

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:
Full Version of the LTCCP

Page Number:
108-113, 142-147, 148-155

I also want to respond to:

Name:	Mark Chubb
Organisation:	
Daytime Phone:	(021) 404-520
Evening Phone:	(03) 356-0311
Email:	mark@chubb.gen.nz
Address:	169 St Albans Street St Albans CHRISTCHURCH 8001
Your Submission:	Do you have any comments on the major projects in our Draft Community Plan?
	<p>The investments in major capital projects (Summary, p4) must recognise that a community consists primarily of people and the connections among them. The composition of our community is set to change significantly over the next few years, and our community's expenditure must focus on what's ahead not just what's here now.</p> <p>As such, the excessive emphasis on maintaining and renewing assets must give way to renewing our sense of community. Rather than building new roads, we should build the connections among the various segments of our community. The proposed discretionary major projects expenditure of \$187.3m on roads and transport seems excessive, especially in light of performance measures that emphasise reduced traffic congestion. As Lee Schipper recently noted in a Radio NZ interview, 'No city in the world has ever reduced traffic congestion by building more roads.' I suspect that the same goes for carparks. Any spending on transportation infrastructure should emphasise changes that favour mass transit, cycles and pedestrians, NOT cars!</p> <p>Reducing the roading and transport major projects spend by 1/3 would make it possible for Council to fund a significant number of projects that were considered but not included in the LTCCP, including many that receive no mention whatsoever in the draft plan (Summary, p4). Many of these projects involve the construction or renovation of community facilities widely used by residents and ratepayers or integral to promoting social, environmental, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community.</p>
	Do you have any comments on groups of activities (The activities and services the Council provides?)
	<p>Council's investments in democracy and governance services (Full Version, 108-113) have systematically undermined the quality of community consultation and participation. Community boards and community advocacy have been disempowered by the current administration contrary to the principle of subsidiarity and the spirit of the Local Government Act 2002.</p>

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

Council should invest considerably more resources in Community Boards and consultation processes that involve residents and ratepayers at every stage of policy development from problem definition through implementation to evaluation and monitoring. Futurepath Canterbury and elements of the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy have illustrated the benefits of such engagement.

Too often Council's approach to public consultation reflects a disdain for the opinions and values of laypeople that smacks of a strong bureaucratic and technocratic bias in its institutional cultural. The people who pay the bills deserve more credit for their ability to make contributions not only to Council's coffers but to the decisions that affect their quality of life as well.

Community Boards should be funded and empowered to take a more active role in setting and implementing the community's agenda. Community advocate positions should be re-established, an ombudsman should be appointed in each major programme area, and Council's senior managers should receive in-depth training on public participation processes and community consultation.

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

Although I found the LTCCP documents visually appealing, I found the quality of the contents appalling. The document reads like a sales pitch for enlisting supporting for Council's expenditure programme, not a plan for engaging the community in the work required to address the challenges confronting us. The LTCCP is not a 10-year version of the old annual plan!

Despite a reasonably compelling community vision and reasonable community outcomes, the document falls flat by failing to illustrate any significant degree of transparency, accountability or alignment. Few sections detail the assumptions underpinning programme priorities, the stakeholders upon whom successful implementation depends or the challenges that must be overcome to achieve success. Many performance indicators strike a hollow chord, concerning themselves more with making people happy by giving them what they want rather than what they need. (This often happens when you fail to engage people intimately in the process of deciding what's important in the first place.) The performance measures associated with Council's regulatory services are a striking example of this (Full Version, 142-147); building control is not just about issuing consents, it's about making sure buildings are safe. People may not want to hear that they have to spend money on seismic strengthening or fire safety, and these investments may not reap significant returns in the real estate market, but they mean a great deal to the community in the immediate aftermath of a natural disaster.

Anyone reading the LTCCP who wondered what they could do to help achieve the community's vision should surely be forgiven for feeling that the only thing Council really wants is the money in their pockets and a pat on the back. It only seems reasonable to expect that the LTCCP should explicitly acknowledge the important contributions so many individuals and organisations make to the quality of life in our community.