

**Briefing – Council**  
**Draft Annual Plan 2022-23**  
**AGENDA**

---

**Notice of Briefing:**

Briefing - Council will be held on:

**Date:** Wednesday 25 May 2022  
**Time:** 9.30am  
**Venue:** Council Chambers, Civic Offices,  
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

The briefing will be broadcast live: <http://councillive.ccc.govt.nz/live-stream>

---

**Membership**

Chairperson	Mayor Lianne Dalziel
Deputy Chairperson	Deputy Mayor Andrew Turner
Members	Councillor Jimmy Chen
	Councillor Catherine Chu
	Councillor Melanie Coker
	Councillor Pauline Cotter
	Councillor Mike Davidson
	Councillor Celeste Donovan
	Councillor Anne Galloway
	Councillor James Gough
	Councillor Yani Johanson
	Councillor Aaron Keown
	Councillor Sam MacDonald
	Councillor Phil Mauger
	Councillor Jake McLellan
	Councillor Tim Scandrett
	Councillor Sara Templeton

---

**24 May 2022**

**Principal Advisor**

Dawn Baxendale  
Chief Executive  
Tel: 941 6996

[www.ccc.govt.nz](http://www.ccc.govt.nz)

**Please Note:**

**This forum has no decision making powers and is purely for the purpose of information sharing.**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. **Apologies** ..... 2  
At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.
2. **Declarations of Interest Ngā Whakapuaki Aronga** ..... 2  
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.

## BRIEFING ITEMS

3. **Draft Annual Plan 2022-23** ..... 3

### 3. Draft Annual Plan 2022-23

Reference Te Tohutoro: 22/642021

Peter Ryan, Head of Performance Management,  
peter.ryan@ccc.govt.nz

Presenter(s) Te kaupāhō :

Lynn McClelland, Assistant Chief Executive Strategic Policy and  
Planning, lynn.mcclelland@ccc.govt.nz

#### 1. Detail Te Whakamahuki

<b>Timing</b>	This briefing is expected to run from 9:30am to 5:00pm.
<b>Origin of Briefing</b>	<p>Following on from the success of the public Council briefings for the draft Annual Plan, which placed an increased emphasis on transparency, this briefing was requested by Councillors.</p> <p>The briefing builds on the now completed community consultation and hearings process carried out through March, April and May, with advice and updates from staff regarding the standalone consultations, financial parameters, operational and capital budgets.</p> <p>The Annual Plan adoption meeting is scheduled for 21<sup>st</sup> June 2022.</p>
<b>Key Issues</b>	<p>The agenda for the briefing is as follows – Presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes arising from community consultation, residents survey (the Thematic Analysis of submissions can be found in Attachment A)</li> <li>• Financial parameters – inflation, interest rates, rates growth, risks.</li> <li>• Operational expenditure (opex) changes</li> <li>• Guidance on Standalone Consultations</li> <li>• Capital expenditure (capex) changes</li> <li>• Councillor proposals</li> <li>• Amendments process</li> <li>• Conclusion</li> <li>• Next Steps</li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Date TBC – Final briefing, staff advice on issues raised</li> <li>• 19 – 29 May – Amendments from Elected Members</li> <li>• Fri 3 June – Collate final Annual Plan documents</li> <li>• Wed 8 June – ELT meeting</li> <li>• Thu 9 June – ARMC agenda released</li> <li>• Wed 15 June – ARMC meeting</li> <li>• Thu 16 June – Council agenda released</li> <li>• Tue 21 June – Council meeting to adopt final Annual Plan</li> </ul>
<b>Key points / background</b>	<p>The briefing is for discussion and guidance – it is not a formal decision-making forum. The aim is to discuss matters in an open setting to encourage healthy, informed debate.</p>

	This will inform Councillor proposals and amendments to the draft, and staff preparation for the final Annual Plan 2022-23.
--	---

## Attachments Ngā Tāpirihanga

No.	Title	Page
A  	Thematic Analysis of Submissions	5

## Signatories / Ngā Kaiwaitohu

<b>Authors</b>	Peter Ryan - Head of Performance Management Boyd Kedzlie - Senior Business Analyst
<b>Approved By</b>	Peter Ryan - Head of Performance Management Lynn McClelland - Assistant Chief Executive Strategic Policy and Performance

# Annual Plan 2022 - 2023

## Submissions Thematic Analysis

Prepared by Monitoring & Research

May 2022

### **How to use this document**

The purpose of this document is not to provide analysis on everything that submitters commented on, but rather to provide a summary of key topics and issues identified by a number of submitters.

The analysis is based on the opinions of submitters, whether they are factually correct or not.

The first part of this report provides an overview of the key themes and messages that have come through in submissions, and the latter provides detailed submissions analysis for some of the topics and issues that were most popular with submitters.

## Key Messages

This year submitters again provided us with detailed and well considered feedback. They responded to the questions we posed, and provided valuable feedback on our game plan.

Submitters highlighted the financial pressures that households are facing currently, and will likely continue to face into the foreseeable future. Many indicated that they were pleased to see the rates increase below what we had signalled in the LTP, however there was a general sense from many that they would like to see us look to reduce our spending further where we can to lessen the burden on households. Others signalled that they would be concerned if we looked to reduce rates further at the jeopardy of important projects and work programmes.

With this in mind, overall the feedback from submitters generally indicated that would like us to take a balanced approach, reducing our spending and the impacts on households where we can but not to the point where we need to sacrifice work and projects that our residents place value in to cut costs.

Residents in the east are feeling increasingly frustrated by our spending on things perceived as “nice to haves” when they feel that they are continuously having to fight to get investment in some of the basics. Submissions received from submitters in the east came with a sense of frustration that we appear to have forgotten about them when they are still waiting to see improvement in the condition and maintenance of infrastructure (particularly transport infrastructure) across many suburbs in the east of the city.

A number of submitters from Bromley also expressed their frustration with the ongoing challenges and issues that they face following the fire at the Waste Water Treatment Plant. Many highlighted that they would like to see us providing more support to residents in this area instead of signalling further rates increases when we are yet to resolve issues having significant impacts on their day to day lives.

Continuing to improve the condition of our assets and infrastructure was a theme that we saw across many topics and issues raised by submitters. While it was particularly prominent in submissions on our transport infrastructure and our planned spend in this area, it also featured in other areas such as parks, three waters and community facilities. There was a sense that some submitters were beginning to see the progress that they would like to see and encouraged us to continue to prioritise this area, however a number of submitters highlighted that we still have some way to go to reach the condition that our residents are expecting. Submissions this year highlighted that our residents really do expect us to get the basics right.

Our approach to climate action was a focus for some submitters, and while most were supportive of what we are doing already, most thought that we could still be doing more. There was a general consensus from these submitters that we need to get serious about prioritising climate action and mitigation and making it clear that they would like to see it embedded in all that we do.

A number of submitters also commented on city planning issues, highlighting concerns about the impacts of our continued growth. Whether it is the impacts of the new Medium Density Residential Standards or the impacts that continuing Greenfield growth will have on both the built and natural environment, there is a sense of apprehension about what continued growth means for our current residents.

Submissions on our tree canopy echoed this sentiment, submitters could see the need to provide homes for our growing population, but do not want to see this happening at the expense of our tree canopy. Others highlighted the role that our tree canopy will need to play in mitigating the impacts of climate change, particularly from the perspective of providing shade and cooling.

As with the LTP, we were once again reminded of the value that residents place on local facilities. Submissions on the Edgware pool highlighted the importance of this facility to the community, with many submitters telling us of their memories of summers spent at the pool and learning to swim there. Submitters

once again told us that we should not undervalue the service and sense of community provided by smaller, local facilities.

Submissions received on future uses for the land at 129 Gloucester Street also reiterated the importance of a range of facilities to meet a range of needs. Many of these submitters supported using the land for a community-led performing arts space, which would provide a more informal space than what is already in and what is planned for the rest of the performing arts precinct. These submitters indicated that they were pleased to see the Council abandon plans for a car park on this land, but were clear that any future use should be for performing arts. This community is extremely motivated to work with the Council to achieve the best possible outcome and use of the land.

Finally, while our residents are happy to provide us with feedback there was some feedback from them that we could make it easier to do so. While some submitters acknowledged that we have made good changes since last year, others feel that the documentation we provide is still hard and cumbersome to navigate which makes it hard for them to provide us with meaningful feedback. The message was clear that if we want our residents to engage, they want us to enable them to do so in an informed and meaningful way.

## Who did we hear from?

Community Board	Number of Submitters	%* of Submitters
Not Stated	182	36%
Banks Peninsula	13	3%
Coastal – Burwood	24	5%
Halswell – Hornby – Riccarton	73	14%
Fendalton – Waimairi – Harewood	43	9%
Linwood – Central – Heathcote	53	10%
Papanui – Innes	104	21%
Spreydon - Cashmere	12	2%

Ward	Number of Submitters	%* of Submitters
Not Stated	182	36%
Banks Peninsula	13	3%
Burwood	13	3%
Cashmere	7	1%
Central	32	6%
Coastal	11	2%
Fendalton	32	6%
Halswell	61	12%
Harewood	4	1%
Heathcote	8	2%
Hornby	10	2%
Innes	97	19%
Linwood	13	3%
Papanui	7	1%
Riccarton	2	0.4%
Spreydon	5	1%
Waimairi	7	1%

\*Proportion is calculated on the total number of submissions received before 23 April. Any received after this date have not been included in this analysis.

## Who did we hear from?

### Number of Submitters by Age Group

Age	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated	183	35%
Under 18 years	2	0.4%
18 – 24 years	15	3%
25 – 34 years	60	12%
35 – 49 years	99	19%
50 – 64 years	82	16%
65 years and over	75	15%

### Number of Submitters by Gender

Gender	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated	198	38%
Male	137	26%
Female	179	35%
Gender Diverse	2	0.4%

### Number of Submitters by Ethnicity

Gender	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
NZ European	265	52%
Maori	20	4%
Pacific Peoples	8	1%
Asian	12	2%
Middle Eastern, Latin American & African	4	0.8%
Other European	36	7%
Other	20	4%

## Rates

### Residential Rates (140 Submissions)

Submitters were divided on the residential rates proposal, 62 submitters indicated that they support our proposal, 62 opposed and 24 provided other views or proposals.

Submitters who supported our residential rates proposal tended to fall into two groups:

- a. Those who appreciate that we have made an effort to keep any rates increases as low as possible, noting appreciation that the overall increase has come in below what we signalled in the Long Term Plan
- b. Those who are conscious that to continue to make progress across a range of council programmes and projects, some level of rates increase is going to be required. In this case submitters tended to indicate that they would rather see a rates rise than projects stall.

Those who opposed largely signalled that households are already under increasing pressure with the rising cost of living, and a further increase to their rates is going to add additional pressure. Some feel that their rates continue to increase but they do not see any additional benefits or services. There was a general sense among these submitters that Council should be looking for more ways to reduce our spending, as opposed to passing on increasing costs to rate payers through rates rises.

### Special Topic | Proposal to increase rates on vacant central city land (69 Submissions)

#### Should Council introduce the City Vacant Differential rate within the Central City Business and South Frame zones?

Submitters were divided on the proposal to increase rates of vacant central city land in these areas. While the majority (46 submitters) indicated that they supported the introduction of a new "City Vacant" differential, twelve submitters signalled that they did not support the proposal and thirteen provided other views or proposals in their feedback.

Those who supported the introduction of the new differential highlighted the positive impacts it would have, including encouraging land owners to maintain and look after their vacant land to an appropriate standard, incentivising land owners to develop their land, and generally improving the overall look and feel and perceptions of our central city.

Submitters who opposed the introduction tended to be from our business and development communities, highlighting in their submissions the challenges involved in redeveloping the city post-quake. There was a sense from these submitters that treating vacant land and derelict buildings differently unfairly penalises the owners of vacant land. Some noted that they feel a more constructive approach would be for the council to proactively work with property owners on other incentives to get these sites developed, as opposed to taking a punitive approach.

#### Should Council introduce a remission to offset the City Vacant Differential Rate impact where owners improve the appearance of their vacant sites?

The majority of submitters supported introducing a remission to offset the City Vacant Differential Rate impact where owners improve the appearance of their vacant sites. Seventeen submitters opposed this proposal and ten provided other views or proposals in their submission.

Those who supported the proposal generally felt that it would further incentivise owners of vacant central city land to improve the appearance of their vacant sites and potentially consider working with local groups and organisations on temporary uses for the land. It was noted by some submitters who supported the proposal that we need to balance rewarding vacant land owners taking steps to maintain and improve their vacant sites with the overarching goal of seeing development begin on these sites.

Those who oppose the proposed remission tended to just generally indicate that they didn't support the proposal. Some of these submitters were of the opinion that providing a remission would just encourage land owners to tidy up their vacant sites and then continue to land bank for the foreseeable future, while others thought that it would be too subjective and hard to administer fairly.

**Should Council introduce the City Vacant Differential rate in other parts of the city?**

26 submitters indicated that they would support the Council introducing the City Vacant Differential in other parts of the city, highlighting that there is vacant land in a number of areas across the city that would benefit from being developed. New Brighton and areas of the Central City outside of the Central City Business and South Frame zones were the most common examples highlighted by submitters.

The benefits raised by submitters were similar to the benefits for the central city, including encouraging land owners to maintain and look after their vacant land to an appropriate standard, incentivising land owners to develop their land, and generally improving the overall look and feel and perceptions of these areas.

**Should Council introduce an equivalent rating arrangement for remaining Central City 'Barrier Sites' (Derelict Buildings)?**

The majority of submitters (40 submitters) indicated that they would support the introduction of an equivalent rating arrangement for remaining Central City 'Barrier Sites'. Eight submitters opposed this proposal and three provided other views or proposals.

There was a sense from the comments provided by submitters who supported this proposal that there is little difference between land banking vacant land and land banking land with derelict buildings. The issues with derelict buildings highlighted by submitters were similar to the issues with vacant sites, including the impacts that they have on the appearance of our central city and consequently people's perceptions of our central city, and a sense that they are holding back the progress and success of the central city.

Feedback from submitters who opposed was mixed, some feel that it would have no impact as the owners of barrier sites do not care and others feel that council should be exploring other solutions such as acquiring the properties. Feedback from the development sector highlighted issues with applying the differential fairly, the complications with heritage buildings and pros and cons of taking a punitive approach vs. incentivising the redevelopment of these sites.

**Special Topic | Proposal for a new policy on Māori Freehold Land (8 submissions)**

*Five submitters indicated that they support replacing the existing Policy on Remission and Postponement of Rates on Māori Freehold Land (MFL Policy) with a new draft MFL Policy, five submitters indicated that they oppose replacing the existing policy.*

Feedback on the proposal for a new rates remission and postponement policy on Māori Freehold Land was mixed, with five submitters providing feedback in support of the proposal and five providing feedback opposing the proposal.

Those who supported the proposal tended to generally acknowledge their support for the new proposal,

indicating that it felt appropriate to update the policy to reflect the amendments made to the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

Those who opposed tended to fall into two groups. On one hand there were those who opposed enabling the land to sit undeveloped and special treatment for Māori owned landholdings, and on the other there was feedback from Rūnanga that we haven't quite got the policy right in terms of responding to our obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Specifics raised included a lack of decision-making provision for Rūnanga, that the process used to develop the policy do not met the good faith obligations of the Crown as tangata whenua have not had a role in the design of the policy, and that the policy does not allow for the exercise of rangatiratanga.

## Our Planned Spending (70 submissions)

70 submitters provided a range of feedback on our planned spending.

There was a sense from submitters who supported our proposed spending that we have the balance and mix about right. Some highlighted again that it was good to see the Council considering the impacts of further rates increases on residents and considering different and more efficient ways of doing things.

There was a general feeling from those who opposed our proposed spending that there is more that we could do to reduce our spending and the subsequent burden on ratepayers. A number highlighted that they think we are spending in the wrong areas, some noting that there is still more we could do to get the basics right before worrying about the nice to haves.

More than half of the submitters (37 submissions) who commented on our planned spending provided alternative views or proposals. These can be broadly categorised into the following areas:

- a. **Additional spending in specific geographic areas:** A number of areas were highlighted by submitters, including the wider Banks Peninsula and Coastal-Burwood community board areas, Phillipstown (Transport), Avondale (Transport), Bromley (Transport) and Spreydon (Green Space).  
  
One submitter noted that it would be beneficial for local communities to have more input into how we are spending money within their areas. Another signalled that they would like to see more focus be placed on spending development contributions revenue in growth areas.
- b. **Reducing the burden on rate payers:** A number of submitters indicated that they would like to see us identify more areas where spending could be reduced to lessen the rates burden at a time when many are struggling with the increased cost of living and the ongoing economic impacts of Covid-19.
- c. **Impacts of capital programme changes on Phillipstown:** members of the Phillipstown community highlighted their concern that changes to the capital programme will lead to their suburb being overlooked and work that they see as long overdue further delayed.
- d. **Additional spending on specific activities:** Some submitters highlighted specific activities where they would like to see us spending more than we are proposing, including roads, footpaths and streetscape, stormwater infrastructure and parks, heritage and foreshore.

Other issues raised by submitters include more transparency in our documentation on where are spending (specifically the "Other" category) and staff and consultant costs.

## Grants and Funding

### Edgware Pool (170 submissions)

The vast majority of submissions (160) received on the proposed capital grant for the Edgware Pool supported the proposal. The community have made it clear what the reinstatement of this facility means to them, with many submitters telling us about their memories of summers spent swimming at the pool and learning to swim there. Others highlighted the important role of local facilities, particularly in a country where we are surrounded by water and have recently seen high drowning rates.

Those who opposed (7 submissions) generally felt that the responsibility for funding a community facility such as this should not fall with rate payers across the wider city, pointing out the original agreement that the council had with the community.

## Transport

### Roads (157 submissions)

Submissions received on our proposed spend on our road network covered a range of issues.

55 submissions were received on the Milns/Sparks/Sutherlands Road intersection upgrades. Submitters highlighted that the ongoing residential development and growth in Halswell is leading to increasing traffic and safety issues. They talked about a range of safety issues, including challenges crossing the road as a pedestrian in this area, safety issues caused by heavy vehicles and speed limits, and the difficulties of making right turns through an uncontrolled intersection, and would like to see the upgrades at the Milns/Sparks/Sutherlands Road intersection put on budget for this year.

A number of submissions (30 submitters) raised issues with roads in the east of Christchurch, indicating that they would like to see funding available for a range of projects. There is a general sense from these submitters that the council continues to forget about the eastern suburbs, and they would like to see investment in these areas before there is any more spending on perceived “nice to haves”.

Specific projects raised by submitters included:

- Road improvements, safety and streetscape enhancements included in the Ferry Road Master Plan for Ferry Road from Fitzgerald Avenue to Aldwins Road.
- Safety improvements along Ferry Road from Wilsons Road to Aldwins Road.
- Prioritising areas of Phillipstown for slow speed neighbourhoods, including Olliviers and Mathesons Roads
- Improving the condition of roads in the east, specific examples included Maces Road, Pages, Road, New Brighton Road, Fleete Street and Lake Terrace Road.

The resurfacing of Dawson Street was also raised by submitters (8 submissions). These submitters highlighted that Dawson Street is a shared zone used by a range of users (vehicles, pedestrians, cyclist, and families with prams) and any resurfacing should be done using a treatment appropriate for a range of uses and users. With this in mind they would like us to revisit the decision to use chip seal when resealing Dawson Street.

A number of submissions were received where submitters generally indicated that they were not happy with the condition of our roads, and think that we could do more to improve this.

## Cycling Infrastructure (75 submissions)

Generally submitters who addressed our proposed spend on cycleways were supportive of the work we are doing to build our major cycleways network.

Submitters who support our proposed spend (33 submitters) highlighted the value they see in the continuing investment in our cycleways network, both in terms of making cycling in Christchurch safer and encouraging more people to travel by bike but also the benefits in terms of reducing emissions and addressing climate change. These submitters urged the council to continue with the work to complete the network.

A number of alternative views and proposals on our cycleways spend were provided by submitters (32 submitters). These can broadly be summarised into the following issues:

- a. **Sparks Road Cycleway:** a number of submitters discussed the Sparks Road cycleway alongside their submissions on the Milns/Sparks/Sutherlands Roads intersection. These submitters would like to see the Sparks Road cycleway be extended to connect to Halswell, improving access to the Halswell Domain, Te Hāpua, and the Halswell commercial centre. Other submitters indicated that they would also like to see it better connect into Kennedy's Bush.
- b. **Local Cycleways Connections:** A number of submitters highlighted the need for local connections that connect cyclists to the major cycleways network, particularly in terms of further improving safety for cyclists. Specific areas mentioned by submitters included connecting Cracroft and Westmorland to the Norwest Arc, a creative solution to connecting Lyttelton with the city, a connection from Quarrymans Trail from where it leaves Sparks Road to Halswell Road, and safety improvements in St Albans.

The majority of the submitters who opposed our proposed spending on cycleways (16 submitters) feel that there are other priorities that we should be focusing on, and that generally the cycleways were too expensive.

## Footpaths and Streetscape (69 submissions)

The majority of submitters on our proposed spending on footpaths and streetscape provided other views or proposals (51 submitters), the vast majority of which identified other areas of the city where they would like to see us investing in footpaths.

Three key themes came through in the submissions on our footpaths and streetscapes:

- a. **The condition of our footpaths:** Some submitters noted that they were pleased to see our focus on maintaining roads and footpaths for all users, and others vented their frustration with the condition and maintenance of our footpaths. There is a general sense from those who expressed frustrations that we could be doing more to maintain and improve the condition of our footpaths.
- b. **Safety improvements:** a number of submitters highlighted areas where they would like to see safety improvements for pedestrians, including improving the condition of footpaths but also new or improved pedestrian crossings in some locations.
- c. **Improving pedestrian facilities:** submitters who commented on this tended to feel that we should change our approach to designing pedestrian spaces to make sure that they are accessible for everyone, or in some locations begin to shift the focus away from car-centric environments towards more pedestrianised spaces.

As with our roads, submitters from the east (18 submitters) reiterated their frustrations with the condition of the pedestrian infrastructure in our eastern suburbs, again indicating that these communities are feeling like we have forgotten about them.

A number of submissions (21 submitters) also addressed pedestrian improvements required in Halswell, particularly around the Milns/Sparks/Sutherlands Road intersection. Improvements in this areas would allow residents to access local facilities (playgrounds, shopping centre, and the library) by foot, whereas at the moment they get in their car and drive as there are no safe pedestrian facilities.

## Three Waters

### Water Supply (29 submissions)

Submissions received on our proposed spend on water supply tended to support our continued investment, or highlight areas where further investment in specific areas.

Nine submitters highlighted the urgent need for upgrades to the water supply infrastructure in Okains Bay, with submitters expressing frustration at how long this work is taking and concern about the ongoing health risks.

### Three Waters Reform (13 submissions)

Thirteen submitters provided feedback on the Government's proposed Three Waters Reform. Generally submitters indicated that they don't support the proposed model, some outright disagreeing and others indicating that they support the need for reform but not the proposed model. There were some calls for more information and clarity around the programme and potential impacts.

## Kerbside Collection

### Special Topic | Opting out of kerbside collection & targeted rate (74 submissions)

*14 submitters indicated that they support the proposed change to kerbside collection rates that would allow multi-unit residential developments to opt out of kerbside collection. 43 submitters indicated that they opposed the proposed changes and six submitters provided other views or proposals.*

The feedback provided was mixed feedback on our proposal to allow some multi-unit developments to opt out of the kerbside collection service and associated targeted rate.

While there was general support for enabling multi-unit developments to opt out, a number of submitters raised issues with the fact that they would still be required to continue funding the Council's other waste management activities, including the kerbside collection and disposal of rubbish. Submitters believed that the proposal should include the ability to opt out of all kerbside collection costs. These submitters also highlighted that they would like to see the council provide more transparent information on how much households pay in general for kerbside collection. It should be noted that these submitters did not oppose what we are proposing, but would like to see some further changes to the proposal.

Those who supported the proposal as it stands highlighted the advantages of alternative solutions for multi-unit developments, including managing the number of bins out on our streets each week in some of these

areas. Others pointed out that it would remove the need for developers to provide space for each unit's bins, and that it was a fairer way of approaching things as the way we live and develop continues to change.

### Special Topic | Proposed extension of kerbside collection service in Wairewa (62 submissions)

*20 submitters indicated that they are supportive of the proposal to service additional properties in Wairewa. Nineteen opposed the proposal, fifteen submitters provided other views or proposals.*

Feedback was also mixed on our proposal to extend our kerbside collection service to additional properties in Wairewa.

Those who supported the proposal noted the impacts that it would have in terms of improved convenience for residents who do not currently have access to the service, with many talking about the trip that they currently have to make to dispose of their rubbish, and the limited hours of the transfer station. Others thought it made good sense to extend the kerbside rubbish service to areas that already receive the recycling service.

A number of those who opposed live in Birdlings Flat, and highlighted issues around wind and weather, and difficulties for trucks getting in and out of the settlement. There were particular concerns around the frequent and strong winds often experienced at Birdlings Flat and the safety issues of having wheelie bins in the settlement during these winds. Others noted that the roads in the settlement are narrow, generally without kerbs and footpaths, and were concerned that having wheelie bins on the street for collection each week would create additional safety issues.

Others who opposed indicated that they were happy with the services currently available, and would object to being charged the full kerbside rate for a service that they do not want nor feel that they need.

Other submitters provided feedback on the additional areas that we are proposing to extend the service to, suggesting additional areas that they would like to see included.

## Climate Change

28 submitters provided us with feedback on our proposed spend and approach to managing the effects of climate change. Submitters were clear that they supported the council taking climate action, however a number felt that we could be doing more to prioritise climate action. There is a sense that the Council should be leading the way on climate change initiatives in Christchurch, and while we have made a good start with projects like the major cycleways network, these submitters would still like to see us putting more emphasis on climate action.

## Performing Arts Precinct

25 submitters addressed possible uses for the land previously designated for a carpark at 129 Gloucester Street. Many of these submitters noted their support for the decision made by council to abandon plans for a carpark in this location, and highlighted the opportunity that this site now presents.

Submitters were unanimous in their view that the future use of this land should be for performing arts, with many supporting a proposal put forward for a community-led performing arts space. Many of these submitters highlighted the need for a more informal performance space in the city, and believe that the

proposed community-led space could provide for this.

## City Planning

### General Planning Issues (25 submissions)

25 submitters provided feedback on a range of city planning issues.

Many were concerned about the ongoing impacts of growth, whether it be intensification and the impacts that the Medium Density Residential Standards will have on communities or neighbourhoods or ongoing greenfields development and the environmental (built and natural environment) impacts of this type of growth.

Others indicated that they would like to see the council provide a regulatory framework and environment that better enabled different housing choices (such as tiny homes) and is easy to navigate.

### Tree Canopy (14 submissions)

Included in the concerns about the ongoing impacts of growth was the ongoing impact that residential growth in particular is having on our tree canopy. Fourteen submitters highlighted that they would like to see us doing more to protect our tree canopy, and continuing to develop it.

Some submitters highlighted that it is going to be an important part of our approach to mitigating the impacts of climate change through providing shelter from the sun and wind, while others discussed the amenity value that trees bring to our neighbourhoods. Generally these submitters acknowledged that there is a need for us to provide housing for our growing population, but feel that this should not happen at the expense of our tree canopy.

## Christchurch Waste Water Treatment Plant

24 submitters addressed the issues currently faced as a result of the fire at the Waste Water Treatment Plant. What we heard from them largely echoed what we have been hearing via other platforms – the impacts of the fire is having a significant impact on residents living in and around Bromley and they would like to see us resolve the situation as quickly as possible.

Many of these submitters said that the council should be compensating residents in the area in some way, as opposed to signalling that their rates would go up while they continue to deal with the impacts of the fire on their day to day lives.

## Consultation, Engagement and Communications

Nineteen submitters provided feedback on our consultation, engagement and communications approach, both in terms of the annual plan specifically and more general feedback on our approach.

A number of submitters noted that they would like to see us providing more user friendly information to enable submitters to make well informed submissions. Others were pleased to see changes made since we

consulted on the LTP to make it easier for submitters to navigate the documentation and get answers to questions, highlighting that when we do make changes our residents do notice and appreciate the changes.

Some submitters indicated that they do not think that we are genuine when we go out to consult, have predetermined outcomes, and generally do not listen to what residents are telling us.