

**SUBMISSION TO:** Christchurch City Council

**ON:** Christchurch Long Term Council Community Plan 2009-19

**BY:** **Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board**  
Bob Todd, Chairperson

**CONTACT:** Jo Daly, Community Board Adviser – Hagley/Ferrymead  
Phone: 941 6601 or 027 236 9052  
Email: [jo.daly@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:jo.daly@ccc.govt.nz)  
Postal: Linwood Service Centre, PO Box 24 214, Christchurch 8642

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board (the Board) welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on the draft Christchurch Long Term Council Community Plan 2009-19 (LTCCP).

The Board has focussed its submission on key areas within the LTCCP, and where appropriate has included references to the section and page numbers of the LTCCP.

The Board **would** like to be heard in support of its submission.

## 2. RECREATION AND LEISURE (VOLUME 1, FROM PAGE 117)

The Board has comments on several sections of the Recreation and Leisure section of the draft LTCCP.

### 2.1 Aquatic Recreational Facility for the East

The Board is disappointed at the lack of planning and inclusion in the LTCCP for an aquatic recreational facility in eastern suburbs of Christchurch City.

The Christchurch City Council Aquatic Facilities Plan – 2006 identifies a plan for a pool in the east (Linwood-Woolston area) to be commenced in 2017-18 and completed in 2019-20. The Board notes that the Aquatic Facilities Plan is a long term framework document to guide and inform the Council's decision making processes, but submits that Councillors were not presented with a business case on the actions listed in the plan, in particular the facility in the Linwood-Woolston area, so were not provided with all the required information to make an informed decision.

The Board acknowledges that the Aquatic Facilities Plan identifies development of a facility in Linwood-Woolston area, or the retention of Aquagym. Aquagym is a privately owned purpose built indoor facility in Cashel Street, designed for the teaching and coaching of swimming to all age groups, not as an aquatic recreational facility. It is noted that in 2006 the facility was operating at capacity.

The Aquatic Facilities Plan states:

*“Council will continue to develop a network of aquatic facilities over time that meets current and future community need as defined through Council's goals and objectives in this Plan. The emphasis will be on filling identified gaps in the aquatic facilities network to ensure core features are provided in each area of the city. Over time current and future gaps in the geographic distribution of facilities will be filled by prioritised developments.”*

The Board submits that Aquagym does not meet the current or future community needs, and that the LTCCP should include planning and provision for the community needs in the future with a facility in the Linwood-Woolston area.

The Board's ongoing interest in an aquatic recreational facility in this area is in part driven by the results of a survey undertaken in 2002 on the needs of young people in the area. The survey showed the top priority for young people in the Linwood, Woolston, Bromley and Phillipstown area was an aquatic or recreational facility. Studies undertaken since support the need and desire for such a facility.

The Board would like the Council to consider inclusion in the 2009-2019 LTCCP of an aquatic recreational facility in the Linwood-Woolston area, and includes some suggestions for funding and location for this facility later in this submission<sup>1</sup>. The Council should also consider the Capital Endowment Fund as a source of funding for an aquatic recreational facility.

The Board's submission on this point is supported by the following (**attached**):

- Letters of support from:
  - Ruth Dyson, Member of Parliament, Port Hills
  - Mary Smillie, Kingdom Clinic
  - Heathcote Valley Community Association
- Petition sheets supporting an Aquatic Recreational Facility for the East – signed by 605 residents.

## **2.2 Centennial Leisure Centre**

The Board notes that an upgrade or improvement of Centennial pool is not identified in the Christchurch Aquatic Facilities Plan – 2006, but is listed in the draft LTCCP to be upgraded, starting in 2011-12. The Board submits that Council funds would be better directed towards a facility in the eastern suburbs of Christchurch city.

## **2.3 Cowles Stadium**

The Board submits that the upgrade of Cowles Stadium does not go far enough towards providing the necessary increase in level of service in this area. In considering the required upgrade of the facility, the Council has chosen a scheme of a smaller scale than what members of the Board believe would be optimal. In the draft LTCCP the upgrade is programmed for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.

## **3. REFUSE MINIMISATION AND DISPOSAL (PAGE 149, VOLUME 2)**

*Recycling bags for the CBD recycling collection user pays service*

The Board considers that the 80 cent charge per recycling bag for the central business district is not a sustainable practice. Under the proposed scheme, most users (households/business) will use one normal refuse bag per week at a cost to them of \$2 per bag. They will be reluctant to pay an additional charge of 80 cents per week for separation into a recycling bag and will instead simply place recyclable materials into the normal refuse bag. The objects or aims of the waste minimisation strategy will therefore not be met.

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer to sections 4 and 5 of submission.

The Board submits that the cost of recycling bags should be included in a small targeted waste levy in rates for the CBD. This would ensure that each user would receive an allocated adequate supply of "free" bags per year which would encourage them to separate their waste at source. Any additional bags required by the user over and above their allocation could be charged for the rate of 80 cents each.

#### **4. PROPOSED CAPITAL PROGRAMME (VOLUME 1, PAGE 246)**

The Board is appreciative of the opportunities afforded to it to give input into the formulation of the proposed capital programme.

##### **4.1 The Board would like to congratulate the Council on the following Capital Programmes:**

- The commitment to the redevelopment AMI Stadium, including the improvement of the surrounding areas (Proposed Capital Programme - Volume 1, page 257)
- Within the Proposed capital programme, the commitment to parks development, in particular the following projects:
  - Sport parks - the Linwood Park pavilion, 2013-2016.
  - Neighbourhood Parks - relocation of Linwood Nursery to the Harewood site.

The Board submits that the land currently occupied by the Linwood Nursery, combined with other Council property in this area would be an ideal location for an aquatic recreational facility.

##### **4.2 Street Renewal Programme (Volume 1, page 259)**

The Board supports the street renewals of Torlesse Street and Holland Street, proposed to commence in 2009-2010, and submits that the Avonside area should be developed as a whole, with the Council taking a holistic approach to neighbourhood improvements. The Board submits that the Council should consider programmes that improve neighbourhoods as part of all street improvement projects.

##### **4.3 New Footpaths Programme (Volume 1, page 255)**

The Board has been advised that footpaths on Ruru Road are included in the new footpaths programme, but as detail of when this will be completed is currently unavailable submit that the footpaths for Ruru Road should be completed as soon as practical within the programme.

##### **4.4 Unfunded Capital Programme – Streets and Transport (Volume 1, page 271)**

The Board notes that the following projects are not included in the Proposed Capital Programme, and submit that they should be included within the LTCCP 2009-2019.

- Taylors Mistake Road (Volume 1, page 271)
- Latimer Square (Volume 1, page 271)

##### **4.5 Community Board Meeting Microphones (Volume 1, page 267)**

The majority of the Board is disappointed to note that the Community Board Meeting Microphones project, at a cost of \$54,000, is unfunded in the LTCCP. The Board opinion is that these are necessary in boardrooms and should be funded with some urgency. The Board submits that microphones for Community boardrooms should be included in the LTCCP and funded in 2009-10.

**5. STATEMENT OF PROPOSAL TO EXTEND THE CITY TRAM ROUTE (VOLUME 1, PAGE 211)**

The Board has the following comments in regard to the statement of proposal to extend the city tram route. The Board acknowledges its invitation as a stakeholder to the meeting called specifically to discuss the proposed extension of the city tram as part of the LTCCP consultation.

It is accepted that as part of the revitalisation of the central city the proposal to extend the city tram route is underway, and in 2008 the Council consulted on and confirmed, subject to funding, the extension (stage I) of the route incorporating Oxford Terrace, City Mall, Colombo Street and Cathedral Square.

The majority of the Board has concerns regarding the impacts of the tram extension on traffic in the central city, in particular traffic on Colombo Street, Manchester Street, and public transport, including the bus priority project. The Board notes that some of these concerns were also raised in the submission to the proposal for the extension of the tram route from the Transport Planning and Passenger Services of Environment Canterbury, April 2008.

The majority of the Board submits that the proposal for further extension of the tram, (stage II) should be withdrawn from this LTCCP, and that proposed funds for this stage, commencing in 2012, should be committed to recreation and leisure, specifically towards facilities included in the Aquatic Facilities Plan – 2006, a facility in Linwood-Woolston.

**6. STREETS AND TRANSPORT (VOLUME 1, PAGE 80)**

The Board submits in relation to Cost of Proposed Services (page 90) and Cost of Proposed Capital Expenditure (page 91) that the Council should be proposing to spend greater amounts on these programmes in the earlier part of this LTCCP, not concentrating the increase in spending towards the second half of the life of this plan.

The Council should lobby central government for as much financial support as possible in this area, and consider borrowing more now to enable savings in the longer term. The figures included in the draft plan show a lower spend on the road network and renewals and replacements in the next few years. Cost for work to be undertaken later in the life of the LTCCP could be higher, which would result in less being able to be achieved with the funds committed. The Board submits that in the current financial climate increased spending in this area now could achieve more before any cost rise, and potentially provide an opportunity for employment of those performing the work.



Bob Todd  
**CHAIRPERSON**  
**HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD**

**16 April 2009**

**Daly, Jo**

---

**From:** Ruth Dyson [ruth.dyson@xtra.co.nz]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 16 April 2009 9:37 am  
**To:** Daly, Jo  
**Subject:** Letter of support

Bob Todd  
Chairman  
Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board  
Linwood Service Centre  
Christchurch.

16<sup>th</sup> April 2009

Dear Bob and Community Board members,

Aquatic Facility – inclusion in Long Term Council and Community Plan

I am writing in support of the proposal outlined in a petition to the Community Board and Council, to re-instate the leisure facility which is part of the Council's Aquatics Facilities plan. This facility has been specifically omitted from the Long Term Council and Community Plan.

My constituents in this area are dismayed that, having worked so hard for so long to have this facility included in the Aquatics Facilities Plan, that it has now been scrapped. This means that the opportunity for Council to address the significant inequity faced by residents in this part of the city has been lost. The only Council pool in this area is the Woolston pool, which has had its last season, and will not re-open in future.

Residents in the Bromley/Linwood/Woolston area are in the lower income earning decile, and so their ability to afford the time and transport to travel to Council facilities is obviously restricted. The children particularly, in these families deserve to have the same access to leisure facilities that others in the city already enjoy.

We have been realistic about the funding requirement and understand that it is a considerable investment. That is why the decision to put the facility on the 10 year plan was strongly supported. That allows for fair investment throughout the city on a planned basis, and ensures that funding is raised and appropriated to reflect the genuine needs of our communities. For this reasonable approach from my constituents to be dismissed with the staff decision to remove the facility from the LTCCP is an insult to the time and commitment that was contributed locally in preparation of the original plan.

I urge the Community Board to advocate for our shared constituents in ensuring that the facility is re-instated in the LTCCP, so that in the longer term, the equity of access to such a fundamental facility is finally delivered to those of us on this side of town.

Thank you for your consideration and anticipated support.

Hon Ruth Dyson  
Member of Parliament  
Port Hills

**Daly, Jo**

---

**From:** Todd, Bob  
**Sent:** Thursday, 2 April 2009 4:07 pm  
**To:** Daly, Jo  
**Subject:** FW: Swimming pool in Woolston area

Hi Joas discussed with you this morning cheers Bob.

---

**From:** Nurse at Kingdom Clinic [mailto:nurse@kingdom.pegasus.net.nz]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 1 April 2009 12:41 pm  
**To:** Todd, Bob  
**Subject:** Swimming pool in Woolston area

Dear Bob.

Further to our conversation yesterday I wish to submit the following.

I am a registered nurse working in healthy lifestyle change at various medical centres in Woolstom and Aranui.

I am finding that many patients, because of excessive weight and often painful hips, knees or backs, need to swim or do other water activity.

Very often they are unable to get to a swimming pool because of the distance and/or cost of getting there. Sometimes it requires 3 buses.

Therefore I believe it is essential if we are to encourage an overweight and unfit population to become active and healthy, to provide an indoor swimming pool which is easily accessible and affordable in this area. \$4 per swim is often not affordable.

With thanks for your consideration of this.

Regards Mary Smillie  
NZRN  
Healthy Lifestyle Counsellor  
Kingdom Clinic  
Ph. 3844274

HEATHCOTE VALLEY COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Chairman  
Ian McLeod  
9 Flinders Road  
Heathcote, Christchurch 8022  
Email [walk.tours@paradise.net.nz](mailto:walk.tours@paradise.net.nz)  
Ph. (03) 384 3321

Secretary  
Hugh Matthews  
72 Port Hills Road  
Heathcote, Christchurch 8022  
Email: [hvcasecretary@hotmail.com](mailto:hvcasecretary@hotmail.com)  
Ph. (03) 384 1831

The Chairman  
Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board  
180 Smith Street  
Linwood  
Christchurch

26 March 2009

Dear Bob,

At our monthly meeting last night we discussed the decision of Council to leave out of the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) any provision for an Aquatic Centre in the city's eastern suburbs. The meeting felt that the decision was at least regrettable and at worst derelict.

We note and support the expressed concern and disappointment of The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board. As a result of our discussions we passed the following motion:

The Heathcote Valley Community Association fully supports The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board endeavours to include a provision, in the Long Term Council Community Plan, for an Aquatic Centre in the city's eastern suburbs.

Further we will try to add as many names and signatures, in support, as we can to the petition presently being passed around the community.

Regards

Ian