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1. **Apologies**
   At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant and to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

Reference: 19/460675
Presenter(s): Sarah Drummond, Committee and Hearings Advisor

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Council to receive the attached volume of submissions of those wishing to be heard at the Draft Annual Plan hearing held on Friday 3 May 2019.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Volume Three - Heard Submissions - Friday 3 May 2019</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sarah Drummond - Committee and Hearings Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Sarah Drummond - Committee and Hearings Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submissions on the Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020

Volume Three

Heard Submissions
Friday 3rd May 2019
## SUBMITTERS WHO WISH TO BE HEARD

**FRIDAY, 3 MAY 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Submission Number</th>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30 AM</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Mike Fowler for Hagley Community College</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.40 AM</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Surinder Tandon for Christchurch Multicultural Council</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.05 AM</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Ekant Veer</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10 AM</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Connie Christensen</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.20 AM</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Dirk De Lu for Spokes Canterbury</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 AM</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Grant Miller for Summit Road Protection Authority</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.40 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 AM</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Anthony Brooks</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10 AM</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>Kenneth Maynard</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15 AM</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Chrys Horn</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20 AM</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>Daniel Hillier</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.25 AM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Katie Symons</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 AM</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Julie Downard</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Submission Number</td>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Page No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.35 AM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sharon Paine</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.40 AM</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Terry Delis</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45 AM</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Rex Harrison</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.50 AM</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Tony Dale</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.55 AM</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Mary O’Conner</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.05 PM</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>John Harcourt</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10 PM</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Timothy Seay</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15 PM</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Graham Robinson</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.20 PM</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Helen Broughton</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.25 PM</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 PM</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Nigel Collings</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 PM</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Gavin Bodger</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35 PM</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Richard Ball</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45 PM</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Sarah Eveleigh for WDL Enterprises</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55 PM</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Sarah Eveleigh for Grants Road Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.05 PM</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Stephen Howard for Keep Our Assets Canterbury</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 PM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ngaire Button for Grassmere Residents Association</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Submission Number</td>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Page No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30 PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>David Goodman for East Lake Trust</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40 PM</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>Thea Mickell for The Loons Theatre</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 pm</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Gary Moore External Advisory Group</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.55 PM</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Gary Moore for the Tuesday Club</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05 PM</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>John Patterson</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 PM</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>Joy Burt</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15 PM</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Kevin Lamb</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20 PM</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Drucilla Kingi-Patterson</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25 PM</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>D H Benson</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 from Fowler, Mike organisation: Hagley Community College behalf of: Principal

Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

If on behalf of an organisation or group, please provide the name:
Hagley Community College

Your role in the organisation:
Principal

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?:
2500 + staff and stu

First Name: Mike
Last Name: Fowler

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

On behalf of Christchurch’s culturally and linguistically diverse [CALD] communities, Hagley Community College is establishing a multicultural hub. One million dollars of the Hagley Board of Trustee’s funds has already been committed.
Hagley is actively seeking funding from the Christchurch City Council, in addition to other funding partners, to realise the project. The indicative total cost is four to five million dollars.

It is important to make a statement both within Christchurch and New Zealand about what it means in a tangible way to be inclusive and to support all diverse communities and in particular the Muslim community.

There already is a clear mandate from CALD communities for the multicultural hub evident in the 2017 OPUS feasibility study into the multicultural hub development, which was presented to the City Council last year. It also was evident in the over 100 submissions in support of the hub made to the 2018 Long Term Plan. It is again demonstrated in 2019 by separate submissions on the 2019 Draft Annual Plan from Surinder Tandon, President of the Christchurch Multicultural Council and Ahmed Tani, Chair of New Zealand National Refugee Association, Chair of the Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre, and Member of the Council of Elders of the Muslim Association of Canterbury.

CALD communities are both a significant part of Hagley and also a factor in the city's growth, yet there is a noticeable gap in provision for them in regard to capacity building and social connection which has accentuated over several years following the 2011 earthquakes.

The multicultural hub will be a key part of helping CALD communities to thrive in ways that currently are simply out of reach. The hub is an embodiment of what multiculturalism really stands for in this city.

### Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Hub Information submission to CCC LTP - March 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Multicultural Hub
The Multicultural Hub

On behalf of Christchurch’s culturally and linguistically diverse [CALD] communities, Hagley Community College is establishing a multicultural hub. One million dollars of the Hagley Board of Trustee’s funds has already been committed.

Hagley is actively seeking funding from the Christchurch City Council, in addition to other funding partners, to realise the project. The indicative total cost is four to five million dollars.

It is important to make a statement both within Christchurch and New Zealand about what it means in a tangible way to be inclusive and to support all diverse communities and in particular the Muslim community. Hagley reaffirms its continuing commitment to celebrate diversity and to embrace diverse ethnic communities as a vital part of learning, as it has done for over 30 years.

There already is a clear mandate from CALD communities for the multicultural hub evident in the 2017 OPUS feasibility study into the multicultural hub development, which was presented to the City Council last year. It was also evident in the over 100 submissions in support of the hub made to the 2018 Long Term Plan. It is again demonstrated in 2019 by submissions on the Draft Annual Plan from Surinder Tandon, President of the Christchurch Multicultural Council and Ahmed Tani, Chair of New Zealand National Refugee Association, Chair of the Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre, and Member of the Council of Elders of the Muslim Association of Canterbury.

As a first for a New Zealand city, the multicultural hub will be a flagship. It is a timely and appropriate opportunity to develop a regional hub for culturally and linguistically diverse communities of all ages. The hub offers dedicated spaces for education, community strengthening, social and financial wellbeing capacity building, with flexible office space for various agencies from educational, public and civil agencies and sectors.

In 2019, the Ministry of Education’s re-development of Hagley begins, offering a unique opportunity to integrate the development of the multicultural hub.

CALD communities are both a significant part of Hagley and also a factor in the city’s growth, yet there is a noticeable gap in provision for them in regard to capacity building and social connection which has accentuated over several years following the 2011 earthquakes.

The multicultural hub will be a key part of helping CALD communities to thrive in ways that currently are simply out of reach. No longer will CALD communities be ‘camping’1 [expression used by a respondent to describe the current CALD experience in Christchurch]. The hub is an embodiment of what multiculturalism really stands for in this city.

Sara Gordon, BOT Chair
Mike Fowler, Principal

27 March 2019

1 OPUS feasibility study into the multicultural hub development, 2017. Funded jointly by the Christchurch City Council and Hagley College
Hagley Community College

Hagley College is home to 65 ethnicities in Christchurch. Ethnic communities see Hagley as their place which was very clear over the three days when Hagley acted as a welfare centre for the families and communities impacted by the 15 March terrorism attacks.

Hagley reflects and welcomes the diversity of Christchurch’s population: age, ethnicity, religion and gender. We welcome people of diverse ethnic, cultural, educational and socio-economic backgrounds, gender orientation and age. We affirm inclusive practice and an atmosphere where everyone belongs.

Hagley is recognised for its successful commitment to learning and support for refugee and migrant people over the last three decades. It is the recipient of two New Zealand Diversity Action Awards (2010, 2014) with a best practice whole family learning approach to education and settlement.

Students from CALD communities form a significant part of Hagley’s student population with over 200 students currently enrolled in a wide range of courses, as well as in community, vocational and academic English language learning programmes. In addition, students from 35 schools across Christchurch attend after-school learning programmes at Hagley.

Hagley’s bilingual liaison staff provide community liaison and interpretation. Social service providers are actively involved at Hagley, including Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre, Christchurch Resettlement Services, Christchurch Multicultural Council, Citizens Advice Bureau, Canterbury Business Association, Canterbury Employers’ Chamber of Commerce and New Zealand Red Cross.

Hagley also runs community capacity building programmes in enterprise skills and business development, financial capability building, life skills courses including driving and digital literacy, career pathways, and health literacy and wellbeing.
Multicultural Hub Concept Design

The multicultural hub is to be located on a prime inner city location on the Hagley College site is in a central and high profile part of Christchurch on the corner of St Asaph and Stewart Streets.

It is envisaged that the multicultural hub will be established as a representative trust drawn from culturally and linguistically diverse [CALD] communities, supported by partnerships with Hagley College and funding partners.

Funding will be invested as a capital contribution towards the building of the hub, consisting of:

- A reception and welcoming area to facilitate easy navigation of the centre and coordination of services
- Small meeting spaces so that various providers can come together under a hot seat arrangement
- Multi-purpose spaces with attached kitchen facilities
The initial concept design shown below is based on the following:

- A central ‘street’ to encourage people to meet casually as they might in a market.
  - The space will be both generous as well as having the opportunity to let small groups meet casually but with a degree of privacy
  - The ‘street’ will connect the corner of St Asaph/Stewart street with the school
  - A reception will be placed close to the street entrance
  - Central to the street will be an open kitchen/eating area for students to share food.

- Three large spaces with differing aspects that can be used separately or as one.
  - The northern 150m2 space will be partially visible from the street but able to be screened off (the concept is to use adjustable perforated screens with specially commissioned designs reflecting the many cultures within)
  - The central 150m2 space will face a western courtyard and could also open itself up to the ‘street’
  - The southern space approx. 120m2, will face the Kōmanawa recreation space to the south of the hub and act as a staffroom and multipurpose teaching space
  - The spaces will be interconnected with a demountable wall system
  - Connections to the commercial kitchen facilities in H1 Block will be explored to enable large events to be easily held
  - The spaces will be acoustically separated from the corridor unless significant glazing is desired.

- On the ground floor of the Stewart Street side of the ‘street’ there will be:
  - Generous storage to store furniture that allows the larger spaces to have multiple uses
  - Separately accessed toilets and
  - A change facility associated with the Kōmanawa space but potentially able to be shared with the Hub

- On the first floor of the Stewart Street side of the ‘street’ there will be:
  - Two stairs and a lift for easy access
  - A suite of meeting spaces of various sizes and aspects
  - A walkway overlooking the ‘street’
Christchurch – a superdiverse city

New Zealand’s and Christchurch’s cultural diversity is growing. The term “superdiversity” has been used to describe New Zealand. Superdiversity occurs when a significant percentage of the community are from overseas and when suburbs and workplaces show this in their makeup.

The results of the last census show there is a wide range of ethnicities residing in Christchurch which will continue to grow at an increasingly rapid pace. Only the European ethnic group is projected to decline.

There are 170 ethnic groups in Christchurch speaking over 140 languages. Asian ethnic groups numbers have doubled in the last 15 years, with 20% of 12 area units [Christchurch City Council measure] identifying as Asian. 21.1 percent of Christchurch’s population were born overseas, compared with 19.6 percent [2006 census].

New Zealand’s population is projected to increase by about 1 million in the next 20 years with all major ethnic groups growing. A high migration, particularly of Asian ethnic groups, will increasing from 12 to 22% over the next 25 year period. Indian, Samoan and Middle Eastern/Latin American/African ethnic shares of New Zealand’s population will all increase, with Chinese and Indian ethnic shares almost doubling.

---

Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

If on behalf of an organisation or group, please provide the name:

Christchurch Multicultural Council

Your role in the organisation:

President

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?:

Over 100,000 from ov

First Name: Surinder  Last Name: Tandon

Do you agree to speak in support of the proposed project?
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

I would like to do a presentation at the hearing in support of Multicultural Hub to be built at Hagley
Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 from Tandon, Surinder organisation: Christchurch Multicultural Council behalf of: President Community College. The need for a Multicultural Hub is now even greater after the 15 March Mosque attacks. We would like people of all cultures and faiths to continue celebrating and practising free as before 15 March. The Multicultural Hub will be a place for running rehabilitation and recovery programmes for the Muslim community. It will also be used to restrengthen the intercultural and interfaith relations. The place will give everyone a sense of belonging and unity.

Please feel free to contact me for further information.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Hub</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Multicultural Hub
The Multicultural Hub

On behalf of Christchurch’s culturally and linguistically diverse communities, Christchurch Multicultural Council supports Hagley Community College, which is establishing a multicultural hub. One million dollars of the Hagley Board of Trustee’s funds has already been committed.

Hagley is actively seeking funding from the Christchurch City Council, in addition to other funding partners, to realise the project. The indicative total cost is four to five million dollars.

It is important to make a statement both within Christchurch and New Zealand about what it means in a tangible way to be inclusive and to support all diverse communities and in particular the Muslim community. Hagley reaffirms its and the school’s commitment to celebrate diversity and to embrace diverse ethnic communities as a vital part of learning, as it has done for over 30 years.

There already is a clear mandate from CALD communities for the hub, evident in the 2017 OPUS feasibility study into the multicultural hub development, which has been presented to Council last year. It also was evident in the over 100 submissions in support of the hub made to the 2018 Long Term Plan. It is again demonstrated by submissions from Mike Fowler, Principal of Hagley College and Ahmed Tani, Chair of New Zealand National Refugee Association, Chair of the Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre, and Member of the Council of Elders of the Muslim Association of Canterbury.

As a first for a New Zealand city, the multicultural hub will be a flagship. It is a timely and appropriate opportunity to develop a regional hub for culturally and linguistically diverse [CALD] communities of all ages. The hub offers dedicated spaces for education, community strengthening, social and financial wellbeing capacity building, with flexible office space for various agencies from educational, public and civil agencies and sectors.

In 2019, the Ministry of Education’s re-development of Hagley begins, offering a unique opportunity to integrate the development of the multicultural hub.

CALD communities are both a significant part of Hagley and also a factor in the city’s growth, yet there is a noticeable gap in provision for them in regard to capacity building and social connection which has accentuated over several years following the 2011 earthquakes.

The hub will be a key part of helping CALD communities to thrive in ways that currently are simply out of reach. No longer will CALD communities be ‘camping’ [expression used by a respondent to describe the current CALD experience in Christchurch]. The hub is an embodiment of what multiculturalism really stands for in an educational setting.

Christchurch is home to over 170 ethnicities. Ethnic communities see Hagley as their place which was very clear over the three days when Hagley acted as a welfare centre for the families and communities impacted by the 15 March terrorism attacks.

Hagley reflects and welcomes the diversity of Christchurch’s population: age, ethnicity, religion and gender. It welcomes people of diverse ethnic, cultural, educational and socio-economic backgrounds, gender orientation and age. It affirms inclusive practice and an atmosphere where everyone belongs.

---

1 OPUS feasibility study into the multicultural hub development, 2017. Funded jointly by the Christchurch City Council and Hagley College
Hagley is recognised for its successful commitment to learning and support for refugee and migrant people over the last three decades. It is the recipient of two New Zealand Diversity Action Awards (2010, 2014) with a best practice whole family learning approach to education and settlement.

Students from CALD communities form a significant part of Hagley’s student population with over 200 students currently enrolled in a wide range of courses, as well as in community, vocational and academic English language learning programmes. In addition, students from 35 schools across Christchurch attend after-school learning programmes at Hagley.

Hagley’s bilingual liaison staff provide community liaison and interpretation. Social service providers are actively involved at Hagley, including Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre, Christchurch Resettlement Services, Christchurch Multicultural Council, Citizens Advice Bureau, Canterbury Business Association, Canterbury Employers’ Chamber of Commerce and New Zealand Red Cross.

Hagley also runs community capacity building programmes in enterprise skills and business development, financial capability building, life skills courses including driving and digital literacy, career pathways, and health literacy and wellbeing.

Dr Surinder Tandon, MNZM

President, Christchurch Multicultural Council Inc

surindertandonz@gmail.com

M 021 295 1089
Multicultural Hub Concept Design

The multicultural hub is to be located on a prime inner city location on the Hagley College site is in a central and high profile part of Christchurch on the corner of St Asaph and Stewart Streets.

It is envisaged that the multicultural hub will be established as a representative trust drawn from culturally and linguistically diverse [CALD] communities, supported by partnerships with Hagley College and funding partners.

Funding will be invested as a capital contribution towards the building of the hub, consisting of:

- A reception and welcoming area to facilitate easy navigation of the centre and coordination of services
- Small meeting spaces so that various providers can come together under a hot seat arrangement
- Multi-purpose spaces with attached kitchen facilities
The initial concept design shown below is based on the following:

- A central ‘street’ to encourage people to meet casually as they might in a market.
  - The space will be both generous as well as having the opportunity to let small groups meet casually but with a degree of privacy
  - The ‘street’ will connect the corner of St Asaph/Stewart street with the school
  - A reception will be placed close to the street entrance
  - Central to the street will be an open kitchen/eating area for students to share food.
- Three large spaces with differing aspects that can be used separately or as one.
  - The northern 150m² space will be partially visible from the street but able to be screened off (the concept is to use adjustable perforated screens with specially commissioned designs reflecting the many cultures within)
  - The central 150m² space will face a western courtyard and could also open itself up to the ‘street’
  - The southern space approx. 120m², will face the Kōmanawa recreation space to the south of the hub and act as a staffroom and multipurpose teaching space
  - The spaces will be interconnected with a demountable wall system
  - Connections to the commercial kitchen facilities in H1 Block will be explored to enable large events to be easily held
  - The spaces will be acoustically separated from the corridor unless significant glazing is desired.
- On the ground floor of the Stewart Street side of the ‘street’ there will be:
  - Generous storage to store furniture that allows the larger spaces to have multiple uses
  - Separately accessed toilets and
  - A change facility associated with the Kōmanawa space but potentially able to be shared with the Hub
- On the first floor of the Stewart Street side of the ‘street’ there will be:
  - Two stairs and a lift for easy access
  - A suite of meeting spaces of various sizes and aspects
  - A walkway overlooking the ‘street’
Christchurch – a superdiverse city

New Zealand’s and Christchurch’s cultural diversity is growing. The term “superdiversity” has been used to describe New Zealand. Superdiversity occurs when a significant percentage of the community are from overseas and when suburbs and workplaces show this in their makeup.

The results of the last census show there is a wide range of ethnicities residing in Christchurch which will continue to grow at an increasingly rapid pace. Only the European ethnic group is projected to decline.

There are 170 ethnic groups in Christchurch speaking over 140 languages. Asian ethnic groups numbers have doubled in the last 15 years, with 20% of 12 area units [Christchurch City Council measure] identifying as Asian. 21.1 percent of Christchurch’s population were born overseas, compared with 19.6 percent [2006 census].

New Zealand’s population is projected to increase by about 1 million in the next 20 years with all major ethnic groups growing. A high migration, particularly of Asian ethnic groups, will increasing from 12 to 22% over the next 25 year period. Indian, Samoan and Middle Eastern/Latin American/African ethnic shares of New Zealand’s population will all increase, with Chinese and Indian ethnic shares almost doubling.

The Multicultural Hub
The Multicultural Hub

On behalf of Christchurch’s culturally and linguistically diverse communities, Hagley Community College is establishing a multicultural hub. One million dollars of the Hagley Board of Trustee’s funds has already been committed.

Hagley is actively seeking funding from the Christchurch City Council, in addition to other funding partners, to realise the project. The indicative total cost is four to five million dollars.

It is important to make a statement both within Christchurch and New Zealand about what it means in a tangible way to be inclusive and to support all diverse communities and in particular the Muslim community. Hagley reaffirms its and the school’s commitment to celebrate diversity and to embrace diverse ethnic communities as a vital part of learning, as it has done for over 30 years.

There already is a clear mandate from CALD communities for the hub, evident in the 2017 OPUS feasibility study into the multicultural hub development, which has been presented to Council last year. It also was evident in the over 100 submissions in support of the hub made to the 2018 Long Term Plan.

As a first for a New Zealand city, the multicultural hub will be a flagship. It is a timely and appropriate opportunity to develop a regional hub for culturally and linguistically diverse [CALD] communities of all ages. The hub offers dedicated spaces for education, community strengthening, social and financial wellbeing capacity building, with flexible office space for various agencies from educational, public and civil agencies and sectors.

In 2019, the Ministry of Education’s re-development of Hagley begins, offering a unique opportunity to integrate the development of the multicultural hub.

CALD communities are both a significant part of Hagley and also a factor in the city’s growth, yet there is a noticeable gap in provision for them in regard to capacity building and social connection which has accentuated over several years following the 2011 earthquakes.

The hub will be a key part of helping CALD communities to thrive in ways that currently are simply out of reach. No longer will CALD communities be ‘camping’ [expression used by a respondent to describe the current CALD experience in Christchurch]. The hub is an embodiment of what multiculturalism really stands for in an educational setting.

---

1 OPUS feasibility study into the multicultural hub development, 2017. Funded jointly by the Christchurch City Council and Hagley College
Hagley Community College

Hagley College is home to 65 ethnicities in Christchurch. Ethnic communities see Hagley as their place which was very clear over the three days when Hagley acted as a welfare centre for the families and communities impacted by the 15 March terrorism attacks.

Hagley reflects and welcomes the diversity of Christchurch’s population: age, ethnicity, religion and gender. We welcome people of diverse ethnic, cultural, educational and socio-economic backgrounds, gender orientation and age. We affirm inclusive practice and an atmosphere where everyone belongs.

Hagley is recognised for its successful commitment to learning and support for refugee and migrant people over the last three decades. It is the recipient of two New Zealand Diversity Action Awards (2010, 2014) with a best practice whole family learning approach to education and settlement.

Students from CALD communities form a significant part of Hagley’s student population with over 200 students currently enrolled in a wide range of courses, as well as in community, vocational and academic English language learning programmes. In addition, students from 35 schools across Christchurch attend after-school learning programmes at Hagley.

Hagley’s bilingual liaison staff provide community liaison and interpretation. Social service providers are actively involved at Hagley, including Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre, Christchurch Resettlement Services, Christchurch Multicultural Council, Citizens Advice Bureau, Canterbury Business Association, Canterbury Employers’ Chamber of Commerce and New Zealand Red Cross.

Hagley also runs community capacity building programmes in enterprise skills and business development, financial capability building, life skills courses including driving and digital literacy, career pathways, and health literacy and wellbeing.
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation/Group

If on behalf of an organisation or group, please provide the name:

Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre

Your role in the organisation:

Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?:

3,000

First Name: Ahmed

Last Name: Tani

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

I strongly support the building of a Multicultural Hub at Hagley College. It is very important for all of
Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre

Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 from Tani, Ahmed organisation: Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre behalf of us, especially former refugees and those who newly arrive to Christchurch City. It provides a welcoming place, safe and secure for all of us, a place to help us navigate services in the City, for better resettlement in Christchurch.

The building of this facility is utmost important, and we would like to request the City Council to prioritize it and to include it in its Annual Plan as part of the Long Term Plan of the City.

I would like to present our submission at a hearing. Please contact me if you need any further information.

Attached Documents
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Multicultural Hub Concept Design

The multicultural hub is to be located on a prime inner city location on the Hagley College site is in a central and high profile part of Christchurch on the corner of St Asaph and Stewart Streets.

It is envisaged that the multicultural hub will be established as a representative trust drawn from culturally and linguistically diverse [CALD] communities, supported by partnerships with Hagley College and funding partners.

Funding will be invested as a capital contribution towards the building of the hub, consisting of:

- A reception and welcoming area to facilitate easy navigation of the centre and coordination of services
- Small meeting spaces so that various providers can come together under a hot seat arrangement
- Multi-purpose spaces with attached kitchen facilities
The initial concept design shown below is based on the following:

- A central ‘street’ to encourage people to meet casually as they might in a market.
  - The space will be both generous as well as having the opportunity to let small groups meet casually but with a degree of privacy
  - The ‘street’ will connect the corner of St Asaph/Stewart street with the school
  - A reception will be placed close to the street entrance
  - Central to the street will be an open kitchen/eating area for students to share food.

- Three large spaces with differing aspects that can be used separately or as one.
  - The northern 150m² space will be partially visible from the street but able to be screened off (the concept is to use adjustable perforated screens with specially commissioned designs reflecting the many cultures within)
  - The central 150m² space will face a western courtyard and could also open itself up to the ‘street’
  - The southern space approx. 120m², will face the Kōmanawa recreation space to the south of the hub and act as a staffroom and multipurpose teaching space
  - The spaces will be interconnected with a demountable wall system
  - Connections to the commercial kitchen facilities in H1 Block will be explored to enable large events to be easily held
  - The spaces will be acoustically separated from the corridor unless significant glazing is desired.

- On the ground floor of the Stewart Street side of the ‘street’ there will be:
  - Generous storage to store furniture that allows the larger spaces to have multiple uses
  - Separately accessed toilets and
  - A change facility associated with the Kōmanawa space but potentially able to be shared with the Hub

- On the first floor of the Stewart Street side of the ‘street’ there will be:
  - Two stairs and a lift for easy access
  - A suite of meeting spaces of various sizes and aspects
  - A walkway overlooking the ‘street’
Christchurch – a superdiverse city

New Zealand’s and Christchurch’s cultural diversity is growing. The term “superdiversity” has been used to describe New Zealand. Superdiversity occurs when a significant percentage of the community are from overseas and when suburbs and workplaces show this in their makeup.

The results of the last census show there is a wide range of ethnicities residing in Christchurch which will continue to grow at an increasingly rapid pace. Only the European ethnic group is projected to decline.

There are 170 ethnic groups in Christchurch speaking over 140 languages. Asian ethnic groups numbers have doubled in the last 15 years, with 20% of 12 area units [Christchurch City Council measure] identifying as Asian. 21.1 percent of Christchurch’s population were born overseas, compared with 19.6 percent [2006 census].

New Zealand’s population is projected to increase by about 1 million in the next 20 years with all major ethnic groups growing. A high migration, particularly of Asian ethnic groups, will increasing from 12 to 22% over the next 25 year period. Indian, Samoan and Middle Eastern/Latin American/African ethnic shares of New Zealand’s population will all increase, with Chinese and Indian ethnic shares almost doubling.

Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

☐ Individual
☐ Organisation/Group

First Name: Ekant
Last Name: Veer

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)

☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

My feedback is simple - the draft annual plan completely lacks a multicultural perspective or any strategy to support multiculturalism in the city.
Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 from Veer, Ekant

I was part of the team that helped write the multicultural strategy for CCC - we were told this strategy would not be ignored and would be brought to life through various measures in the coming years. I cannot see any of these measures enacted in the draft plan and little evidence to suggest that multiculturalism is an important part of our future.

With communities and people contributing a significant portion of rates funding to see little to support for a united city that is not divided by race, background, religion or language is disappointing. As we heal and grow after the March 15 terror attacks a strategy to unite the different peoples of our city is needed now, more than ever.
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Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Connie
Last Name: Christensen

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Carbon reducing projects need urgent priority to achieve carbon zero for Christchurch and help stop sea level rise.
Cycleways need particular priority to help reduce traffic congestion and provide safe school routes for cycling & walking for all children. This will also allow less confident adult cyclists to commute to work, shops, drop off children etc.

Future proofing of our drinking water infrastructure and investment in greywater collection & use for watering of gardens/parks and toilet flushing in all council buildings should be a given for all ccc building renovations or new builds.

CCC need to can the disastrous Christchurch Northern Corridor downstream Cranford street and surrounding area project. The widening of Cranford st is dividing the residents on either side of Cranford st, is destroying the St. Albans community and will achieve nothing positive for reducing single occupancy car traffic into and around Christchurch.

We can do so much better than just provide for more traffic, noise and pollution!
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From: McRae, Katy
Sent: Tuesday, 2 April 2019 8:07 a.m.
To: CCC Plan
Cc: Drummond, Sarah
Subject: PW: Submission Annual Plan 2019-21

From: Dirk De Lu
Sent: Monday, 1 April 2019 10:28 a.m.

Dirk De Lu, Spokes Canterbury
G

Best, Dirk De Lu, Submissions Convener
April 1 2019

RE: Annual Plan 2019-21

SUBMISSION FROM SPOKES CANTERBURY

Spokes Canterbury is a local cycling advocacy group with approximately 1,200 members that is affiliated with the national Cycling Action Network (CAN). All submissions are developed online and include member’s input. Spokes is dedicated to including cycling as an everyday form of transport in the greater Christchurch area.

We would like the opportunity to appear at any public hearing that is held to consider submissions on these projects. Should there be an officer’s report or similar document(s) we would appreciate a copy(s).

If you require further information or there are matters requiring clarification, please contact our Submissions Convenor Dirk De Lu in the first instance. His contact details are:

Don Babe
Chairperson, Spokes Canterbury
Spokes supports Council’s moving forward the completion dates of Major Cycle Routes, MCR’s. Spokes also appreciates the focus on keeping rates rises and borrowing to a minimum.

Council can do more to achieve its goals. To that end Spokes offers our concerns.

Just what is the commitment to cycling at Council?

In the Annual Plan summary, page 12, it is clearly stated that the Major Cycle Routes, MCR’s have been advanced to secure central government funding which may not be available in the future. This is forward looking and sensible. Given that this funding also funds underground utility improvements, kerb and channel upgrades, road paving and intersection improvements it is a pragmatic way to repair quake damage and upgrade infrastructure at significant savings. It is estimated that between half and two thirds of MCR expense is due to non-cycle specific improvements.

Good on Council for moving forward on the MCR’s and getting the maximum benefit for ratepayers from central government contributions. But that should not be the main impetus for deciding on funding for cycling or the projects to be advanced. Completing the local cycle networks to connect the MCR’s would also be forward looking and sensible. It needs to be funded in this Annual Plan.

Council has promoted the focus on the MCR’s as a way to get the ‘interested but concerned’ cyclists onto their bikes. It has been successful. The infrastructure already delivered has exceeded user numbers projected through 2030.

Funding support for cycling aside from the MCR’s is weak. The ratepayer contribution to cycling infrastructure is woefully out of balance with the numbers of people choosing to cycle in Christchurch.

About 7%+ of Christchurch commuters are already on bicycles, more would like to be. Growing that percentage will significantly reduce the funds required to build new and expand existing roads and for maintenance.

What are the shortcomings in this Annual Plan? Cycle parking receives $40,000.00 total funding over three years with no funding in the final year. Funding for car parking for the three years is $8.14 million. Please increase funding for cycle parking to 10% of car parking funding.

Cycle parking, like cycle infrastructure generally, has been grossly neglected for decades. Funding to create the local cycle links needed to connect the MCR’s and to make streets safer for commuter cyclists who need to get from a to b efficiently is also grossly lacking.

NZTA provides up to 66% of the funding for the MCR’s. MCR funding reduced by 60% offers a conservative indication of the percentage of the total (Roads and Footpaths plus Transport allocations) budget provided for cycle infrastructure.
In 2019-20 cycling infrastructure, primarily the MCR's receives just shy of 13% of total funding. In 2020-21 this jumps to 19.4% and in 2021-22 it plummets to 4.2%. This includes the MCR funding which benefits quake replacement and upgrades, as much as 50% of the costs.

Subtracting the funding for the MCR’s, which Council has stated clearly are being built to secure the NZTA funding and which provide even greater overall infrastructure benefits, cycle funding in Christchurch for the three year period drops to just $6.9 mill or 1.74% of total funding. Nearly $5mill of that is to give cyclists a way to get off of Cranford Street, now to be turned over to cars thanks to the Northern Arterial Extension.

That reduces non MCR cycle infrastructure Council funding to just half a percent of the total roading spend. Clearly cycle funding is driven by the desire to secure central government funds and in an attempt to mitigate one of the worst car centric roading debacles in Christchurch. Good on Council for that. But, the overall needs of people who cycle appear to have negligible impact on funding decisions. Those needs are clearly secondary when they need to be a primary focus.

People who cycle, or would like to are offered 0.5% of transport funding for much needed cycle infrastructure to provide the local cycle networks to connect the MCR’s.

Quoting from the Mayor’s letter in the consultation document one of the non-prioritized featured goals is “• Increasing active, public and shared transport opportunities and use.” The MCR’s are but one initiative required to allow people 8-80 to choose to cycle.

The Mayor goes on to report that “It is also vital that we develop an emissions reduction programme to ensure that we meet our targets of net carbon neutrality by 2030 as a Council and 2050 as a city.” To achieve that goal will require drastic cuts to transport related emissions. Active transport achieves the greatest cuts possible, while improving road safety and supporting transport mode choice.

Council has adopted some laudable policies and goals. To achieve them requires major funding for active transport. Moving people out of cars and onto bikes, scooters, etc. has the potential to greatly reduce both capital and maintenance expenses. In turn rate’s rises and borrowing can be reduced and our city can achieve the promise of being a great place which people choose to live in.

We are assured that this plan has placed a priority on active transport and implementing policy on reducing emissions to confront climate change. The funding decisions do not support these policies or assurances. The draft plan has lost sight of both human need and policy through its neglect for delivering complete cycle networks in the foreseeable future.

Spokes asks that at least 10% of all transport spending be guided by the needs of people who choose to cycle. As active transport becomes more common this percentage will need to increase.
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

If on behalf of an organisation or group, please provide the name:
Summit Road Protection Authority

Your role in the organisation:
Chair

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?:

First Name: Grant
Last Name: Miller

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Please refer attached submission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attached Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRPA AP Submission 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMIT ROAD PROTECTION AUTHORITY
Te Mana Tiaki i Te Ara Akitu

31 March 2019

Annual Plan Submissions
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 73017
CHRISTCHURCH 8154

SUMMIT ROAD PROTECTION AUTHORITY SUBMISSION ON THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL’S DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2019-20

The Summit Road Protection Authority is constituted under the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 and deemed by that Act to be a joint committee of Christchurch City Council and Selwyn District Council. The Authority, however, has independent statutory powers and purposes; the purposes of its constituting Act are:

(a) to provide for the preservation and protection of the scenic amenity associated with the Summit Road and other roads, walkways, paths, and public open spaces within the protected land;
(b) to provide for the preservation and protection of natural amenities associated with land within the protected area;
(c) to provide for the improvement of facilities for the public enjoyment of the scenic amenity and the natural amenities.

For a number of years the Authority has been extremely concerned about damage to the amenities and facilities of the Summit Road corridor caused by antisocial behaviours mostly occurring at night that discourage the installation of desirable improvements at risk of being vandalised and signal a potential threat to the safety of users of Summit Road. Burnouts, damage to the road surface, signs, and structures, such as the Sign of the Bellbird, have seriously diminished the value of this important Port Hills recreational and environmental asset and reduced its potential for greater and safe public use and enjoyment.

The Authority notes that the City Council on 22 March 2018 resolved to not approve the installation of proposed Prohibited Times on Road Restrictions for the Summit Road following a significant response to the public consultation indicating the high significance of the Summit Road to the greater Christchurch region. The City Council also resolved at that meeting to request that the Port Hills Management Plan be advanced as soon as possible recognising that the outcomes and objectives of that Plan may assist in achieving positive outcomes for the Summit Road and other affected roads in the area covered by that Plan.

Chair Grant Miller
The Authority requests that the City Council in considering its draft Annual Plan is mindful of the city-wide significance of the Summit Road and the vulnerability of its amenities, facilities, and recreational and ecological values that so many, for so long, have worked to protect.

The Authority understands that a form of Port Hills Management Plan is starting to take shape as the ‘Port Hills Parks Plan’, but is concerned that it should be shown to be advancing as soon as possible in accordance with the Council’s resolution; recognising that the complexity, magnitude and importance of the Plan will require its development take due time, but requesting also that its development be given due priority and resource for the reasons noted.

The Authority and its Advisory Committee have accordingly agreed the submission to:

Request that the City Council gives appropriate prioritisation to the advancement of the Port Hills Parks Plan in line with its resolution of 22 March 2018 to request that the Plan be advanced as soon as possible recognising that the outcomes and objectives of that Plan may assist in achieving positive outcomes for the Summit Road and other affected roads in the area covered by that Plan.

The Authority thanks the City Council for receiving this submission.

Yours faithfully

Chair Grant Miller
Summit Road Protection Authority
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Anthony
Last Name: Brooks

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

As a ratepayer I am tired and confused by the continued mismanagement at the Council.

We are told there is a requirement to bring forward spending on cycle ways because the
Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 from Brooks, Anthony

Government may remove there funding and not because they are a good thing. Does the amount we have borrowed and have to pay back out way the subsidy. At traffic lights where there are cycle ways why do they have right of way over motorists especially where there are no cycles shouldn't they be button operated saving motorists time and fuel costs.

Why are we lending CCHL $50m has the organization been so badly managed that they are unable to borrow there own mo

We have seen millions of dollars wasted in the central city making it a nightmare for motorists you could have saved a lot of money just by banning them which I believe is the ultimate goal.

Who actually runs the city the staff or the councilors. This years theme is We're making Christchurch better you couldn't be more wrong
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HAVE YOUR SAY

Draft Annual Plan 2019–20 submission form

Your details:

Full name  Kenneth John Maynard

I am completing this submission:

☒ For myself or ☐ On behalf of a group or organisation (please tick one)

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?

Organisation name

Your role in the organisation

Signature  Maynard  Date 05/04/19

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing?  ☐ No  ☒ Yes (if yes, you must provide contact details below)

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You may add more pages if you wish.

Asset Sales: I am against the sale of assets. Once sold, there is no income from the asset. Selling (say) 49% would not realize much money. Nobody wants to buy something they have no control of! Also, any funds raised would be paying down debt in the holdings co., and produce no real benefit.

Rates basis: Government attempts to deal with the rich/poor problem with incremental tax rates. CCC need to make rich pay more than poor, using the rating valuation as indicator of wealth. They should move as much as possible from the UAGC to the value-based rate to ensure that the least well off are not disadvantaged.

Living Wage: Council need to ensure that all those who do work for the council receive the Living Wage, whether they are direct employees, employees of companies owned or controlled by the council, or employees or subcontractors of any contractor retained by the council.
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Chrys

Last Name: Horn

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

I’d like to see more money being put into cycle infrastructure overall and less put into supporting the use of motor vehicles.
As a resident in a fast growing area on the outskirts of Christchurch City, I want our city have a lower carbon footprint. I’d like the City to be attractive and easy to move around without having to deal with pollution, noise and congestion caused by cars. Having great cycle facilities is an important part of achieving this as we are seeing by the way the current cycle routes are performing in terms of the number of cyclists using them. Continuing to grow the number of people commuting by bike will provide ratepayers with significant savings from providing car parks, building new roads or maintaining current roads. Cycling also delivers significant health and productivity benefits for taxpayers and for businesses in the City.

As such, I strongly support the commitment that the CCC express (on P 12 of the draft plan) to speeding up the delivery of the Major Cycle Routes. This makes even more sense given the funding available from Central Government to assist with this. I was a bit surprised to see that the plan doesn’t seem to support this.

NZTA funding also funds underground utility improvements, kerb and channel upgrades and intersection improvements, so it is a pragmatic way to repair quake damage and upgrade infrastructure at significant savings. I understand that between half and two thirds of the cost of the MCRs is non-cycle specific improvements. Looking at the funding allocated for transport in the draft Annual Plan, pages 53-60 raises some questions.

Cycle parking looks a bit underfunded given that cycle use is clearly growing faster than the Council expected. As someone who cycles, I often find it difficult to find good cycle parking. $20,000.00 total funding in 2019-20 and again in 2020-21 years with no funding in 2021-22 seems a bit small. Given how much is being spent on Carparking over the same three year period (nearly $8million). It would be great to see that the percentage of expenditure on bike parking could more than 1/400th of that spent on car parking given that 7 percent of people commuting into the city are using bicycles and that that is likely to grow.

Over the 3 years 2019-2022 outlined in this plan, MCRs are being funded to the tune of $82 million which represents 93% of all funding for cycling infrastructure. NZTA provides up to 66% of the funding for the MCRs so one might assume that ratepayers are covering a maximum of 40% of the MCR’s costs, reducing Council’s contribution to $32.8 million. Around half of the cost of MCRs are for non-cycle related infrastructure improvements which implies that Council’s funding for actual cycling infrastructure drops to $16.4 million, most of which will be spent on the MCRs. Anything left looks to be being spent on providing a way for cyclists to get off Cranford St needed as a result of the Northern Arterial Extension. That very little for any cycle infrastructure which provides local cycle networks to connect the MCR’s.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.
From: Daniel Hillier
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2019 6:37 PM
To: Val Bar, Katy
Subject: Lets connect our communities better.pdf

Re: Lets connect our communities better.pdf

daniel hillier
Let's connect our communities better

Our active transport pathways & networks are only as good as the connections between them.
What an amazing opportunity our blessed city Ōtautahi has to show the world about how a modern city should be - as part of our modern learnings.....

Born and bred in Christchurch - as a youth whom used cycling for recreation, commuting to school and work. After 15+ years living in London from 2001 - I chose to navigate the Capitals very congested roads. In 2001 I was working in a company with 100 people. Aproximately 3-5 bikes where ever parked at our offices. But after the 2005 London bombings & increased transport ticket prices - along with the growing trend of cyclists using active transport to commute around London. There where at least 40 men and women from that office of 100 riding to & from work. The cycling tribes developed - the classic cyclist, the courier inspired riders and the practical road bikes adoring panniers & laptop. Then the Team GB Olympics success in cycling spread like a virus in 2012. As part of the increased cycling population also came the statistics of cycling fatalities. Since this the city was really throwing money at making cycle routes safer. The Cycle Highway Network was being developed and improved. Pedal power in London and the unstoppable growth of cycling its transforming this huge metropolis.

According to the National Travel Survey, about 7% of the population aged 5+ cycled three or more times a week in 2017. If applied to the whole of Great Britain, this equates to around 4.2 million people of 5+. (NTS 0313).

In contrast, the survey report says: “Approximately four in ten respondents in the Netherlands (43%) cycle daily. Roughly three in ten respondents in Denmark (30%) and Finland (28%) also cycle daily.

Looking at the Netherlands in particular:
More than a quarter of all trips made by residents are by bike;
In 2016, there were 4.5 billion bicycle trips, spanning a distance of 15.5 billion kms;
There are 17 million inhabitants, and 23 million bicycles;
Bicycle use, measured in kilometres, was 12% higher in 2016 than in 2005.

So isn't it time we improved our active transport population.
Cars dominate the traffic on Christchurch’s streets, and cycling has become a challenge among the motor vehicles. In 1924, the city council’s motor inspector estimated that there were 40,000 cyclists in the city, half the population at the time.

In 1936, a traffic census found 11,335 cyclists passing through one corner of Cathedral Square between 8am and 5.30pm, a rate of 19 cyclists per minute.

In fact, cycling was once the main mode of transport in Christchurch, a far cry from today’s affairs, which begs the question: when and why did cycling become such a challenge? Fast forward to the late 70’s where 10-speed and BMX bikes took to the streets as alternative modes of transport. This is what some now recall as the most recent golden age of cycling in Christchurch. Long-time Christchurch resident and bike commuter Meg Christie remembers: “At university, you would be lucky to get a bike stand at a preferred central location after 10am. Car ownership of secondary students was unheard of and fairly rare among tertiary students.” But when oil prices came back down in the 1980s, Christchurch residents ultimately returned to business as usual in their automobiles.

Has the age of cycling in Christchurch come and gone, or is there still hope for cycling in the city? There are many who believe there is. Not only that, there is hope that cycling might even thrive. The first order of business is to understand why people choose not to cycle. “The greatest barrier to cycling is that people feel unsafe,” says Meg Christie, who also co-coordinates a Christchurch cycling club called Frocks on Bikes.

Motorists also report feeling nervous about sharing the road with cyclists too. Further, pedestrians report feeling unsafe on footpaths with cyclists whizzing by.
Since my return to Christchurch in 2017. I’ve really noticed cycling around - especially with my 6yr son that there are so many disconnects for cyclists/walkers. We all know this is a perfect city for cycling - being flat.

Even though I’m aware there are several new cycleways planned for Christchurch. They are still disjointed. Residing now in the seaside village of New Brighton - the gateway from the The Avon River / Ōtākaro green corridor to the endless kms of wild open beaches North & South of New Brighton.

It would be so beneficial to have a trail from NB to Waimari Beach - and actually connect Bottelake forest too. You can’t really ride safely to bottle lake from the South/East side of Christchurch. Unless you venture from NB West forward QE2 drive where there are sections of trail/pathways - but these are also disconnected - requiring on road riding and navigation of high speed intersections. Not idea for kids/families. I’m sure the large cycling population from the Sumner/Redcliffs to Woolston/Cashmere (generally the South East) would also venture more to the East Coast beaches / NB / South Brighton / Bottelake - If there was a safer cycle/ running connection across the Dyers Road Causeway (ponds) Surely having them all popping over for a latte, ice cream or radler would be good for local NB business. We need to make it a pleasure to access NB - not just by car.

I’m aware there is planning to improve the embankment tracks on the Avon - especially the West side on the Avon river - this is another disconnect. The Bridge at South Brighton needs to also be made safer for cyclists/walkers to pass. If so, I’m sure the circuit from NB down to the Sth Brighton Bridge and back around the other side of the river to return to NB would become a well utilised pathway. Theres a great example of safe pathway which seems to be frequented - that’s the stretch from the South Ramp south to Tovey Street. But suddenly your pleasurable family ride is at a dead end at Tovey Street. Unless your a decent rider you can hit the bumpy/sandy track to Sth Brighton Surf Club. It would be great see a pathway actually go all the way to Caspian Street and connect with the Estuary Edge pathway.

Don’t get me started on trying to get from South to North across NB Village. That section of Marine Parades a nightmare for kids/family to ride across. A huge disconnect there! Is there a better way to navigate South to North through NB - Its great once you get to the Central path-
way through Rawhiti Domain - but on the North side on Bowhill Road your car dodging again. This is a great opportunity for a safe passage from Rawhiti Domain to & past Rawhiti School, then to connect the New QE2 & SBHS/Avonside campus. I can imagine there must be some contingencies for improvements there. Before the first High School road/cycle fatalities hit the Pegasus Post. Hope not. Yes we survived riding to school - but our roads where better, the cars where smaller and the drivers where better on average. Here's possibly one of the worst sections of pathway - its on the East embankment from the Pages Road Bridge to the Hardy Street Boat Slipway. I observe on a daily basis retired walking groups, school children, dragon boat & kayakers, cyclists, dogwalkers, tourists attempting to use this section of pathway on the embankment. At least 90% of the users of this stretch of pathway along Owles Terrace actually have to walk/pass/cycle on the road because the track is so third world. Most end up crossing the road dangerously to make - what is a crucial connection between a brilliant pathway arriving from up the Avon river. This should be a seamless route that cyclists/commuters use biking from Southshore/8th Brighton without having go off the track on that section to then get back on the great embankment track up river from the Pages Road Bridge. It really needs to be sorted. This is one of my personal fav bonkers thoughts - don’t quote me on this. But I think a cycle/pedestrian swing style bridge could become a wonderful asset - crossing the Avon (end of Evans Ave) before it widens to the estuary. It would solve several purposes. Tourism = Bird watching, it would connect South Brighton & NB with the Red Zone - Its currently isolated on that side of the river - its full of doggers in ears, weirdos. Security - Its would make walkers/cyclists feel safer and more connected having a pedestrian bridge there. And in the event of a Tsunami - its another escape route. This response was really about paths/safe routes for pedestrians/cyclists - I could go on for another hr with more rants/suggestions about the pathways. In short. The pathways are only as good as the connects/disconnects along them. I’m happy to organise a group ride/walk around some of these routes at some stage - that’s when you really realise how inadequate the routes are.
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Katie
Last Name: Symons

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

I wish to support Council’s moving forward of the completion dates of the the MCRs.

I use an MCR every day on my way to work, and regularly cycle with my young children from our
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home to activities in Hagley Park and the city centre. It would be great if there were other routes
that allowed us to bike to other parts of town, such as towards the Adventure Park.

Apart from cycle routes, there are many other ways council could support cycling in the city. Cycle
parking in the city centre isn't great, and further investment in this would be a visual sign that cycling
is supported. Car parking shouldn't be prioritised over cycle parking: whilst I understand the need to
encourage people back into the city post EQ, encouraging people to come in there cars is creating
problems for the future (congestion, increased emissions, lower activity levels leading to general
health issues).

I am one of the 7% of Christchurch commuters who cycle. This involved more infrastructure than the
MCRs, most of which I believe is provided by NZTA. Please can we have 7% of the transport
spending dedicated to cycling infrastructure, it has been proven to deliver excellent returns on
investment. Thank you.

Attached Documents

File

No records to display.
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Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name:  

Julie

Last Name:  

Downard

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Earlier completion of the major cycleways is a listed priority in the LTP. The stated purpose is to enable the council to take advantage of Govt subsidies which may not be available later. In line with this, the 2019-2020 draft annual plan proposes to bring forward the funding for a number of...
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cycleways to take advantage of NZTA subsidy increases.

Bringing forward these cycleways and obtaining NZTA subsidy towards constructing them is clearly going to reduce the burden on ratepayers and save the city considerable funds. Our financial situation is not so good that we can afford to throw away an opportunity such as this.

Even more importantly, looming climate breakdown means we need to urgently transition away from fossil fuel-based transport, towards more sustainable and active modes of transport. Funding these cycleways as soon as possible is therefore essential. I note that your consultation document on the draft annual plan states that as identified in the 2018-28 LTP, a major challenge shaping your decision-making is Climate Change. Assisting citizens to learn to adapt to the changes climate breakdown brings is not sufficiently visionary. You also need to implement measures to minimise climate breakdown, and transport mode shift is one of these.

I call on you to ensure that as per the draft annual plan, the funding for sections of the South Express, Heathcote Expressway, NorWest Arc and Southern Lights Major Cycle Routesis brought forward.

Attached Documents

| File |

No records to display.
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Sharen

Last Name: Paine

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Regarding: Key changes to the capital programme

* $0.5M in funding for a new footpath on Richmond Hill has been brought forward, to help ensure it aligns efficiently with other work planned in the area.
I would like to express my full support for the new footpath funding for Richmond Hill. I walk up and down the hill every day [for health, exercise, engaging with people in the community] and in the section without a footpath it is dangerous. The road in that section is very narrow, with barely enough room for two cars to pass each other, let alone accommodate pedestrians. I have had experienced a number of near misses whilst walking. In two instances trucks have come so close that they almost hit me. There are also children walking up and down the hill to get to school and as the upper hill development proceeds resulting in evermore traffic the risk of serious injury or death occurring continue to increase. A footpath cannot come soon enough.

Many thanks

Sharen Paine

Attached Documents

File

No records to display.
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Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Terry
Last Name: Delis

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Very concerned about the safety on Richmond Hill Road Sumner with the lack of road width but more importantly no footpath.
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A further 50 plus sections have been sold in the Greenwood Farm sub division, most households have at least two vehicles this will equate to another 100 plus vehicles travelling up and down the road daily. With the new homes being built there are a lot of trades vehicles and large trucks traveling the road.

There are children walking to school, there has been an increase members of the public hiking / walking and biking up and down the hill, near hit incidents are not been recorded or reported to the council, sadly it is only a matter of time be for someone is seriously harmed or killed.

Recent reduction in the speed limit to 40 km is an improvement to slow traffic, but this is not making Richmond Hill Road any safer for pedestrians.

Richmond Hill Road requires a footpath and road repairs to be included councils current budget.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No records to display.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Rex

Last Name: Harrison

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Attached Documents

File
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020

The current draft annual plan has both good news and bad news. The good news is that some effort has been made to contain the rates increase forecast in the current Long-Term Plan, and it is encouraging to see reference in the consultation document to those on fixed incomes. There are, however, two specific items of bad news:

1. The percentage rates rise is lower for high capital value properties than for lower – 5.11% for a capital value of $400,000 vs 4.53% for a capital value of $1,000,000. Rates are therefore a regressive tax. The divergence is even greater for business properties. Economists have argued that regressive taxation is one of the contributors to rising income inequality.

2. There is little overall reduction in the total rates rise projected in the current Long-Term Plan. My rates in 2018 were $717.00 per quarter. If the projected rates rise of 50% over the life of the plan continues, my rates in 2028 will be $1,111.00 per quarter, an increase of almost $400.00 per quarter. My ability to pay will not increase by a commensurate amount.

Clearly there must be changes. I will address each of the above issues separately.

1. Regressive taxation.

The rationale give form the uniform annual charge is “ensuring that all rating units are charged a fixed amount to recognize the costs, associated with each property, which are uniformly consumed by the inhabitants of the community”. Whatever the merits of such a rationale, it introduces a regressive component to the rates. Regressive taxation is to be avoided for the reason given above, especially considering that capital value is an unreliable indicator of a person’s ability to pay the tax. This was addressed in some detail by the Council in the late 1990’s. It needs to be addressed again.

In the meantime, the uniform annual charge should be eliminated, or reduced to no more the $50.00 per rateable property.

2. The rates rise.

As a ratepayer, I am going to be forced to economise to find the additional $400.00 per quarter I will ultimately have to pay. The Council must, if it requires ratepayers to economise, must set a good example by doing the same. The Council must accept that it, like the ratepayers on which it depends, cannot do everything it would like if it is constrained by revenue.

Where to make savings.

Cash handouts.

There is no need for ratepayers to provide assistance to the business community, for example by supporting the Canterbury Development Corporation, in these times of rising economic activity but stagnant wage growth. If the business community truly values the services of the CDC they will find the money to support it without calling on the ratepayer.

Likewise there is no need for ratepayers to provide assistance to the tourist industry. Our infrastructure is already straining to cope with rising tourist numbers. It makes no sense to spend ratepayers’ funds to support a booming and presumably profitable industry that is taxing our facilities. Again, if the tourism sector believes it is necessary to make extra effort to attract visitors to Canterbury, let them find the money.
A good way to test whether or not those services are valued by the supposed beneficiaries would be to propose funding them with a targeted rate. The necessary consultation process would no doubt throw up some forceful submissions.

Rescind the payment to the Christchurch Cathedral. There is no doubt the cost of restoration will far exceed the $104 million than has been published as the cost. There is no doubt heritage enthusiasts will return to the Council to ask for more money. This must not happen. The Council has too many other calls on its funds to support the demands of a few well-organised zealots.

**Capital programme**

The Council must become realistic in its assessment of likely capital costs, especially for projects not related to earthquake recovery or core activities. (Core activities include sporting facilities, libraries and the art gallery.) A classic example is restoration of the Town Hall, whose well-publicised cost blow-outs should have been anticipated at the outset, and may have influenced the Council’s decision to proceed with full rather than partial restoration.

Planning for future capital expenditure must provide for a realistic increase in costs. This will no doubt result in some proposals being shelved as unaffordable.

The cycleways programme needs to be re-assessed from first principles. In terms of its objective of reducing vehicle numbers it can only be described as an abject failure. Far more cyclists use the road to Dyers Pass, where there are no cycleways, than the urban system.

The Council is spending / has spent tens of millions of dollars for a facility that is used by tens of people. This makes no sense. Spending on cycleways must stop.

In conclusion, the issue is not the merit *per se* of the Council’s proposals, but rather their affordability. Rates are projected to rise faster than people’s ability to pay. The rises must be contained, even though this may constrain the services the Council can offer.

I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Rex Harrison
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name:  
Tony

Last Name:  
Dale

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Please reinstate plans for reconstructing the road, footpath, stormwater and kerb in Bradshaw Terrace in the 2019/20 Council budget. This work has been deferred a number of times since 2010. The road, footpaths and kerbs in Bradshaw Terrace continue to deteriorate, as per the attached document.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attached Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw Toe Road Footpath and Kerbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw Renewal 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Road, kerbs and footpath conditions in Bradshaw Terrace
Key features of the Bradshaw Terrace proposal

- Replacing all existing kerb and filled dish channel with kerb and flat channel, matching in with the existing kerb and flat channel at the Straven Road intersection. The new kerb will be built on a consistent 9 metre alignment, centralising the carriageway where the road bends at #10 Bradshaw Terrace, and forming a 17 metre diameter turning circle at the cul-de-sac end.
- Reconstructing footpaths and the carriageway, as required, from the existing threshold treatment to the cul-de-sac. The footpaths will generally be located 0.7 metres off the property boundary. This will avoid obstruction in the path from power poles and allow space for trees to be planted in the kerbside berm.
- Planting 18 trees along both sides of the street, in new grass berms on the kerbside. Landscape planting is provided outside No. 10 Bradshaw Terrace.
- Drainage upgrades at the south-east end of the street.
- Relocating the ‘Bradshaw Terrace’ street sign approximately 5 metres west so that it is visible from the Straven Road approach.

Note: Existing overhead wiring will not be undergrounded. The overhead wires belong to the phone and power companies and there is no Council funding available for this purpose.

Project Objectives

- Maintain or improve user safety
- Renew the kerb and channel to suit drainage and adjacent street drainage needs
- Renew street drainage pipes as required
- Renew carriageway, footpaths and berms as required
- Renew streetlight assets as required
- Renew signs and markings as required
- Renew other Council assets e.g. cycle, traffic signals, retaining walls, fences and railings if required
- Install new landscaping and street trees to meet Council’s Community Outcomes
- Complete the project within the allocated budget and in a cost-effective way

What happens next

Once the consultation period closes on 21 May 2010, the project team will consider the responses before producing a recommended construction plan. If you make a submission we will advise you of the outcome of the consultation and recommended plan. A report will then be submitted to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board seeking approval to proceed to final design, tender and construction.

The Christchurch City Council intends to replace the existing kerb and filled dish channel in Bradshaw Terrace, Riccarton, in the financial year beginning 1 July 2011. Other street improvements, including landscaping, are also planned.

The proposal in this document is still only a concept. Your comments will be taken into account in the development of a final recommended plan which will be presented to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board for approval.

The enclosed street renewal design has been selected as the best of several options considered and has undergone a safety audit. As a result of a 2009 parking survey of residents in the street, no restricted parking has been included.

You can comment by:
- Returning the enclosed freepost form
- Visiting the Christchurch City Council’s ‘Have Your Say’ website: www.ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay
- Contacting the Consultation Leader

If you wish to discuss any aspect of this plan or process please contact:

Jennie Hamilton
Consultation Leader – Transport
Christchurch City Council
Phone 03 941 5307
Email jennie.hamilton@ccc.govt.nz
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Mary
Last Name: O'Connor

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

More consideration of pedestrians, especially infrastructure. Toilet design in parks to continue to be single cubicle with outward opening doors for user safety.

Attached Documents
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I wish to comment on the provision for pedestrians. With the emphasis on active travel being for cyclists, e-bikes, e-scooters, skateboards, etc. There are now better materials for paths for pedestrians instead of loose shingle or asphalt.

In the Mayor’s Introduction is, “Maintenance is absolutely critical to our residents’ experience of living here, and the look and feel of the city matters to residents and visitors alike. The focus on our parks, roads and footpaths remains a real priority”. But do the Council and engineers give much thought to improving the infrastructure for pedestrians that they allocate so much funds too? Is the amount of asphalt in parks making them too urbanised?

Nearly all the population are pedestrians at some time. But the infrastructure for pedestrians appears to be assumed to be the same as that for wheels. There appears to be little consideration of the effect of a foot strike onto a hard surface like asphalt. Footpaths have a camber and with the majority of footpaths beside roads, the sidewalks camber is increased for every driveway and often in areas where buildings come to the footpath, like shops. The camber will make the body uneven, putting pressure on ankle, knee and hip joints. The hard surface sends a force through the body, which is greater if the pedestrian is jogging or running.

The Coastal Pathway (The Star newspaper, 21 March 2018, page 19) has that this will be a multi-functional pathway of asphalt. There are to be ‘hard surface renewals’ in Hagley Park, Botanic Gardens, Community Parks and Coastal. If it is intended that pedestrians will use any of these paths, should more pedestrian-friendly surfaces be used instead? Paths can now be constructed using recycled rubber, if an artificial surface is required. The advantage of these is that it is a softer surface so less force in a footstrike, can be permeable so no need for a camber, and less injury likely if someone falls. Because rubber will stretch, there is also less damage from tree roots to the path. In most situations there is no need to have a hard path edge, reducing sprained ankles.

Shared paths are not pedestrian-friendly. The active travel budget appears to be nearly exclusively for cycling. I am unsure what ‘MCR’ means. It concerns me that even if there are dedicated cycleways being built, they appear to direct cycles onto footpaths at intersections. There is often no visibility around a corner, especially when there are small children on the footpath. On some off-road paths there is no forward visibility. In others there is insufficient width for cyclists, e-cyclists, e-scooters, skateboarders and pedestrians to all be using the path. Asphalt paths appear to be getting wider. There is often no provision for a pedestrian to have level natural surface ground next to the asphalt path. Asphalt paths sometimes are built up so the sides of the path are on slopes. Or the path is cut into a bank so the path remains flat, but there is a bank beside it.

A distinction is needed between ‘active travel’ and ‘green travel’. For good health, active travel is beneficial. Active travel, be it for health and enjoyment or to get from one place to another, needs to be encouraged for all the population. There is a need for pedestrian-only, pedestrian-friendly paths. Because of the speed of wheeled cycles/scooters/skateboards on paths in Hagley Park, it is no longer pedestrian-friendly and many pedestrians are discouraged from using these paths. It is no longer possible to go for a stroll. Sadly, around Christmas another path in Little Hagley went under asphalt. The asphalt paths constructed now differ from older paths, by having a hard-fill layer under them, making the path harder than the previous asphalt path. They are built like mini-roads, designed for wheels.

While not as damaging, the shingle paths are not pedestrian-friendly either. The shingle shifts under the soles of one’s shoes, it is noisy, pebbles get into sandals and shoes, and in wet weather the edge ensures that the path has puddles for longer. Prior to these paths, there was usually a natural path that had the grass worn, leaving a packed clay surface. So much better for pedestrians. But it appears that when pedestrians use it often enough for this to occur, the Council consider that they must form it into a path. Why? A natural path among trees will have a good surface that is enhanced with leaf litter. Why urbanise it with shingle or asphalt?

On the Port Hills there are the footpaths above the Summit Road and Harry Ell track from the Sign of the Takahoe to the Sign on the Kiwi, and those in Bottle Lake Forest (with inadequate signage) but elsewhere within the City boundaries, there are very few exclusively pedestrian-only paths now. Is it necessary to present cyclists with every path to cycle on?
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Jon
Last Name: Harcourt

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Regarding:
Page 12: Key changes to the capital programme
* We are bringing forward the funding of some footpath, cycle route, intersection improvements and public transport projects to take advantage of NZTA subsidy increases.
Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 from Harcourt, Jon

* $0.5M in funding for a new footpath on Richmond Hill has been brought forward, to help ensure it aligns efficiently with other work planned in the area.

Two of us walk from Elworthy Way down and back up Richmond Hill Road 5 or 6 times a week in the morning and sometimes early while it is still dark. While the 40kms limit has helped someone is going to get very hurt trying to make their way on foot around all the traffic (cars, trucks, motor bikes, cyclists, big new SUVs, etc).

I have a few classic photos taken recently on my phone and would welcome the opportunity to present these as stress there is a very real safety issue up there. I dont have time right now to collate and submit with this submission.

Finally, thank you for the speed limit, especially on the two hairpins and the 15km is spot on.

Regards

JonH

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No records to display.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

☑ Individual
☐ Organisation/Group

First Name: Timothy

Last Name: Seay

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)

☑ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Submission to the Christchurch City Council’s Annual Plan 2019 / 2020 – Robert McDougall Art Gallery

My name is Timothy Seay
I am completing this submission for myself.

I wish to present my submission at a hearing to the full Council.

My submission is that the Council makes two changes to the Annual Plan in respect to the Robert McDougall Art Gallery (RMAG):

1. That the future use of the gallery is changed to the display and storage of works from the city’s two dimensional art collection and the Canterbury Museum’s two dimensional art collection.
2. That in the Long Term Plan’s Capital Programme the $12.7 M allocated for the gallery’s earthquake strengthening in the 2021/24 years be re-prioritised to be undertaken in the term of the Annual Plan 2019/20. I note that only $534,000 has been allocated for this purpose in the Annual Plan for the year 2021/22.

I understand the Council is going to finally consider its future use over the next few months as a result of the Expressions of Interest process established for inner city heritage buildings currently being conducted by the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee. I understand Council has decided to conduct this process as a requirement for the approval of the necessary funds for the strengthening work.

Background

The gallery still remains closed to the public and has been virtually unused since 2002. It was undamaged in the earthquakes but needs to be earthquake strengthened to 67% of the new building code before it can be re-opened for public use. This work has been allowed for in the Long Term Plan and is scheduled for 2021/24 at an estimated cost of $12.7 M. By 2024 it would have been virtually unused for 22 years!

Back in 2003 the Council at that time decided the gallery would be leased to Canterbury Museum for 50 years but this decision has never been implemented by successive councils as no lease has ever been signed by any Council. At that time the McDougall Act was changed to allow the Museum to lease it and use it as a museum rather than as an art gallery – a completely inappropriate use for such a purpose built two dimensional neo-classical art gallery. The Museum still wishes to use the gallery for their own purposes and they wish to incorporate it into their own proposed re-development plans which involve digging out their whole site for underground storage and base isolating all their buildings including the McDougall’s own site despite it already having its own underground basement areas for the storage of paintings.

Present situation

It is against this background that the Council has to now decide the gallery’s future use and I believe these are the following matters of fact that Councillors need to consider in arriving at a decision:
1. The Museum does not have the funds to carry out their present development plans despite first announcing these plans in 2015 ten years after their previous 2005 revitalisation plans failed to be consented. So the Museum has talked about the redevelopment of their site ever since 2005 but to date have never been able to implement a plan that has been consented and funded. So no development is going to happen in the foreseeable future and may never happen.

2. I have received a legal opinion that the Christchurch City Council (Robert McDougall Gallery) Land Act 2003 (the McDougall Act) does not allow its site to be used for another purpose either above or below ground so I cannot understand why the Museum has ever thought it could include the gallery into its redevelopment. It is not able to extend its buildings onto the McDougall site or excavate its site to store the Museum’s collections underground. I understand the Museum has told the Council that it needs to secure a lease for the McDougall now in order to be able to raise the necessary funds for the redevelopment of their own site. I have been advised the Council would not be able to grant a lease with terms allowing the Museum to incorporate the McDougall into their development plans by building on or excavating the McDougall site.

So as I see it the only way the McDougall is going to be re-opened is by the Council doing it on their own. This is because any future redevelopment of the Museum’s site cannot do anything to the McDougall site that would in any way help the Council re-open it. And the funding for the strengthening and re-opening of the McDougall has already been allowed for in the LTP.

Decision on future use

So the question then becomes what is it going to be used for and how is it going to be run?

Virtually every city of any size has built a new art gallery. As far as I am aware no city anywhere in the world with the exception of Wellington has used their old gallery for another purpose. In Wellington the old National Museum and Art Gallery was given up and leased to Massey University because Te Papa was intended to be an integrated museum of history and art but this idea has not been successful as the gallery spaces have been inadequate to show a good representation of the national collection. Like the Christchurch Art Gallery Te Papa has never shown much interest in it being used again for its traditional art collection. The $8.4 million upgrade that opened in March has given 35% more floor space in the museum but it is still only able to show a small amount of its art collection. The Council should certainly not repeat Wellington’s mistake.

If it was used by Canterbury Museum as a museum they would have no shortage of decorative arts and crafts (3 dimensional objects) to display in the gallery but this would be a totally inappropriate use of such a heritage building as it would damage its heritage fabric. It was never designed for this purpose. It would breach the terms of Robert McDougall’s gift to the citizens of Christchurch to be used as a public art gallery to display the city’s own art collection. The Council would also breach its responsibilities as the owner of a category one heritage building under the Heritage NZ Act and also the gallery’s Conservation Plan.

Assuming it will be used instead as an art gallery for historical works and not as a museum how it can be run must depend on what historical art collections are available to be displayed in it. The McDougall can display 150 paintings at any one time and has storage capacity for around 800 paintings in its storage rooms. So, if it is to be fully utilised, close to 1000 paintings could be moved there on re-opening. The only historical collection available in Christchurch big enough to supply these paintings is the city’s collection.

Availability of historical art works in city collections

The Council has a real problem in Christchurch with the public availability of our city’s historical art collection which it must sort out as it is a core service the Council is required to provide under the Local Government
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Act. Council is required to provide a good quality service and plan for its future requirements.

The historical collection is made up of paintings and other works held in storage at the Christchurch Art Gallery that were produced before 1970. This is taken as a cut off date as it was when the McDougall Art Gallery began acquiring a higher number of contemporary art works in order to broaden the collection and give it more diversity.

The Registrar at the Christchurch Art Gallery has confirmed that the city’s collection contains 691 oil paintings, 382 watercolours, 230 drawings and 30 sculptural works that were produced before 1970. This is a total of 1333 works. Of the 691 oil paintings no more than 50 are ever shown at any one time and no more than 150 of them are displayed at all intermittently. The estimated value of these approx. 550 oil paintings remaining in permanent storage is $15 M.

The staff at the Christchurch Art Gallery are not interested in displaying these paintings and even if they were they are not able to because the gallery does not have the capacity to display them as well as all the modern art they display from visiting collections that the city does not own. This is because the gallery due to lack of funding was only built to half the size required to provide the necessary storage and display capacity for the collection over the 50 year life of the building. It was reduced in size in the planning stage in 1997 from 13,674 to 6297 square metres total floor space. As a result it can only display around 250 works from the permanent collection at any one time in addition to its temporary exhibitions of modern art. This is 3.7% of the collection which compares with the national average for all local authority owned galleries of 7%.

It is amazing to consider that when the Christchurch Art Gallery was being planned it was argued that the main reason for needing a new gallery was in order to display a greater proportion of the collection – upwards of 10%. But since the new gallery has re-opened after the earthquakes it has consistently displayed less of the collection than was displayed by the McDougall! Instead the new gallery has displayed more temporary exhibitions of contemporary art. This has been done at the expense of the collection as it is simply not large enough to do both.

To make matters worse it has not much storage space left for additional paintings to be added to the collection and will run out well before the end of the remaining 40 year life of the building. As a result their staff are already talking of the need for a new outside storage facility but there is no funding allowed for this in the Long Term Plan. I do not know the number of spare racks remaining in the storage rooms for paintings at the gallery but this is something the Council should ascertain straight away. The number cannot be great and will not be nearly adequate to meet the needs of a growing collection. If a private collector offered to gift the city 200 paintings would the gallery be able to accept them into the collection?

The lack of display capacity at the Christchurch Art Gallery is already affecting the intention of citizens with paintings by well known artists to gift them to the city’s collection. I have been told of several people who have recently been considering leaving paintings to the city but when realising they are unlikely to be shown to the public are reconsidering their decision. This situation is disastrous for the future of the collection.

The registrar at the Museum has advised me of the extent of their collection. They claim to have over 500 oil paintings and 5000 works on paper including watercolours, drawings, lithographs, etchings and engravings. But my consultants who know the Museum’s collection well from previous experience advise me that there are only up to 300 works in total - mostly by lesser known amateur and professional artists - that are of a public art gallery standard. Of these there are around 50 oil paintings - the rest of the 300 being water colours and works on paper - prints, (mostly published) and sketches and drawings in either pencil or ink.

Nature of the collections

It is important to understand the difference between the city’s collection and the Museum’s collection. The city’s collection includes an internationally recognised 16-20th century historical collection. It contains 6734 works including about 2700 paintings, works on paper and other works of sculpture and contemporary art. It is an internationally recognised 16th to 20th century collection valued at around $35M. Initially in 1932 it was a collection of 156 paintings, 3 sculptures and two cases of miniatures. Of these 110 paintings were presented by the Canterbury Society of Arts while others were presented by the Jamieson family, Canterbury College and other private donors. The rest of the collection has been acquired over the years as gifts or by bequest made by prominent Christchurch citizens. Since 1932 more than 3,000 works have been gifted to the city collection by donors. The paintings in this collection have been accepted after a rigid process of selection. Many potential gifts over the years have been declined as not being of a public art gallery standard or not being appropriate for the collection.
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Canterbury Museum on the other hand has not deliberately collected art in the last 120 years. Works have come to them by accident rather than design. Their art collection has been formed principally by gifts and bequests whereas around half of the City’s collection has been purchased on the open market on the basis of their artistic merit by way of funding from the Council and other bequests. As a result all of the City’s collection is worthy of displaying in a public art gallery whereas much of the Museum’s collection is of an archival nature so suitable for research, reference, book illustration or support as an accessory for museum displays rather than for display in a public art museum. If it wished the Council could consider asking an art curator from outside of Christchurch to assess which works in the Museum’s collection were suitable to be displayed in the McDougall.

The McDougall as a public art gallery

It is important to understand that the McDougall is the city’s second public art gallery and was designed and built to be used to display works of a public art gallery standard – namely works from collections which have been built up over the years to this standard. Robert McDougall gifted it to the citizens of Christchurch to be used for this purpose. It wasn’t built to be used as an additional display area for anything from the Museum’s collections. As a result the majority of the paintings that will be suitable to be displayed in the McDougall will come from the city’s collection at the Christchurch Art Gallery and if the McDougall was run by the Museum all of these works would have to be lent to the Canterbury Museum even though the McDougall is a Council owned building. Works from public collections held in local authority owned galleries are only loaned for specific exhibitions to other publicly owned art galleries where there are properly trained curatorial staff. Also there would be problems with insurance cover leading to additional costs if they were lent to a gallery not run by Christchurch Art Gallery staff.

With so many paintings from the city’s collection having to be transferred to the McDougall it would be impossible for it not to be run by the Christchurch Art Gallery as they would have to control which paintings went to the McDougall and when transfers back and forth would take place. There couldn’t be a situation where the Museum at any time could just tell the Christchurch Art Gallery which paintings were to be transferred to the McDougall for display.

So as the vast majority of paintings displayed in the McDougall can only come from the city’s collection it will have to be run by the Council as an adjunct gallery to the Christchurch Art Gallery. This would mean that it would have to be placed under the administration of the Christchurch Art Gallery, as the most appropriate department of Council, who would assign one of their four curators to have charge of the RMAG and its programme. The Christchurch Art Gallery would then work collaboratively with Canterbury Museum to ensure that access to space was given for display and storage of works from the Museum’s collections and any other collection of a public art gallery standard that may wish to be displayed and / or stored there.

Future running costs of McDougall as an adjunct gallery

The Council has expressed concern about the future running costs of its heritage buildings. Not to continue to meet the costs of running the McDougall would dishonour the terms of Robert McDougall’s gift as the agreement reached with him in 1928 required the Council to continue to operate the gallery over the life of the building. There was no time limit on the agreement after 70 years. So the Council is obligated to run it and there would be no financial advantage in allowing the Museum to run it as 87% of the Museum’s levy revenue comes from the Council and they would have to increase these in order for the Museum to find the funds to operate it.

But the additional costs to the Council of operating it would actually be very small. The direct operating costs are wages, electricity for the air conditioning and lighting and cleaning. There should be no need for any additional security staff to be employed as these would be able to be provided on a roster basis from the
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Christchurch Art Gallery. When the McDougall closed in 2002 the staff employed numbered 35 and increased to 64 at the new gallery when it opened in 2003. The staff required at the McDougall to run it as an adjunct gallery would be only three to four for security. These visitor services staff would need to be rostered and the curator assigned based at the McDougall. Installation and de-installation could be coordinated by the Christchurch Art Gallery exhibition technicians. Installations would remain for longer periods and some anchor works would be exhibited continuously. So the only additional operating costs would really be just electricity and cleaning. Some expenses could be offset by hiring the centre court for evening events as occurred between 1990 and 2001. Nor would there be any savings in the overhead costs of insurance, repairs and maintenance and depreciation as these would still have to be met by Council as the owner of the building as they are at the moment even though the gallery is not open to the public.

Future visitor numbers

It should be remembered that Christchurch has run an adjunct art gallery before as from 1989 to 2001 such a gallery, the Robert McDougall Art Gallery Annex, was run successfully on this basis by the McDougall in the Arts Centre attracting an average of 68,000 visitors per year. There is no question that the retention of the McDougall as an adjunct gallery for the city’s collection would be of enormous benefit to the Christchurch Art Gallery’s visitor numbers. With 1.5 M visitors each year to the Botanic Gardens it could probably attract 200,000 visitors to the city’s collection which would represent a 50% increase on present numbers.

Unique visitor experience

Finally I am advised that the retention of the McDougall to display historical works from the city’s and Museum’s collections ( and any other ones available ) would in Christchurch present a unique visitor experience not currently available in any other New Zealand city. (Invercargill did have Anderson Park Gallery as well as Southland Museum and Art Gallery but Anderson Park is now closed). This is because visitors would be able to see a lot of contemporary art in the Christchurch Art Gallery and traditional historical art in the McDougall.

Other considerations

Heritage constraints restricting use of the McDougall

Apart from the terms of Robert McDougall’s gift there are other factors that impose limitations on how the gallery can be used especially in respect to the Museum’s wish to use it as a museum instead of an art gallery for their decorative arts and crafts which are three dimensional objects of varying sizes. The McDougall comprises 13 intimate gallery spaces which are wall specific for the display of paintings. They are not designed for large three dimensional objects to be displayed and moving these in and out of the gallery spaces would damage the heritage fabrics.

District Plan

The Council has used its powers under the RMA to list the fabrics recorded in the Conservation Plan 2010 in the District Plan ( 9.3.7.2 ) which means that it will be legally binding on the Council to return the gallery to its original heritage form. This will impose severe restraints on how the gallery can be used in the future because between 1978 and 1993 around 75% of the internal walls were covered with false walls made of custom wood which covered the walls from ceiling to floor. These were installed to make it easier to display contemporary art works and covered up such heritage features as the dado rail, floor skirting board and ceiling coving. The fact that these heritage features have to be preserved means that when the gallery is strengthened the Council will have to remove the false walls in order to return the gallery to its original heritage form which is also required by the Conservation Plan. This will then make it much more difficult to display large
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contemporary art works as the dado rail feature of each gallery will limit the wall area available. Some of these works can extend to the level of the floor. The original walls have wooden battens embedded at intervals as part of the original fabric and this makes it easy to hang traditional paintings. It will also become difficult to install vitrines to hold decorative art items as they will not be able to be set flush against the wall.

The other main interior heritage fabric listed in the District Plan to be preserved is the cork floor that is throughout the gallery. This was always intended to be only walked over by people and not to have to withstand the weight of large 3 dimensional objects. If the gallery was used for this purpose it is inevitable that with heavy 3 dimensional objects being moved in and out of the gallery floor spaces, as exhibitions changed, damage to the floor would also result from items being dragged across the floor.

Conservation Plan 2010

Apart from the requirements of the District Plan the Conservation Plan states the following:

- The Robert McDougall Gallery should have appropriate new use so as not to detract from its heritage values.
- Wherever possible, a heritage building should continue to be used for the purpose for which it was built as a way of maintaining its heritage values.
- Fabric having heritage value should be retained as a way of conserving the cultural significance of a historic building.
- The Robert McDougall Gallery should be returned to a known earlier form where such work would enhance its heritage values.
- Work to the Robert McDougall Gallery should seek to preserve significant fabric or elements that make up the building.

So the Conservation Plan is quite clear that the McDougall should be used in the future for the purpose for which it was built in order to preserve its heritage fabric which in turn the Council is legally obligated to do.

In addition it should also be noted that the Conservation Plan also states that the sculpture Ex Tenebris Lux which Robert McDougall donated to the gallery in 1937 to stand in the centre court should be returned to the McDougall to its original position.

Fire and Earthquake Egress

Also I have been advised by Council staff that if the intimate floor spaces of the galleries were filled with decorative arts and crafts the Building Code could require additional provision for fire and earthquake egress which could involve new exit routes having to be created. This in turn would damage the heritage fabric of the building and would not be permitted by the District and Conservation Plans. This could become quite a problem in itself as if the gallery floor spaces were filled with 3 dimensional objects it could be difficult getting people out in darkness in an earthquake situation.

Council’s statutory obligations

As I have discussed before the Council has statutory and other obligations it has to comply with when deciding the future use of the gallery. These are:

Local Government Act s 10 and 11 – art galleries and museums are a core service that must be provided and be of a good quality and be efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances. This must mean the Council is required to provide a service suitable for all citizens and plan for its future in respect to the capacity they have available to deliver this service.
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Heritage NZ Act – the McDougall is a category one registered heritage building under the Act and as discussed above its heritage fabrics are listed in the latest Conservation Plan 2010 and also in the Council’s own District Plan. As owner of the gallery the Council is obligated to protect its heritage fabric into the future.

Other obligations

Donors of the city’s collection – about half the collection over the years has been donated by private citizens and half by ratepayers and other sources of finance. Donors and ratepayers from when the McDougall Art Gallery opened in 1932 to the present day gave works on the understanding they would be regularly displayed. The Council has an obligation to honour these agreements.

The terms of Robert McDougall’s gift of the gallery in 1928 to the citizens of Christchurch. It was given as an art gallery to the city (confirmed by an exchange of letters) to initially display the new collection given to the citizens of Christchurch when the gallery opened in 1932 by the Canterbury Society of Arts, the Jamieson family, Canterbury College and some private donors. In other words it was given to the city to be used as a public art gallery which it was for 70 years. Robert McDougall is on public record (Press 12 March 1928) as saying he did not want it to have anything to do with the Museum. He wanted it be an art gallery for the city. Other terms of the gift that were obviously agreed at the time required the Council to own the building on behalf of the citizens, to meet its future operating and capital expenditure requirements and to look after it and use it for the purposes for which it was designed and gifted for the duration of the life of the building.

Robert McDougall gave the Council the funds to build and own the gallery for the citizens of Christchurch. He gave it to the Council to own on their behalf because they were the body that has a statutory responsibility to represent the interests of the citizens. It would not be possible for the Canterbury Museum to fulfil this role under a 50 year lease arrangement as it does not have the same statutory responsibilities. This is because it is a charitable trust which is governed partly by representatives from the Council and partly by other community groups and organisations which have their own particular vested interests.

Future role of McDougall Art Gallery

The McDougall Art Gallery has a special identity as a New Zealand heritage gallery. In fact it is the only purpose built municipal gallery to remain largely unaltered in its design since it was built. Christchurch has an opportunity to present visitors, both local and overseas, with a special experience that enables them to see a heritage gallery installed with a heritage art collection. The experience of a gallery installed with works from its original collection would provide a truly unique art heritage visitor destination found nowhere else in New Zealand.

This role as a museum of art is the most appropriate future for this beautiful heritage building and it is the only use that would comply with all the Council’s obligations as well as to its donor, Robert McDougall. I believe the majority of the people of Christchurch wish it to be used for this purpose which will in turn in the future ideally compliment a redeveloped Canterbury Museum.

1 April 2019
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Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Graham  Last Name: Robinson

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

1. As a resident in Addington, with a higher level of rental properties and a higher level of lower value properties, the higher general (standard) rate will affect the lower income residents more harshly than those who own or rent higher value properties.
2. The proposed average rate of increase for the whole LTP is much higher than the rate of inflation/cost of living increase for workers (let alone those people on fixed incomes or benefits). Workers are unable to get a comparative cost of living increase in their wages to cover the extra costs proposed by the rates increase. There has also been a substantial increase in the cost of residential insurance and levels of disposable household income have decreased for many people.

Although I understand the need for better traffic flow, to bring residents from outer residential suburbs into the inner suburbs and city centre, the loss of on-street parking reduces the ability of small businesses to survive in many suburban centres. The removing of on-street parking should be reflected in a substantial reduction in rates for affected business property rate-payers. Any intention to remove on-street parking (an existing amenity) should be notified well in advance, to give businesses the opportunity to not renew their leases (This is a change in circumstances they had not been aware of when they signed their existing lease). Businesses in suburban areas (like strips of shops along the roadside) should not be penalized further because they cannot supply off-street car parking.

4. A regular and free circular transport system around the city centre would encourage people to get on a bus instead of driving their cars from the outer suburbs. Not everyone works close to the bus exchange.
An annual plan submission from Helen Broughton, . I wish to speak to my submission-

To All Councillors

I am making this submission as an individual, but the submission is consistent with the HBR Riccarton Community Board’s submission.

I am requesting that Bradshaw Terrace be returned to the 2020/21 year.

There is a long history to this road. It was a line item in the 2018/2019 plan which was unexpectedly moved when Council did the 2018-2028 LTP. The HBR Community Board queried this at the time, as did local residents, and we were advised the road would be constructed in 2020/2021. The residents reluctantly accepted this, but it appears Bradshaw Terrace has been moved again.

As the Riccarton Councillor from 2001 to 2013, I am aware of the background to the road not being completed.

A It was inadvertently omitted when the roads around it were reconstructed. All roads Hanlokei, Kilnsmock, Rata, Rimu Kauri have had reconstruction and Bradshaw Terrace was inadvertently overlooked. The Riccarton/Wigram Board corrected this error and the road was to be reconstructed; formal written consultation to residents had occurred when the September 2010 Earthquake occurred.

B During the 2010-2013 period Bradshaw Terrace was indicated as a priority but not formally ratified.

C During the 2013 to 2016 period with a largely changed Council, there was a street meeting with the then elected members and it was agreed HBR Councillors would advance this street. Subsequently it was tabled for the 2018/2019 year.

D As noted above it was removed when Council was undertaking its 2018/2028 Long Term Plan, but we were given assurances it would be reconstructed in 2020/2021. It was in the initial Draft Plan, but appears to have not been ratified when the Draft Plan was formalised.

I understand it may be approved in the $5 million allocated to Riccarton for capital projects. I would ask that it either be returned as a line item or allocated under the Riccarton Capital Works allocation.

We have given assurances to the residents on three occasions that have not been upheld. Two assurances have been given in the post earthquake environment by the current or previous Council.

I believe Council needs to uphold the previous assurances given to residents. There is a moral imperative to complete this road. Council’s commitments need to be upheld to keep public trust in Council.

I would like to be heard in person on this submission.

Regards

Helen Broughton

Ps The project appears to have escalated by 50%... I am investigating the reasons for the escalation.

Helen Broughton
This area has not been maintained for far too long. Especially considering the amount of use it has from cyclists, dog walkers, joggers etc. On any given day you see a multitude of people here.

This area adds to the feel of the community and needs to be protected for the walking tracks and also the residential property in the area.

Recently the the South Brighton holiday park and tennis club flooded due to the low nature of the bank and the high spring tides. At the same time unprotected council assets Godwit and Herron Street flooded. Properties on the west side of Estuary Road were protected by the mound created by CERA/LINZ. The water that went though made it though these streets.

Further south down the estuary through the red zone many previous home owners had built their own walls to hold back the estuary. The well built wall that remain do a great job.

The eot so well built walls or walls damaged during demolition of the housing that once stood there are compromised and need to be replaced with a similar method. I am not in favour of the land being contoured as this will cause further erosion. The previous coastal planting there has not succeeded and the best way to protect the assets is to reinstate a hard edge along the sea boundary as defined on title plans.
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Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Gavin
Last Name: Bodger

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

I wish to make a brief submission to the Council on the Annual Plan

Attached Documents
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Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: 
Nigel

Last Name: 
Collings

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

I would like to see the Estuary edge running from Bridge Street to the start of the wooden walk way at the south end of the South Brighton Reserve reinforced back to the documented position as shown by the occupation of the remains of the old estuary edge (visible in photo's attached)
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

If on behalf of an organisation or group, please provide the name:
Kartsport Canterbury

Your role in the organisation:
Club President

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?:
130

First Name: Shayne  Last Name: McLaren

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

I am submitting in relation to an existing approved funding event (#1454, relocation of the

An amount of $3,500,000 was agreed upon back in 2013 as a fair cost for the re-establishment of a replacement facility at a Mcleans Island address. This funding was ultimately approved by council in 2016.

The work to find a suitable site to re-establish this facility has taken a large number of years.

Since the initial costings were agreed and ratified the actual costs of construction have increased significantly.

This submission is to request that this amount ($3,500,000) be reviewed and subsequently & Retrospectively linked to CPI in order that the same purchasing power for which these amounts were originally agreed upon still hold true in today’s market.

This would also ensures that the Kart track relocation remains feasible as we continue to work through the challenges we face in obtaining resource consent.

Regards

Shayne McLaren
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Richard  Last Name: Ball

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

I support of the submission of Dr David Miller on behalf of the Pest Free Banks Peninsula working group (copy attached).
Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 from Ball, Richard

Having an on-going fund of $60,000 to support community based predator control initiatives will not only help our native plants and birds but supports community participation and development. From the national vision of Predator Free 2050, there is a growing interest in these activities across New Zealand, including urban areas. Local initiatives help our environment and, most importantly, foster and maintain connections and a sense of belonging, participation and citizenship - something we need even more strongly since 15 March 2019. Clearly, not everyone will participate but the evidence from other cities, such as Wellington, indicates that 1 in 4 households do participate when given the opportunity. In that context, having a fund available to enable and support active participation is money well spent. It empowers citizens to undertake these activities together in a safe, effective and sustainable manner.

Thank you,

Richard Ball
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Pest Free Banks Peninsula Working Group

Submission to Christchurch City Council’s 2019/2020 Annual Plan

From:
Dr David Miller
Chair, Pest Free Banks Peninsula Working Group

26 March 2019

This submission is made on behalf of the Pest Free Banks Peninsula Working Group.
We wish to be heard in support of our submission.

Summary:
We ask that the Council:

- Support local community groups in Christchurch and Banks Peninsula that wish to work towards a vision of predator free New Zealand. This supports community engagement. The benefits include: greater connection between people, their communities and the places they live; an improved natural environment, and; a strong and sustainable economy through tourism and agriculture.

- Make budget provision of $60,000 in the 2019/2020 Annual Plan and subsequent years, to directly support community groups wishing to undertake backyard trapping or related initiatives in their neighbourhoods. The fund may be used to provide advice or training, buy traps, or to assist community volunteers to help organise and run such groups.

- That this funding compliments, rather than replaces, the Council’s support for other initiatives, such as Predator Free Port Hills or Pest Free Banks Peninsula.

A vision for a predator free Christchurch
We propose that the following as a predator free vision can apply to the whole of Christchurch District, including the City and urban areas:

We live in a natural environment where our native plants, birds, animals and insects flourish, free from the threats of introduced animal pests. Native trees are thriving and filled with birdsong. Our native lizards and invertebrates are prolific in the native scrublands and rocky outcrops of the Port Hills and Banks Peninsula. Seabirds nest safely in the coastal areas. Species that were previously locally extinct are now being re-introduced and growing in numbers.
The abundance of native wildlife provides a sense of identity to the City and Banks Peninsula. It is valued by the community and integrated with both urban and rural life, tourism and recreational activity. Achieving this has bought our community together. It is known as a special place to live and attracts local and international visitors.

With community support and emerging changes in technology, we believe this vision is ambitious but achievable. It supports working collaboratively with the community and partner agencies, including Ngāi Tahu.

Growing support for a predator free vision

Throughout the New Zealand, there is a rapidly growing interest for the vision of being predator free. This extends into urban areas. In Wellington, for example, there is an organised network supported by the City and Regional Councils. Over four years this has exploded from 9 to 140 local groups. The Councils are now running to catch-up with the level of interest in their community, as tui, kereru and kaka once again fly across the City.

Here in Christchurch, there are groups establishing in communities as diverse as Halswell, Richmond, Mt Pleasant and Wainui. These are community lead initiatives. We believe this will grow rapidly and the Council needs to make provision to support such initiatives, to encourage community engagement, as well as a better environment.

The benefits

Community based initiatives have many benefits. While nominally this is about protecting and enhancing biodiversity, it also creates a sense of belonging and connection between people, their neighbours and communities within Christchurch and the wider District. In good times, such initiatives provide a sense of purpose and achievement. In times of crisis, as we have experienced again recently, the connections with others are even more critical: they provide a network through which people communicate and share, helping our emotional and mental well-being.

As a biodiversity initiative, there numerous benefits. It provides a connection to our natural world and supports a healthier environment through various mechanisms, such as less erosion leading to better water quality in rivers and streams. It supports improved mahinga kai. It provides economic benefits for tourism and farming.

How the Council can help

We want to ensure that it continues to be community led. We are asking for funding to empower these local initiatives through advice and training on how to make them effective, helping to overcome the financial barrier of purchasing safe and humane traps, and supporting co-ordinators who can organise and promote communication through local networks. To enable this, we ask that the Council make an on-going budget provision of $60,000 per year from 2019/2020. This can be administered by existing staff, such as rangers, to support local groups in the most appropriate way.

While we, as the Pest Free Banks Peninsula working group (which includes the Port Hills), have an interest in animal pest control, we see this as supporting local initiatives across the City and wider district. While we focus on our priority areas, it has become apparent to us that there is a much
wider demand from other local groups wanting to be active and contribute in their neighbourhoods. We ask that the Council shows leadership and helps these groups.

Complements, rather than replicates.

There is a substantial amount of work planned for the Pest Free Banks Peninsula project. We are hopeful this will be supported by substantial funding from Environment Canterbury, Predator Free 2050, the Department of Conservation, the Council’s own pest control programmes and others, including thousands of hours of volunteer time each year. This work is in targeted areas where the greatest biodiversity benefits can be achieved. However, the funding we are asking for from the Council in this submission, is largely outside of these priority areas, working with local community based initiatives across the City and wider District. It is to support local groups, helping them to be effective and sustainable.

We are aware that the Summit Road Society received Community Board funding in the current year for its predator control activities. We strongly support that and hope it continues. However, most small community based groups are unaware of Council funding processes, such as Annual Plans. Having to submit funding submissions or applications, especially for small amounts, is burdensome, unfamiliar and difficult for these groups. Having a fund such as this, providing flexible support for small, local initiatives, administered proactively through Parks or other staff, reduces the height of the hurdle and makes it easier for communities to get things done.

About the Working Group

The Pest Free Banks Peninsula / Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū Partnership is a collaborative programme to protect and enhance biodiversity on the Peninsula through the widespread eradication of animal pests. In November 2018, it was formalised through a Memorandum of Understanding signed by 14 foundation signatories, including the Council.

This submission has been prepared by the Pest Free Banks Peninsula Working Group. It has been endorsed by all the members of the Working Group apart from the Council’s representatives, who abstained from decision making on this matter. The working group is an informal group put in place to progress this initiative until the governance and management arrangements outlined in the Pest Free Banks Peninsula MOU are established. The members of the working group currently represent Christchurch City Council, the Department of Conservation, the Rod Donald Banks Peninsula Trust, the Summit Road Society, Banks Peninsula Conservation Trust, Environment Canterbury and the Council. Other signatories to the Pest Free Banks Peninsula Initiative include the Cacophony Project, Living Springs, Ōnuku Rūnanga, Selwyn District Council, Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, Te Taumutu Rūnanga, Wairewa Rūnanga and the Quail Island Trust.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Dr David Miller

Chair, Pest Free Banks Peninsula Working Group
Please find attached a submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 on behalf of WDL Enterprises Limited.

Kind regards,
Sarah
Sarah Eveleigh
Senior Associate
Anderson Lloyd
Submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2019-20

To: Christchurch City Council
ccc-plan@ccc.govt.nz

Submitter: WDL Enterprises Limited (WDL)

WDL wishes to present its submission at a hearing.

Background

1 This submission relates to funding to facilitate the timely provision of infrastructure within the Cranford Regeneration Plan area.

2 The Cranford Regeneration Plan (Regeneration Plan) was prepared by the Christchurch City Council (Council) and approved by the Minister for Christchurch Earthquake Recovery on 24 August 2017. A Regeneration Plan must meet one or more of the purposes of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 (Regeneration Act), which include:

   (a) enabling a focused and expedited regeneration process

   (b) facilitating the ongoing planning and regeneration of greater Christchurch

   ....

   (d) recognising the local leadership of Canterbury Regional Council, Christchurch City Council, Regenerate Christchurch, Selwyn District Council, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, and Waimakariri District Council and providing them with a role in decision making under this Act

3 The Regeneration Plan relates to a 125 hectare area in Papanui/St Albans and provides for a large multi-purpose stormwater management facility bordered by innovative housing development. Goals for the areas regeneration include:

   (a) Goal 1: Residential development, in appropriate areas, that provides for a choice of housing types, sizes and densities providing for a range of housing needs and contributing towards meeting the household growth targets for Greater Christchurch;

   (b) Goal 3: Integration of new residential areas with infrastructure (including the Northern Arterial Extension, public transport, and water and waste networks), walking / cycling networks, and the planned enhancements for Cranford Basin as a major stormwater management facility and public open space asset; and

   (c) Goal 7: Development of the Plan area is undertaken in an efficient and timely manner.
4 The Regeneration Plan also states (emphasis added):

6.7.2 Coordinated and Collaborative processes

The East Papanui ODP covers an area that contains a number of landowners, particularly in the Grassmere Street block. The coordinated development in the Plan area is essential to ensuring an integrated solution to hazard management, well-designed urban development, and efficient provision of infrastructure. The East Papanui ODP, as directed through this Plan, will co-ordinate development of multiple sites and facilitate integration for the Plan area, and a supporting commitment by the Council has been included in this document to work with landowners.

The timing for issuing titles and house construction, marketing and occupation are not matters the Council has direct control over. However, the Council has committed to working with landowners to provide advice, and to develop a memorandum of understanding with developers which seeks to deliver a percentage of the anticipated housing in the Plan area by the end of 2020.

5 In relation to the supporting commitments, the Regeneration Plan provides (emphasis added):

8.2 Supporting commitments

This section describes the undertakings by the Council during development of the Plan to facilitate development and to achieve the vision and goals. They are neither statutory requirements nor requirements directed by the Plan.

8.2.1 Facilitating coordination and timing of development and infrastructure provision between landowners

The Grassmere Street and Croziers Road blocks have multiple landowners and a number of constraints need to be addressed through sensitively designed development. The Council has committed to working with landowners to ensure development is progressed expeditiously, and is coordinated to achieve the ODP and vision of this Plan… This commitment supports Goal 7.

8.2.2 Expediting development

It is desirable that there be an instrument to help ensure the housing development proceeds quickly. The Council commits to endeavour to enter an MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) that obliges the developers to delivering a percentage of the potential housing by the end of 2020, and that this is signed by the relevant parties within 6 months of the gazettal of this Regeneration Plan. This commitment supports goal 7.

6 The Regeneration Plan includes amendments to the Christchurch District Plan which establish the district planning framework for the area and include an East Papanui Outline Development Plan (ODP) for the 38 hectare residential development area. A copy of the ODP is attached as Appendix 1. The Plan provisions establish a number of pre-requisites to residential development, including:

(a) Preparation of the Geo-hydrological Management Plan for the management of groundwater, for all of Areas 1 – 4 at least;

(b) Provision must be made for flood attenuation and treatment of the stormwater first flush onsite. Land to be set aside for stormwater management / recreation / conservation uses is identified on the ODP; and
(c) There is to be no more than 99 residential units in Areas 1 – 4 prior to completion of a Collector road from Cranford Street to Grassmere Street.

7 As noted above, the East Papanui ODP area is held by multiple private owners. WDL owns the 57 and 59 Grassmere Street, within the area identified on the ODP as Area 2. The stormwater management area and collector road are not located on land owned by WDL.

8 In order to make the first application for subdivision, the applicant must have prepared the Geo-hydrological Management Plan and made provision for stormwater management. Both of these requirements come at significant cost. For WDL’s landholding (and it is understood for other landowners as well) it is not commercially viable to commit to these costs, which relate to the entire developable area, given the likely returns on development of individual landholdings and uncertainty as to their ability to recover a pro-rata proportion of wider development costs from other landowners, or the timeframe for this recovery. This is particularly the case given the additional limit of 99 residential sections until the collector road is completed. Construction of the collector road comes at further additional cost and the limit of 99 sections creates uncertainty for any landowner who begins to undertake preparation of the Geo-hydrological Management Plan or provision for stormwater management that they will be able to secure development of their site within the initial 99 sections.

9 The multiple ownership of the ODP area and the prerequisites to development, in particular the centralised location of stormwater management areas outside of landholdings which contain the majority of developable area and which are likely to be first to develop, currently creates an impediment to development. In light of these constraints, landowners are unable to commit to a MOU as anticipated by the Regeneration Plan, because they have no certainty as to their practical ability to develop.

10 Over 18 months since the approval of the Regeneration Plan, both preparation of the MOU, and development of the site generally, have stalled. Neither the purposes of the Regeneration Act, or the vision and goals of the Regeneration Plan, appear able to be met with respect to the ODP area in the foreseeable future.

Draft Annual Plan

11 WDL seeks sufficient provision of funds through the Annual Plan to enable Council to facilitate development within the Regeneration Plan area:

(a) WDL considers that this would best be achieved through funding to enable provision of stormwater management areas and construction of the collector road, with these costs to be recovered through development contributions on subdivision of the ODP area. Landowners would be prepared to fund groundwater investigations and complete the Geo-hydrological Management Plan, where there was certainty regarding funding and timing of the stormwater management areas and collector road construction.

(b) In the alternative, WDL seeks such other funding provision as would facilitate prerequisites for development to be met, for example by providing for stormwater management within the Designated Stormwater Area (outside of the ODP boundary).
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Submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2019-20

To: Christchurch City Council
ccc-plan@ccc.govt.nz

Submitter: Grants Road Holdings Limited (GRHL)
c/- Anderson Lloyd

GRHL wishes to present its submission at a hearing.

Background

1. This submission relates to funding to facilitate the timely provision of infrastructure within the Cranford Regeneration Plan area.

2. The Cranford Regeneration Plan (Regeneration Plan) was prepared by the Christchurch City Council (Council) and approved by the Minister for Christchurch Earthquake Recovery on 24 August 2017. A Regeneration Plan must meet one or more of the purposes of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 (Regeneration Act), which include:

   (a) enabling a focused and expedited regeneration process

   (b) facilitating the ongoing planning and regeneration of greater Christchurch

   ....

   (d) recognising the local leadership of Canterbury Regional Council, Christchurch City Council, Regenerate Christchurch, Selwyn District Council, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, and Waimakariri District Council and providing them with a role in decision making under this Act

3. The Regeneration Plan relates to a 125 hectare area in Papanui/St Albans and provides for a large multi-purpose stormwater management facility bordered by innovative housing development. Goals for the areas regeneration include:

   (a) Goal 1: Residential development, in appropriate areas, that provides for a choice of housing types, sizes and densities providing for a range of housing needs and contributing towards meeting the household growth targets for Greater Christchurch;

   (b) Goal 3: Integration of new residential areas with infrastructure (including the Northern Arterial Extension, public transport, and water and waste networks), walking / cycling networks, and the planned enhancements for Cranford Basin as a major stormwater management facility and public open space asset; and

   (c) Goal 7: Development of the Plan area is undertaken in an efficient and timely manner.
4 The Regeneration Plan also states (emphasis added):

6.7.2 Coordinated and Collaborative processes

The East Papanui ODP covers an area that contains a number of landowners, particularly in the Grassmere Street block. The coordinated development in the Plan area is essential to ensuring an integrated solution to hazard management, well-designed urban development, and efficient provision of infrastructure. The East Papanui ODP, as directed through this Plan, will co-ordinate development of multiple sites and facilitate integration for the Plan area, and a supporting commitment by the Council has been included in this document to work with landowners.

The timing for issuing titles and house construction, marketing and occupation are not matters the Council has direct control over. However, the Council has committed to working with landowners to provide advice, and to develop a memorandum of understanding with developers which seeks to deliver a percentage of the anticipated housing in the Plan area by the end of 2020.

5 In relation to the supporting commitments, the Regeneration Plan provides (emphasis added):

8.2 Supporting commitments

This section describes the undertakings by the Council during development of the Plan to facilitate development and to achieve the vision and goals. They are neither statutory requirements nor requirements directed by the Plan.

8.2.1 Facilitating coordination and timing of development and infrastructure provision between landowners

The Grassmere Street and Croziers Road blocks have multiple landowners and a number of constraints need to be addressed through sensitively designed development. The Council has committed to working with landowners to ensure development is progressed expeditiously, and is coordinated to achieve the ODP and vision of this Plan… This commitment supports Goal 7.

8.2.2 Expediting development

It is desirable that there be an instrument to help ensure the housing development proceeds quickly. The Council commits to endeavour to enter an MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) that obliges the developers to delivering a percentage of the potential housing by the end of 2020, and that this is signed by the relevant parties within 6 months of the gazetted of this Regeneration Plan. This commitment supports goal 7.

6 The Regeneration Plan includes amendments to the Christchurch District Plan which establish the district planning framework for the area and include an East Papanui Outline Development Plan (ODP) for the 38 hectare residential development area. A copy of the ODP is attached as Appendix 1. The Plan provisions establish a number of pre-requisites to residential development, including:

(a) Preparation of the Geo-hydrological Management Plan for the management of groundwater, for all of Areas 1 – 4 at least;

(b) Provision must be made for flood attenuation and treatment of the stormwater first flush onsite. Land to be set aside for stormwater management / recreation / conservation uses is identified on the ODP; and
(c) There is to be no more than 99 residential units in Areas 1 – 4 prior to completion of a Collector road from Cranford Street to Grassmere Street.

7 As noted above, the East Papanui ODP area is held by multiple private owners. GRHL owns 63 and 69 Grassmere Street (approximately 9 hectares), within the area identified on the ODP as Area 4. There is a stormwater management area located on land owned by GRHL and it is anticipated that this could accommodate all stormwater from GRHL’s development, however access to stormwater management facilities is an impediment to development of other landholdings within the ODP area. In this regard, GRHL considers a better outcome would be for stormwater management to be provided for within the neighbouring (but not yet constructed) Designated Stormwater Management Area. The collector road is not located on land owned by GRHL.

8 In order to make the first application for subdivision, the applicant must have prepared the Geo-hydrological Management Plan and made provision for stormwater management. Both of these requirements come at significant cost. For GRHL’s landholding (and it is understood for other landowners as well) it is not commercially viable to commit to these costs, which relate to the entire developable area, given the likely returns on development of individual landholdings and uncertainty as to their ability to recover a pro-rata proportion of wider development costs from other landowners, or the timeframe for this recovery. This is particularly the case given the additional limit of 99 residential sections until the collector road is completed. Construction of the collector road comes at further additional cost and the limit of 99 sections creates uncertainty for any landowner who begins to undertake preparation of the Geo-hydrological Management Plan or provision for stormwater management that they will be able to secure development of their site within the initial 99 sections.

9 The multiple ownership of the ODP area and the prerequisites to development currently create an impediment to development. In light of these constraints, landowners are unable to commit to a MOU as anticipated by the Regeneration Plan, because they have no certainty as to their practical ability to develop.

10 Over 18 months since the approval of the Regeneration Plan, both preparation of the MOU, and development of the site generally, have stalled. Neither the purposes of the Regeneration Act, or the vision and goals of the Regeneration Plan, appear able to be met with respect to the ODP area in the foreseeable future.

Draft Annual Plan

11 GRHL seeks sufficient provision of funds through the Annual Plan to enable Council to facilitate development within the Regeneration Plan area:

(a) GRHL considers that this would best be achieved through funding to enable provision of stormwater management areas and construction of the collector road, with these costs to be recovered through development contributions on subdivision of the ODP area. Landowners would be prepared to fund groundwater investigations and complete the Geo-hydrological Management Plan, where there was certainty regarding funding and timing of the stormwater management areas and collector road construction.

(b) In the alternative, GRHL seeks such other funding provision as would facilitate prerequisites for development to be met, for example by providing for stormwater management from the ODP area to be accommodated within the Designated Stormwater Area (outside of the ODP boundary).
Kia ora

Please find attached and embedded Keep Our Assets Canterbury's submission on the draft annual plan.

Naku noa, na Stephen Howard

Submission to

Christchurch City Council

On

Christchurch City Council draft Annual Plan 2019/2020

For

Keep Our Assets (KOA) Canterbury

KOA Canterbury wishes to speak to this submission.

Authors

Stephen Howard
Murray Horton
John Minto

Introduction

KOA maintains our long-term interest in the people of Christchurch continuing to retain all assets, both tangible and intangible, for the good of the generation of the People's Republic of Christchurch and for future generations. One of these assets is the tradition of open and democratic government of the city. Democracy demands that all citizens are given the same access to decision making; the entire citizenry are the stakeholders and need to be consulted. Consultations behind closed doors with smaller groups of privileged stakeholders is not acceptable.

Arena Spending

When the extra central government money was announced as it was said to be available for the people of Christchurch to decide on the use. That has not happened and the decision to proceed with the stadium seems to be at odds with the citizens' priorities. It appears that the council is holding stakeholder meeting with various "stakeholder" groups. The only valid stakeholder group in a democracy is the citizenry. The Arena for the Rugby Union is not a priority for most Christchurch citizens who want to see more infrastructure repair and development for the good of all.

This year's Annual Plan reflects confirmation from Central Government that the $300 million Christchurch Regeneration Acceleration Facility can be allocated for the Canterbury Multi Use Arena ($220 million), with the balance across the Otakaro Avon River Corridor and horizontal infrastructure requirements. The investment cases are being prepared for each of these. The $220 million has been committed to the Arena, which gives surety that the project will proceed.

The plan reports a risk of further unknown costs to this project. Stadiums in general are loss making assets and V base has a history of making losses. The Convention Centre is a similar White Elephant.

Cost Share Agreement

Although the central government gave $300 million recently this was allocated largely to the rebuild of the arena. The then National government made the most of the rebuild to appear to be an effective government, taking more out of increased income tax on wages and GST than they put into rebuilding Christchurch. The mayor committed to renegotiating the cost share agreement in public but the only payment was immediately, largely allocated to the rugby union's stadium. More central government funding of Christchurch is yet to be fully achieved recovery is quite justified and should be expected.

Rates;

It seems that this year's plan is further descending the path of increasing fix charges. By increasing the use of fix rate charges rather than just capital charges, lowest valued homes see a much larger increase than the more costly homes. The people's republic of Christchurch for a long time resisted this sort of neoliberal slight of hand, a slight of hand to transfer costs from the well off to the poorer elements of society.

"Fixed charges that depend on the number of SUIPs (described above) - In total, the fixed charges paid by a typical household will increase from $390.32 to $324.71 – an increase of 11.8 per cent. - This includes an increase in the uniform annual general charge (UAGC) from $117.56 to $130 and an increase in the waste minimisation (wheelie bin) rate from $146.24 to $169.19."

An increase in fixed charges has a more significant impact on lower value properties, as the fixed charges make up a higher proportion of the overall total charge for rates. This means residential properties worth $500,000 or less will actually see a rates increase of more than 4.92 per cent. Even centers will carry a higher cost as landlords of lower priced homes try to recover the increase.

Rates can also be used to encourage the direction of economic decision making. The idea of charging greater rates for underutilized real-estate is growing internationally. The council should charge an empty home/property rate that is a significantly higher than for a fully occupied property.
Car parking areas rated at a higher level would also lead to a reassessment of future planning of these. Areas of land that are sealed over and used for car parking incur costs for the council, and society as a whole, and those costs should be recognised in the rates.

Transport

ECAN has been failing in establishing a strong locally directed public transport network. We would go farther and point out that transport decisions that are being made by New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and, as part of the cost share agreement, threaten to lock us into motorways and the private motor vehicle for years. It is really notable that the Northern Express was rejected more than once by the citizens of Otautahi but has been pushed through by NZTA while the people were distracted by the recovery. That is a great example of disaster or crisis opportunism. This expressway now requires a fine in the annual plan. As the decision was made by an agency of central government all costs should be paid by central government. If we are to meet the carbon budgets by 2030 this monstrous motorway will become stranded assets.

Koa’s position is:

1. The council should be prepared to spend a considerable effort on nudging attitude to transport within the city, encouraging walking, cycling and public transport.
2. There is a hierarchy of cost in the building of infrastructure for the various forms of transport. Transit reports that heavy trucks require a spend on road structure in the tune of 10s of thousands greater than that required for cars, and cars require more than that required for cycles. Most road users remain blissfully unaware of the costs which are not reflect in fuel tax or road user charges.
3. Christchurch City Council must reassess and pressure central government to shift the focus of transport away from the sunset technology of motorways and ever more road building to rail, light rail and buses, strongly complemented by cycling and walking.
4. Facilities for walking and cycling should have priority over motorways and road. Both cycling and walking would be further encouraged if the city could establish reduced speed limits in residential streets and close to institutions likely to generate much foot and cycle traffic.
5. The city council should have direct control of public transport in coordination with the district councils in the greater Christchurch area. The council should both own and control the infrastructure, the route planning and the vehicles.
6. Public transport should be free for users. It appears to be cheaper overall to have people use public transport than to indulge in a never ending round of motorway building.

Housing

KOA notes that the capital value of the housing stock drops by 99,2000 compared to the existing long term plan and spending by 2,638,000. These reductions are not acceptable.

Christchurch City Council has a long, proud history of providing affordable rental housing for families and tenants on low incomes in Christchurch. The plan proposes that only 2% of council spending is to be on housing and that all council rental housing activity is funded out of rents. Public rental housing with secure tenancy was one of the major policies that raised most indicators of wellbeing in our society after the first Labour Government. Public housing is not just about supplying housing to the very poor. Rather it is about housing in a way that allows the building of strong community.

KOA argues the council to increase spending on secure, decent rental housing. We emphasise that the council must reprioritise its long-term plan and make building council rental housing a top priority. The present trust model of delivery has failed and was setup under false assumptions. It is long time to reassess this model.

Given that climate change and sea level rise is almost certain the Council needs to be prepared to deal with the loss of housing that will represent, not so much to guarantee the market value of homes but to guarantee that decent, appropriate, affordable and secure housing is available in the west of the city, both building more council housing and working with central government to ensure that state housing is available.

“Affordable” housing in the private market is not really affordable for most of the citizens of Christchurch. Koa notes that project 8011 was in response to strong representations made in private by Property Council and Canterbury Employers Chamber of Commerce.

Red Zone

Given that climate change and sea level rise is almost certain, the council should be very cautious about spending on capital development in the red zone in the East of the city.

Central Bank and possible financial dangers

The RBNZ has said that OCR changes are not likely to be upwards in the near future. This has major implications for the draft plan and council finances as it signals a perceived weakness in the world economy. The plan should recognise this. It could imply lower interests for the council and a need to spend to stimulate the local economy.
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

If on behalf of an organisation or group, please provide the name:

Grassmere Residents

Your role in the organisation:

Helper

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?:

About 10

First Name: Ngaire

Last Name: Button

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

We are residents of Grassmere street on the fringe of the Crawford basin. We have been trying for many years to develop our land for residential use. Council have been good enough to support our inclusion within the urban boundary however we find ourselves unable to develop. We are asking the Council to include the Grassmere development into the annual plan/LTP. This is so that infrastructure can be paid for through development contributions. We would like the opportunity to come and explain our situation to you.
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Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

If on behalf of an organisation or group, please provide the name:

East lake Trust

Your role in the organisation:

Trustee

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?:

All Flatwater Users I

First Name: David

Last Name: Goodman

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Funding should be put aside to investigate future ownership options for the Red Zone and changes to the Draft Regenerate Plan to reduce maintenance and opex costs for Council. Regardless of whether the Red Zone becomes a Council Reserve or is owned by a trust, ultimate financial responsibility will likely fall to Council. Is the proposed storm water wetland solution in the Plan Council's preferred option? That said, the proposed lake does actually allow for the proposed storm water solution (see plan attached). The lake would occupy 70 hectares or 12% of...
Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 from Goodman, David organisation: East lake Trust behalf of: Trustee

the Red Zone and be self funding for opex and maintenance, as is the case for lake Hood and Lake Ruataniwha. Council should not continue to fund Regenerate. Millions have been spent to create a plan that does not even allow for the options on the Refined Short List to be built. It is a "Claytons" plan that makes any lake, any white water park (WOW) or Eden project an impossibility, because of the refusal to touch the LWRP. Just costly greenspace and wetland that Council will have to maintain. Council must act or inherit a financial millstone that will dog Council for generations.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190225_ELT_Altimate ODP_CLIENT REVIEW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Loons Club Inc of Lyttelton seek permission to submit a late submission to the Annual Plan process. We apologise for the lateness, key people were away until Monday this week. If a late submission is acceptable we wish to be heard at a council meeting.

Attached is our submission.

Kind regards,
Thea Mickell
Treasurer
The Loons Club Inc
Christchurch City Council Submission to Annual Plan

The committee of The Loons Club Inc of Lyttelton wish to submit a request to be heard at a CCC meeting to showcase 16 Canterbury Street a large multifaceted theatre in Lyttelton.

We are an Incorporated Society and Registered Charity of longstanding in our community and own a building built well over 100 years ago at 16 Canterbury Street. The venue itself has vast social history attached and played a vital role during the 1951 Watersiders Strikes.

During those long months of strike action, it was illegal to supply food to striking workers and their families. Like most communities in similar situation this law was ignored, and 16 Canterbury St was used as an illegal food distribution point for strikers and their families. Donations of food and necessities came from as far away as Australia. 16 Canterbury St also housed an illegal printing press and from there pamphlets were written, printed and distributed.

Those days are long gone of course, and the building was then used for key local groups including sports club. The Lyttelton Rugby Club and Netball club, amongst various other entities, called the building ‘home’.

During those years 16 Canterbury St remained as a hub for many community needs and activities. Meetings, fundraisers, birthdays, weddings, wakes, and other events took place in this iconic building. The writer recalls many conversations with the late Community Board Chair Christine Wilson, nee Mauger, nee Bachop where she recalled as a girl joining her Mother and Father (parents to All Blacks Graeme and Stephen Bachop) and committing to endless fundraisers for the local sports clubs. There are many surviving families still attached to these clubs in the main due to the communal ethics of the Lyttelton community.

Push forward to the years 2000-2010 and the building activities once again flourished this time in arts and theatre performance. During these years a theatre co. thrived, performed and adopted the Loons name. This theatre group is now branded as LAF and continue their excellent activities in a theatre attached to the local school. Our committee is hopeful some of the LAF productions/events will be more suited to 16 Canterbury venue. For example, their famous Burlesque evenings, or circo arts productions (the building has a fully engineered, high capacity Fly Tower), or perhaps their quiz evenings.

In 2010/2011, like many buildings, 16 Canterbury was hit hard. When the dust settled the committee embarked on a campaign to restore and improve the building. The desired intent and architectural design were determined in 2011 and continues today. Original QS figures showed the rebuilding costing $2,9ml.

Currently, the rebuild is more than ¾ complete and approximately $1,5ml has been raised via funding and insurance claims. The committee can confidently say the finished product will come in well under budget. At this time, we estimate a shortfall of approximately $400k.
Lyttelton, for some reason, produces over and above it’s fair share of famous names. From All Blacks to musicians, to artists, poets and authors...Lyttelton runs the full gambit.

We need help to push this project over the line so we can activate and contribute to the arts, Lyttleton and beyond.
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

If on behalf of an organisation or group, please provide the name:
External Advisory Group

Your role in the organisation:
Chair

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?
021427796

First Name: Garry
Last Name: Moore

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

I chaired the External Advisory Group which reported to the Mayor and elected Councillors last.

I would like to submit on the implementation of this report

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No records to display.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

If on behalf of an organisation or group, please provide the name:

Tuesday Club

Your role in the organisation:
Facilitator

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?:
hundreds

First Name: Garry
Last Name: Moore

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

It has not been possible for the Tuesday Club to consider the Annual Plan due to the last two weeks
Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 from Moore, Garry organisation: Tuesday Club behalf of: Facilitator post the terrorist attack. I will be able to make more detailed submissions after a group has met to consider alternative ideas.

Our submission will include commenting on:

- Capital Programmes how realistic are they;
- 3 Waters;
- Public goals in Annual Plan;
- Lack of transparency with finances;
- Culture of CCC;
- Horizontal infrastructure;
- S17A reviews;
- Operational expenditure;
- Other issues raised by Tuesday club attendees.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No records to display.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Sarah

Many thanks
John

Here is John Patterson’s submissions for the AP.

John wishes to remind the Council that he made a submission on the LTP last year and wishes to remind the Mayor and Councillors about it and to ask what progress has been made in the past year to implement an Aging Strategy.

Submission on CCC 2019 Annual Plan:

Positive Aging Strategy.

In May 2018, Peter Beck and I made a verbal submission of the Positive Aging Strategy. A transcript of our submission is attached.

We would again like to make a further verbal submission at this year's Annual Plan hearings.

As part of understanding the current status of the Council's re the formulation and adoption of a Positive Aging Strategy, I would appreciate written advice as to what relevant actions have been taken by Council since our submission in 2018.

I confirm that Peter Beck and I will attend the hearings and we are likely to be accompanied by others who have similar concerns to ensure a Positive Aging Strategy is adopted.

Yours sincerely

John Patterson
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Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Joy

Last Name: Burt

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Thank you for continuing funding for additional cycleways.

I note in the plan $3.8 million allocated for the south-west leisure centre. As part of this funding I
Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 from Burt, Joy

request serious consideration be given to a hydrotherapy pool suitable for adults. I was delighted to hear of one at QEII but am excessively disappointed with the outcome. Staff obviously did not visit the Burwood Hospital pool, consult with physiotherapists, or look at the terrific facility provided by Selwyn District Council in the Rolleston Aquatic Centre. The QEII pool is nothing but a learner’s pool as it is too shallow to swim a length in - your hands hit the bottom of the pool over a third of the distance and it is only waist deep at the "deep" end. Obviously no research was undertaken by staff about the requirements for hydrotherapy.

How does any adult with neck, arm or shoulder problems exercise in such a shallow pool? There are no handrails for stability with leg exercises for those with balance difficulties. With an ageing population there will be an increasing need for such facilities. As a person with arthritis the warmth of the water enables stiff joints to loosen enough to be able to move in a way I cannot in any other environment. I feel Christchurch City Council ratepayers should not have to travel to a neighbouring local authority to use their facilities which are very busy.

Thank you for reading this submission.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No records to display.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Kevin  Last Name: Lamb

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

Lack of response for submission to 2018-2028 Long Term Plan

Attached Documents

File
| File | No records to display. |
Are you submitting as an individual or as an organisation?
- Individual
- Organisation/Group

First Name: Drucilla
Last Name: Kingi Patterson

Do you wish to present your submission at a hearing? (If yes, you must provide contact details above)
- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views. You can upload supporting documents below.

zero carbin bisecurity archive for planning community events and film projects.

Attached Documents

File
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If Auckland were to host the 2030 Commonwealth Games (they are spending 4 billion on Infrastructure), what benefit would it be to Christchurch and South Island?

If not this event they will host others events eg American Cup, Rugby

What would be our biggest Risk be - Terrorism & Natural Disaster

How could we promote Canterbury what key structures and safe guards need to be put in place.

Could Canterbury Cope

We need the New Stadium in Christchurch for Economic Development and Sport Development
We need the Aquarum back in Cathedral Square 2m

We need after hour health service Rangiora 2m
We need after hour health service Selwyn 2m
We need maternity health Care Burwood 2m

We need zero carbon a bio security Archie at Christchurch Airport 4m

We also need these to cope with Public Community Health due to population growth and ageing population increase, plus the high risk of terrorism and natural disaster.

These healthcare services must provide additional medical beds for civil defence, isolation wards.
To reduce long term workload of sending people home or to populated rest homes is not a Solution.
Drucilla Kingi-Pallister

ToA - zero carbon & bio security Archive
My role is to determine what is required for my own peace of mind, having extended family living all over Canterbury. I personally have not felt safe since 2011 earthquakes and worry about family and workmates. I was also caught up 15 March 2019 Attack.
We need to provide a safe working and living environment.
To come up with a Strategic Plan of Action.

To seek and work with government, NGO and councils to make it happen.

To seek and work with community groups, schools and public to make it happen.

Long term to
- develop events that engage the public
- to promote health
- to establish a economic film unit
- to promote zero carbon and bio security
- to develop film in Canterbury and South Island
- to establish the Archive
- for film week
- to run events
- to promote good policy in zero carbon planning and bio security
- to promote youth emergency management training
- to promote emergency management training
- to train youth for work in construction and related Industries
- to attract investment in Canterbury and Aotearoa.

"To have Fun"
SUBMISSION TO CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN
2019-2020

Water Rates, Land Drainage Rates and Sewerage Rates should be on usage for water and the other 2 on a UAC, I get the feeling that by you using Capital Value as your method that you are thinking that the higher valued properties have the ability to pay.

Council Debt. Your Debt Servicing Performance Benchmark is in serious danger of exceeding your stated level if costs are under estimated.

Asset Sale. Nearly $5 million is planned. What are you selling?

Anglican Cathedral. By doing this to me you are funding the under insured and leave the door open for more funding.

Roads and Footpaths. If the floors in Council buildings were in the same state of disrepair as the roads and footpaths that we have to use your staff would walk out for Health and Safety reasons. Cheap patchwork style of repair work is being done. Some holes in Jacksons, 1 was patched 2 others very close by (within 2 to 3 metres) were not touched. Be proactive. The use of bricks and stones to stop parking on the verges has to be stopped. Clifford Ave is a good example, Cars parked opposite each other reduce the road to one way traffic. Garden Road is a road that has been rebuilt and is narrow again parking and a 1 lane issue. The road surface on Clifford Ave is appalling. Shock Absorber replacement business are enjoying their increasing work.

Council Vehicles. Only staff who are on call should take vehicles home at night. Will be a saving on FBT. Size of Building Inspectors cars. It is not necessary for them to have a larger station waggon. Except for the Banks Peninsular. On
taking vehicles home a temporary Building Inspector the Council car was at his home for 2 weeks while he was on holiday.

New Council owned buildings (finished and proposed). Council should be open to the ratepayers and tell them what each of these buildings annual cost will be.

The Town Hall
The Convention Centre
The City Centre Library
The Events Centre
The Stadium.

I raise these buildings because there are a lot of Ratepayers who struggle to pay or get assistance to pay their rates without further increasing their burden. Stadiums the world over do not make money.

Lime Scooters. Get rid of them. They are a danger to the riders, road users and footpath users.

Councils country wide should demand from Government that Electric cars and Hybrid cars have a Road User Tax something similar to the tax diesel vehicles pay.

Your maintenance savings plan for the houses that you own is totally wrong as it will cost you more in future years as you will be in catchup mode.

Funding for Councillor Training. More needed to train them in their role of what they can and can not get involved in, and how to communicate to constituents.

I wish to be heard.