

# Long Term Council Community Plan

## Submission – Cashmere Residents Association – 5 May 2006

As a community organisation representing the interests of the residents of Cashmere, we wish to bring a number of concerns and issues about the contents of the LTCCP to the attention of the Council.

In this submission we wish particularly to focus on the ability of the Council as a whole to engage with its community, other governance issues and infrastructure and customer service issues.

The plan appears comprehensive

Issue	Actions and comments	Why
<p><b>Governance</b>            We are concerned about the way Council is working at present. We see a reduction in trust in the community as a whole and a growing perception that the Council’s engagement with the Community, particularly through its Community Boards, is weakening. This is of real concern to the Cashmere Residents Association as the relationship with the Community Board is of significant to us.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the Council is not working harmoniously with Environment Canterbury.</p>	<p>Community Boards should be more involved and have more input into Council decision making.</p> <p>Councilors need to be advocates for community projects.</p>	<p>We expect a well governed city, in harmony with its sister organisations and one which is working in an “open, transparent and accountable way”. (P.291)</p> <p>Our experience is that Council is engaging less with its citizens and our expectation of an increase in responsibility for the Community Boards does not appear to have happened.</p>

<p><b>Policy on determining significance p22</b></p>	<p>We do not support the move to \$1million for significance – retain existing \$500,000.</p> <p>We assume the dropping of Housing from the list of strategic asset was an oversight.</p>	<p>Lack of trust in decision making.</p>
<p><b>Contributions policy p 22</b></p>	<p>We support a greater charge on the developer.</p>	<p>This is where the costs lie and the profit results!</p>
<p><b>Capital Works p71 Rooding issues.</b> There is no mention of improvements to roading in our area required to cater for increased volumes of traffic from the harbour basin and Worsley Spur.</p>	<p>We have expressed concerns already about the increased congestion at both the Dyers Pass and Hackthorne Road intersections where they meet Cashmere Road. We wish to know what is planned to keep traffic flowing as traffic further increases over the next 10 years.</p>	<p>This is a long term plan and this is the issue which causes the most consternation to Cashmere residents and should be considered in any document looking 10 years out.</p>
<p><b>Community outcomes –</b></p>	<p>We support the ideals in the plan and support increased responsibilities for Community Boards so they can grow strong links to their communities and advocate on their behalf.</p>	
<p><b>Strategic Directions – Strong Communities.</b>  Aging populations p50</p>	<p>We want to know of Council’s planning around an increasingly aging population and also around other changes in our age structure. We also want further detail on how Council means to increase the capacity of voluntary and community groups and increase civic engagement.</p>	
<p><b>Strategic Direction- Healthy Environment.</b>  We support the Cashmere Stream proposal as an extension of this.</p>	<p>Wish to applaud Council’s work in this area particularly the enhancing of waterways – evidenced in the increased number of native duck species on major waterways.</p> <p>The Cashmere Stream should become a funded project</p>	<p>The project supports the partnership between Ecan and CCC, supports the <b>Healthy Environment</b> and also has community input.</p>

<p><b>Transport Strategy and bus exchange. P59.</b> We are supportive of the move away from use of the car and of a long term sustainable plan for both the bus exchange and the transport network.</p>	<p>We support actions in this area.</p>	
<p><b>Civic Offices p71</b> We support a good working environment for Council staff. However we are concerned that the Council is not using a transparent process for funding of the office building itself.</p>	<p>We would like to be made aware of the funding strategy and its impact on the overall Council finances in the long term.</p>	
<p><b>School safety zone infrastructure.</b></p>	<p>We are supportive of this initiative, however we believe that Council should be a minor funder of this and more should come from the schools and Government.</p>	
<p><b>Botanic Gardens.</b> Cost of replacement building too high.</p>	<p>This seems a lot of money for a replacement building in the gardens. We believe the cost of this should be reduced or alternatively a user pays initiative put in place to assist funding.</p>	
<p><b>New Leisure Centres</b></p>	<p>We are supportive of the strategy and keen for the new learn- to-swim pool to be built at Pioneer Stadium</p>	
<p><b>Walkways development</b></p>	<p>CRA notes the high number of people in its area who are walkers and would be keen to support a widened network of walkways as a priority.</p>	
<p><b>Cashmere Stream Living Streams development p75</b></p>	<p>CRA support this as a priority project</p>	

<p><b>Capital works programme p82</b>          In the plan we are able to identify the local and metropolitan projects but we are concerned that we are not able to see where the spending goes on Technical projects for the City's infrastructure.</p>	<p>Significant projects, whatever they are should be identified in the plan.</p>	<p>There is significant funding applied to technical projects with no indication of what these projects are.</p>
<p><b>Proposed reductions p86.</b>          – these appear very small in the grand scheme!</p> <p>The provision of Libraries, leisure centres and swimming pools are all part of broader strategies. To cut these without revision of the strategy for short term gain is short sighted.</p> <p>Any reduction in service levels at service centres as a result of provision of payment facilities at NZ Post would be detrimental to the communities they service and relationships forged with those communities.</p>	<p>We do not support the closing of facilities, most especially Spreydon Library which is well used by our residents.</p> <p>The strategies should be revised, full public consultation undertaken on the revisions, then decisions made on the future of these facilities.</p> <p>We support any extension of payment facilities, but do not support any reduction in service levels or community support from local service centres.</p> <p>Any changes in service level which could reduce links to local communities are “<b>significant</b>” to them and must be part of a separate consultation process.</p>	
<p><b>Community support –p99</b></p>	<p>We are pleased to see a measurement of satisfaction with the quality of support to community groups.</p>	

<p><b>Satisfaction with customer contact with Council –p145</b> Regulatory Services have a measure for customer satisfaction with their walk in services; however there are no measures for satisfaction with other contacts with Council.</p>	<p>Council should make available the standards and measures for customer satisfaction with walk in and phone in services overall. These should be available now and become part of the next LTCCP.</p>	<p>Our experience in dealing with Council on routine maintenance matters, e.g. about streets and parks is that the service is very variable with some matters falling into “black holes” e.g. the old Takahe toilets.</p> <p>We would like to know what we should expect.</p>
--	--	---

Barry Armstrong  
59 Dyers Pass Rd  
Cashmere  
Christchurch

Ph 9424 784

on behalf of Cashmere Residents Association