

LTCCP 2006-16 Submission - Received by Email

Name:	Sumner Residents Association Inc. (Brian Swale [bj@caverock.net.nz])
CC:	
Sent:	Fri 5/05/2006 16:04
Your Submission:	<p>Dear City Council</p> <p>This is the submission of the Sumner Residents Association Inc., and is presented by the Secretary, B. Swale (contact details below).</p> <p>We wish to talk to the main points</p> <p>I am unable to give a precise figure for the size of the community we represent.</p> <p>This submission refers to the full version of the LTCCP.</p> <p>Some of the comments are more of an editorial nature, and apply to aspects of the draft plan that may be difficult to comprehend.</p> <p>1) The housing maps, pp. 34, 35 and 37 each have an info box with a key. In this boxes are numbers inside brackets. The meanings of these numbers are not explained, but should be.</p> <p>2) p. 71. Replacing Stormwater Pipes</p> <p>The section with this heading goes on to discuss the city sewer network.</p> <p>Something is very wrong here. The City Sewer Network, and the City Stormwater Drains are supposed to be quite separate.</p> <p>This small Section has these importantly separate topics hopelessly mixed up. Most people know that stormwater must be kept out of sewers, and vice versa.</p> <p>It would engender hope that City Council staff also know this, if the two topics were dealt with separately, as they richly deserve.</p> <p>There is a separate section dealing with replacing older wastewater pipelines (p. 72). It is quite unclear as to whether or not this discussion refers to sewers, or storm-water pipes. It should be clear and unambiguous.</p> <p>3) p. 72</p> <p>Central City Transport Strategy projects.</p> <p>No mention is made of the very successful free Shuttlebus system which operates in a loop from the Town Hall to the Old Railway Station.</p> <p>We hope that this Shuttlebus continues. There have been rumours that it is to be shut down. In our opinion, shutting it down would be a great mistake, as it really aids the movement around the central city of tourists and elderly people in particular.</p> <p>4) p. 87 Proposals to increase parking fees / charges.</p> <p>On one hand, Council bemoans the reduced popularity of the Central City as a shopping and entertainment area. On the other hand, it is proposing to make drastic increases in central city car parking costs.</p> <p>Has it not occurred to Council that more expensive parking is a real incentive to stay away from the central city?</p>

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

The reasons that people really like the suburban shopping malls include:

FREE parking close to the shops.

Total protection from the weather while in the Mall; no hot sun, no hot wind, no cold easterly, no rain, nor any wind, no cold, no cars and street crossings, no narrow footpaths, plenty of food shops, convenient toilets.

No dodging bikes and skate-boards.

Also I am not aware that there have been any muggings or murders in any Mall in Christchurch. None I think. Cars possibly a little safer. Certainly I feel safer going to my car in a Mall carpark than in a City parking building.

The CBD does not have these attributes.

5) p. 97

Civil Defence and Rural Fire Fighting.

I drafted this paragraph before the recent kerfuffle about CD and the Tonga earthquake / tsunami alert hit the headlines.

It seems to me that there are grave deficiencies in identification, forward planning, protective works, public response, education of the affected public about tsunamis and what they should do when in specific places, participation of the public in the development of strategies and methods, and emergency signalling, especially in the case of tsunamis.

Similarly with regard to fire risk on the vulnerable southern and eastern hills where, through excessive scrub and grass growth, there is a proven significant fire risk with elevated danger to human life and property.

These matters need detailed and prompt attention.

6) p. 111 Measuring our achievements.

The 47% satisfaction level of residents, compared with the 75% target, should tell the Mayor and CEO something. Not so many years ago, in a national survey published in the daily rag, Christchurch was at, or near, the top in resident satisfaction with the performance of Council. We consider that, due to the loss of institutional knowledge, the loss of valued key staff, and consequent degrade in performance, if such a survey were to be repeated today, Christchurch would be placed at the other end of the scale.

In addition, due in part to the halving of the number of Councillors (by the Local Government Commission?), but also the manner in which matters previously presented to Community Boards are presented to Council, effective access to Council by citizens has been significantly curtailed.

Council must find ways to improve democratic and effective representation.

7) p. 123 Measuring our achievements

Does not include resident satisfaction with goals and management quality for Parks and Reserves. Brownlee Reserve is a highly pertinent example, which over a period of 18 months at least, has still not been resolved despite resolutions having been passed at Board level and still not put into effect by Council staff.

8) pp 158, 159 Wastewater collection and treatment.

Does not mention and acknowledge, but should, the ongoing parts contributed by the Christchurch Estuary Association, and the official Discharge Audit Group.

9) pp 159 Wastewater collection and treatment.

Does not mention but should, the effects on open sea beaches, such as at Sumner.

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

10) p. 160 Maintaining our assets

There is no mention of the need to protect the quality and quantity of the water supply to the city's main aquifers, and what is, or should be, done about this critical matter.

11) p. 198

CCHL is not defined, but should be

12) p. 225 Water supply

No mention, but should be, of the fluoridation option as a means of significantly improving the dental health of children, and elderly people, in particular.

13) p. 232 Red Bus Limited

The Red Bus Company is stated to be not a strategic asset.

In view of the primary role this company plays in the city public transport system, this proposal is preposterous, and should be reversed.

14) p. 233 Selwyn Plantation Board (and the City Forests)

It is amazing that such a primary resource should not be considered a strategic asset. We urge Council to rethink this matter.

15) p. 277 CCTO not defined.

16) We could find no mention of the need for Council to be a Good

Employer, a general standard that was created by central Government over the previous 15 years.

In our opinion, there should be a significant section dealing with such matters.

Note the recent Press article by Martin van Beynen (sic).

17) We could find no mention of the control and need for maintaining a high ownership level by the City in the Lyttelton Port.

Recent moves to pass control to a Chinese individual whose primary motives would be self-aggrandisement rather than the good of Christchurch and Canterbury have led to significant public disquiet.

This matter needs more, and public, attention.

18) City Care, city Environment group.

Recently, publicity was given to the assertion that these parts of the Council were considered not to be core assets.

In our opinion, this, if true, is ridiculous, and should be remedied.

.....
Sincerely,

Brian Swale
Secretary

Honorary Secretary,
Sumner Residents Association Inc.
P O Box 17-608
Christchurch 8030
Tel: 326-7447