

LYTTELTON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC.  
SUBMISSION ON CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL DRAFT  
ANNUAL PLAN AND DRAFT LONG TERM COUNCIL  
COMMUNITY PLAN

The Lyttelton Community Association wishes to submit on several matters in our district's draft annual plan and long term council community plan. Both documents are very important in shaping the future for Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula. However we wish it noted that it is difficult for residents of Banks Peninsula to see where they fit in and what is planned for Banks Peninsula in the way that the draft CCC annual and long term plans are set out. Prior to amalgamation it was easier for residents to see what was planned and when. There was greater visibility of proposed expenditure and changes to planned expenditure. We support the comments and suggestion made by the Lyttelton / Mt Herbert Community Board that listing the councils scheduled capital works programme would give them greater transparency.

As part of our submission, the Lyttelton Community Association would like to state it supports the submission put in by the Lyttelton / Mt Herbert Community Board. We would also like to thank them for the good work they do in our local community.

Alternative Road Access to Lyttelton Port of Christchurch

For many years Lyttelton residents have had safety concerns about the increasing amount of heavy commercial / port related traffic on Norwich and Godley Quays, and the need to separate this heavy commercial traffic from residential traffic. These concerns have been centred around the safety of residents, and the degradation of Norwich and Godley Quay resulting from heavy traffic, and the limitations this places on residential and commercial activities and development, especially on Norwich Quay. The need to separate commercial traffic from residential traffic is well recognised by Transit NZ.

In 2002 the former Banks Peninsula District Council commissioned OPUS to look at inner harbour roads. The OPUS report recommended diverting port and heavy commercial traffic off Norwich and Godley Quays. In 2005, BPDC commissioned MWD to do a further update on the OPUS report. The recommendations of the MWD report, including the brilliant McNaughton option, have not been publicly released for wider consultation and consideration. Why is this given it was a publicly funded report?

As part of the preparation for the merger of BPDC and CCC, Capital Strategy Ltd were commissioned to report on operational and financial considerations. Their report identified the need to set aside the money to adopt the OPUS recommendations to resolve inner harbour and Lyttelton roading issues. The recommendations in the Capital Strategy report were adopted by the Local Government Commissioner and were part of the merger package. It is therefore extremely concerning to see that at a CC Council meeting on 23 February 2007 it was resolved that staff 'report back to the council on the possible utilisation of all or part of the \$4.2 million currently budgeted for heavy traffic to access the port container area to cover the cost of other Banks Peninsula capital works' (that we understand to be the Akaroa Wharf and Little River Fire Station).

Apart from the fact this has never been put out for consultation with the community, we question the legality of altering what was part of the legal basis for merger with Christchurch City. Lyttelton Community Association is utterly opposed to this money being diverted for other projects, and will fight to prevent this happening. Road safety is paramount. Lyttelton residents have been submitting for many years on the need to get the heavy traffic off Norwich Quay. Now many local businesses are joining in and want long term planning done for Lyttelton's infrastructure, including diverting port traffic onto port land. Evidence of this will be submitted when we present our submission verbally.

Lyttelton township is enjoying somewhat of a renaissance with an increasing number of visitors coming to Lyttelton. There are a number of new subdivisions both in Lyttelton, and in surrounding bays, all contributing to foot and vehicular traffic. When it happens, the Lyttelton marina will also significantly contribute to increased traffic particularly in the western end of Lyttelton. Lyttelton Port of Christchurch is also projecting an increase of more than 30% in container traffic, as well as growth in other areas, much of which will end up on Norwich Quay. There is an urgent need to start planning for infrastructure needs for the future, and this has to include getting the port and industrial traffic off Norwich and Godley Quays. Putting it in the too hard basket will not make the problem disappear. It is also arguable that by not planning for the future in a sustainable way CCC is failing in its statutory duty.

#### Public Good Facilities at Naval Point

There is an urgent need for an upgrade and cleanup of the public good facilities down at Naval Point, in particular the boat ramp and access area. Apart from the myriad of potholes one has to navigate to get down to Naval Point and the boat ramps, the facilities themselves are a disgrace to Christchurch City. We appreciate that the complexity of the potential marina development has delayed its implementation, but there is no good reason for the public good facilities and roading not be upgraded, especially as the money was set aside in the 2006 financial year.

#### Proposal to Set Up Additional Shelf Companies Within CCHL

The Lyttelton Community Association is very concerned about the lack of public accountability or transparency with the proposal for Christchurch City Holdings to set up 5 shelf companies under the guise of allowing it to respond more quickly to commercial opportunities. We appreciate that the commercial activities and resulting dividends from Christchurch City Holdings have kept rates at a lower amount than may have been possible otherwise. However, sometimes this has been at a greater rate than the companies within CCHL could sustain.

The dividends returned to CCC by Lyttelton Port over the years have been at the expense of necessary port infrastructure maintenance and development. Hence the proposal in 2006 to sell almost half of Lyttelton Port of Christchurch to a foreign company because of the stated need to raise capital for infrastructural development of LPC. Lyttelton and Christchurch residents were not consulted about the fortunately failed proposal to sell half of OUR port to a foreign owner. However, Lyttelton and Christchurch people have to live with the results of LPC under-spending on maintenance of public facilities within the port, such as A & B jetties, Collins Steps and the inner harbour moorings.

The commercial mandate of CCHL and the companies within it does not always sit easy with the role of local government and public good issues and desires. Any company in which CCC has effectively a controlling interest, should have clearly and publicly stated aims and objectives which take into consideration public amenity as well as profitability, and report regularly and publicly to Council on their achievements in both areas.

Lyttelton Community Association wishes there to be greater discussion over the role and direction of CCHL and the need to establish 5 shelf companies.

#### Proposed Amendments to Developments Contribution Policy

We refer to the draft amendments to the LTCCP on the Developments Contribution policy.

P7, para 2.1 (a)-(e) talks about the Council's 'user pays' approach to the DCP, designed to ensure that developers bear the full cost of growth, which many in the existing community think equitable, since they see no reason why they should subsidise expenditure incurred to service new developments.

Most of the 130 submissions on this topic objected to the resulting increased charges (the objections were presumably from those wishing to develop). As a result

a joint working party was set up 'comprised of the Council and industry representatives' (sub-para (f)). This working party has watered down the excellent proposal of sub para (e), resulting in a loss of revenue of \$11m. (see Draft Annual Plan P14), and therefore a continuing burden on existing ratepayers.

If the joint working party really does consist of only Council and industry representatives, and not existing residents or their representatives, the working party cannot be considered to be impartial. The self-interest of the developers on the working party is self-evident. And some might consider that the Council itself is largely on the side of development, since more development means more rates revenue.

We therefore propose that a new working party be formed with membership from Council, industry, *and residents*, in proportion to their populations, and that the new working party reconsiders the Development Contributions Policy.

-----  
We wish to speak to our submission.

Please contact Lyttelton Community Association Inc c/-

- Chairperson

Tas Young ph 328-8845

[topas@xtra.co.nz](mailto:topas@xtra.co.nz)

or

- Secretary

Kirsty Macnab ph 328-8481 [kmacnab@paradise.net.nz](mailto:kmacnab@paradise.net.nz)

25 Voelas Road, Lyttelton