

LTCCP or the adopted LTCCP because if these changes were made the document would have to be reviewed again by Audit New Zealand. If changes were suggested by Members at the end of the process, close to adoption then a second 'hot review' would need to be carried out. It is understood that this process is necessary to ensure that assumptions, levels of service and financial information are consistent however Audit New Zealand could have done much more to inform the Members and Council staff of the process that Audit New Zealand and the Office of the Auditor general planned to follow.

#### **4.18 Submission Point Seven**

*4.19 Audit New Zealand should be reminded that unless the process is carefully explained and Audit New Zealand stay strictly within their mandate as described in the LGA then the democratic decision making ability of Members can be eroded.*

#### **5.0 DRINKING WATER STANDARDS/DRINKING WATER AMENDMENT BILL**

5.1 Council owns and operates eight water supplies in the District. Seven of these water supplies would be classified as small under the Drinking Water Amendment Bill. There are also a number of very small community-owned water supplies in the District.

5.2 It is important to note that to the best of Council's knowledge there has never been an outbreak of a serious water borne illness in our District. For this reason, the Bill appears unnecessary in the context of the Ruapehu District and it is Council's opinion that the Bill should not be progressed further.

#### **5.3 Submission Point Eight**

*5.4 The Drinking Water Amendment Bill is unnecessary.*

5.5 Council is concerned about the short timeframes granted under the Drinking Water Amendment Bill. Large water supplies (serving a population of over 10,000 for at least 60 days per year) would need to comply one year after commencement (there are no water supplies of this size in the District). Medium drinking water suppliers (serving 5,000-10,000 people) would have two years to comply. Minor suppliers (501-5,000) would have three years, small (101-500) would have four years and very small (25-100) would have five years. Suppliers of fewer than 25 persons will also have to be inspected and if applying for assistance through the Drinking Water Assistance Programme (DWAP) will need public health management plans.

5.6 A lack of foresight has been shown on the part of central government to impose these new regulations now, outside of the LTCCP process. The additional cost of compliance for many Councils would be significant. Significant changes to the content of LTCCP's cannot be made as part of the Exceptions Annual Plan process.

*M101*

## **5.7 Submission Point Nine**

5.8 *Any new legislative requirement that imposes costs on local government needs to consider and take into account the three yearly planning timeframe that is required under the LGA. Timeframes need to be developed that allow local authorities to budget for the increased cost that legislation will have on the ratepayer base.*

## **5.9 Drinking Water Assistance Programme**

5.10 Central government has developed the DWAP that will go some way to offsetting the cost of compliance on smaller water supplies.

5.11 It is the Council's opinion that this does not go far enough. The DWAP only covers the capital cost to upgrade the supply. Small water supplies will still be required to fund the depreciation and maintenance of these water supplies, that in many cases, will be unaffordable for these communities.

5.12 At this stage there is no guarantee of receiving DWAP funding, and the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Bill may be adopted before DWAP is finalised.

## **5.13 Submission Point Ten**

5.14 *DWAP must help fund the depreciation and maintenance costs of small water supplies.*

## **6.0 LAND TRANSPORT**

6.1 The land transport budget is the largest budget of most (if not all) smaller councils. However the cost of providing land transport assets (specifically roads) disproportionately affects rural councils. Rural councils have a higher proportion of kilometres of road compared to the number of people. Therefore the land transport activity is a significant issue for this Council.

6.2 Often regional 'R' funding is used for state highways. State highways are important transport routes and need to be maintained to a high standard. However Council feel that 'R' funding needs to be directed at local roads. State Highways serve a national benefit and should be funded by central government. 'R' funding is generated to provide regional routes; therefore this funding should be directed at local roads in the District.

## **6.3 Submission Point Eleven**

6.4 *'R' Funding should be directed at local roads in the District not at State Highways.*

6.5 Transit New Zealand are the Road Controlling Authority (RCA) for state highways. They have an important role to play in ensuring the state highway network provides safe, effective and efficient travel on the high volume inter-regional transport routes. However Transit New Zealand are wishing to be more involved in the resource consent process for issues that may affect the safety of state highway users.

M102

6.6 It is understood that Transit New Zealand needs to have input into District Plan and Resource Management Act (RMA) decisions. However it is of concern to this Council that Transit New Zealand's concerns about resource consents take a long time to arrive at Council. It can be difficult to predict if Transit New Zealand considers themselves an affected party. It would be helpful if Transit New Zealand developed a national policy framework that explained Transits position in relation to the RMA and District Plans.

**6.7 Submission Point Twelve**

6.8 *Transit New Zealand should be encourage to develop a National Policy framework that explains their involvement and ensures nationally consistent treatment in relation to the RMA and District Plans.*

**6.9 Land Transport New Zealand**

6.10 Land Transport New Zealand (LTNZ) has the ability to make 'rules' in accordance with the Land Transport Act 1998.

6.11 LTNZ Rule 54001: Setting of Speed Limits (the Rule) allows RCAs to set speed limits suitable to their local conditions. This allows councils as the RCAs for local roads, to set speed limits that are suitable for the local conditions. However all speed limits developed a RCA must comply with the provisions laid out in the Rule.

6.12 This Council developed speed limits in consultation with the community and in most cases in compliance with the rule. LTNZ assessed the proposed speed limits against the Rule and found that in some instances the proposed speed limits did not comply with the Rule and requested Council modify the speed limits to comply with the Rule. The speed limits that were developed using the Rule were different to those that were identified by the community as being fit for the conditions. LTNZ informed Council that the Director of LGNZ had the ability to gazette speed limits that did comply with the Rule.

6.13 The speed limits developed by Council and LTNZ (in compliance with the Rule) were released for public consultation. Some members of the community submitted that the speed limits were not suitable for the community that they live in. Council responded to these submitters saying that all speed limits were developed in accordance with the Rule and Council had little choice but to uphold the provisions of the Rule.

6.14 It makes no sense and is counter productive to a harmonious relationship with members of the community for a document, that does not in effect allow for community to influence the outcome, to be released for consultation only to have to state to members of the community that Council cannot take their wishes into account.

**6.15 Submission Point Thirteen**

6.16 *The Rule is restrictive and does not allow councils (as RCA's) to take the needs and wishes of their local community into account. This Rule is also in opposition to a key premise of the LGA which empowers territorial authorities with the ability to develop local solutions to local problems.*

**M103**

## **7.0 DEVOLUTION OF NON CORE FUNCTIONS / IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL COSTS**

- 7.1 Over the last two decades central government has placed an increasing responsibility on local government. Local government is now required to consider the environmental, social, cultural and economic well being of its communities.
- 7.2 Local authorities are being called upon by their communities to enter into areas of community development and economic development, 20 years ago central government was the primary provider of these services.
- 7.3 In many cases local government is the right vehicle to provide community and economic development services as local government knows its communities and can provide local solutions to local problems however local government cannot do this alone. Local government requires the freedom to make decisions that are in the best interest of their communities and this premise is enshrined in legislation like the LGA and the RMA. However in many cases central government has not provided the funding or allow councils to develop appropriate funding mechanisms to ensure that local government can fulfil the needs and wishes of the community.
- 7.4 The following section provides three examples of how central government has imposed additional responsibilities on local authorities without providing the appropriate funding to ensure that local government can implement the proposals effectively.
- 7.5 **Building Act 2004**
- 7.6 The Building Act 2004 has imposed significant new costs on local authorities. In particular, the requirement to develop policies on earthquake prove buildings and dangerous and unsanitary buildings. It is positive that central government has given local authorities the ability to develop standards that are fit for purpose in the context of territorial authorities administrative area, however these policies have imposed significant additional costs on councils.
- 7.7 Each of these policies needs to be developed and consulted on which creates a significant cost to council and as stated above the issue of consultation fatigue is of serious concern. The consultation process for these policies gives another indication of this issue. In the case of the Earth Quake Prone and Dangerous and Unsanitary Buildings Policies there were less than 10 public submissions received.
- 7.8 Council must also enforce the principles outlined in these policies. To effectively control these policies Council must either employ additional highly skilled staff or contract the additional workload out to a consultant. This imposes additional costs on both Council and ratepayers.
- 7.9 **Submission Point Fourteen**
- 7.10 *Changes to existing legislation that increases the cost to Council and the ratepayers needs to be accompanied with additional central government funding so that the*

M104

*existing ratepayer base is not expected to bear the costs for the additional services or responsibilities.*

#### **7.11 The Waste Minimisation Bill**

7.12 A very similar situation is likely to occur in the case of the Waste Minimisation Bill, which was introduced to parliament on 14 June 2006. The Bill contains a number of measures with the objective of minimising waste disposal including:

- Establishing a centralised Waste Minimisation Authority (WMA)
- Specifying roles of territorial authorities for waste minimisation and management (Waste Control Authorities)
- Enabling prohibition on disposal of certain materials
- Introducing a levy on residual waste to provide both a disincentive and a funding source for waste minimisation
- Ability to require extended producer responsibility programmes for certain products including related targets for waste reduction
- Requiring all public organisations to implement procurement policies, which give priority to waste reduction and also to report on their resource use, waste generation and waste management.

7.13 Territorial authorities would be required to become Waste Control Authorities. As a Waste Control Authority local councils would be required to develop a 'Waste Minimisation Plan'. This would result in a Council such as Ruapehu developing

- Solid Waste Management Plan,
- Solid Waste Asset Management Plan,
- Summary of Water and Sanitary Services and
- Waste Minimisation Plan.

7.14 It is questionable if it is efficient and effective use of ratepayer's funds to develop yet another 'plan' for the control and management of solid waste. In addition central government needs to ensure that the development of any new plans or modification of existing plans fits into the three year planning cycle of the LTCCP which is enshrined in the LGA.

#### **7.15 Submission Point Fifteen**

7.16 *If new management strategies are required then central government should look at incorporating these into existing plans and strategies, not creating new plans, if it is decided that a new plan is required then funding should be provided by central government and not sought from the existing ratepayer base.*

*M105*

7.17 The Bill suggests that councils as Waste Controlling Authorities should utilise their bylaw making power under the LGA to control waste entering landfills and the wastestream. It implies that bylaws can be used to develop a comprehensive structure of waste minimisation and management to control all waste in society. In effect it becomes its own RMA, but would have none of the special powers, delegations or penalty mechanisms required to enforce it. Again it appears that the entire legislative framework has not been taken into account before new Bills are proposed.

**7.18 Submission Point Sixteen**

7.19 *The existing legislative framework should be examined and new proposals or requirements should fit within this framework.*

7.20 *Central government to consider the total cost that this change in the legislative framework will have and provide funding accordingly.*

**7.21 Dog Control Act**

7.22 Central Government recently introduced changes to the Dog Control Act 1996. Now all dogs (excluding farm working dogs) must be micro chipped. This change to the Dog Control Act imposes significant new costs. Most of these costs will be passed on to dog owners in the form of fees and charges.

7.23 These legislative changes will inevitably result in increased monitoring, equipment and compliance costs for local authorities.

7.24 In addition Council's Dog Control Bylaw was scheduled to be reviewed this year. A key change that occurred as a result of changes to the Dog Control Act was that the Dog Control Policy also needed to be reviewed. This has resulted in increased costs to Council.

**7.25 Submission Point Seventeen**

7.26 *Changes to the Dog Control Act have resulted in increased costs to both Council and the dog owners in the Community.*

**7.27 Rates Rebate Scheme**

7.28 Council agrees in principal with the outcomes that the rates rebate scheme is trying to promote. This scheme however is problematic. The cost for implementing, monitoring and administering this scheme is almost equal to the amount that the DIA provides in rebates to members of the community. Essentially what has occurred here is a rate burden shifting away from lower income earners to the higher income earners but has provided little in the way of overall benefit to the community.

M106

## **7.29 Submission Point Eighteen**

7.30 While the principals behind the rates rebate scheme are sound, the cost of implementing, monitoring and administering this scheme needs to be assessed against the benefits that are provided to certain parts of the community.

## **8.0 LGNZ**

8.1 LGNZ plays an important role in supporting local authorities and ensuring that their interests are taken into account. There have been instances where the timeframe to respond to important issues is very short. It is understood that this may not be the fault of LGNZ, however it should be noted that a short consultation period can erode the democratic ability of Members to carefully consider issues and respond to them in the best interests of the community.

## **8.2 Submission Point Nineteen**

8.3 *LGNZ to ensure that local authorities are given enough time to respond to consultation issues. Council/Committee meetings occur on a sox weekly or monthly basis and so it is essential that at least one month is provided to enable Members to carefully consider the issues and provide an appropriate response.*

8.4 LGNZ should ensure take all local authority views into account. In some cases the views and concerns of urban councils are quite different to those of rural councils, or the concerns of large councils are different to those of smaller councils. LGNZ need to ensure that it's response to central government or other body take into account the views of all councils even if the opinions are conflicting.

## **8.5 Submission Point Twenty**

8.6 *LGNZ needs to ensure that the views that it advocates for are representative of the entire local government sector as each Council is unique and their concerns need to be taken into account.*

M107

} Referrals -  
 } democracy - process -  
 } nothing new -  
 } referrals -  
 } Freedom,  
 } flexibility - good stuff  
 } web site - Rating -

Local Government New Zealand  
PO Box 1214  
Wellington

File Ref: 311/02-09  
Ref: DM:KS

Attention: Colleen Bredican

8 September 2006

- Freedom -

Dear Colleen

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEGISLATION REVIEW**

Upper Hutt City Council would like to thank Local Government New Zealand for the opportunity to present our views on the local government legislation which has been introduced over the past ten years.

In presenting this submission, we have chosen to focus only on the Local Government Act 2002, as the other two acts have raised far fewer concerns.

**PRINCIPAL CONCERN: Councils are doing the same but it costs more**

Our principal concern is that while the Local Government Act 2002 has granted Councils the power of general competence, these enhanced capabilities have effectively been nullified by the significantly greater process requirements. The net effect is that our Council is still doing what it used to do, decision-making processes now take longer and it costs more to prepare plans and consult.

The following are examples of this concern:

**1. Decision-making Processes**

The new local government legislation requires Councils to consider possible projects in quite different ways, adding new process steps for formal consultation, as well as creating an expectation that pre consultation will occur for major proposals. Indeed, it is difficult to assess social, economic, environmental and cultural impacts without some form of pre consultation or research.

In some situations, Council has identified the right issues but has not identified an acceptable solution. Action to address the issue has been delayed while proposals are re-worked, and these in turn must be re-tested through the special consultative procedures.

For example, Council identified the need to improve the library services three years ago. Two years ago, in response to submissions, the proposal identified was delayed pending a full assessment of the Library service by an independent reviewer. This review was undertaken and a new proposal prepared earlier this

M108

year. This second proposal was rejected following further public submissions, and more detailed work must now be undertaken into funding sources, design work and feasibility assessments. Any new proposal will again have to be consulted on using the same special consultation procedures.

Each time the special consultation process is used, a minimum of four months is added to the time needed to make a decision

On a different note, our community expects us to provide basic infrastructure services that work well - water supply, wastewater, stormwater, road maintenance - without elaborate consultation.

## 2. The Long Term Council Community Plan

A number of the provisions relating to the preparation of the LTCCP are highly prescriptive e.g. the use of the special consultative procedure, the requirements of Schedule 10.

Our main concern is that there is a danger that Councils will concentrate on ensuring that the quite complex process is correct to the detriment of the merits of the policy or plan content. For example, in addressing the detailed requirements for any Development Contributions Policy, it is possible to lose focus on the underlying principle that developers should meet the costs of development.

A large amount of information is required to be included in the plan. Our LTCCP is about 200 pages long; some are over six hundred pages long. While the works programme needs to be easily accessible and is reviewed annually, and the budget forecasts are important, the policy sections are used and reviewed much less frequently.

The size issue is compounded when:

- o other legislation requires additional information to be included as part of the LTCCP [e.g. the Land Transport Management Act's requirement to prepare a Road Safety Action Plan]
- o summaries of other plans [e.g. waste management plan, water and sanitary assessment] must be included in the LTCCP.

We think the supporting information, like the financial and funding policies, could be prepared and made available as separate documents, but only referenced from the LTCCP.

## 3. Auditing of LTCCPs

The new requirement to audit the draft LTCCP and adopted LTCCP is onerous, costly and time consuming, and it not apparent how the audit process has improved the plans prepared.

There are two concerns arising from this auditing requirement.

The additional auditing costs were high - Council incurred a direct cost of \$50,000 for Audit NZ to complete the auditing of the draft and final plans. They identified that this exercise actually cost them \$70,000. In addition, Council incurred additional costs involving:

M109

- o staff time
- o reallocation of existing work priorities
- o undertaking processes that would not otherwise be done
- o additional meetings of Council

The concern that best practice, or those practices of larger and better resourced Councils, become expected standards within a short time. One example is the expectation that Councils will undertake extensive consultation processes to establish levels of service for basic infrastructure services. We have found that our community does not expect us to consult on maintaining the existing level of service. They are interested in expressing their views when discretionary larger works are proposed e.g. the proposal to build a \$1million+ bridge linking the city centre with a large park; the proposal to meter water use by all households and businesses.

if the audit is to be retained, then the audit report should only be made at the Statement of Proposal stage, in terms of giving confidence to potential submitters about the quality of the process used in preparing the draft.

#### 4. **Amendment of LTCCP**

The requirement to amend the LTCCP is triggered in a number of situations, most of which are acknowledged as being for significant proposals. However, they are also triggered for minor matters such as re-wording a policy to clarify intent. This is quite out of proportion for relatively minor matters.

We think that if there is to be an Audit requirement for amendment of the LTCCP, it should only extend to the change being proposed. Also, there needs to be a material threshold to requiring an LTCCP amendment. The Annual Plan process could be used instead.

#### 5. **Policies**

A number of the policies required have limited value. For example:

##### **Significance Policy**

Thresholds were typically set sufficiently high to ensure that a review of the LTCCP and/or special consultative processes would not be needed for any particular proposal.

##### **Policy on Public – Private Partnerships**

The policy adopted was typical of that being used by other metropolitan councils. It was not relevant at the time, and has not been applied since 2004 when it was first adopted.

##### **Policy on Remission of Rates on Maori Freehold Land**

A policy was required for a situation that is not relevant to Upper Hutt.

##### **Funding Policy**

There needs to be a simpler way to present why a particular funding solution is suitable for an activity or project.

*M110*

**SECONDARY CONCERNS: Review of Community Outcomes and engaging central government**

Our sense is that the requirement to prepare and then review community outcomes for the city every six years is onerous, and that a nine or twelve year review cycle may be more practical.

The Community Outcomes are at a very high level, and six years is a very short time to achieve substantial visible change, or for strategic priorities to change.

For example, wide community support for a major library upgrade was identified through the outcomes formulation process in late 2002/2003. Four years later, we are still in the concept development phase, and if the project passes the next two hurdles to time, it will still be at least three years before physical work can commence.

We think the most value for the Community Outcomes process comes with the potential to gain commitment from central government agencies and other funding bodies to work on prioritised local/regional issues. Such commitment could be short or longer term, as appropriate to the importance of the issue and the type of intervention/s.

However, there is no binding requirement on central government to participate in these discussions, or to commit to such joint initiatives, and there is no security of funding for medium-long term projects. There is also a risk that engagement with central government takes the form of a 'tick-off' process, rather than genuine engagement to work together. We think that central government agencies need to make a real commitment to this process.

We also consider that liaison with central government and the community at a issue priority and projects level needs to occur on a regular basis, and more than once every three years, to create more genuine engagement.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, we would like to support the work of Local Government New Zealand in working to make local government legislation more effective and efficient for our communities.

Yours sincerely

Max Pedersen  
**CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

*Mill*

## The Mayor's Office

### Mayor Garry Moore, Speech to Christchurch City Council

**Thursday 28th September 2006, Rapaki Marae**

The first time I spoke to Council as Mayor I made a promise. That promise was that we would conduct "business as unusual." It's a promise that I like to think I have kept. It was also a promise made with a purpose. This purpose was to make reforms that ultimately were aimed at returning Christchurch to its best traditions as a humane and innovative city.

Eight years ago I ran for Mayor because of this vision for Christchurch. It was a continuation of the beliefs that had led me to serve the St Albans community as a Councillor for six years before that. I knew, in that first Mayoral campaign, that we needed to modernise, but in doing so to also renew our social roots and tradition of innovative democracy. This passion has driven me ever since.

I had, and have, a deep commitment to making sure Christchurch keeps its unique qualities and lifestyle.

At the same time, as New Zealand's major trading city, we need to stay nimble and adaptable to meet constantly shifting economic, social and political changes. These changes are taking place both here and overseas.

Managing our way through these has become part of the job description for modern mayors of major cities.

Back when I ran the first time, I already could see that our way forward called for reforms. It also called for a new breed of "public entrepreneur" willing to forge viable partnerships between the public and private sectors to achieve common good goals. Goals like jobs and prosperity.

It was why I developed ideas like Mayors for Jobs organisation, which turned into a major force for getting our young people into work and training.

I'd now like to take us all on a short trip down memory lane to when I came to office as Mayor in 1998. It was toward the end of a huge wave of change in local government structure and philosophy that had gathered force since the 1980's.

Rather than partnerships the other "P" word, privatisation, was in favour. The national, indeed international trend was to divest from public ownership.

It was a trend that many of us here in Christchurch fought against until it was shown as the short term fix that it is.

Christchurch's core character is as a city that has always been prepared to look after our less advantageous citizens. We were the first city in New Zealand to provide affordable public housing. We did it before central Government and we never wavered in our commitment to providing affordable housing.

We still have not.

There were enough of us then to stand against the tide of flogging off the family silver, including housing, to carry off the goal of holding onto public property. In fact we have

MI12

grown our stock of public housing in recent years.

We also held onto the rest of our public assets while others sold theirs.

The result? We have a billion dollar plus asset base, which enables us to have the lowest rates of any major city, while offering more services. In investment terms it has more than paid off for the public good.

Internally, the Council faced a different dilemma.

We had slowly become a victim of our own success, praised for years nationally and internationally for innovation and humanity, we had slowly begun to rest on our laurels.

At a time of huge economic and social change we had slid out of the habit of staying ahead of the pack. We had allowed ourselves to become unwieldy and cumbersome.

It was clear to me that to keep true to our traditions the Council needed to go through some major changes. We needed to face the reality that to provide a truly socially responsive Council, able to meet changing needs, required big changes, starting at the top.

This has been a sometimes difficult journey for us all.

Politically, it led eventually to the big changes to wards and to the decisions by the Local Government Commission to reduce Councillor numbers from 24 to 13.

It has led to a system where issues have to make it on merit, not numbers. This has been good for us all.

It has led to a portfolio system rather than the old standing committees of yesteryear. It has also led to the seamless amalgamation of Banks Peninsula Council into this Council.

Change is best led from the top. The appointment of Dr Lesley McTurk as CEO was a pivotal point in our trip toward successful reform.

Lesley was given our clear mandate to transform the Council and has done so by a programme of organisational and cultural restructuring.

For the public perhaps one of the simplest examples of what this means is this; their libraries are now open longer and at times better suited to the public.

For us the evidence of success is starting to pile up. We were the only local government applicant to get a New Zealand Performance Excellence Study Award this year. It was noted at the time of this award that it was also very unusual to win first time. We did win, and Dr McTurk and the reform process deserve a large slice of the credit for this.

We have also got some top notch staff in our new executive.

Councillors will still remember how crisp, coherent and compelling were the papers they provided us to work with in developing our second Long Term Council Community Plan. They were the best I have ever seen.

With these changes we have also been able to enter into productive and progressive partnerships with the private sector.

I take pride in our efforts to keep the Pratt and Whitney Engine Centre firmly tethered to

*M113*

Christchurch. We put in seed money at a time when it was needed and can look with pride on the 450 jobs there and the growing aviation industry presence in Christchurch.

We can look to at our record for fostering high-tech innovators as part of the reason Christchurch is now the high tech hub of New Zealand.

We have become much more of an active trading city in the global market.

Commercially we are extroverts. That requires trade trips and I have been happy to serve as a door opener internationally.

Although we are justifiably famous as the one of world's best Garden Cities we are also a major trading city.

We have more export activity overseas than we have trading ties with the rest of New Zealand.

We have more than earned our status as the undisputed capital of the South Island. I remain firm in our commitment to ensure our sea port, air port and data ports support strong export growth.

I also take pride in witnessing our central city projects, eight years in the making, building up a powerful head of steam as we work with the private sector.

We have been the broker, not the banker. Sending the right signals has lured in hundreds of millions of dollars of private sector cash to the inner city. We will have an inner city precinct we can all take pride in.

I am also proud of what we have done with the Long Term Council Community Plan. It is a plan that reflects grassroots democracy steering the future direction of our city.

You may have noted today that I have chosen to wear the hefty mayoral chains.

One reason they weigh heavy is because each passing Mayor leaves behind another link in the chain. I can touch these links and be reminded of the vision and aspirations of those who have helped create the city we now enjoy.

These chains of office have a proud history.

They also remind us all of the continuity of a city. How a city is always more than just whoever is at the helm at the time. Of how at the same time those who carry that load can also be crucial to setting the right direction.

The mayoralty is not a role for life.

I believe the time has come for me to prepare to hand these chains on.

After nearly three terms, nine years at the next local body elections, I want to state now that I will not seek re-election as Mayor of Christchurch next year.

I decided to make this announcement today, a year away from the next election, for three reasons.

Firstly, by doing so here I honour and recognise our close and vital relationship with the Tangata Whenua of this place, Ngai Tahu.

The logo consists of the number '114' in a stylized, handwritten font, with a small 'M' positioned above the first '1'. The entire logo is rendered in a dark, possibly black or dark blue, color.

Ngai Tahu welcomed the settlers for the knowledge they could bring. It is an old and powerful relationship.

Secondly, by stating my position today, I open the door for other contenders to have time to think about whether they want to meet this challenge. Whether they have what it takes to carry forward our city vision and tradition.

This is not a job for the faint of heart. It takes stamina, optimism and very real belief in the value of active public office.

Thirdly, freed from the demands of an election I will be able to set my sights firmly on those projects that mean so much to me and to Christchurch.

This includes the revival of the city centre, the review of city housing to meet future needs, and getting the 10 year plan off to a strong start.

The new art gallery, the new libraries, QEII becoming a centre of sporting excellence and our aquatics plan are exciting new additions to our thriving city.

This will let me leave, confident that the city is in the best shape possible for meeting the challenges of the future, long after I am gone.

For me that is still what matters.

I look forward to working with you, my colleagues, over the next 12 months. Thank you.

Christchurch City Council, PO Box 237, Christchurch, New Zealand.  
[Contact the Council](#) : [Terms of use](#)

MI15

# Green

Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand

**Sue Kedgley MP**

*Spokesperson: Health, Safe Food, Organics, Animal Welfare,  
Broadcasting, Communications, Consumer Affairs,  
Women's Affairs, Arts & Culture, Civil Aviation,  
Associate Transport (Wgtn) & Associate ACC*



13<sup>th</sup> October 2006

Bob Harvey  
Mayor of Waitakere City  
Private Bag 93109  
Henderson  
Waitakere City 650

Dear Bob

Thank you so much for your support of the Overlander train service, and the work you did to ensure that the service was retained. The Green Party is absolutely delighted that Toll chose to keep the Overlander, albeit on a reduced service.

I am certain that were it not for the support that you and other Mayors gave, the groundswell of public opinion, and our petition we would not have a passenger rail service on the main trunk line right now.

There is still a huge amount of work to be done, to upgrade the service and get it back to running seven days, and I look forward to working with you on this.

I presented our 25,000 signature petition to the Transport & Industrial Relations Select Committee last week and as a result the Select Committee is going to investigate the issue.

Please don't hesitate to contact me at any time.

Regards

Sue Kedgley MP

**Parliament Office**

Parliament, Wellington, New Zealand  
Ph 04 470 6717 Fax 04 472 6003  
E-Mail: [sue.kedgley@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:sue.kedgley@parliament.govt.nz)  
Website: [www.greens.org.nz](http://www.greens.org.nz)



**Wellington Office**

Cnr Cambridge Terrace and Courtenay Place  
PO Box 19 136 Wellington  
Ph 04 381 4640 Fax 04 381 2576  
E-mail: [suekedgley@vta.co.nz](mailto:suekedgley@vta.co.nz)

# CITY OF WAITAKERE POLL

**SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12th**

**THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION DOES NOT CONSIDER YOU SHOULD HAVE A POLL!!**

**MR YALDWYN, THE CHAIRMAN, SAID:**

"Electors are generally not qualified to exercise a considered vote on something of which they virtually have no knowledge." Mr Yaldwyn said that the Commission should have power to do its job without being dependent on the result of a poll.

"THIS IS A GREAT WEAKNESS OF THE ACT."

—Herald, 12/8/64.

**YOU HAD TO PETITION FOR A POLL**

**BUT**

**UNLESS 61 OUT OF EVERY 100 WHO VOTE, RECORD A VOTE AGAINST THE CITY PROPOSAL, IT STANDS.**

**THE CITY OF NORTH SHORE SCHEME WAS VOTED OUT BY THE PEOPLE**

**DEVONPORT VOTED 89 PER CENT AGAINST.  
NORTHCOTE VOTED 70 PER CENT AGAINST.**

**They KILLED the Scheme. YOU Can Do It.  
Vote It OUT.**

**The Hon. Tom Bloodworth, that elder statesman of the Auckland City Council speaking of the North Shore City said:**

"But I have always believed that mergers meant the loss of local community interest and pride."

"If I had my way, I would restore some of the city's outer areas to borough status."

"The Auckland City Council has lost touch with some of these areas such as Blockhouse Bay, and has had to introduce advisory committees of local people."

## **WEST AUCKLAND**

**Don't Sell Out Yourselfs, Your Towns, Your Amenities FOR A PIPE DREAM**

# **VOTE OUT CITY OF WAITAKERE**

**SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12th**

(ISSUED BY SEVEN COMBINED RATEPAYER GROUPS OF THE WAITEMATA COUNTY)