

Draft LTCCP - Our Community Plan 2006-16

Have Your Say - LTCCP 2006/16 Our Community Plan

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.

It's your City



www.ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay

If you wish, you can present your submission at a hearing. (If that is the case, please check 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, address and contact number of the submitter. All submissions will be published on the Council's website from 10 May 2006.

No anonymous submissions will be accepted.

Note: all fields marked with * are required:

*Select which applies: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I do NOT wish to present my submission at the hearing, and ask that the submission be considered <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to talk to the main points in my submission at the hearings to be held between Thursday 25 May and Wednesday 7 June 2006.	
*Are you completing this submission: <input type="checkbox"/> For yourself <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On behalf of a group or organisation If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent? <input type="text" value="15"/>	
*My submission refers to: <input type="checkbox"/> Full Version <input type="text" value=""/> Page Number OR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Version <input type="text" value="6-7"/> Page Number	
Do you also want to respond to: <input type="checkbox"/> Development Contributions <input type="checkbox"/> Aquatic Facilities <input type="checkbox"/> Other	

*Contact Name:	<input type="text" value="Kesley McMillan"/>
-----------------------	--

Organisation Name (if applicable):	Ch-ch Community Development Workers Network
*Phone (Day):	381-6615
Phone (Evening):	942 2771
Email (if applicable):	avebury@xtra.co.nz
*Contact Address:	9 Eveleyn Cousins Ave P.O. Box 26-097 North Avon Christchurch

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views

1) Do you have any comments on the major projects in our Draft Community Plan?

Please see attached Submission

Your Comments:

Hint: This comments field will expand as you enter your text.

2) Do you have any comments on groups of activities (The activities and services the Council provides?)

Your Comments:

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

Your Comments:

If you would like a copy of your submission emailed to you, please enter your email address below: (Hint: Please ensure your email address is correct - if it is not, you will not receive a copy of this!)

Community Development Workers Network Submission to CCC LTCCP

CDW Network

We are a group comprises of up to 15 practicing community development workers and managers from various resource centres, community centres and community cottages within the Christchurch metropolitan area. Collectively, the group has extensive community net works. The group has met monthly for the last four years.

Community development is an established way of working with generally socially and economically depressed communities and is aimed at helping to redress imbalances of power and choice, access to resources and information, community participation, education etc. that contributes to the overall community well being. While methods of approach can be as varied as there are communities, the theory and process, which occurs at a grass roots level, is accepted practice both nationally and internationally. It is from this perspective that our submission is made.

LTCCP Document

Our network appreciates the history of community support provided by the City Council, and acknowledge the need to take stock. The LTCCP appears to be a vision document, but we have some disquiet as to how this is to be implemented. At face value the document appears to be a cost cutting exercise to the exclusion of community consequences. From a practitioner's point of view, the "Strategic Directions" on page 7 are often incompatible with proposed actions. Also, like a number of other colleagues, we have found some difficulty in linking the LTCCP summary information with the complete plan. It has been described as "grasping at clouds".

Community Outcomes p 6- 7

Safety

- Our experience shows clearly there is a significant gap between the rich and poor in Christchurch and that there is a strong correlation between poverty and crime. The social cohesion, and participation desired in the LTCCP is often generated through the activities and efforts of community centres, cottages, resource centres, outdoor pools and other community amenities where engagement can take place and where to some degree disparities can be addressed.

Community

- The “Community Outcomes” affect the 8 other outcomes in the LTCCP – there is a basic need to get this right the first time
- There is no indication as to what the Council understands by “community development” – a very important issue for the formulation of the community of the strategy.
- The LTCCP speaks of doing things *to* and *for* the community. Strong communities and social cohesion result from doing things *with* the community.
- The tight timelines and the very corporately worded nature of the LTCCP basically exclude large sections of the Christchurch community.
- How can the closing of 3 community libraries increase the involvement in lifelong learning? – the proposed alternatives are basically not readily accessible for many communities.
- Closing local pools will not enhance the ‘encouragement of healthy and active lifestyles’. Neither do pool closure proposals support the prevention of obesity and diabetes which is now the Governments #1 priority in health.
- There are some community activities that are not financially viable but this should not always be the measure of community importance.
- Of the 168 ethnic communities in Christchurch, how many have been able to contribute to the current round of the LTCCP?
- We endorse the CCC decision to allocate \$8.2M per year for community funding. Community organisations understand the dynamics and generally have the trust of the community populations within their respective areas. From our network perspective we see the evidence of communities being happier, healthier, better informed, stronger etc, all outcomes desired in the LTCCP, than they might otherwise have been without community organisation input.

Environment

- We endorse the Councils revitalisation of stream plantings, and support the striving towards zero waste
- We also endorse the “Development Contributions Policy” p4
- We encourage the introduction of a light rail system – this has a direct impact on alleviating engine emissions.
- Low cost public transport is essential to address the social isolation of depressed socio economic communities in the city – this is even more pressing with inevitable fuel price increases
- We question the wisdom of selling strategic assets such as the Red Bus Company as privatisation is unlikely to provide a low cost public transport system.

Governance

- There has been a noticeable lack of Councillors at meetings promoting the LTCCP – As city governors, we would have expected a greater promotional input.
- The LTCCP appears to be aimed at the literate, educated section of our city community to the exclusion of other cultures, and those with disabilities. A comment was made at one meeting by a Maori community worker that because of the manner in which LTCCP was being promoted Maori were “voting with their feet” and consequently basically boycott the process.

Prosperity

- From a community point of view, one measure of prosperity is being able to access low cost transport some of which can be related to: more accessibility to central city for bicycles, public transport; restricting peak hour vehicle traffic; cheaper bus fares; less car parks and more bus stops; free busses within the city centre;
- The manner in which the Canterbury Development Corporation, a professed city council leader in regional economic development, lost \$360000 in a funding vote, at face value, is at odds to the “Prosperous City” label.

Healthy City

- Motor transport restriction in the city centre – reduce emissions
- High electrical power cost have significant detrimental health consequences particularly on the elderly and the very young
- Depression is a big concern

Recreation

- Attractive neighbourhoods are not enough – it is the activity within those neighbourhoods (not at some far distance venue) that is the community issue

Knowledge

- Making community libraries less accessible to suburban communities appears to be counterproductive and does not support the aim for life long learning

City Development

- While we support the development of the central city, it should not be at the expense of the suburbs where the majority of the city's population live and where the majority of the city's social cohesion occurs
- There is an imperative need for the council to *listen seriously* to initiatives coming from the community. For example the Travis Swamp Heritage Wet Land Park, began from a town planning objection to an 800 section residential subdivision from a north New Brighton community group in 1988. The Council's subsequent involvement resulted the establishment of the park. The Halswell Quarry Park began as a community initiative, which again, with Council's subsequent involvement has seen the park's development. These examples are repeated throughout the city. The Council – Community partnership is vital for development of the city.
- The proliferation and growth of urban shopping malls, which is at variance to contemporary overseas practice, can also have detrimental consequences on community structures and cohesion.
- The increase in in-fill housing development is likely to over tax current infrastructures.

Final Comment

In the past, staffed community cottages, community centres, resource centres and the like have acted as a bridge between the community and the Council. We see great community – city benefit of this link and look forward to this partnership continuing, and as the practical community issues of the LTCCP are developed.

Prepared from LTCCP discussion notes from 29 March and 19 April meetings

Community Development Network

5 May 2006

Contact phone (03) 3816615