

Feedback on the Representation Review 2015 Initial Proposal.

Please submit your views by 5pm on Friday 9 October 2015.

To submit online: Go to www.ccc.govt.nz/repreview and click on Have Your Say.

To submit by email, send to: repreview@ccc.govt.nz

To submit in writing, either using the print submission form or in any other written form, post to:

Freepost 178 (no stamp required)
Representation Review consultation
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 73017
Christchurch 8146

Submission Form

I am completing this submission:

On behalf of Mt Pleasant Memorial Community Centre & Residents Assn. Inc.

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?
300 paying members, the Mt Pleasant Community Centre has a catchment of 4,000 residents..

Name:

Organisation: Mt Pleasant Memorial Community Centre & Residents Assn. Inc.

Role in organisation: Coordinator

Postal address: 3 McCormacks Bay Road

Christchurch 8081

Phone: 03 384 1656 021 2398946

Email: coordinator@mpcc.org.nz

Date 7 October 2015

Do you want to be heard?

Do you wish to present your submission at the hearing?

YES

Yes

Daytime phone number 021 2398946: Email: coordinator@mpcc.org.nz

We encourage you to combine your hearing presentation with other submitters – please discuss this when we contact you to arrange a hearing time

Are you submitting a supporting petition?

No.

Background

The writers of this submission would like to acknowledge that the current council and community board representation is the best they have enjoyed for many years. There is a feeling of wide community engagement and residents feel heard by the elected members. We are fearful that this quality of representation may be lost in the proposed Representation Review.

Questions

The initial proposal for the six-yearly review of our electoral arrangements is for the following representation:

- 16 councillors, with one elected from each ward (13 at present) 16 wards
- 16 wards (7 at present)
- 7 community boards (8 at present)
- The Mayor is elected by the whole city, and this will not change.

Number of representatives and community boards

1. Overall, do you think you and/or your community of interest will be fairly represented by the proposed number of councillors, wards and community boards?

Disagree

We do not support the proposal of 16 wards as it pertains to our location as it is not providing for adequate representation for the Port Hill suburbs of Sumner, Redcliffs and Mt Pleasant paired as it is with the whole of the Banks Peninsular area.

2. Why do you say that?

Comments about the number of councillors

The proposal for Councillor Representation, for the area covering the new Banks Peninsula-Sumner ward is to be reduced from two positions to one is not supported by our group.

1. The area involved is a very large geographic area with a highly dispersed population. This would result in the sole Councillor (like no other) having to travel very large distances to adequately represent the area.

2. The dispersed geography of the area gives rise to many complex issues including the Peninsula being a very important tourism gateway for the city and its special relationships with at least three Maori Papatipu Rūnanga.

3. The Banks Peninsular ward due to its proximity to the epicentre of the February 22 earthquake suffered severe impacts from that and successive earthquakes which are still very evident in our ward. These impacts continue to give rise to a great deal of work for any elected councillor.

4. In addition, the Banks Peninsula-Sumner Councillor, will have two community boards to attend, unlike any other Councillor. Under these circumstances having only one councillor would result in an unfair representation for the people of the ward and place an excessive work load on the sole elected councillor.

5. Due to the proposed pairing of Community Boards every other board except Banks Peninsula Sumner will have 3 councillors sitting around their community board table and able to take forward and support those community board issues at the Council table. Banks Peninsula residents will not have this support or voice with a sole councillor taking forward issues from not just one, but two community boards.

While there may be lower population numbers in Banks Peninsula-Sumner Ward than

others, we submit that the above factors outweigh this rather simplistic criteria. We strongly believe that the circumstances of this geographic area warrant two councillors for this ward even if this remains so only until the next Representation Review in 2021.

Comments about the number of wards

The number of wards – at 16 – is not at issue rather it is the boundaries drawn which will create unfair representation for residents living in Mt Pleasant and the number of Councillors proposed for the Banks Peninsular Sumer ward.

Comments about the number of community board

We are in general agreement with the number of boards but are concerned that they truly represent appropriate communities of interest and that the pairing of wards is compatible. We do not believe this is so with the proposed boundaries and pairing of wards.

Boundaries for the proposed wards

1. Overall do you think the proposed boundaries will reflect your community and/or communities of interest?

Strongly Disagree

Community of Interest

The residents of Mt Pleasant feel that their community of interest is more closely linked to that of our sister suburbs of Redcliffs and Sumner but feel equally as strongly connected to the Ferrymead commercial area and the residential suburb of Brookhaven. The current proposal does not include the later areas but instead cuts Mt Pleasant off at the western side of Ferrymead Bridge.

2. Why do you say that?

(Ferrymead Commercial area

Mt Pleasant being largely a dormitory suburb without its own village or shopping centre is serviced by the Ferrymead commercial area. This area contains our supermarket and our local post office (TakeNote) and hardware store as well as numerous other cafes and amenities.

For at least two decades the commercial area of Ferrymead has formed part of the Council's officially recognised residential area of the Mt Pleasant Residents Association. The design and function of this area is of real interest to our residents – it closest neighbours along with Brookhaven.

Roading

The majority of Mt Pleasant residents use the major arterials of Ferry Road and Linwood Avenue to travel to the city for work and education. These routes are vital life lines to us and what happens to them is of great concern to us.

It is important to us that the road and cycling corridors of Ferry Road, Humphrey's Drive and Linwood Avenue remain within our ward area. We want our councillor/s to have influence over issues which pertain to these key road corridors for our community.

Greenspace and the Estuary

Additionally, the Charlesworth Reserve is a precious reserve and green space to many Mt Pleasant residents bordering as it does the western end of the Estuary. Many hill residents

share guardianship of this reserve as well as the Estuary edge along with many locals from Brookhaven. This is demonstrated through attendance at planting days and maintenance of that reserve

The suburb of Brookhaven

The residents who live in Brookhaven have strong ties with Mt Pleasant and vice versa as many people leaving Mt Pleasant in retirement age choose to live in Brookhaven due to its views and close proximity to the Port Hills.

Similarly many young families living in Brookhaven choose to send their children to Mt Pleasant School rather than send them west to Woolston. Brookhaven currently forms part of the Mt Pleasant school zone.

Given the above reasons we believe it is logical to leave Mt Pleasant paired not simply with Redcliffs and Sumner but Brookhaven and the Ferrymead commercial area.

Natural boundary

We therefore see that Dyers Road is a natural and very clear western boundary for our ward area.

Increased delegations to Community Boards

We support Community Boards having increased delegations.

Ward name

We do not support the proposed name of the Lyttelton Summer ward

We suggest that to be more inclusive and descriptive of the area that the new ward be named **Harbour-Bays Ward** rather than Banks Peninsula-Sumner.

Community Board name

We submit that the Board name should be changed to be more reflective all of all geographical communities covered by it.

We would suggest the name become Estuary – Hills or Port Hills/Estuary.

Other wards:

We are also concerned that the Woolston village (shopping area) seems to be included within the Linwood Ward – this seems counter intuitive and not fostering of cohesion. We would like this revisited.

Other comments

3. Do you have any other comments to make about the proposals?

Regardless of the outcomes of this review we would encourage elected Councillors to have resident's and community associations meetings diarised as a priority and that they liaise closely with community board representatives to ensure the concerns of the community are heard and captured. This could be through quarterly scheduled fora or consultations workshops. Councillors need to remain open to ad hoc contact as the need arise.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit.