Our Community Plan Submission Form

Instructions

Please read before completing your submission

It will help us process your submission if you clearly state the issue you want the Council to consider, what specific action you think the Council should take, and why that should be done.

If you wish, you can present your submission at a hearing. (If that is the case, please tick the box). The hearings will be held between Thursday 25 May and Wednesday 7 June 2006. Generally, 10 minutes are allocated for hearing each submission, including time for questions.

It will help us if your submission also refers to the page of either the full version or the summary version.

Please note: We are legally required to make all written or electronic submissions available to Councillors and to the public. This includes the name and address of the submitter. All submissions will be published on the Council's website from 10 May 2006.

No anonymous submissions will be accepted.

You may send us your submission:

By mail

Please mail your submission (no stamp is required) to:

Freepost 178
Our Community Plan
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 237
Christchurch 8003

By email

Please email your submission to:
ccc-plan@ccc.govt.nz
Please make sure that your full name and address is included with your submission.

On the internet

You may enter your submission using the form provided on the Council's web site at
http://www.ccc.govt.nz
Please follow all the instructions on the web site.

Please remember to indicate if you wish to present your submission in person at one of the hearings.

Please ensure your submission arrives no later than Friday 5 May 2006.

Your submission

You may use this form for your submission on our draft Community Plan if you wish. Whether you use this form or not, please include your name, address and contact telephone number with your submission.

Tick one

- ☐ I do NOT wish to present my submission at the hearing, and ask that this written submission be considered
  OR
- ☑ I wish to talk to the main points in my written submission at the hearings to be held beween Thursday 25 May and Wednesday 7 June 2006

Are you completing this submission: ☑ For yourself ☐ On behalf of a group or organisation

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent? _____

My submission refers to: ☐ Full version ☐ Page No. ☐ Summary version ☐ Page No.

Do you also want to respond to: ☐ Development Contributions ☐ Aquatic Facilities ☐ Other

Contact Name: Colin Jenkins

Organisation name (if applicable): _____

Contact Address: P.O. Box 910
Christchurch.

Phone No. (day): 366 6613 Phone No. (evening): 3894961

Email (if applicable): colin@bodyworksnutrition.co.nz

Signature: _____ Date: 5/5/06

There are three issues I would like to address in the LTCCP, however the fact I have not commented on other aspects is only because of the lack of time I have available at what is our busiest time of the year.

I'm a ratepayer both in Christchurch and the former Banks Peninsula Council. We operate two retail businesses within the CBD i.e. within the four avenues.

!) Inner City Revitalization

a) In the recent past there appears to be a piecemeal approach to the treatment of problems encountered in the CBD in that problems or issues are addressed in isolation often leading to escalation of another issue. Fore example, solutions to transport issues and the increasing of parking costs act as a negative to people visiting the central city yet we are spending large sums to attract people back into the city as part central city promotional campaigns.

   We have a retail store in central Wellington and as a result have observed their central city revitalization with interest. They have higher parking fees than Christchurch during the business week however at weekends provide free parking to encourage people back into the city. Comparing this to Christchurch where we not only continue to charge for our parking buildings but also have Parking Wardens issuing tickets on Saturday and Sunday even though there is usually ample street parking. – the message to Christchurch people is that we don't want you in the city even during the weekends!!

b) The proposed targeted rate. I'm strongly opposed to rate proposed as both of our retail outlets would not benefit from the proposed upgrade of the Mall. The principle beneficiaries of the Mall upgrade will be the Mall landowners and their tenants.

   If one looks at the Mall over a 24/7 period by far the greatest activity is outside retail hours i.e. the young people from all over the Christchurch come into the city at night where the Mall becomes the major entertainment focus for the city. Given this, the upgrade of the Mall has a substantial public good and therefore funded out of general rates.

The final two issues I wish to submit on relate to Council activities that replicate central government responsibilities.

2) Council Housing. Social housing is a central government responsibility and should not be part of the City Council's core activities.

The question I would ask the Council is would Christchurch City Holdings Ltd take these activities onto their books on the condition the Council accept a lower return for that portion of capital (say equivalent to the council's current cost of capital). If not then the ratepayer is subsidizing what is a Central Government responsibility – social housing and therefore the full cost of the subsidy should disclosed and reflected in the Annual and Long Term Plans.

Social housing appears to be a major cost to ratepayers and therefore the Council should sell its housing portfolio to Housing NZ and apply the capital released to some of the major capital programs scheduled over the next decade.

I suggest Early Learning Centres fall into the same category as the housing and should be sold off or leased long term to private operators. There is fundamentally no difference between early learning centres and schools as they both carry out similar functions. I'm sure ratepayers would be horrified if the Council got involved in subsidizing schools which in effect they are doing with early learning centres.

3) Community Support and Grants. I note the plan states these activities are to be maintained. This implies the status quo is to remain. With approx. $12.58m annually being expended in this area there needs to be a critical review of the effectiveness of this funding on a project by project basis. Again activities should not be funded where central government funding programs are available and that all programs should be zero based each year i.e. I suspect there are many programs which are rolled over year after year without a critical annual review as to their necessity and effectiveness.

   I must make it clear I support this general activity in principle however my experience is that where a budget item is made up of a large number of smaller items the same rigger is not applied as in the case of a single larger item.

The thrust of my submission in these later two areas is that in recent years central government have readily transferred responsibility and hence costs onto local government and in effect placing an additional tax on ratepayers. Local government therefore should not be bearing the costs of social programs which are clearly a central government responsibility.

I would therefore submit that all the above community support programs be subject to a review over the next two years.

Thank you for the opportunity of contributing to an element of the LTCCP.