Economy (p56)

Promote environmentally - sustainable business practices, by:

- Using sustainable development approaches in the Council’s own activities.
- Encouraging businesses to adopt and report on sustainable development approaches.

While signalling its support, the Board seeks details of reporting back in respect of these objectives as to how that will be achieved.

### 4. ESSENTIAL CAPITAL PROJECTS

#### 4.1 New Bus Exchange (p71)

The Board submits that the present site should be retained for the use of inter-city and tourist coaches. Further investigations and details should be followed up in respect of a suitable site to accommodate city bus transport.

#### 4.2 Fitout for New Civic Offices (p72)

The Board is unable to support the building of new Civic Offices, currently estimated to be approximately \$111 million. While the LTCCP indicates that alternative avenues are being considered for this; the Board notes it will still have an impact on rates indirectly if it means that there is less of a dividend payable by CCHL to the Council as a result of it funding the new building. It does however, support appropriate renovations to the present Tuam Street offices. The Board is mindful of the statement in the overview of a challenging rates level.

#### 4.3 The Board supports the inclusion of tree renewal and the replacement of old wastewater pipelines.

The Board **does not** support the need for a new civil defence building. It can accept renovations, but not a new building.

**5. DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS: PRIORITY (p72)**

**5.1 Central City Transport Strategies and Avon River - Central City Strategy (p73)**

The Board supports the funding for Central City Transport Strategy projects and the Avon River Central City Strategy and requests that all projects be integrated in a co-ordinated manner with reference to the Avon River Central City Strategy, which the Board also supports. The Board would like to be involved as a key stakeholder.

**5.2 School Safety Zone Infrastructure**

The Board supports the level of funding for the school safety zone infrastructure and seeks a schedule of schools where the 40km/h is installed together with details of those schools on the waiting list.

**5.3 New Leisure Centres (p73)**

The Board supports the need for new leisure centres and places before the Council the submission it made on the Aquatic Facilities Plan. The Board's submission on the Aquatic Facilities Plan is attached as Appendix A. The Board remains convinced that Hagley/Ferrymead area is the most deserving to be the first site for an aquatic/leisure facility.

**5.4 Waste Minimisation and Botanic Gardens Projects (p73)**

The Board supports the level of funding provided in the draft LTCCP for waste minimisation and the Botanic gardens project.

**5.5 City Mall Renovation (p73)**

While supporting the project the Board submits that the proposed targeted rate to raise \$10.3 million should not fall 100% on businesses (as it is understood that this could involve businesses from a wider catchment area than just the environs of the City Mall) but be shared equally, 50% Council 50% businesses with the proviso that once the City Mall area is completed other areas of the central city are considered, such as north of the square/New Regent/Gloucester/South central city etc, so that retailers and businesses benefit in their areas as well. The Board believes this will provide better buy-in from retailers etc.

**6. DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS: NON-PRIORITY**

The Board would like to express its disappointment that the following projects have been considered a non-priority and are not included in the draft LTCCP for funding.

**6.1 Water re Use (p74)**

The Board strongly supports the provision of \$200,000 for a feasibility study for the re-use of water such as rain water.

## **6.2 Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust Development**

The Council entered into a Memorandum of Understanding and established the Trust. The Board requests that funding be provided for the projects that have already been identified in the management plan.

## **6.3 Undergrounding Policy (p75)**

The Board understands the budgetary pressures that the Council faces. However, the Board does not agree with the decision made by Council in December 2005 to maintain the current level of expenditure until the arterial/collector programme is complete and the effects that this has on previous commitments given by Council. The Board reminds the Council that the Board and the residents of Charleston are of the understanding that when decisions were made several years ago to put lights in at Jade Stadium and other improvements certain streets in the Charleston Cluster received a commitment from the Council that in addition to the street renewal programme they would be converted to underground wiring. The Board respectfully requests the Council to honour this commitment.

## **6.4 Upgrade of Seating at Cowles Street (p75)**

The Board supports this project and would like it included in the draft LTCCP. The Board also signals disappointment at the ever increasing hire charges associated with the Westpac Centre which means that it is difficult for community groups to afford the charges.

## **6.5 Strengthening Incentive for Heritage Buildings**

The Board would like \$1 million to be transferred from the heritage capital budget to set up a fund to be used for earthquake-prone, dangerous heritage buildings to be used as a strengthening incentive.

## **7. "BRING-UP LIST"**

The Board recommends that the Council set aside several projects that have not been included in the 2006-16 LTCCP to reconsider them for the 2009-19 LTCCP. The Board suggests that the following be included in the list:

- Taylor's Mistake Road Upgrade
- Community halls savings of 20%
- Awaroa Godley Head development
- Scarborough to Moncks Bay walkway/coastal development
- Linwood library fitout

## **8. CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAMME (p83-84)**

The Board supports the projects in the Board area in the capital works programme but would have appreciated more detailed information in the draft LTCCP on the local and technical projects, so that the public could be more informed about them.

## **9. COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SAVINGS (p86)**

### **9.1 20% Fewer Community Halls**

The Board suggests that decisions in this area be deferred for the next three years depending on the outcome of the community facilities review. However, it should be noted that Board members were divided on this issue with some members agreeing to progress the rationalising of the community halls (stage 1) over the period of the 2006-09 years.

### **9.2 Rationalise Community Libraries**

The Board supports waiting until the 2025 library strategy is finalised until consulting and making any decisions on rationalising community libraries.

### **9.3 Exit Mobile Library**

The Board unanimously opposes this recommendation and further that if the recommended closure of the three Libraries noted in the LTCCP goes ahead that there be more stops by the mobile library in those areas.

### **9.4 Reduce the Number of City Scene**

The Board objects to this proposal.

### **9.5 Use New Zealand Post for all Council Payments**

The Board assumes that such a facility is in addition to the payment opportunities available at Service Centres. The Board believes it is vitally important for the Council to retain Customer Services at the Service Centres as they provide a much wider range of advice than just accepting payment of accounts.

### **9.6 Areas Considered for Raising Fees (p87)**

The Board supports the proposed increase of off-street parking charges but opposes the proposed movement in on-street parking charges.

The Board also recommends "highlighting" the retention of the one hour free parking.

## **10. COMMENTS ON COUNCIL'S ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES**

The Board strongly supports the plan in respect of heritage items (p92) and considers that with the development of the policy on earthquake prone, dangerous and insanitary buildings the Council will have to do more in years 4 to 10 in terms of heritage buildings.

The Board fully supports the Council's housing policy (p98).

The Board supports the retention of the current level of community funding (p101).

### 10.1 **Democracy and Governance** (p110-111)

The Board would like the Council to develop a memorandum of understanding with the Maori community. The measure of facilitating opportunities for Maori to participate should read Maori residents' satisfaction.

The Board suggests that the words **and resourcing** be shown after the word remunerating. The Board believes the ongoing target for percentage of residents satisfied with the way the Council involves the public in decision-making should (in the years 2009-15/16) remain at 75% rather than drop to 65%.

### 10.2 **Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways**

The Board fully supports any moves to reduce the incidence of vandalism and graffiti (p124).

The conservation plans for cemeteries should be funded from the cemeteries operating budgets rather than Board Project funding as this Board has the majority of cemeteries in Christchurch in its Board area (p127).

### 10.3 **Regulatory Services** (p144)

The Board expresses concern and seeks ongoing improvements in monitoring and enforcement of the City Plan and responses to complaints or requests for investigations completed. The Board notes that there is no measure or target for overall city and environmental planning.

### 10.4 **Streets and Transport - Public Transport** (p155)

The Board has for several years recommended an extension of the current north/south shuttle with a new "east/west" shuttle. The Board continues to request that service.

### 10.5 **Public Conveniences** (p208)

The Board recommends that the public toilets in Manchester Street be open 24/7.

### 10.6 **Christchurch City Holdings Limited (CCHL)** (p229)

The Board asks if it is possible to forecast the likely level of dividends.

### 10.7 **Community Development Corporation**

The Board agrees with the reduction in funding to the CDC of \$300,000 and asks the Council to consider a further reduction opportunities.

### 10.8 **Policy on Significance** (p291 -294)

The Board strongly believes that Red Bus Limited and City Care Limited should remain in the list of strategic assets. It is important for the local authority to have a public passenger service and the Council need City Care for maintenance of its infrastructure.

The Board is very concerned that the land and buildings as a whole owned by the Council for its public rental housing provision is not included in the list of strategic assets in the draft LTCCP, when it was listed in the previous 2004-14 LTCCP. The Board requests that the Council reinstate this in the list of strategic assets. The Board is concerned that while mention was made in the draft plan of the deletion of Red Bus and City Care there was no reference also to the Council's public housing.

The Board also requests that the LTCCP refers to the Council's equity in strategic assets, and not just a controlling interest as written (p294)

#### 10.9 Capital Endowment Fund (p296)

The Board would like the Council to consider readjusting the percentage of the capital endowment fund from Economic development to civic and community - this could then fund the further community projects such as an aquatic facility in the Board's area.



**SUBMISSION OF THE  
HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD**

**ON**

**DRAFT CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AQUATIC FACILITIES PLAN**

The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board (the Board) makes the following submissions on the draft Christchurch City Council Aquatic Facilities Plan.

The Board acknowledges the valuable contribution of information to this submission of the Aquatics Facilities Working Party. This is a group made up of key community leaders in the Hagley/Ferrymead area.

The Board would like to be heard in support of its submission and will be represented by Bob Todd, Chairperson, Yani Johanson, Deputy Chairperson and Richard Wisnesky, Community Development Worker, Linwood Resource Centre.

The Board submits that:

1. In November 2003, the Board, commissioned a Hagley/Ferrymead preliminary site investigation study that identified an Aquatic/Leisure facility in this area as a top priority for the area. The Board remains convinced that this area of Christchurch, is the most deserving to be the first site for an Aquatic/Leisure facility.
2. The Board, by way of comment, would like to draw your attention to the inadequate presentation of information in the draft plan. For example, key data is unable to be read on maps, making information inaccessible to anyone who is a non-internet user. The Board would also like to express its concern on the radii used. At a seminar earlier in the year a 3k citywide radius was requested and this has not been used except for QEII. Traditionally the Council has always used 4k radiuses. What is the rationale for changing the radius?
3. The Board acknowledges that the draft Aquatic Facilities Plan is currently only out for feedback from identified key stakeholder groups but the Board considers that the time frame of 21 November 2005 to 31 December 2005 for submissions is insufficient when key stakeholders are occupied and engaged with Christmas and end of year commitments.
4. The Board would like to express its serious concern over the placement of an Aquatic facility in the Papanui area and the impact that this facility will have on the Jellie Park redevelopment. The placement of a pool within 4 km of an anchor facility (Jellie Park) defies logic, when areas such as the southeast and west have a more obvious and palpable need. The Board is concerned that significant investment is being made in Jellie Park and an additional facility, positioned so close to this existing facility, could compromise public usage of Jellie Park.

5. The Board considers that there has been a long history of a lack of investment in major facilities in the Hagley/Ferrymead area. Unlike other areas of the city, the Hagley/Ferrymead area has no "Aurora Centre" or YMCA facilities. The Hagley/Ferrymead area is in need of major investment in infrastructure to provide for and meet the recreational and social needs of members of this community. The Leisure, Parks and Waterways Study (Global Leisure, 2003) highlighted the need for a YMCA type of facility in this area. The Board urges the Council to implement an Aquatic/Leisure Facility in this area to meet the current and future needs of this diverse community.
6. The Board considers that Aquagym should not be included when looking at provision of facilities in the Hagley/Ferrymead area. Aquagym is more expensive, primarily a training pool and does not provide any recreational usage ruling it out as a leisure facility in this area. Aquagym, in the future, could be looked at for partnership opportunities for future development but at present does not meet the needs of our community.
7. An Aquatic/Leisure Facility in the Hagley/Ferrymead area has the support of all local schools. The Hagley/Ferrymead area has a high proportion of low decile schools, which have pools in poor condition or have already been closed down. The Christchurch City Social trends 2003 states "areas of the city with high deprivation include the Central City, Riccarton, Wigram and Hornby to the West, Linwood and Bromley to the East and Sydenham and Addington to the South. This highlights that both Hornby (with the closure of Sockburn) and Linwood are most deserving of a facility in their area. The Board remains convinced that the demographics contained within its preliminary site investigation report are correct i.e. the Hagley/Ferrymead area has the largest percentage of older persons and has the least mobile population. Our young people are some of the most deprived in the city. Why is the Council planning for predicted population increase ahead of providing for where need exists today. Our community cannot afford to wait until 2020-26.
8. The Board understands that the Council is reluctant to place a facility in the Hagley Ferrymead area because of fears that in doing so it will affect the usage of QEII, Aquagym and Centennial. We do not accept that this risk is valid. QEII is a destination pool for our area and as such our residents would continue to use it in this way as all residents do across the city. Centennial is already over capacity and Aquagym does not provide anything other than training.
9. The Board does not believe that land opportunities and property development for Papanui High School should be driving this plan and we question the urgency of a decision being made by the Council on such a facility. The Board would like to highlight that the Hagley/Ferrymead area has equal opportunity, as in the Papanui case, to provide partnership and land opportunities and we have had expressions of interest from Aquagym, Eastgate Mall, Linwood College, Linwood Rugby League Club to form partnerships which would provide a facility in an accessible location. The Board also considers that there would be extremely high usage of such a facility due to the intensification of housing and residents living in Phillipstown, Woolston, Bromley, Linwood, Ferrymead, Sumner and with amalgamation Lyttelton and peninsula residents. Why should we be catering for Waimakiriri residents with location of another aquatic facility in the northern corridor when we should be looking after our own ratepayers.

10. The Board considers that in general Council facilities are generally more affordable than private providers. Why should people who live in the lowest socio-economic area of the city have to pay higher prices and access private facilities when it is the role of Local Government to provide such facilities.
11. Transport is a further major issue for people living in the Hagley/Ferrymead ward. It takes 45 – 60 minutes using public transport to get to QEII, Waltham or Centennial whereas people in Papanui can access public transport that takes them direct to Jellie Park from Northlands in 10 minutes. The Board have lobbied Environment Canterbury consistently over the past four years but have been unsuccessful in achieving any improvements to the service. The cost of \$2.50 is prohibitive in many cases but it is the time taken for the journey, which renders the current proposal an inadequate solution for our community.
12. The Board would like to recommend a particular focus on currently available land bounding Bromley East and Oxidation Ponds. This land is of limited commercial use and as a result, Bromley East faces an isolated future with no local focus. The Board would like to suggest that comprehensive analysis be conducted to not only the recreational impact of a facility in the area, but also the long-term social gains for an immensely under-resourced and under-serviced area with a significantly high level of deprivation.

Thank you for considering this submission.

**BOB TODD**  
**CHAIRPERSON, HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD**