

Waitai
Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Board
Submissions Committee
MINUTES ATTACHMENTS

Date: Tuesday 16 April 2024
Time: 3.32pm
Venue: Boardroom, Corner Beresford and Union Streets,
New Brighton

TABLE OF CONTENTS NGĀ IHIRANGI	PAGE
3. Draft Long Term Plan 2024-2034 - Consideration of Board Submission	
A. Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Board Submissions Committee 16 April 2024 - Draft Long Term Plan Board Submission	3

SUBMISSION TO: Christchurch City Council

ON: Draft Long Term Plan 2024-2034

BY: Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Board

CONTACT: Paul McMahon
Chairperson, Submissions Committee
C/- PO Box 73023
CHRISTCHURCH 8154
021 184 1072
paul.mcmahon@ccc.govt.nz

1. INTRODUCTION

The Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Board appreciates the opportunity to make a submission to the Christchurch City Council on the Draft Long Term Plan 2024-2034.

The Board wishes to be heard in support of this submission.

2. SUBMISSION

What Matters Most?

Our overarching proposal is to focus on a deliverable capital programme that helps drive our city forward, with particular investment in roads and transport infrastructure and in protecting and upgrading our water networks. We're borrowing for new projects that have long-term value and ensuring that the debt repayments are spread fairly across the generations of ratepayers who will benefit from them. We're maintaining enough financial flexibility to be able to handle unplanned events, and we're finding permanent efficiencies in our day-to-day spending.

Overall, have we got the balance right?

Comments:

The Board accepts that the Council is in a difficult position, particularly due to the extra burden the "Multi-use Arena" places on the capital budget.

- The total net cost of debt servicing is \$216.1m in 2024-25, and \$2.9b over 10 years (\$1.2b repayment and \$1.7b interest).
- The \$216.1m of debt servicing is 27.8% of 2024-25 rates of \$777m.
- That is almost 28 cents of every ratepayer dollar for debt servicing.
- In 2033-34, debt servicing will cost \$335m a year.

Previous Councils have chosen this path, and this Council is proposing to borrow \$93m more in the period to 2031, thereby failing to meet its Balanced Budget Benchmark for the first three years of the LTP. It's breaking its own policy by reducing the portion of renewals which it funds from rates.

The solution to this problem is to defer some non-urgent capital projects to fund more renewals from rates (or to increase rates).

Rates

Given that both the Council and residents are facing significant financial challenges, should we be maintaining our existing levels of service and level of investment in our core infrastructure and facilities, which will mean a proposed average rates increase of 13.24% across all ratepayers and an average residential rate increase of 12.4%?

Select one:

Yes

Comments:

The Board understands that the inflationary pressure the Council faces is greater than households, due to supply chain disruption, global instability, and labour market shortages.

However, the Board wishes to note that residents of the Waitai Board Area are, on average, lower income than across the city as a whole – they are less able to absorb rates increases than in some other areas.

The Board notes that the proposed rates increases are lower than other metropolitan councils.

We're proposing some changes to how we rate, including changes to the city vacant differential, rating visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business, and changes to our rates postponement and remissions for charities policies.

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to how we rate?

Comments:

The Board strongly supports the extension of the vacant land differential to include New Brighton (and other areas) and would like to see additional measures to encourage the development of vacant buildings in suburban centres and where they are contributing to loss of amenity.

The Board strongly supports the 'AirBnB' rate change.

The Board opposes the changes to rates postponement because it will require additional administrative costs and put in place barriers to access.

The Board supports the proposed simplification of rates remission for charities policy.

The Board supports incorporating the Heritage Targeted Rate into the general rate because it is a fairer method of applying costs across the whole city.

The Board would prefer the Active Travel Targeted Rate to be incorporated into the general rate, for the same reason as the Heritage Targeted Rate.

Fees and Charges:

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges (e.g. our proposal to introduce parking charges at key parks)?

Comments:

The Council should consider both the financial and equity impacts when making this decision. The Board suggests 1-hour free parking then \$4.50 for three hours after that.

Trim: 24/

Operational Spending

Operational spending funds the day to day services that the Council provides. Our operational spending is funded mainly through rates and therefore has a direct impact on the level of rates we charge. Everything we build, own and provide requires people to get the work done. For example, ongoing costs to operate a library, or to service our parks and waterways includes staff salaries, and maintenance and running costs such as electricity and insurance.

Are we prioritising the right things?

Select one:

Yes

Comments:

The Board supports maintaining levels of service at the same levels as present in general. However, we would like to see the level of service increased in and around suburban villages such as Woolston, New Brighton, and Queenspark. For example, rubbish removal, weeding, infrastructure maintenance (pothole repairs), back-flow valve maintenance, beach access boardwalks/tracks/infrastructure being 'lifted'.

The Board wishes to ensure that the funding for playground renewals is adequate for true like-for-like replacements and would like staff to investigate additional procurement avenues.

The Board would like to ensure that there is adequate funding to maintain the sand dunes at a low enough level in-front of He Puna Taimoana.

Capital Programme

In this LTP we have focused on developing a deliverable capital programme.

We're proposing to spend \$6.5 billion over the next 10 years across a range of activities, including some key areas that you've told us are important through our residents' surveys, and our early engagement on the LTP:

- \$2.7 billion on three waters (drinking water, wastewater and stormwater) (31.5%)
- \$1.6 billion on transport (24.9%)
- \$870 million on parks, heritage & the coastal environment (13.4%)
- \$286 million on Te Kaha (4.41%)
- \$140 million on libraries (2.16%)
- \$137 million on solid waste and resource recovery (2.11%).

Are we prioritising the rights things?

Select one:

Yes

Comments:

The Board supports the overall spread of proposed spending.

Our top five priorities are:

- Pages Road Bridge (27273): this is our top priority. It is an essential lifeline.
- New Brighton Mall Upgrade including line items 45165 and 63360, which are a part of our Board Plan.
- Southshore Estuary Edge project to continue as consenting allows (61615).
- Wastewater Treatment Plant (59076 etc), including any new funding required to eliminate or mitigate the impact on residents (including the Eastern Priority project).
- Marshlands Hall Trust – support the funding required for the Marshland Hall Trust community facility business case and that these should be included within the LTP allocations.

Trim: 24/

The Board notes the urgent need for integrated coastal hazards adaptation and emergency response planning.

Is there anything that you would like to tell us about specific aspects of our proposed capital spend or capital programme?

Transport?

Comments:

In addition to the top five priorities, the Board wishes to highlight the following:

- Keep Otakaro-Avon Major Cycleway Route \$100k (26603), tying into Aranui Streets for People – planning work can be done now.
- Burwood/Mairehau Intersection (2034)– supportive.
- Burwood/Mairehau corridor improvements (42010) – supportive.
- Funding Improving Bromley’s Roads to ensure (value-engineered) projects proceed.
- Street renewals where surfaces have deteriorated most significantly, including Hay Street, Bower Avenue, Maces Road and Ruru Road between Maces Road and Dyers Roads.
- Wyon and Hulbert Street Renewals (formerly CRAF) should be Long Term Plan projects.
- Funding to renew the North Linwood streets (formerly through the Healthy Streets Linwood Plan).

Parks, heritage or coastal environment?

Comments:

In addition to the top five priorities, the Board wishes to highlight the following:

- QEII Master Plan (56898, 56899, 58911 and 61787) – the Board supports the implementation of the plan but would like to prioritise the playground and the number 2 carpark and, if need be, to use the funding left over from the partial sale of QEII land to make sure that these things are not delayed.
- The Board requests that the QEII playspace be a separate line item.
- Burwood Park Cricket Facilities renewal.
- New Brighton Olympic – track upgrade at Rawhiti Domain
- Hard Surface renewals at Rawhiti Domain – stand-alone item to be included in the LTP.
- South Brighton Community Centre carpark renewal.
- Cockayne Reserve Car Park renewal.
- North Ramp Retaining walls – street side need renewing.
- Spencer Park flooding issues need to be remedied.

Libraries?

Comments:

The Board loves libraries.

Solid Waste and resource recovery?

Comments:

The Board is concerned that low-income households still struggle to dispose of their waste and wishes that the Council provide mechanisms to support them to do so.

Trim: 24/

Other aspects of our capital spend or capital programme?

Comments:

In addition to the top five priorities, the Board wishes to highlight the following:

- 74801 Waitaki Storm Basin (OARC) – strongly support.
- Stormwater and Flood protection – in an earlier draft of the LTP, when the consenting issue with Environment Canterbury was unresolved, there was a \$40m reduction in stormwater and flood protection – the Board wishes to ensure there is no reduction in this, which was identified as the top priority in What Matters Most for our Board Area.
- Accessible Toilet/Changing facility at Taioira QEII – supportive.
- 2415 Programme - SW Management Plan on Pūharakekenui - Styx Waterway Detention & Treatment Facilities – proceed as quickly as consenting allows.
- The Board would like to see investigation of stop-banks for Spencerville through to Brooklands.
- The Board would like to support funding for the Bexley Landfill remediation being brought forward, if at all possible.
- The Board would like Cygnet Street Pipeline as a separate line item.

Additional opportunity and options to our main proposal

We're working hard to reduce the impact of rates rises on residents while ensuring that Christchurch and Banks Peninsula continue to be great places to live. To do this we have had to balance the impact of rates rises with the investment needed to care for our city and asset. However, there are some additional things that we could do that would accelerate work on some projects and programmes, or we could continue to explore ways to bring down our proposed rates increases.

Which of the following do you think should be our focus for the 2024-2034 Long Term Plan?

Select one:

Don't know.

Additional savings and efficiencies

Are there any areas where you feel we should be reviewing the services we provide to reduce our costs throughout the Draft LTP 2024-2034?

Comments:

See introductory comments.

Major event bid funding

Christchurch competes with other cities in New Zealand and around the world to attract major international sports, business and music events through event bid funding. While the city has an established portfolio of events and attracts a range of other events, there are opportunities to grow the existing events and attract new events to the city. This would require additional funding.

Should we leave bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed? Or should we increase the bid funding?

Select one:

Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed.

Trim: 24/

Do you have any comments on the additional event bid funding proposal?

Comments:

Nil.

More Investment in adapting to Climate Change

Our district faces diverse climate hazards, from rising sea levels to more frequent extreme weather events. At a high level, we're spending \$318 million over 10 years on projects that have a direct impact on climate change mitigation, and \$1 billion over 10 years on projects that directly help us adapt and build our resilience. We could bring forward to 2024/25 the additional \$1.8 million annually that is currently proposed to start in 2027/28. This would accelerate the Coastal Adaptation Planning Programme and boost overall community preparedness and resilience.

Do you think we should bring forward to 2024/25 the additional \$1.8 million spend currently proposed to commence in 2027/28, to accelerate our grasp of the climate risks? The early investment would bring forward a rates increase of 0.29% to 2024/25 from 2027/28.

Select one:

Yes

Should we create a climate adaptation fund to set aside funds now to manage future necessary changes to Council assets, including roads, water systems, and buildings, in alignment with our adaptation plans? Implementing this fund would result in a rates increase of 0.25% per annum over the LTP period. How this fund would be established, managed and governed, and the criteria of how the fund will be used, all require further work. As part of that process there will be further opportunity for residents to have their say.

Select one:

Yes

Do you have any comments on our additional proposals to invest in more adapting to climate change?

Comments:

The Board would support additional funding for Coastal Hazards Adaptation Planning and for Civil Defence preparedness and response planning. We consider both can and should be addressed in an integrated manner, supported with funding and some urgency. Our Board Area, along with Banks Peninsula communities, will be most affected by sea level rise and tsunami events.

While the Board supports the upgrade of the Tsunami Warning System, this does not relieve the Council of the need to fund the completion of an evacuation plan, a response plan, and supporting our communities in their preparedness.

Our Community Outcomes and Priorities

Our LTP is guided by the Council's Strategic Framework 2024-34 - it's the cornerstone for our long term vision, steering how we dedicate our energy and resources. Our community outcomes and priorities have shaped all our proposals in this Draft LTP ensuring that every initiative, project, and effort resonates with our commitment to build a thriving, inclusive, and sustainable city for all.

Trim: 24/

Do you have any thoughts on our vision, community outcomes and strategic priorities?

Comments:

Nil.

Potential disposal of Council-owned properties

What do you think of our proposal to start formal processes to dispose of five Council-owned properties?

Comments:

Nil.

What do you think of our proposal to dispose of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties?

Comments:

The Board supports this *if* there is demonstrable benefit to the public.

What do you think of our proposal to gift Yaldhurst Memorial Hall to the Yaldhurst Rural Residents' Association?

Comments:

The Board supports this.

Anything else?

Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about the Draft Long Term Plan 2024-2034?

Comments:

The Board notes with concern that East Christchurch still does not have the same level of Council Social Housing as prior to the Earthquakes. We would like to see the amount of social housing increased to the same (2010) level adjusted for population growth.



Paul McMahon
Chairperson, Submissions Committee
WAITAI COASTAL-BURWOOD-LINWOOD COMMUNITY BOARD

16 April 2024

Trim: 24/