

**Submission to the Christchurch City Council
Regarding the
Long-Term Community Council Plan (LTCCP)**

5th May 2006

This is a general submission made by representatives of groups from the voluntary sector that were present at a meeting held on 29th April at Te Amorangi Richmond Wellness Village, Pages Road, Christchurch. Their names are recorded at the end of the submission.

ASPECTS OF THE LTCCP SUPPORTED BY THIS SUBMISSION

1. We congratulate the Council on their decision to retain the community sector funding, as it is vital in enabling many groups and organisations to enhance the lives and wellbeing of people in the Christchurch community. We urge the Council to continue this funding on an ongoing basis.
2. We also congratulate the Council on its decision not to allow any further developments of gaming in Christchurch, which has a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of many people in the community. Members of the voluntary and welfare sector are only too familiar with the fall-out that occurs in relation to problem gambling, and fully support the Council in its decision.
3. Finally, we acknowledge the broader view of health that has been taken by the Council overall.

ASPECTS OF THE LTCCP NOT SUPPORTED BY THIS SUBMISSION

1. Concerns for Tangata Whenua and Maori in General

We are concerned that the lack of information contained in the LTCCP will not adequately recognise the input of Mana Whenua, Tangata Whenua and Maori groups and organisations, as per the legislative requirements.

The LTCCP (p.289) does not outline how the CCC intends giving effect to the Local Government Act 2002 (Section 81). Specifically, the Plan does not state how the Council will establish and/or maintain processes for Maori, or how it will foster the development of Maori capacity so that Maori can have the opportunity to contribute to the decision-making processes of the Council, and how the Council will provide relevant information to Maori about these previous two points.

2. Concerns for Health and Wellbeing

Although the Council states that it wants Christchurch to be a healthy city, we are very concerned that it intends to remove a number of the resources associated with healthy lifestyles, such as libraries and swimming pools. We acknowledge that some libraries and swimming pools may not be cost-effective any longer, however, however, by closing them, many thousands of users will be disadvantaged. We recommend that a programme be developed for the systematic replacement of these facilities as the old ones are pulled down.

The omission of several key health inequalities, such as mental health and elder health. These are two areas where support by the Council is of primary importance, and we are concerned that there could be significant impact on the health of the elderly and those with mental health issues due to this omission.

We also believe that concern for the “people factor” of our communities and the eco-system is not represented adequately in the Plan.

3. Allocation of Transport Funding

At least 70 million dollars of transport funding (allocated to roading) is debatable and could be re-distributed. We already have an excellent roading system, and in many places, maintenance only is required. Building roads does not necessarily reduce congestion. We suggest that the proposed transport funding that is allocated to roading be re-investigated and funds re-allocated to other areas (such as those listed above).

4. A “First-Class” City

Although it is an admirable goal to become a “first-class city”, it is not absolutely necessary to become a first-class city within the next ten years. We believe that the city’s beautification should be staggered over a longer period, with surplus money redistributed into other areas.

5. Removal of Strategic Assets from the Policy of Significance

We are extremely concerned about the removing of strategic assets (such as Redbus and City Care) from the Policy of Significance. The Council should be required to consult the public before any decisions are made about these hugely important assets, and the removal of them from the Policy of Significance reduces the Council’s accountability by not requiring it to consult, for example, if they want to sell the assets. We recommend that these assets be put back into the Policy of Significance.

6. Lack of Financial Information

We believe that the Council have made their budgetary decisions based on inadequate information, and have focused on bulk allocations with little detail outlined.

In addition to this, there is a lack of financial information about key investments, such as that of Orion (half a billion dollars).

There is also no information about what funding is allocated within each geographical area, or to each Community Board.

7. Lack of Mention of Community Boards

We are concerned that Community Boards, and the vital work they do, receive little mention in the Plan.

8. Geographical Resource Allocation

We note that the eastern suburbs of Christchurch (such as Linwood), which tend to have poorer communities, are missing out in terms of resource allocation, whereas communities in the north and west are receiving new resources.

THIS SUBMISSION IS MADE BY THE FOLLOWING PEOPLE WHO WORK IN THE VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR:

Sharon Torstonson
Richard Tankersley
Mairehe Louise Tankersley
A Hensch
Jenny Smith
Jan Rogers
Shelley Walker
Katherine Peet
John Peet
Noeline Tennant
Lorna Szentivanyi
Lorraine Woodfield
Lesley Godkin
Weng-Kei Chen
Kenneth Ratcliffe
Sally Latham
Tracey Paterson

For further information, please contact Sharon Torstonson, CEO of Christchurch Council of Social Services (ph. 366-2050).