

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

Draft LTCCP 2009-19

- Received via Web

Submissions close on 16 April 2009

I do NOT wish to present my submission at the hearing, and ask that this written submission be considered

Are you completing this submission:

For yourself

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

Name:

A.H. & V.N. Mander

Organisation Name:

Organisation Role:

Contact Address:

9 Vardon Crescent

Postcode:

8061

Daytime Phone:

385 1833

Evening Phone:

385 1833

Email:

tmander@clear.net.nz

Email Address for copy of submission:

Date:

16 April 2009

Your Submission:

1. Do not support the development of Hagley Oval for international (test) cricket for these reasons:

a) It is public land, used by community (amateur) cricket teams, whereas international cricket is a totally commercial enterprise. The Council has no business using ratepayer money to support commercial enterprises. It already expects ratepayers to support similar developments (eg. AMI Stadium) where only a small minority of citizens benefit, and where it has become obvious that the commercial enterprises that do benefit (Rugby Union, hospitality industry, etc) are not prepared to pay their fair share. The Council is already unsure where the boundaries of its expenditure should be, and it's time to start defining those boundaries more clearly.

b) The Council has already spent money on the Village Green development, aimed at professional (ie. commercial) cricket. It should continue to develop this.

2. Do not support the proposal to set up a charitable trust. While it is possibly legal to do so, it is not ethical, as the intention of the legislation was to assist legitimate charities. While acknowledging that activities of the City Council are primarily for the benefit of the public, they are done on the behalf of people paying for these services. They are not charitable works, which are primarily aimed at supporting activities unable to be funded otherwise. Should the IRD accept this then it is likely that some enterprises may be able to avoid paying rates in ways similarly legal, but not ethical, leaving the Council with no defence. (Presumably we could pay our rates with the same discretion on the amount we pay as we currently exercise for the charities we support!) We expect the Council to set the example in how to carry out its activities both legally, ethically, and according to relevant best practices. while expecting the Council to ensure maximum value is achieved for our rates, we do not expect it to stretch the boundaries of ethical behaviour.

3. Do not support the current approach to inner city revitalisation, which seems aimed at bringing people to the city centre. The only way it will thrive is in the same way suburban malls do: service a local population. There needs to be far greater emphasis on central city living. Presently the type of development design does not really encourage central city living. With the costs of travel increasing central city living should become more attractive, but needs a much better standard of street and building design that is currently evident.

4. Support the Development Contributions Policy. One thing missing in central city development are sufficient public spaces.

5. Support water supply and management, except prefer to see sustainable pricing for domestic and commercial properties. That is, a basic allocation is provided consistent with the amount of rates paid, with a charge for use above this, the charge increasing per water charging unit with increasing consumption.

6. Support the intention to increase the use of public transport, but we are critical of the slow rate at which bus shelters are being added to the network. Bus shelters are one important factor in encouraging use of buses and the Council should be providing them at a much greater rate. It should not be spending large amounts for money on pandering to residents' requests for bus shelters in their area which match existing architectural features. Those can come later once all bus routes have an adequate number of shelters, which is far from the case at present.

7. Support the continuation of the one-hour free parking in selected parking buildings, for us it is an incentive to shop in the central city (but doing away with it would be a disincentive to visit the central city and would save us money!). The proposal to increase the cost of on-street parking seems at odds with the wish to encourage more visits to the central city.

8. The Council is to be congratulated for its 3-bin waste collection system with the appropriate composting and recycling facilities.