

**Christchurch City Council**  
**ATTACHMENTS - ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS**

---

**Date:** Wednesday 11 May 2022  
**Time:** 9am  
**Venue:** Council Chambers, Civic Offices,  
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**PAGE**

<b>3. Hearing of Verbal Submissions for the Draft Annual Plan 2022-23 (and other concurrent consultations) - Wednesday 11 May 2022</b>	
F. Opting out of kerbside collection and targeted rate - All Submissions .....	3
G. Proposal for a new Policy on Māori Freehold Land - All Submissions.....	28
H. Proposed extension of kerbside collection service in Wairewa - All Submissions.....	37
I. Proposal to increase rates on vacant central city land.....	47

---



Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
45961	Yes	The Board is in support, in principle, of the proposed change to curbside collection rates that would allow multi-unit residential developments to opt out of kerbside collection, since they pay for this without being able to use it. We would like Council assurance that waste management providers are required to provide for rubbish, recycling and green waste collection, as this is often not the case currently.	No	Bebe Frayle	Waitai Coastal-Burwood Community Board	Submissions Committee Chairperson
45934	Yes	I support progress made towards this issue but you should allow opting out of red waste as well as per the alternative proposals. Rates are already hefty for those of us who live in the inner city and on top of which you are charging us for a service we cannot/should not use. If we all opted in to red rubbish bins - the area around Welles Street/Dundas would become a mess of bins and a hazard. I understand putting the burden on those who can afford it, but all this does is further incentivize urban sprawl and that is incredibly inefficient - both from a council expenses perspective and climate change perspective. You should be encouraging density and charging extra for unused waste management services is against that.	No	Kyle Mazlin		
45933	Yes	I no longer live in a multi-unit complex, but I deliver mail in Riccarton where medium density housing is increasing, which is a good thing. I support medium density housing complexes having alternative options, especially if it means less bins on the footpath/kerb. I do worry about the effect of opting out on the costs for others who haven't opted out and are low-income households, so the balance seems right for now.	No	Fiona Bennetts		
45927	No	<p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</li> <li>2. The Proposal contradicts the Council's own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</li> <li>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</li> <li>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</li> <li>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</li> </ol> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>	No	Gillian Smeith		
45924	No	<p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</li> </ol>	No	Kieran Williamson		

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		<p>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</p> <p>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</p> <p>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</p> <p>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</p> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>				
45922	No	<p>Submission on Council's Annual Plan proposal to opt-out of the Waste Minimisation Targeted Rate</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>Name: Oylen and Vernon Payne</p> <p>██</p> <p>Email</p> <p>I wish to be heard at the hearings.</p> <p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <p>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</p> <p>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</p>	No	Oylen and Vernon Payne		

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		<p>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</p> <p>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</p> <p>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</p> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>				
45901	Yes	<p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <p>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</p> <p>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</p> <p>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</p> <p>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</p> <p>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</p> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>	No	Areesa Chunsangfah		
45893	No	<p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <p>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</p> <p>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with</p>	No	Nick Hutchinson		

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		<p>central city revitalisation.</p> <p>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</p> <p>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</p> <p>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</p> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>				
45886	No	<p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <p>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</p> <p>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</p> <p>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</p> <p>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</p> <p>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</p>	No	Kimberley Sewell		

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.				
45879	No	<p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</li> <li>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</li> <li>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</li> <li>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</li> <li>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</li> </ol> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>	No	Simon Chambers		
45876	No	<p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</li> <li>2. The Proposal contradicts the Council's own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</li> <li>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</li> <li>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</li> <li>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</li> </ol>	No	Alyn Hemens		

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.				
45873	No		No	Belinda Clarke		
45871	Yes		No	Alanah Kauhou-Kenyon		
45869	No	<p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</li> <li>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</li> <li>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</li> <li>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</li> <li>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</li> </ol> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>	No	Vanessa Jones		
45865	No	<p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</li> <li>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</li> <li>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</li> </ol>	No	Emily Miller		



Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		<p>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</p> <p>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</p> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>				
45843	No	<p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</li> <li>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</li> <li>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</li> <li>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</li> <li>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</li> </ol> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>	No	Lynette Stenning		
45842	No	<p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</li> <li>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</li> <li>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</li> </ol>	No	Phillip Stenning		

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		<p>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</p> <p>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</p> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>				
45841	Yes	<p>Name Alyssia Zhang</p> <p>██</p> <p>████████████████████</p> <p>I wish to be heard at the hearings.</p> <p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</li> <li>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</li> <li>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</li> <li>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</li> <li>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</li> </ol>	No	Alyssia Zhang		

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.				
45837	No	<p>From:</p> <p>Chuan Law</p> <p>████████████████████</p> <p>████████████████</p> <p>I wish to be heard at the hearings.</p> <p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</li> <li>2. The Proposal contradicts the Councils own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</li> <li>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</li> <li>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</li> <li>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</li> </ol> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>	No	Chuan Law		
45835	No	I oppose the proposal because:	No	Paerangi Matunga		

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		<p>It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include all three bins.</p> <p>The Proposal contradicts the Council's own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</p> <p>The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</p> <p>The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</p> <p>There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</p> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>				
45833	No	<p>Submission on Council's Annual Plan proposal to opt-out of the Waste Minimisation Targeted Rate</p> <p>From: Zhen Jia [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p> <p>I wish to be heard at the hearings.</p> <p>I oppose the proposal because:</p> <p>1. It is only a partial solution to the issue. Developments such as the Atlas Quarter would still pay for the red bins. It should include</p>	No	Zhen Jia		

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		<p>all three bins.</p> <p>2. The Proposal contradicts the Council's own policy objectives. It does not promote waste reduction and it does not align with central city revitalisation.</p> <p>3. The proposal is not transparent. The Council has not provided any information on how much we pay in general rates for rubbish collection.</p> <p>4. The reasons given for not providing a full refund do not stack up. The Council says that it would be unfair for low income households to include the red bins in the Targeted Rate but that reasoning does not apply to the yellow and green bins. Why not?</p> <p>5. There are ways that the Council could give a full refund and meet their objectives.</p> <p>If the Council is unable to change the proposal, then implement the opt out and direct staff to develop a solution that is fair, transparent and aligns with the Council's policy objectives for inclusion in the next Annual Plan.</p>				
45801	No		No	Mike Peers		
45793	Yes	<p>The Board supports giving people the opportunity to opt out of the targeted rate if they are not using the service.</p> <p>This support is on the basis that the opt-out will only be approved where appropriate equivalent services are in place.</p> <p>The Board expects that an opt-out would only be approved in situations where the Council service is not appropriate to meet the needs of the property. We have concerns about the potential for setting dangerous precedents for other Council services by developing opt-out policies.</p>	No	Bridget Williams	Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board	Chairperson
45771	Yes	<p>The Waipapa Papanui-Innes Community Board ('the Board') thanks the Council for the opportunity to submit on this consultation.</p> <p>The Board supports the proposed changes – with increasing intensification there is a need for practical alternatives to large kerbside clusters of individual units' bins.</p> <p>The Board considers that where alternative arrangements are made, monitoring is required to ensure adherence to their waste minimisation management plan.</p>	No	Emma Norrish	Waipapa Papanui-Innes Community Board	Chairperson
45758	No	We are opposing this as we still pay for red bins despite having our own rubbish collection service which we also pay for.	No	Lucienne Shelley		
45712	No	Hi, We are property Developers (Williams Corporation), some of our developments do not qualify for council waste collection, making private waste collection the only available option. In these situations, our owners should not have to pay for a private waste collection provider and pay for CCC rate provider in their rates. This is a fair and reasonable amendment to be made for waste collection services or alternatively, council should collect all waste and not refuse some developments .	No	Chanaya Michaels	Williams Corporation Limited	Office Manager

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
45635	No	I live in a multi-unit residential development, we don't use the City council services at all (including the most expensive rubbish one - red- ), and I dont see why we should pay for this still given that we already pay for another company to remove all our rubbish. I would like to be able to completely opt out (yellow, green AND red).	No	Mathilde Vachon		
45523	No	I am grateful for the fact that our current rates would be reduced as we have been paying for a service we do not use and have to pay for in our BC levies - This is a system that works well both for us and would create an enormous amount of work if we were to use the smaller red bins for the council removal system. I have chosen to live in the city in a safe environment as being a single woman it is a great way to not feel alone and i am able to support as many of the local businesses around this regrowing city of which I am proud to be a part of. However the costs of rates is high and to pay for a service which we don't use is just wrong.	No	Jenni Snowdon	Self employed	
45516	No	Atlas doesn't use the facility thus saving the CCC the cost of collection plus they receive the money for the non-collection from us.	No	Max Lucas		
45508	Yes	This seems very sensible, for the reasons outlined :-)	No	Arthur McGregor		
45505	No		No	Heidi de Groot	Billing	
45492	No	The proposal is headed in the right direction but does not go far enough to correct a very obvious unfairness.  Garbage rates should be a fee for service, not an opaque means of wealth redistribution. By the way, poor people live in high density housing too.  Don't penalise high density efficient living by charging for a service that is not delivered. If you use a targeted rate for red bins, it would directly support your policy to reduce the amount of garbage going to land fill.  Council should allow opt-out of ALL curbside collection for high density blocks with an approved alternative plan.	No	Matthew Seymour		
45486	No	I'm paying for bins twice, within my rates and within my Bodycorporate fees. Very annoying	No	James Longden		
45484	No	Hi. I actually submitted in favor earlier but would like to change my submission as I now understand it is only for green and yellow and not red bins.  While its great that Council is considering removing our rates for yellow and green bins, this proposal also needs to include red bins.  A couple of years ago, Council made the call encouraging residents to return to the city. We invested in Chch city and bought an apartment at Atlas Quarter. Since then, we've enjoyed the city life, watching new businesses return and have enjoyed supporting them in turn. We live in a medium/high density development reducing our impact on Council's infrastructure, including not using the Council's rubbish and recycling collection service.  Council should, in good faith, be doing as much as possible to support those who are choosing to live in the central city. Council should absolutely not be charging us unfair council rates for services that we are not able to access.	No	Anne Glackin		
45388	No	I already have to pay privately for red, yellow and green bins as I own an apartment in the Atlas Quarter and do not see why I should pay for any of the bins through the council. Having 100+ council bins of each colour outside The Atlas Quarter is not practical.	No	Peter Morris		

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		Common sense should prevail here.  Thanks,  Peter				
45368	Yes	I think all multi unit complex that use commercial contractors should all get the capital value based rebate.	No	Liz Croxson	Pitcaithly Body Corporate Services Limited	General Manager
45329	Yes	I support the ability for multi-unit residential developments to opt-out of the Waste Minimisation targeted rate so they can take advantage of economies of scale to co-ordinate and share waste services among their residents.	No	Cameron Bradley		
45327	Yes	I would want to ensure that the changes to the wheelie bins do not increase the cost in any way if people are to keep the existing bin sizes.	No	Liam Chrisp		
45263	No	I believe we should not pay for the red bins as we do not have individual bins.	No	Kelly McLaughlin		
45261	No	I do not trust developers to sell this as a savings opportunity, and then have the residents start dumping their trash as maintaining a contractor will cost them money. There seems to be nothing in place to make sure the rubbish gets handled long-term, and not just as a once off when they opt out.  The council should examine the possibility of giving extra sized bins to these properties to maximize storage space, or include in the local plan that new developments need to have space for these bins.	No	Karlia Larsen		
45253	Yes	I support the proposal as long as waste definitely is collected by an approved alternative service.	No	Jean Flannery		
45251	No	Do you ever do anything else but look how you can make residents pay?? Maybe if the CEO took a pay cut - there is \$400,000 there without penalising anyone else.	No	Jennifer Lawrence		
45242	Yes		No	Sarah Wylie		
45196	Yes	It makes sense from a multi-tenanted complex perspective, reduces need to space at their end and on the footpath and provided the requirements for the complex ENSURE (which may have an element of active contract management - by CCC?) that proper recycling is occurring, it seems like a pragmatic decision all round.	No	Jill Borland		
45182	Yes	As we get more dense housing in the city (Yay!) dozens and dozens of bins along the curbside is a bit of a hazard. It means disposal trucks are in the streets longer (often narrow streets) and often the bins get blown or bumped into cycle ways or roads. This is a good change.  However! I can easily see this as a way for development and rental companies to skimp out and not take care of the environment and city. Along with having a private service of equal (or better!) standards, the council should probably do an annual or bi annual checkup to make sure these developments are compliant. Or perhaps make it very simple (and private so there is no retaliation) for tenants to report non-compliance to the city for enforcement.  It always looks bad when a big developer or someone skirts a council law and enforcement is lacking, slow, or a worthless slap on the wrist. Especially around environmental/climate type issues.	No	Philip Renich		

Submission ID	Do you support the proposed changes?	Comments - Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
		Thanks for continuing to improve things!				
45169	No	Why shouldn't all Christchurch rate payers be offered this option regardless of property type. This would potentially drive up costs to other ratepayers. These units are counted in the city councils 'average' for water usage etc so they should be treated the same in all areas.	No	Jen Anderson		
45168	No	It will impact on the other residents in the street (or the complex if not all residents choose the option).  What will SURELY happen is that those who have opted out will maybe sign up with a contractor just to "prove" to CCC that have one, and then they will simply put their waste in their neighbours' bins!  How big is a "large multi-unit development" anyway? And who makes the decision - the developer, the body corporate, the individual residents?  This is a very short-sighted proposal. Why is council even thinking of this? I think there is an ulterior motive!	No	Beverley Nelson		
45159	No	As a residential property owner who would have (given the chance) strongly objected to 6 units going up on a residential section, because of 1. Impacts in terms of privacy, 2.noise 3.lack of light and 4. closeness to other properties, as built almost to the fence, we have now ongoing problems with bins on the front of the units, not in areas intended at the back. As this is a cash cow, owned by Harcourts at Oxley and has caused over a year of disruption to neighbours, other residents, I object strongly to such 'developmentd' effectively putting further burdens on ratepayers, if this proposal goes ahead.	No	Jules Venning		
45158	Yes	One of the big advantages of multi-unit developments is the ability to share things so yes I feel it is good to allow them to sort out their own plans that will take advantage of this.	No	Cameron Bradley		
45156	Yes		No	Peter Morrison		
45129	Yes	Moving rubbish to the targeted rate and therefore being able to opt out of all 3 would make more sense though.	No	Mitchell Davies		
45124	Yes	This a fair approach , and supports apartment rate payers, who subsidize other ratepayers through their ineffective land use.	No	Tim Allan		
45123	Yes		No	Anne Glackin		
45114	Yes	Opt out would be my preference we take our rubbish away with us.	No	Sid McAuley	Coolpak Coolstores Ltd	Managing Director











































































































































































































































































