

7694

# CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

## Draft LTCCP 2009-19

**- Received via Web**

Submissions close on 16 April 2009

**I wish to talk to the main points in my written submission at the hearings to be held between Monday 11 May 2009 and Monday 18 May 2009.**

**Are you completing this submission:**

On behalf of a group or organisation

**If you are representing, how many people do you represent?**

Trustees of charitable trust for the Belfast residents

**Name:**

Hayley Powell

**Organisation Name:**

Belfast Community Trust

**Organisation Role:**

Trustee

**Contact Address:**

PO Box 36-242  
Merivale  
Christchurch

**Postcode:**

8146

**Daytime Phone:**

3236599

**Evening Phone:**

**Email:**

latimer.holdings@xtra.co.nz

**Email Address for copy of submission:**

latimer.holdings@xtra.co.nz

**Date:**

16 April 2009

**Your Submission:**

SUBMISSION ON LTCCP 2009-2019

To Christchurch City Council  
PO Box 237  
Christchurch

Name of Submitter: Belfast Community Trust (BCT).

This is a submission on the draft Christchurch Long Term Council Community Plan 2009-2019(the "Plan").

1. Belfast lacks community infrastructure and facilities.

Belfast requires as soon as possible:

- a library, and

- a community centre. Belfast urgently requires a facility to mesh together the divides of the community, and to provide a means for growth, with the ability for more continuing education classes and activities.

Consultations on the Belfast Area Plan began in 2003 with a draft plan for consultation planned for early to mid-2009.

The progress report states:

Belfast is undergoing considerable change. Its population is rapidly increasing and it is one of Christchurch's most rapidly expanding urban areas. As Belfast continues to grow, there is a need to ensure that the area

retains a strong sense of community, which involves ensuring access to appropriate and effective community facilities.

And further notes:

Increasing the number of households in the area from some 2,850 in 2006 to 6,800 by 2041, is an increase of approximately 10,000 additional residents  $6,800 - 2,850 = 3,950$  new households or approximately 10,000 new residents at 2.53 residents per household. The report suggests there were 7,200 Belfast residents when it was written, i.e. more than the 1 community centre/hall/cottage per 6700 residents. Its performance target in the Plan [p179].

There is no community centre/hall hallmarked for Belfast until 2019. The Belfast Community Network's current premises have been earmarked for a designated road within the proposed new Applefields development. The current time frame for this may be within the next 3-5 years, which will leave Belfast without its vital community hub that the Belfast Community Network currently provides. It is essential that there is continuity of service.

- park and recreational areas including cycleways and walkways. BCT supports a walkway/cycleway from Papanui Road through Belfast to Kaiapoi adjacent to the existing rail corridor.

- Better public transport.

- Belfast cemetery is at capacity now. BCT requires the Plan to provide for a new cemetery within close proximity to the existing one. This is a high priority.

- A pool. BCT does not support the closure of the Belfast Pool. This type of facility is beneficial on many levels both social and physical. The Belfast School will be greatly affected by the closure, and would mean that they will incur the transportation of the pupils to the Papanui Pool. It is inconceivable that the Council believes that it is safe for children to attempt to bike to Papanui, negotiating the Styx Mill Bridge, a huge safety issue.

With child obesity being at all time high, BCT believes that the Council should have a policy of promoting child health through exercise. Swimming is good exercise.

BCT believes that Belfast should have a new indoor, heated pool or at the very least the Belfast pool upgraded and operated.

The travelling distances to the nearest Aquatic facilities: from the corner of Johns Rd/Main North Rd Belfast: to Kaiapoi is 10.74km, to QEII is 9.41km, to Jellie Park is 8.62 Km and to Papanui, if a proposed facility, eventuates is 6km. These distances are excessive and hinder the ability for many to frequent the facilities.

We also note the draft Plan omits the \$150,000 which was previously allocated to the maintenance of the Belfast Pool.

The Belfast Pool is an integral part of the Belfast Community and still very much meets the needs of community.

## 2. Central City Revitalisation

BCT supports the concept that people like to work, play and live within close proximity. This encourages closer, safer communities and benefits the well being of the people.

This Policy is to the detriment of existing and future suburban business and will discourage expansion and innovation in the suburbs. BCT believes that Belfast will benefit greatly from further retail expansion in Belfast.

## 3. Child safety is paramount. Belfast urgently needs a safer more accessible

entrance to the Belfast school and Sheldon Park. BCT would like this to be prioritized by the Council.

4. Belfast requires the construction of the Northern Arterial to alleviate Traffic issues and generate industry and commercial activity. BCT believes that Belfast is divided due to traffic issues, and supports the prioritization of:

- Northern Roothing Option (Northern Arterial).
- Western Bypass. BCT believes the best routing for this is following the NW outskirts of Clearwater going direct to the Airport.

5. The Plan states that \$1.5m will be taken from the money to be allocated to community type organisations and instead be used to pay overheads. In effect an 11% decrease in funding. In addition there is no inflation adjustments planned for the 10 years of the Plan. The cumulative effect of these measures to take some \$30m out of community organisation funding over the life of the Plan.  
We do not support this reduction in community organisation funding.

6. The draft Plan appears to promote greater proportionate rates increases for the poor compared to the wealthy. In the Plan a residence capital value of \$200,000 will get an 8% rate increase while a \$1,000,000 will get a 3% increase. The same anti-progressive outcome occurs for businesses and rural properties.

In our view the proportionate increase should at worst be the same for all residents. Similarly all businesses and rural properties should, at worst, have the same rate increase.

7. The Plan states that "Another key assumption in this draft LTCCP is the assumption that environmental change (i.e. global warming) will not have a significant impact on the environment or economy of Christchurch within the ten year LTCCP period". We expect the Plan to consider and respond to climate change. It would be useful to foreshadow the Climate Change Strategy development process in the Plan.

8. Some not-for-profit Early Childhood Education operators are uneasy that their rents/ leases will escalate to market rents. This is not the case and should be confirmed publicly by the Council.

9. Policy on determining significance "we do not support the removal of financial thresholds in determining significance. These should be retained along with the move for the Council to consider "current and future community wellbeing, the views of those affected, and the Council's capacity to perform its role."

10. Development Contributions Policy 2009-2019 (DCP)  
The timing of the obligation to pay Development Contributions under the DCP must be aligned with the time the Developer receives its return on the development. The developer should not be required to obtain costly bridging finance for the payment of any Development Contributions.

Realistic payment options/mechanisms need to be defined in the DCP to help developers deal with the cashflow demands of the assessed Development Contributions and to alleviate the risk of reassessment under the DCP. Permitting the bonding of Development Contributions is one way.

The DCP does not provide for any remissions or reductions to be applied for or granted. It is inappropriate that the DCP does not make provision for reduction or remission of development contributions. While it is arguable under section 201 (1)(c) that such provisions are not required, they should be incorporated as a matter of public policy. The removal of any possibility of a reduction or remission of development contributions will provide a disincentive to developers to incur expenditure in, for example, developing local reserves within large-scale developments over and above what is required by the Council.

There is no clear and binding period by which the Council must provide the reserves, network infrastructure and/or community infrastructure the Development Contributions received relates too.

There must be a certain proximity and benefit for any development from the Development Contributions assessed, paid and allocated to the Projects pursuant to the DCP. That is, there must be a clear and measured benefit to the development from the payment of a Development Contribution under the DCP. If there is not or to the extent there is not then the Development Contribution should be refunded back to the developer.

BCT therefore seeks in addition to options in paying Development Contributions, conditions and criteria where the Council may exercise its discretion for the remission or reduction of Development Contributions, and to refund that part of any Development Contributions paid by a Developer when the benefit assessed by the Policy for that development does not occur within the time prescribed.

BCT wishes to be heard in support of the submission.  
If others make a similar submission, it will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

For Belfast Community Trust  
Hayley Kim Powell, Trustee

Date: 16 April 2009

Address for service of submitter:  
Belfast Community Trust  
PO Box 36-242  
Merivale  
CHRISTCHURCH 8146  
Telephone: (03) 386 3249  
Fax: (03) 386 2473  
Email: [latimer.holdings@xtra.co.nz](mailto:latimer.holdings@xtra.co.nz)  
Contact person: Hayley Powell