

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:
various

I also want to respond to:

Name:	Clive Thomas
Organisation:	
Daytime Phone:	03 963 5556
Evening Phone:	
Email:	clive@noesis.biz
Address:	277 Kennedys Bush Road Halswell Christchurch
Your Submission:	<p>Do you have any comments on the major projects in our Draft Community Plan?</p> <p>1.Cycling safety:</p> <p>I commute to work by bike, and appreciate the efforts made to improve the safety of cyclists with the new lanes and red marking near junctions. However, at peak commuter traffic times, extra is needed. The biggest danger presented to me as a cyclist is traffic coming from the opposite direction turning across my right of way to access roads to my left. At peak traffic, the cars are so tightly packed in the direction I am traveling, that cars coming from the opposite direction have no visibility of me. I would like to see a matching hatched yellow area marked on the roads alongside the red areas on the cycle path that tells cars to 'keep clear'. This would allow cyclists to see and be seen.</p> <p>2.Water charging:</p> <p>It is about time a user pays policy was adopted. With the water table so low and the resource stretched, the simplest policy to adopt is one of pay by usage. This would soon focus users minds on whether they want that perfect green lawn if they had to pay for that 24hour sprinklers water usage. This would also a valuable source of income.</p> <p>3.Determining significance</p> <p>I do not agree with the policy of increasing the level of operating expenditure criteria for significant decisions from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000. I want all these decisions to remain under the scrutiny of the elected representatives, and want the level to remain at \$500,000.</p> <p>Also, I do not want Redbus and City Care to be removed from the list of strategic assets. This move would again reduce the amount of scrutiny our elected councilors are able to put on decisions about these assets.</p>

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

4. Infrastructure and Halswell Library

Firstly, the amount of revenue received from developers for contributions to local infrastructure should be increased many fold. At the moment I consider them to get off lightly, leaving the rate payers to fund local amenities. In Halswell, where the number of subdivisions has been very high, the council has missed an opportunity to fund much needed local community resources as the new library, improved play areas etc.

Even though this opportunity has been missed, I do not see why the local residents should go without a much needed and improved library. I want this to be put back into the plan for the next three years. There are so many new residents in the area, with more expected, that the current library is wholly unsuitable to meet the needs of. It is too small, with a too limited a selection of items.

4. Cost reductions and fund raising:

I would like to see the following changes to fund the above:

raise money by water usage (water meters)

get developers to pay their fair share on all new developments, and not just the small scraps of land accepted to date.

Continue with other 'user pays' principals. If you need to spend \$187.3m on street and transport improvements, then focus the raising of those costs from the road users by all legitimate means available. And since road wear is related to the square of vehicle weight, let's target those heavy diesel vehicles.

cut back on tree renewal.

In order to be able to give better suggestions on where to save money, I would be happy to review the costing estimates of \$59.5m for a new bus exchange, and the other large budgetary items.

5. And finally, the councils desire to improve its standing

The council states it wants to raise its flagging popularity amongst Christchurch residents, but as a means to doing this intends to 'carry on as usual' (page 111, target 75%, actual 47%). It should be no surprise from the figures on popularity, that the council is seen as authoritarian and remote, and that while it goes through consultation, in the end the CCC goes off and does what it wants regardless of the submissions.

To counteract this, there needs to be a policy of openness and genuine consultation. I urge the elected councillors to continue to scrutinise all decisions and policies on behalf of the people of Christchurch. Finally, to challenge all policy guidance documents from the CCC, are they really for the benefit of the people of Christchurch, or the bureaucrats in the CCC?

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

see box 1

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

see box 1