

1-4 Harmans Rd  
Lyttelton  
MAY 10th 2007  
Ph 328 8359

To the Christchurch City Council

This is a private submission from Wendy Everingham. I would like to endorse the submission written by the Lyttelton Mount Herbert Community Board. I have attached their submission to this document.

In particular I would like to say that the money set aside to remove trucks from Norwich Quay should not be re-allocated to any other projects. This is the most pressing issue in Lyttelton. Until truck movements are diverted from Norwich Quay, Lyttelton can not reach its full potential.

I am also very concerned about the use of self companies by the Christchurch City Council. These companies take transactions out of the democratic process. It means assets can be shifted and utilised in a way not beneficial to the public good. I do not support any more of these companies to be set up. In fact I would prefer to see existing ones dismantled.

I want to see a council that operates as a business but has a strong social and environmental focus.

Kind Regards,

Wendy Everingham.

**Submission to Council's Draft Annual Plan 2007/08 and  
2007 amendments to the Long-Term Council Community Plan 2006-16 from  
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board**

**2007 Amendments to the Community Plan**

**1. Include schedule of proposed capital works programme**

Local people are interested in Council activities, what's proposed, when it will happen and what it will cost, not only in their immediate vicinity, but city-wide. This is particularly so in this immediate post-merger phase. However, people do find it hard to relate and respond to the content and layout of the Community Plan or understand its importance as a consultative document. The Board suggests listing Council's scheduled capital works programme in the Plan could be a helpful start. We made a similar submission last year.

## 2. Delete proposal to set up new shelf companies

- ***There is not enough information about the future trading activities, policies and practices envisaged.***

The rationale for establishing some shelf companies is vague and inconsistent. One part of the proposal in the Community Plan presents the need for 'several' shelf companies as being merely pragmatic, a way to enable Council to respond if opportunities arise. However an additional initiative comes from Christchurch City Holdings Limited, which '*wishes to establish five such companies*'. This is specific and suggests specific plans, although the five projects planned by CCHL are obscure. Detailed analysis and consultation would allow for clarity before ratepayers find themselves committed to policies and practices they have had little opportunity to peruse.

- ***There is concern that council-controlled trading organisations lack awareness of community aspirations and feelings and prevent opportunities for public dialogue.***

Last year there was considerable community unease about the proposal to bring in a foreign port operator at Lyttelton. While this was a substantive change of direction for Lyttelton Port Company, there was absolutely no opportunity given over to public discussion or enquiry about the proposed sale.

It has been mooted that one of the purposes for additional shelf companies might be development opportunities relating to surplus Council land. In our ward land use is critically important. The Board is mindful of the significant bare-landholding at Diamond Harbour. Any development of this will have a noticeable impact on the community, its existing fragile infrastructure and services. It would be alarming if any sale or development process is undertaken by Council without a sincere commitment to a real conversation with the local communities about its timing, manner and genuine sustainable development.

- ***The commercial imperatives of council controlled trading organisations can over-ride public-good issues.***

'Flexibility' in delivering Council's core services and the needs of CCHL, with its requirement to act with commercial intent, can be at variance. The Local Government Act requirement for the Council to seek triple bottom-line outcomes can be at variance with the mandate of commercial companies to maximize short-term profits. The failed Lyttelton Port Company attempt to sell its operational arm to a private overseas monopoly was seen as operational and practical by some, and by others as a matter with public good aspects that required genuine consultation.

There is public demand for clarity between the various roles of councillors, staff and CCHL management.

For these reasons, the Community Board urges the proposal to set up new 'shelf companies' is deleted from the Community Plan until the Council can be sure it has public approval to do so.

**3. Confirm on-going access to \$20,000 discretionary reserve funding** The Board's annual discretionary funding allocation currently totals \$35,000 per annum. Of this, \$20,000 must be applied towards local reserve projects, via reserve development contributions. This is a valuable source of funds used in the main to support landscaping and planting initiatives by volunteers. It is unclear if the Board's *Discretionary Reserve Funding* allocation will continue to meet the criteria relating to growth-related reserve activities, as a result of the proposed revisions to the Development Contributions Policy. Without a commensurate allocation, the Board would frankly be rendered impotent and unable to contribute in a modest but meaningful way.

#### **Draft Annual Plan 2007/08**

The Board asks for the following Council activities and services to be actioned this year. Almost all should be budget-neutral.

**1. Implement effective road safety programmes, Banks Peninsula Ward**

Traditional delivery of Banks Peninsula road safety programmes, in partnership with Selwyn District Council ends on 30 June 2007. Some critical road safety initiatives, relating to the unusual character of the roads and the safety needs of its users should not lapse, but no provision has been made for Banks Peninsula-specific road safety projects in the Council's proposal to LTSA this year. However, there will be some operating expenditure for Banks Peninsula road safety projects that exists as of right, with \$6,000 per annum allocated in the BP Community Plan. The Board asks that the Christchurch Road Safety Strategy is updated to include new road safety issues and reflect the exciting *Banks Peninsula Walking and Cycling Strategy*. The Board also requests a programme of responsive road safety projects for the Banks Peninsula Ward, effective from 1 July 2007.

## **2. Review options for green waste disposal**

The Board notes that the proposed end to backyard burning in all residential areas introduces a green waste disposal dilemma, particularly for ratepayers who will need to travel some distance to city-located refuse stations. The Board therefore requests a review of green waste disposal options that takes into account local facilities to process green waste. We also think a green waste education initiative exploring recycling and refuse options would be of value.

## **3. Update Council website**

Some work has been done, but the Board thinks the time is right to review and update the Council's website, so its pages inform and reflect the character, activities and stories of the entire city. There are some outstanding local newsletters for example that could be added to the Council's Environment page. There is a new wealth of city heritage, particularly maritime heritage that will be of interest. We think this is particularly important to embed now while there are resource people available with a "finger-tip" knowledge of Banks Peninsula information.

## **4. Clean up Lyttelton's public boat ramp and access area**

This must be the biggest public-good project for Christchurch's harbour recreationists. The community has been saddled with a devastated wilderness since 2000. Last year the Board asked if this area could be cleaned up. Summer has been and gone but nothing has happened. The multi-million dollar commitment made by the Christchurch City Council, before the merger, and independently of marina planning, to restore and improve Naval Point, has been appreciated. Clean-up activities which are relatively inexpensive and would not compromise future projects on the adjacent marina, could start immediately. As part of the newly expanded City's waterfront, the public boat launch facility and hinterland currently creates a poor image for the City. This work would have a nil rates impact as it is already funded.

## **5. Accelerate Lyttelton Harbour Basin Plan to 2007/08**

The greater Lyttelton Harbour Basin plan, scheduled for 2009/10 quite rightly recognises that whatever occurs in one part of the harbour can have consequences for another. Nothing happens in isolation. A number of major planning decisions will be made during the next two or three years in regard to Lyttelton marina, Lyttelton port access roads, Lyttelton inner harbour, public transport routes and so on. There is danger in taking each of these projects out of context with the other. All are inter-

related. For this reason we believe the Greater Lyttelton Plan should be accelerated and precede or accompany planning for these budgeted major capital projects.

#### **7. Reject any proposal to reallocate funding for the construction of alternative port access road at Lyttelton**

The Board understands there is a suggestion that all or part of the \$9.6 million budget allocation in the capital works programme for the construction of new access roads to Lyttelton port, could be substituted for other apparently unbudgeted initiatives, such as a fire-shed at Little River and improvements to Akaroa Wharf. Lyttelton port access roads form part of the Council's contribution to the *Urban Development Strategy and Implementation Plan for Greater Christchurch* which correctly notes the long-term secure access to the airport and port as a strategic need. It is the responsibility of public authorities to design transport links so that wherever possible, heavy traffic is diverted from towns. Planning should respect heritage values, the needs of local economies, and the wishes of local communities.

The provision of capital expenditure for the construction of new port access roads during the period 2007 to 2012 (Our Community Plan, p.83) has recognized these needs. Its inclusion in the capital expenditure programme is a superb gift resulting from the merger, an opportunity to design permanent secure access to Lyttelton, Port of Christchurch, while creating a necessary condition for the revitalisation of Lyttelton's historic town centre. There is no public awareness at all that funding for this capital project could be exchanged for others.

Norwich Quay, Lyttelton has deteriorated over four decades to the extent that its former vibrancy has been displaced by the roaring and shaking of trucks bound for Cashin Quay. The replacement of rail by road cargo, particularly since the 1964 opening of the road tunnel, occurred gradually. Lyttelton Port Company estimates 40% traffic growth on Norwich Quay (from current 180,000 to 250,000 containers) during the next three years. This represents an additional 75,000 containers and truck movements a year, around 1,500 a week or 250 a day! Norwich Quay will be dead, and with it, the local tourist economy.

Norwich Quay is Canterbury's *original main street*. We believe its streetscape is of *national significance*.

All port-bound traffic should be diverted from the town centre so that Lyttelton is accorded the same respect as other towns, where through traffic is diverted as a matter of national policy. State Highway 74 has recently been separated from its Opawa Road component so that port-bound traffic has a clear run and local residents are granted some relief from vibration, speed and noise. This highway improvement

needs to be completed through the tiny distance from the tunnel mouth in Lyttelton to the port.

We are convinced it would be unwise to rule out this roading option on the grounds of cost or expediency.

**8. Lyttelton town centre upgrade, 2007-2009**

The Board notes that early estimates indicate a budget shortfall for the Lyttelton Town Centre upgrade. This shortfall is the result of petroleum and construction cost increases that have occurred since the project was originally scoped in 2004 with a 2006 completion date in mind.

**9. Provide laptop computers and supporting software for all elected representatives**

The Board believes there should be a facility to provide laptop computers and appropriate supporting software for all elected members.