

## Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Submissions Committee MINUTES ATTACHMENTS

---

**Date:** Monday 29 March 2021  
**Time:** 10.30am  
**Venue:** Horoeke Room, Rārākau: Riccarton Centre,  
199 Clarence Street, Christchurch

---

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>3 Christchurch City Council's Draft Long Term Plan 2021-31 - Board Submission</b>	
A. Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Draft Long Term Plan 2021-2031 - Board Submission.....	3
<b>4 Christchurch City Council's Draft Development Contributions Policy 2021 - Board Feedback</b>	
A. Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Draft Development Contributions Policy 2021 - Board Submission .....	9
<b>5 Draft Ōtautahi Christchurch Climate Change Strategy</b>	
A. Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Draft Ōtautahi Christchurch Climate Change Strategy 2021 - Board Submission.....	13

---



Waipuna/Halswell Hornby Riccarton Community Board

Submission to the Christchurch City Council Draft Long Term Plan 2021-31

1. Introduction

1.1. The Waipuna Halswell Hornby Riccarton Community Board ("the Board") appreciates the opportunity to submit on the Draft Long Term Plan 2021-31 ("LTP").

1.2. The Board would like to speak to its submission.

2. Board Plan Priorities

2.1. The Board brings to attention the following priorities that it agreed at the start of this term through its Board Plan and asks that Council prioritise these projects.

2.1.1. Local road network improvements in the Halswell

Residents in Westmorland have asked for better connections to their surrounding areas by means other than by car – specifically the Board requests that resource is given to developing the connection from Westmorland to the recently completed Sparks Road Wetland.

2.1.2. Hornby Centre – Project delivery and increased budget

The Board and the Hornby community has been anticipating the Hornby Centre (a new library and leisure centre complex) for a number of years and are excited that the construction is about to get underway on the east side of Kyle Park. The Board is grateful for the funding in the LTP that will see this project completed by late 2022. The Board asks, however, escalation that provision be include in the LTP for escalation costs to be applied to the existing Hornby Centre budget.

As the Hornby Centre is progressed, it is vital that safe and reliable linkages exist to enable safe passage to and from this important new venue, particularly for those using active transport modes. In addition, it will be important to ensure the wider Kyle Park infrastructure, environment and transport linkages are fully investigated, consulted, and/or developed, along with the surrounding areas. The Board therefore seeks that there be an investigation undertaken as soon as possible into the extension of Chalmers Street through Kyle Park to Hei.

2.1.3. Local Road Network Improvements in Hornby

The Board brings to the attention of Council the ongoing inefficiencies of the present Shands/Amyes/Springs/Awatea link need urgent attention. Localised spot flooding on this corridor can create traffic congestion that impacts on the functionality of the local and wider roading network.

2.1.4. Develop connections between the Al Noor Mosque and Hagley Park

The Board requests that attention be given to the installation of safe crossing points from Al Noor Mosque to Hagely Park (i.e. a pedestrian crossing)

2.1.5. Complete the Bradshaw Terrace Street renewal

The Board continues to be disappointed that Bradshaw Terrace, a short cul-de-sac in Riccarton, has not been added back in to the street renewals programme. Over the past few years, the Board has tracked the street's initial inclusion, its rescheduling in the long Term Plan 2018-21 and now its exclusion from the forward programme. This work is identified as a priority in the Community Board Plan 2020-22.

Consultation on this project was completed just before the 2010 earthquakes but the work was subsequently deferred. While those were exceptional times, the Board notes that it was most unusual for an included project to be removed entirely in the first three years of a Plan especially without the residents or the Board being informed at the time. The Board therefore believes that the Council has a moral obligation to fix-up this very minor road.

Bradshaw Terrace is the sole remaining street in the cluster of local renewal projects completed before the earthquakes.

The Board therefore strongly submits that the Council should accept the reinstatement of Bradshaw Terrace back into the renewals programme to honour a previous commitment.

### 3. General Comments

#### 3.1. Rates

- 3.1.1. The Board understands the financial constraints the Council is operating under and that efforts have been made to curb rates rises. It is aware, however, that in the current financial climate residents are also operating under financial constraints and many are experiencing difficulty meeting the increasing demands on their financial resources.
- 3.1.2. In principle the Board does not support the proposal in the LTP for an average residential rates increase of five percent for the 2021/2022 rating year and an overall rates increase of four percent over the next ten years. The Board suggests that a better approach would be for rates increases to be linked to other external measures such as the Construction Price Index.
- 3.1.3. The Board is generally disappointed that a five percent reduction is proposed for community and grants programmes in the first year of the plan. While the Board understands the need for the Council to reduce its spending it does not accept that this is an area where there should be any reduction. The effects of the response to the Covid 19 virus has hit many not for profit, groups, volunteers and the communities they serve hard and any reduction in Council grants would have a disproportionately negative effect. The Board therefore opposes this proposal.
- 3.1.4. The Board notes that the Council's Draft Development Contributions Policy 2021 is currently out for consultation and suggests that the level of contributions under this policy could significantly affect the level of rates.

#### 3.2. Proposed changes to existing rates and new targeted rates

3.2.1. Excess Water targeted rates for households

The Board opposes the proposal to introduce an excess water use charge for households that use more than 700 litres of water per day.

The Board considers that setting a per household “limit” for water is inequitable and could result in large households’ legitimate water use for daily activities such as bathing and washing clothes being constrained while neighbouring small households are free to squander water.

The Board fully supports the Council’s aim to limit water use at peak demand times and to reduce water wastage, however it considers that this aim could be more equitably achieved by other means including public education which is already in place *and by focussing on water leakages across the city before any consideration of water rates (see 2.3)*. The Board is mindful also of the monitoring, collection and enforcement costs that would necessarily be attached the introduction of excess water use charges, *noting that in cases of multiple units that share a water meter separate meters will need to be installed*.

3.2.2. Land Drainage Targeted Rate

The Board shares the concerns of its Halswell residents regarding the proposed Council land drainage charge changes, noting that residents in the Halswell River Rating District currently pay an Environment Canterbury charge for land drainage. The proposed Land Drainage Targeted Rate could have an unintended consequence for these residents and possibly others in the city having to pay twice.

3.3. Investing in upgrading and protecting our city’s water networks

3.3.1. The Board supports the Council’s ongoing investment in the city’s water networks, particularly as it goes to addressing leakage and water wastage from the system, and with a view to getting as soon as possible to a position where chlorination is no longer necessary. The Board also records its opposition to any proposal for fluoridation of the water supply.

3.3.2. With regard to investment in addressing leakage and water wastage the Board wishes to draw attention to the longstanding flooding issues in Goulding Avenue, Hornby and asks that provision be made to address this problem without delay.

3.4. Investing in transport infrastructure

3.4.1. The Board acknowledges the importance of the Council’s investment in transport infrastructure as a priority to provide safe networks for all forms of transport and to better provide for a range of transport options that reduce carbon emissions including public transport.

3.5. Park and Ride Facilities

- 3.5.1. The Board considers that the distance many residents need to travel to access reliable passenger transport services is a hindrance to them changing from private motor vehicle use to buses. The Board suggests that the answer lies in the provision of park and ride facilities in association with passenger transport improvements that are being made and asks that this be provided for in the plan for the next ten years, particularly in the high population growth areas such as South West Christchurch.

3.6. Major Cycle Routes

- 3.6.1. The Board is aware that concept designs have been completed and approved by the Council for some of these as yet to start significant projects. The Board is aware, however, of some continued local opposition to aspects of the design for the South Express MCR. The specific areas concerned are Gilberthorpes Road/Waterloo Road/Hei Hei Road in Hei Hei/Islington, and the Lochee Road/Elizabeth Street route sections through Riccarton. The Board would request that these residual issues are considered and addressed by the Council so that what is eventually built, is acceptable to the impacted areas and fit for purpose for all travel modes and road users.

- 3.6.2. The Board notes that the Major Cycle Routes programme has been a hot topic for residents during LTP engagement, with many questioning the need to spend as much as is programmed given the financial constraints faced by Council. The Board suggests that a pause is taken, after the 'shovel ready' projects are completed, to see if the MCR programme remains affordable.

3.7. Rubbish, recycling and organics

- 3.7.1. The Board supports the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan that focusses on changing the 'throw-away' culture and reducing the amount of waste sent to landfill. In recognition of Christchurch being the Garden City of New Zealand the Board also supports its residents' requests for changes to the Bin recycling system to provide an option for residents to dispose of more green waste without incurring additional costs.

3.8. Our facilities

- 3.8.1. The Board is very conscious of the importance of our facilities to our communities and appreciates the funding proposed in the LTP for the provision, repair and maintenance of these. The Board accepts that it is important that best use is made of available funds and that where appropriate changes in levels of service should be made.

3.8.2. Riccarton Bus Lounge

The Board is astounded by the proposal to remove the Bus Lounges from Riccarton Road given the recent reports to the Board strongly promoting the benefits of these.

Riccarton Road is a bus route and the Lounge facilities complement the 24/7 bus lanes and makes the use of public transport a more viable, attractive and safe option for many people. The Board notes the proposed removal will necessitate dealing with the

leases for the premises that have expiry dates of 2025 and 2026 with no guarantees of these being able to be sublet in the current climate.

The Board considers that the removal is short sighted and urges the Council to reconsider.

### 3.8.3. Wharenuī Pool Closure

The Board is concerned by the proposed closure of the Wharenuī Pool when the new metro facility opens. This Pool has a long history and is important to local residents, clubs, schools and community. While the Board understands the economies of consolidating use of other pools in the city it is concerned that this will not adequately meet the needs of many local families, schools and groups in areas of high social deprivation that really need to be able to walk their children to a pool. With this in mind the Board asks that the Council continues to explore all avenues to allow the pool to continue operating.

### 3.9. Our heritage, foreshore and parks

3.9.1. The Board recognises Christchurch's history of protecting and respecting the city's heritage and supports the Council's proposed investment in this trusting that economies will be incorporated where possible. In this regard the Board seeks, however, to have the proposed restoration of the Mona Vale Bathhouse advanced.

3.9.2. Likewise the Board supports proposed investment in foreshore and parks that are important to the city and its way of life.

3.9.3. The Board notes that there is provision in the LTP for the refurbishment of Wycola Skate Park in 2026 (CMPS 61794) but given the poor condition of the facilities the Board asks that changes be made for this project to commence earlier.

### 3.9.4. Funding for the Arts Centre Te Matatiki Toi Ora

The Board supports the proposal to provide the Arts Centre with a capital grant of \$5.5 million via a targeted rate that would recover the grant cost over ten years, phased in over two years to carry out remaining restoration work. The Board regards the Arts Centre as an asset for the city so supports its restoration being paid for by all ratepayers.

### 3.9.5. Funding for base isolation of the Robert McDougall Art Gallery

The Board supports the base isolation of Robert McDougall Art Gallery at a cost of \$11.8 million as a key part of the Canterbury Museum's redevelopment noting that this will result in an additional 0.07 per cent rates increase.

The board considers it important that the building is reinstated for use for its intended purpose.

### 3.9.6. Potential disposal of surplus Council owned properties

The Board supports in principle the disposal of properties that are surplus to the Council's requirements. With regard to the properties in Hasketts Road identified in the LTP the Board would like to see preference being given to disposal of the land for activities compatible with motor sport.

The Board cautions against disposal of property for which there is or could be a current or future community use. In this category the Board supports the restoration of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall. Additionally the Board seeks the retention of approximately one third of the land in Quaiffes Road, Halswell identified as surplus to meet future community needs in this fast growing area.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1. The Board requests that the council considers the matters set out above in relation to the Draft Long Term Plan 2021-31.



Debbie Mora

CHAIRPERSON Waipuna Halswell Hornby Riccarton Community Board Submissions Committee



Mike Mora

CHAIRPERSON Waipuna Halswell Hornby Riccarton Community Board

Dated 13 April 2021



**SUBMISSION TO:** Christchurch City Council  
**ON:** Draft Development Contributions Policy 2021  
**BY:** Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board  
**CONTACT:** Matthew Pratt  
Community Governance Manager  
matthew.pratt@ccc.govt.nz

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board ("the Board") appreciates the opportunity to give feedback make a submission on the Council's Draft Development Contributions Policy 2021 ("the Policy").
- 1.2. This submission was compiled by the Board's Submission Committee under the delegated authority granted by the Board.
- 1.3. The Board wishes to be heard in support of its submission.

## 2. SUBMISSION

- 2.1. The Board recognises the importance of development contributions to funding new and improved infrastructure necessary for the growth of Christchurch.
- 2.2. The Board notes that Greater Christchurch population expected to be about 640,000 by 2048 with 86,000 homes needing to be planned for with the majority of these being in Christchurch. It is therefore necessary to get the policy for development contributions right.

## 3. COMMENTS

- 3.1. Development Contributions
  - 3.1.1. The Board considers it fair that property developers pay a fair share of the cost of providing infrastructure that supports growth so that ratepayers are not overly burdened. Requiring developers to pay a contribution to the cost of provision of additional or new infrastructure necessitated by their development ensures that beneficiaries of the investment pay a fair share of the cost that would otherwise fall on the Council.
- 3.2. Use of catchments to calculate development contributions
  - 3.2.1. The Board notes that under current policy development contributions are calculated at a catchment level for road transport, neighbourhood parks and stormwater and flood

protection and that the Policy proposes to extend the use of catchments for Water supply, Wastewater collection, Wastewater treatment and disposal, and Public and active transport. The Board supports the use of catchments as proposed as it considers that this ensures the development contributions charged are aligned to the cost of providing infrastructure to service growth in each part of the district so that the beneficiaries of the services are paying for it.

3.3. Use of a maximum charge or cap to keep development contribution charges in smaller communities

3.3.1. As indicated above at 3.2.1 the Board supports the use of catchments as proposed so that the costs of infrastructure and services are borne by the beneficiaries of those. The Board therefore does not support the use of a cap to keep development contribution charges in smaller communities lower.

3.4. Development contributions for community infrastructure

3.4.1. The Board supports the use of development contributions to recover the costs of providing future growth capacity for facilities such as swimming pools, sports centres, libraries and cemeteries, noting that this reverts to the situation that applied prior to 2014.

3.4.2. The Board further supports the proposal that business developments are assessed for development contributions for community infrastructure as well as residential developments. The Board considers that this is appropriate given that community facilities are frequently used by the employees of businesses who may not live in the area.

3.5. Reserve development contributions for non-residential developments

3.5.1. The Board agrees with the proposal that non-residential developments be required to pay development contributions for reserve infrastructure as it is likely business development will place some demand on reserves.

3.5.2. The Board accepts that given the difficulty in accurately assess this demand it is appropriate for business developments to be assessed as being one household unit equivalent for each development.

3.6. Neighbourhood parks in infill areas

- 3.6.1. The Board supports the proposal in the Policy to introduce a 'medium density infill' catchment for the neighbourhood parks activity in the Long Term Plan, which mirrors the medium density and transitional residential zones in the District Plan. The Board recognises that this will enable investment in neighbourhood parks in areas of the city where there is infill growth that would be funded from developments in those areas.
- 3.6.2. The Board accepts that this provide funds for investment in existing parks as a cost-effective way to meet growing community needs without the need to acquire additional land for parks.

3.7. Small residential unit adjustment

- 3.7.1. The Board does not agree that small residential units should receive a reduction in the development contribution charge based on an assumed lower than average demand on infrastructure. The Board is not convinced that smaller units do in fact relate to a lower than average demand on infrastructure.
- 3.7.2. While the Board accepts that the current policy provides for a small residential unit adjustment to be applied to residential units with a gross floor area of less than 100 square metres it does not support this going forward.

3.8.

We

- 3.8.1. The Board notes that the Development Contribution is lowered for central city and medium density development and notes that this contribution is at the same level. The Board suggests that the development contribution level for suburban medium density be higher than for the central city.
- 3.8.2. If Council is serious about creating a vibrant central city, it needs to encourage residential development there. If it equalises the payment with medium density in the suburbs, e.g. Riccarton Hornby Linwood etc. it will defeat the goal of creating a vibrant central city residential development, as developers tend to go to medium density in the suburbs rather than provide units in the central city. It is easier and cheaper.

4. CONCLUSION

- 4.1. The Board requests that the council considers the matters set out above in relation to the Draft Development Contributions Policy 2021.



Debbie Mora

Chairperson Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Submissions Committee



Mike Mora

Chairperson Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board

Dated 13 April 2021

**SUBMISSION TO:** Christchurch City Council  
**ON:** Draft Ōtautahi Christchurch Climate Change Strategy 2021  
**BY:** Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board  
**CONTACT:** Matthew Pratt  
Community Governance Manager  
matthew.pratt@ccc.govt.nz

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board ("the Board") appreciates the opportunity to give feedback on the Council's Draft Draft Ōtautahi Christchurch Climate Change Strategy 2021 ("the Strategy").
- 1.2. This submission was compiled by the Board's Submission Committee under the delegated authority granted by the Board.
- 1.3. The Board wishes to be heard in support of its submission.

## 2. SUBMISSION

- 2.1. The Board recognises that climate change is an immense challenge facing us at this time. It is a global issue with local impacts and the Board strongly believe that the challenge will only be effectively met through collaborative partnerships that focus on developing solutions.
- 2.2. The Board supports the four goals set out in the Strategy.
- 2.3. Additionally, the Board anticipates that the population of the SouthWest area will increase as residents retreat from coastal areas, therefore the Board asks that Council turns its attention to these matters and plans ahead for the relevant and required infrastructure.

## 3. COMMENTS

- 3.1. Programme 1: Building the foundation - partnerships and resourcing
  - 3.1.1. The Board believes that locally, partnerships need to be formed with central government and The Canterbury Regional Council (ECAN) to tackle this global matter. It will not be solved by Christchurch City Council working alone.
- 3.2. Programme 7: Low-emission transport system
  - 3.2.1. The Board believes that options for effective and efficient mass transit systems for the greater Christchurch area need to be investigated.

3.3. Programme 10: Sustainable food system

3.3.1. The Board supports this programme, however, asks that high quality versatile soils close to the city are protected – this may involve revisiting the District Plan.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1. The Board requests that the council considers the matters set out above in relation to the Draft Draft Ōtautahi Christchurch Climate Change Strategy 2021.



Debbie Mora

Chairperson Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Submissions Committee



Mike Mora

Chairperson Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board

Dated 13 April 2021