

## Briefing - Council NOTES

---

**Date:** Tuesday 30 April 2024  
**Time:** 9.30 am - 3 .30 pm  
**Venue:** Council Chambers, Civic Offices,  
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch  
**Zoom Link:**  
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6439418430?omn=86418455067>  
**Meeting ID: 643 941 8430**

---

### Present

Chairperson	Mayor Phil Mauger
Deputy Chairperson	Deputy Mayor Pauline Cotter
Members	Councillor Kelly Barber
	Councillor Melanie Coker
	Councillor Celeste Donovan
	Councillor Tyrone Fields
	Councillor James Gough
	Councillor Victoria Henstock
	Councillor Yani Johanson
	Councillor Aaron Keown
	Councillor Sam MacDonald
	Councillor Jake McLellan
	Councillor Andrei Moore
	Councillor Mark Peters
	Councillor Tim Scandrett
	Councillor Sara Templeton

---

**Principal Advisor**  
Mary Richardson  
Interim Chief Executive  
Tel: 941 8999

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

**Please Note:**  
This forum has no decision-making powers and is purely for information sharing.

The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

## **1. Apologies Ngā Whakapāha**

That an apology for absence from Councillor Harrison-Hunt for leave of absence, be accepted.

Councillor Gough submitted an apology for lateness. Arrived 13:30.

Councillors Templeton and Donovan joined via zoom.

Started: 09:31am

## **2. Christchurch City Growth Models**

- Aimee talked to the presentation.
- Note Council relies on StatsNZ to project future population and household growth.
- Population likely to grow, but household size to drop due to aging population projection.
- Note that models are distribution models.
- Ashleigh discussed the Household model distributions.
- Zoning model to be updated for PC14. Currently based off pre plan change.
- Councillor Johanson: Christchurch vs Greater Christchurch – Aimee confirmed just Christchurch.
- Councillor Johanson: Localised level data – Aimee confirmed that data can only go down to a mesh block level. Query regarding how to ensure environmental issues are captured. Staff confirmed more of a ‘how it’s used’ issue. Discussion on importance of monitoring.
- Population vs household density – bedroom data? Aimee confirmed not bedroom. Discussion of StatsNZ birth and death data. More strategic tool.
- Councillor Scandrett: Pg3. Discussion on overseas buyers and AirBnB. Aimee confirmed that staff are waiting on census data which should inform how many of the major building companies are households vs AirBnB.
- Councillor Henstock: Alignment with Greater Christchurch Spatial plan – did anything impact modelling? Aimee confirmed not really, but it is embedded into the models.
- Councillor Henstock: How often do you review? Staff reviewed growth 2019, and the business one last year. Note: Very little change.
- Discussion on how model is being used on a day to day basis. Aimee confirmed that it won’t necessary be seen. Being used, but not necessarily being discussed, technical level only. Discussion on DCs.
- Councillor Fields: Projection numbers based of NZ population? Scenario modelling? Aimee confirmed that we can. Discussion on importance of following the most likely model.

10:01am

### 3. The Arts Centre - Follow Up

- Note briefing is to provide full information as requested by Councillors on 26 March 2024 and discuss external financial advice. Introduction to Scott.
- John Filsell discussed background – summary of previous workshop
- Art Centre made a submission to LTP - Scheduled to meet Council 3 May 2024.
- Discussion regarding limitations of the workshop. Art Centre present. Not available to answer questions. Confirmed outside of scope of the workshop.
- Clarification regarding the Deloitte report, confidentiality and what can be discussed in the public workshop.
- Scott McClay discussed Deloitte report. Note that Micheal McAuley (Deloitte) is present as well.
- Councillor Keown: No Rates impact? John Filsell using existing budget for rates relief plus capital endowment fund over two years.
- Scaling back arts programme – how much can this be stretched and it still be an arts centre? Question best placed to the Arts Centre, note that Deloitte just observed the deficit and suggest this is an area of scope.
- Councillor Templeton: Deficit or cost? Peter confirmed that was the subnet cost. Scott clarified FY23 net loss of \$600k. deficit based off \$800k
- Councillor MacDonald: Commercial tenants – recovering 100% opex? Scott notes a key observation 300-350 net service. Not showing as a direct loss. Deloitte believes so. Bruce Rendall noted that staff do not have sufficient information, question best directed at Arts Centre.
- Councillor Scandrett: Request for clarification on impact that using the no rates impact option would have on other people seeking funding in the city. **ACTION:** Staff to provide.
- Councillor Scandrett: **ACTION:** Request for councillors to receive information on Arts Funding.
- Councillor Moore: Who would take over ownership? Elizabeth Neazor confirms no basis. Have not looked into the question.
- Mayor Mauger: Dux estimate difference in financial decision if this was given a priority. Deloitte - no comment.
- Councillor Johanson: Financial situation vs creative value. Considered in the report? Deloitte confirm not within scope requested by Council. Discussion on the scope, creative funding, grants, and external funding.
- Councillor Templeton: Discussion of what someone else taking over the Arts Centre would be – impacts on the city. **ACTION:** Staff to provide to councillors prior to 3 May 2024.
- Councillor Moore: Dux. Bruce Rendall previous advice, not sufficient rent for restoration costs. More work has been done by the arts centre, council does not have this **ACTION:** will request from the arts centre and get back to councillors.
- Councillor Keown: Need to know the difference. Cost for if we take over.
- Councillor Keown: Can this be rolled into Museum Levy?
- Councillor Scandrett: No zero funding proposal. John Filsell discussed current funding. Confirmed not zero.
- Councillor Scandrett: Liability of picking up legal costs. Elizabeth Neazor discussed financial information relating to a high court outline.
- Councillor MacDonald: Deloitte report – not funding depreciation – discussion of long term sustainability and depth of review.
- Councillor Henstock: Rates remission – Elizabeth Neazor confirmed that it was possible.

Break: 11:00 – 11:17

#### 4. Draft GPS implications for transport programme

- Discussion about the change timelines. LTP and GPS alignment and the amount of change.
- Jane Cameron discussed further information received relating to the Draft GPS, Draft NZTA investment Prioritisation Method, and State Highway Investment Proposal.
- Discussion of the analysis of implications to date.
- Lynette discussed how it impacts the transport programme. Discussion on funding/ subsidy impacts and the projects likely affected.
- Jane discussed next steps, the need for a briefing in September and the potential need for an LTP amendment. As well as the update to the Council's 30 year Strategic Transport Plan
- Councillor Peters: Is there opportunity for redesign for cost savings. Lynette reminded that this is funding related only. Discussion regarding scope of the workshop.
- Mayor Mauger: discussion regarding internally funding a portion of the projects that might be impacted.
- Councillor Henstock: Financial risk exposure. **ACTION:** Lynette to talk to finance BP and provide Councillor Henstock with information on how the transport programme gets funded if external funding is not received.
- Discussion on Walking and Cycling.
- Councillor Barber: Pages Road bridge. Discussion of National prioritisation.
- Councillor Fields: 2025 major cycle routes – 15 currently on budget. How much is funded? Lynette confirms that only one is not shovel ready. Wheels to wings only one impacted.
- Councillor McLellan: Discussion on Oram Ave assumptions.
- Councillor McLellan: MOR – anything at risk from an opex perspective. Lynette confirms that it is.
- GPS signalled that all work relating to walking and cycling has to come out of the walking and cycling category.
- Councillor Cotter: Discussion on processes regarding proposals, whether resubmission is necessary, and what is included in subsidy.
- Discussion regarding the scope of works and the legislative process.
- Councillor Scandrett: Government revamp of civil defence. Discussion on submission reliance on economic benefit. Argument for pages road bridge as a road of national significance.
- Councillor MacDonald: Programme focused on maximising funding. Discussion that this would not be possible in the timeframe. Peter Langbein discussed the issue with building in assumptions into the LTP. **ACTION:** Peter to come back with advice on what can be included in the LTP.
- Councillor Donovan: When do we get an idea of when we will get information back regarding successful submission. Lynette confirmed that we will not know until 1 September if the submission is accepted.

Break 12:24 – 1:30

## 5. Plan Change programme

- Mark Stevenson discussed the plan change programme, what has already happened, the current drivers, and their influences.
- Discussion of budget and costs.
- Note regarding additional resources provided.
- Councillor Moore: Discussion regarding the Te Kaha noise contour and central city noise. Why not one and the same? Mark discussed need for differing timeframes.
- Discussion regarding staffing issues, MPS, and PC14.
- Councillor Fields: Forward work programme, staff confirmed will come back later in the year.
- Councillor Henstock: **ACTION:** staff to provide timeframes for all line items of the forward work programme.
- Councillor Peters: Industrial residential interface. PC14? Staff confirmed that work advanced around Riccarton already.
- Councillor Templeton: PC12 Coastal hazards timeframe. Awaiting IHP recommendation. Requires more analysis.
- Discussion regarding resourcing and capacity. **ACTION:** Mark to provide information regarding what can be done to ensure capacity for priority plan changes.
- Discussion regarding Port noise overlay.
- Councillor Barber: Rural land review.
- Councillor Henstock: **ACTION:** Include update on timings in 6 month review

2:20

## 6. Draft Development Contributions Policy

- Gavin Thomas presented.
- Councillor Barber: regarding priorities, 3 waters infrastructure would this be the first priority for DC's to be spent on? Gavin confirmed that DCs pay for infrastructure outside of the development footprint.
- Discussion regarding Preston's Park.
- Discussion regarding DC's. Clarification regarding what they are and how they work.
- Councillor Johanson: Disconnect between high density networks and offsetting impacts for growth projects.
- Councillor Johanson: How is industrial growth calculated? Demand on infrastructure that each development is going to create.
- Councillor Keown: Discussion regarding rebate schemes and influence this might have to creating development. Staff confirmed that DC rebate schemes alone would be unlikely to promote influence, would need to be wider.
- Councillor Coker: Is there a way of making it more expensive to develop on Greenfield? Staff confirm that they can't attribute specifically to Greenfield.
- Councillor Moore: Discussion regarding when DC's are not enough for the infrastructure requirements of a development and how catchment change options may increase the burden on rates.
- Discussion regarding greenfield development and infill development. Note that in the first presentation [Item 2] biggest developers in Christchurch are infill developers.
- Councillor Peters: Single Metro zone, will this impact the infill developers in Hornby. Staff confirm that there is no evidence that DC's impact or drive development.
- Councillor Johanson: Regional Development Contribution. **ACTION:** Gavin to provide information on whether we can't receive development contributions

**Meeting concluded at 3:10pm.**