



Christchurch City Council AGENDA

Notice of Meeting:

An ordinary meeting of the Christchurch City Council will be held on:

Date: **Wednesday 8 May 2024**

Time: **1.10pm**

Venue: **Council Chambers, Civic Offices,
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch**

Membership

Chairperson	Mayor Phil Mauger
Deputy Chairperson	Councillor Pauline Cotter
Members	Councillor Kelly Barber
	Councillor Melanie Coker
	Councillor Celeste Donovan
	Councillor Tyrone Fields
	Councillor James Gough
	Councillor Tyla Harrison-Hunt
	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

1 May 2024

Principal Advisor

Mary Richardson
Interim Chief Executive
Tel: 941 8999

Cathy Harlow, Democratic Services Advisor
Samantha Kelly, Team Leader
Hearings and Council Support
Tel: 027 225 5454

cccplan@ccc.govt.nz

Note: The reports contained within this agenda are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. If you require further information relating to any reports, please contact the person named on the report.

To watch the meeting live, or a recording after the meeting date, go to:

<http://councillive.ccc.govt.nz/live-stream>

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, go to:

<https://www.ccc.govt.nz/the-council/meetings-agendas-and-minutes/>
www.ccc.govt.nz



TABLE OF CONTENTS NGĀ IHIRANGI

1. Apologies Ngā Whakapāha 4

2. Declarations of Interest Ngā Whakapuaki Aronga..... 4

STAFF REPORTS

3. Draft Long Term Plan 2024-2034 Hearing of Verbal Submissions - Wednesday 8
May 2024 5

1. Apologies Ngā Whakapāha

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. Declarations of Interest Ngā Whakapuaki Aronga

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.

3. Draft Long Term Plan 2024-2034 Hearing of Verbal Submissions - Wednesday 8 May 2024

Reference Te Tohutoro: 24/738525
Responsible Officer(s) Te Cathy Harlow, Democratic Services Advisor
Pou Matua: Samantha Kelly, Team Leader Hearings and Council Support
Accountable ELT Mary Richardson, Interim Chief Executive
Member Pouwhakarae:

1. Brief Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Council to receive the attached volume of submissions of those wishing to be heard at the Draft Long Term Plan 2024-34 hearing held on Wednesday 8 May 2024.
- 1.2 Attachment A contains the hearing schedule.
- 1.3 Attachment B contains a volume of submissions.

Attachments Ngā Tāpirihanga

No.	Title	Reference	Page
A 	Hearing Schedule - 8 May 2024	24/738619	6
B 	Volume of Submissions - 8 May 2024	24/737144	9

Time	Submitter	#	Agenda p
1:10 pm	Mary O'Connor	3989	9
1:15 pm	Alice Shanks	3660	21
1:20 pm	Dean Banks	3965	24
1:25 pm	Michael Healey	3935	26
1:30 pm	Jerry French	3988	79
1:35 pm	Lynette Harris-Hogan	471	84
1:40 pm	Orton Bradley Park Trust David Ferguson - Chair	2776	87
1:45 pm	Te Ahu Pātiki Charitable Trust Sarah Wilson – Co-Chair	2783	90
1:50 pm	Rob Beechey	1527	94
1:55 pm	Gap		
2:00 pm	Canterbury Cricket Trust Lee Robinson	886	96
2:05 pm	Felicity Price	1287	98
2:10 pm	Janna Robinson	2200	101
2:15 pm	Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust Kit Doudney	1532	104
2:20 pm	Lee Robinson	2989	108
2:25 pm	Gap		
2:30 pm	Adele Geradts	3325	114
2:35 pm	Richard Smith	3872	118
2:40 pm	Martini Investments – Robbie Harris Better for Brighton Group - Lin Klenner Greater New Brighton Community Leadership Group - Neil Cooper	2669 2850	119 121

Time	Submitter	#	Agenda p
2:50 pm	New Brighton Community Gardens Lin Klenner	2503	127
2:55 pm	Gap		
3:00 pm	Anton Wilke	95	130
3:05 pm	Transport, Society and Environment Group Angeal Curl	3873	131
3:10 pm	Mary Louise Hoskins	339	133
3:15 pm	Victoria Neighbourhood Association Mary Louise Hoskins	1873	134
3:20 pm	Save the McDougall Campaign Timothy Seay - Manager	2589	138
3:25pm	Jan Cook	3010	142
3:30 pm	John Thacker	3036	144
3:35 pm	Gap/Break		
3:50 pm	Friends of Banks Peninsula Sue Church – Secretary on behalf of: Sue Church Craig Church Chris & Annette Moore Fionna Turner	3665 3402 3180 2689 2398	146 169 172 173 174
4:10 pm	Gap		
4:15 pm	Citizens Advice Bureau Christchurch Area Ronnie Davey – Board Chair	2995	175
4:20 pm	David Fleming	2886	178
4:25 pm	Gap		
4:30 pm	Virginia Wright	2615	181

Time	Submitter	#	Agenda p
4:35 pm	Forest and Bird Nicky Snoyink – Regional Conservation Manager	2465	184
4:40 pm	Jonty Coulson	2868	187
4:45 pm	Andrew Metherell	3954	191
4:50 pm	Mainland Canoe Polo (MCPA) Jensen Alcock	1597	199
4:55 pm	Chrys Horn	3618	201

3989

Submission to CCC Draft Long Term Plan 2024-2034

On reading your community outcomes (page 15) I am dismayed that you do not consider residents' health and wellbeing to be a necessary community outcome. Further, while you mention wellbeing in one of your strategic priorities, you have failed to mention health. Your decisions and priorities for Christchurch City Council must include health and wellbeing in your decision making as the infrastructure, communication, travel, water supply, sewerage, flooding, disaster planning and parks and open spaces will all impact on all residents' health and wellbeing, some more so than others.

On page 31 regarding Transport, you propose spending \$1.6 billion over 10 years across the entire transport network.

There is no mention of train travel for passengers or freight. I would like to see some travel moved onto the train network.


It is impossible to determine how much will be spent on pedestrian infrastructure but it appears to be much less than the over 200 million to be spent supporting cycling. Looking at the below tables there are far more pedestrian trip leg durations, and for cycling less than 36% have cycled at least once in the last year.

Item 3
Attachment B

Distribution of trip leg durations by mode (2020 - 2023)

Travel mode	Trip legs in sample	Minutes			
		Average (mean) trip leg duration	25th percentile	Median trip leg duration (50th percentile)	75th percentile
Car/van driver	68,543	16.4	5	10	20
Car/van passenger	25,806	15.9	5	10	20
Pedestrian	13,431	15.5	5	10	20
Cyclist	2,129	21.2	10	15	28
PT (bus/train/ferry)	2,513	29.4	15	25	40
Motorcyclist	155	21.9	10	15	25
Other household travel	699	26.6	5	10	25
All modes	113,276	16.6	5	10	20

Source: Dept of Transport – Household travel survey



3989

Cycling in the last month in NZ by age and gender Source: Dept of Transport
Household travel survey (2020-2023)

Unfortunately, Department of Transport did not record how many people were pedestrians in the last year, but it can be assumed to be over 90%.


From your data there will be \$20 million for new footpaths and a share of \$78 million for footpath renewals and pedestrian improvements. And perhaps some of the cycling paths will be designated "shared paths".

Waka Kotahi has the below speed ranges for shared paths. I do not consider e-scooters to be 'active' travel. Regardless, is it not obvious that pedestrians cannot safely share paths with these modes of transport which travel much faster and have much more bulk? A pedestrian, regardless whether they are running or walking would risk serious injury if hit at speed by someone on an e-bike with the combined weight of e-bike and rider possibly being over 150kgs. There are also many people who are too afraid to go for a walk if their only option is to share path space with fast, bulky vehicles permitted on these paths.

Item 3

Attachment B

3989



Operating speed ranges for various active modes.

Although some people who will be pedestrians to get from one point to another, there are others who are on paths for their health and wellbeing. Particularly on the flat in Christchurch, it appears that any path that can be used by pedestrians is a 'shared path'. No one polices cycling on footpaths and with so many 'shared' paths cyclists tend to treat all footpaths as 'shared'. There is a need for pedestrian-only spaces.

Research has shown that there is more benefit from exercising in natural environments than in urban environments. There are alternative streets that those on cycles, e-bikes, e-scooters and the like could use instead of going through Ernle Clark Reserve. If it were to be for pedestrians-only the path could be made pedestrian-friendly and with use only for pedestrians there would be more pedestrians using it. The atmosphere for pedestrians would be much improved. In winter it is less exposed to wind so not as cold and in summer the tree canopy keeps it cooler than urban streets. I ask that you

3989

make this pedestrian-only so those who are afraid to use “shared” paths will have an option for exercise. And consider other pedestrian-only places too, like Little Hagley.

The street footpaths for pedestrians are not pedestrian-friendly. They go up and down for every driveway, are often at a camber and the asphalt surface is hard and is often cracked so a trip hazard. There is lots of clutter sometimes – hire bike and scooters, bins on bin days and often developers encroach onto footpaths. There are pedestrian-friendly path materials that are porous, hence no need for a camber, use recycled rubber so have some give to stretch over tree roots where asphalt would crack, and falling on the path would be less painful. Can CCC at least trial these? With all the redevelopments is it possible for CCC to require developers to slope the end of driveways so they are just below the road kerb height resulting in the footpath not having sideways dips at every driveway. Even better would be a design where the footpath design had preference for pedestrians over vehicles crossing. With high front or side solid fences at the front of properties there is little visibility of pedestrians by drivers. Electric cars being quieter make their approach from a driveway silent to pedestrians.

Pedestrians wait longer at intersections than any other mode. Even if another pedestrian has pushed the button to cross the intersection parallel on the other side of the road, the lights will not give the green person on your side. At other intersections pedestrians are held in the middle of the street in a cage structure in all weathers to wait for the next pedestrian green light. As pedestrian infrastructure is not reevaluated regularly, but doing what has happened for decades, being a pedestrian in urban areas is challenging and can be risky.

I am concerned that intensification is not considering the occupants health and wellbeing, especially for children living in small spaces. Removing one house and replacing it with 4 or 5 flats leaves little space for inside or outside play. Developments on larger parcels of land can usually have a shared playground if individual space is limited. Kainga Ora’s residential developments are less dense than private developments, perhaps because they design for the future residents rather than financial gain.

3989

Is it no wonder that people drive to a park for their pedestrian exercise – running, jogging or walking? CCC should be encouraging pedestrian activities for health and wellbeing, but instead you are going to deter them from coming to Hagley Park by charging them for parking. There is also an ageing population and pedestrian activities are the most accessible for the population as a whole, but particularly this age group, but you are not encouraging them to be active and have better health as a result. Please drop your plan to charge for parking in Hagley Park to encourage activity for health and wellbeing in natural spaces, as the urban environment is unsuitable.


There are dog parks, and dogs are excluded from some areas to protect native fauna, but there are no dog-free parks to protect pedestrians. With the number of sports people, some being national representatives, using Nga Puna Wai can you please make the whole of Nga Puna Wai dog-free. As a pedestrian, dog bites are a constant fear and if bitten possible long-term negative consequences. Along paths where it is not possible to distance oneself from a dog, only small dogs should be permitted. Dog owners often do not understand what “under effective control” means.

Way Safer Streets Consultation – 16 June 2023 – 16 July 2023

It concerns me that when you put an item like “Way Safer Streets” out for consultation that you do not include a safety evaluation and a list of pros and cons of your plan for the public. These were some of the images in the consultation. There were three areas for me locally, and the implications was that they were streets (two weren’t) and they were only of interest to cyclists – they were of interest to all users of the spaces

Everyone should be able to safely walk, scooter, bus, cycle or drive where they want to go. That's why we're making several Ōtautahi Christchurch areas safer for travellers – way safer.

3989



In Simeon Street and Milton Street cyclists would join pedestrians on the footpath.



Christchurch City Council
LITTLE RIVER CYCLE CONNECTIONS
SIMEON STREET
Consultation Plan
Original Plan Size: A3
ISSUE 1 06/2023
TP982301 CPS04051
Sheet 4 of 4

Do you think this proposal will improve safety for cycling?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Somewhat
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / Not sure

Is there anything else we could do to improve cycling safety in this area?

Optional

Why was your only interest cycling safety when you were encroaching on pedestrian spaces? Why introduce an urban cycling “shared” path to a previous natural area and for pedestrians mainly?

Item 3

Attachment B

3989

Why introduce lightning into that area of Nga Puna Wai which is well away from traffic and risks personal safety?

No concern that Bronco Playground will have asphalt paths on two sides close to the playground that bikes and scooters will be able to travel fast along very close to the playground.

Child safety and pedestrian-only natural quite spaces are not considered as cycling always comes first. Please reconsider

Montgomery Spur Reserve: This spur is not far from the base of the Port Hills but has been lost to pedestrians on the lower section by being taken for mountain biking. About \$90,000 was spent on a mountain bike track compared with about \$7000 for a pedestrian track that does not go to the knob at 285m above sea level which would give 360 views at a much lower elevation than the crater rim. The Management Plan has the Kowhai Track to include this high point but that has not occurred, perhaps because the zigzag of the mountain bike track would have to be realigned. Additionally, the Kowhai Track has 6 gates with catches that are difficult to reach from one side. An alternative would have been to have a cattle stop like on Rapaki Track or kissing gates. The first section off Rapaki Track is shared with the mountain bike track, which is narrow and too dangerous to share. While the mountain bike track has sweeping curves the Kowhai Track section just past the mountain bike section requires a more gradual curve as it is too steep.

We are fortunate to have the Port Hills tracks which are on the whole maintained as natural tracks. But recently \$23,000 (from memory) was spent destroying the natural path in Coronation Hill Historic Reserve by digging it out and filling the area with gravel and dirt material foreign to the area. This was a “downgrade”, not an “upgrade”. A few years ago, wooden steps were added which are not as safe to negotiate as the strategically placed stones that they replaced on a short uphill/downhill section. Natural surroundings are better for wellbeing and please CCC don’t waste money by urbanising our natural spaces. When we venture into natural spaces we should expect that sometimes our footwear may get muddy, wet or dusty. If an area must be avoided it is better

3989

to build a boardwalk that can be completely removed when decayed than use loose foreign materials that will be scattered.

There are often plans for “upgrades” to pedestrian paths and spaces that become “downgrades” because CCC keeps wanting to urbanising natural spaces or add paths for wheels and expect this to be improvements for pedestrians. Especially, when running there is the impact on the surface with every stride and while for fast times a firm surface is desirable, for training to prevent wear and tear and injury most training is best done on natural surfaces. Another reason for pedestrians to need their own spaces and paths. Feet and wheels require different path surfaces and design.

In 2022 I made some FOI requests regarding Somerfield Park. In my and a few others’ opinion the paths in the park did not require replacing as they were in a much better condition than some of the footpaths nearby. CCC had sub-contractors complete the works. I asked for the plan, but the FOI reply was that there was no plan as it was just replacing what was there. The FOI reply was that there were no new paths and no paths were widened. I have now found old photos that shows another path was added and a photo showing a path was widened by the gate. I am at a loss as to how my FOI reply was that there was no plan of works for a job done by external contractors. Who approved to add the extra path and widen another? What was the extra cost? The reply also was very late in being answered. (FOI’s 573427 and 548926). I am concerned that proper procedures were not followed and replies were false.

Please can you provide water sites without chlorine or fluoride added for residents to fill their own containers for drinking water to reduce one use plastic bottles?







3660

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: Alice Last name: Shanks

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Fri 10 May

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.
Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.
We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.
Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in **Section 1** so we can contact you.

Feedback

Average rates - multiple-choice

Yes

Changes to how we rate - comments

Retain the rates remission for conservation land protected in perpetuity by conservation covenants. The ongoing contribution from the public helps the landowners fund weed and pest control. With the imminent removal of the Significant Natural Area obligations (and the proposal to uplift scenic reserve status and Conservation covenants under the draft Fast-Track Approvals bill) covenants will be critical to the retention and enhancement of City and Banks Peninsula biodiversity. I am part of two covenants that receive this rating relief and it really does make private conservation projects feasible in the long-term.

Fees & charges - comments

It is fair to charge for the use and maintenance of public car parks, as long as the time interval is long enough to enjoy or use the facilities at the park.

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

Yes

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

Yes

Capital programme - comments

I think it very clear now that the Council made the wrong decision to go ahead with the current stadium. The building costs and ongoing maintenance and running costs are a burden to the ratepayers and will suck funds from other meritorious investments.

3660

Item 3

Attachment B

Capital: Transport - comments

I would benefit if the western end of Opawaho-Heathcote and the Southern Lights cycleway projects be completed earlier. It would make my cycles use safer and and prompt me to cycle more, helping to reduce my use of a car or bus. Improving the he Colombo-Strickland-Somerfield corner through the Beckenham shops is critical to the cycleway network. I feel scared and vulnerable when I stand at the lights, sandwiched between the stationary Colombo Street straight-through traffic and the moving curbside lane turning into Tennyson Street. Cycle-friendly crossings of Colombo and Tennyson Streets, would be very helpful for schoolchildren cycling to school to Beckenham, St Peters, Hillview, Waltham, and Rudolf Steiner Schools and the students to Cashmere who currently wobble across Colombo Street amongst the morning traffic..

Capital: Parks, heritage or the coastal environment - comments

Banks Peninsula (including the Port Hills) is uniquely placed geographically and ecologically as a biodiversity hotspot. Because biodiversity is mobile, Banks Peninsula acts as a seeding node, and a storehouse of carbon for Greater Christchurch and the wider Canterbury area. I would like to see the City Council make strategic purchases of land/farmland on Banks Peninsula to balance the cities carbon budget through natural regeneration of forest and at the same time provide more land for recreation for our growing city. In Somerfield town houses are sprouting like mushrooms in autumn. The convenience of no garden needs to be offset by more leafy green places to walk and community gardens. These people are sure to seek out all the benefits of being in nature, planting trees, growing fruits and vegetables. This requires the Council to employ rangers to oversee and provide guidance to community projects.

Capital: Other - comments

Since Christchurch is built on high ground deposited by a big braided river, surrounded by streams and swampy ground it is critical that drainage and stormwater is prioritised. Add in extreme rain events and higher sea levels (1 cm on average since 1920) and keeping the city dry is the main priority of Council. This means restricting building on the Port Hills to reduce the inevitable flow of loessial silt into the Opawaho/Heathcote river and building detention basins when in low-lying swampy places (most of Sparks Road) are developed for housing.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Deliver what we have proposed in the Draft Long Term Plan (e.g. maintain existing levels of service and invest in our core infrastructure and facilities that keep Christchurch and Banks Peninsula running).

Areas to reduce costs to provide savings - comments

Reduce funding for major events to enable private investment to manage events. Please fund the Arts Centre to stay open and alive. It is the centre of the visitor experience to Christchurch - The Botanic Gardens, Museum, Art Gallery, The Square, the Otakaro/Avon eels, tram, with the beautiful Arts Centre in the middle. After the earthquakes we have so little heritage to enjoy.

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed. This expenditure is included in the proposed rates increase. While it may not have an impact on rates, it could have implications for our ability to attract major and business events in the short term.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

I always thought I would not see the impacts of the increase of GHG in the atmosphere in my lifetime. Now I am growing limes, passionfruit, and kawakawa where they have been frosted out in the past. The graphs of carbon in the atmosphere are steadily increasing. March was the hottest March ever recorded. The impacts are likely to come fast from now on so planning and preparation is essential.

Strategic Framework - comments

I support the Council working towards a green liveable city, climate resilience, protecting and regenerating the

T24Consult Page 2 of 3

3660

environment (especially indigenous biodiversity), water bodies, and tree canopy, across the urban areas and rural Banks Peninsula. I support the retention of the Environmental Partnerships Fund (EPF) to help community-led organisations to deliver conservation outcomes for the benefit of current and future generations of Christchurch City residents. I support funding to increase indigenous biodiversity health and recreational opportunities. I wish the Council to put regulations in place to control the location and impacts of exotic tree plantations registered in the ETS as permanent forest. The regulations need to include the obligation to plant to reduce seed spread, maintain firebreaks, and remove wilding trees, and control pest animals (possums, deer, goats, pigs, wallabies) and agricultural and biodiversity weeds. On 3 November 2023 changes were made by MPI to give Councils more power to decide where new forests are located, and the regulations now apply to both plantation forestry and exotic continuous-cover forests (carbon forests) that are deliberately established for commercial purposes. The National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry wishes to see all forests are well-managed to ensure any adverse effects are managed. For example, assessing wilding conifer risk, establishing setbacks from roads, dwellings and waterways, and managing harvests. For Banks Peninsula the spread of wildings and who is responsible for their removal requires addressing through Council regulations to prevent the cost of ongoing control of spread of wilding exotic trees being paid by ratepayers. Likewise the increased fire risk from flammable exotic forestry needs to be addressed by the Council to prevent the costs of controlling fires and recovery being a growing burden to ratepayers. <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/biosecurity/exotic-pests-and-diseases-in-new-zealand/long-term-biosecurity-management-programmes/wilding-conifers/> "In the wrong place, certain species of conifers are a major threat to New Zealand's ecosystems, land, and farms. Their seeds can be blown many kilometres by wind, and quickly infest vulnerable landscapes in affected regions. They spread into farmland, the high country (including above the native bush line), and public conservation land. If not contained or removed, these wilding conifer trees compete with native plants and animals for sunlight and water. Within a few years they can severely alter natural landscapes and obscure the views New Zealand is famous for. Controlling the spread of self-seeded wilding conifers is important if we're to protect our ecosystems, iconic landscapes, and farms. Control will also help with water conservation in some regions, particularly the South Island high country." I have experienced the impact of Pest-Free Banks Peninsula when I visited the Ōnuku hostel. The bird song was huge and humbling. All it took was the removal of predators. Investment of rates into biodiversity will create natural "events" that will attract visitors to Christchurch and Banks Peninsula. Ocean tours, Geopark, farm visits, forests with walks and birdsong, mountain-bike trails community engagement in weed and pest volunteer programmes is what will make young people come home and stay here.

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

Yes. Place for community activities, meeting is essential for healthy social capital.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

3965

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: Dean Last name: Banks

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

No. I think that there needs to be more focus on address the ongoing effects of climate change. I understand that raising rates to fund that actuoan is unpopular but so will continued wildfires and other extreme weather events. I am greatly concerned that Christchurch will not reach its net zero carbon goal so more action neees to be taken.

Average rates - multiple-choice

No

Average rates - comments

You should be increasing it.

Changes to how we rate - comments

No

Fees & charges - comments

Some of the funding provided by those fees should be used to ensure they are accessible to public tranaportation and by seperated bike lanes.

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

Don't know

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

3965

Capital programme - comments

The money for transportation is being spent on roads not on bike lanes. And there is not enough emphasis on the climate resilience of these projects as well as how carbon efficiently they are using the land.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed. This expenditure is included in the proposed rates increase. While it may not have an impact on rates, it could have implications for our ability to attract major and business events in the short term.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

It is likely to cost well more than the set aside 1.8 Million. There needs to be real accountability to that fact and the actual fund could be rapidly emptied during an extreme event.

Strategic Framework - comments

Sustainably might be a focus but that does not seem to be coming through in many of the actions in the plan especially around cutting funding for bike lanes.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

3935

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 from healey, michael

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Christchurch
City Council 


Item 3

Attachment B

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: michael Last name: healey



Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Thu 2 May eve Mon 6 May am Tue 7 May eve Thu 9 May am

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

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.

For more information about the Draft Long Term Plan see the [Consultation Document](#).

1.1.1

Overall, have we got the balance right?

3935

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 from healey, michael

In my opinion, no, I would like to see (i) sustained innovation in the urban environment through public arts and culture. In this case, defunding the Christchurch Arts Centre disrupts the artistic ecology that needs to be cultivated and not merely activated around events. Effective professional administration is essential to maintain the line. The inner city risks becoming a vapid billboard without substance or actual cultural activity behind it. (ii) On the grounds of access and cultural equity, I suggest that the proposal is not targeted toward supporting ethnic communities' intersection in full participation in the institutions funded by ratepayers.

Rates

For information about Rates see [page 39 of the Consultation Document](#).

1.2.1

Given that both the Council and residents are facing significant financial challenges, should we be maintaining our existing levels of service and level 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%**?

Yes

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

1.2.3

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

I agree with city vacant differential, I disagree with rating visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business

Fees & Charges

For information about Fees & Charges see [page 43 of the Consultation Document](#).

1.3.1

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

I disagree with parking fees for the botanical gardens during the weekends, this would disadvantage full community access.

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.

For more information about Operational Spending see the [Consultation Document from page 23](#).

1.7

Are we prioritising the right things?

Yes

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:

Item 3

Attachment B

3935

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 from healey, michael

- \$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%).

For more information about the Capital Programme see the [Consultation Document](#) from page 23.

1.4.1

Are we prioritising the right things?

No

1.3.7

Comments

I live in a city called Christchurch. Transit-orientated development is the future of Christchurch. What is TOD? From 'the horse's mouth', or [REDACTED] in this case: "moderate and high-density housing along with complementary public uses, jobs, retail and services, are concentrated in mixed-use developments at strategic points along the regional transit system." In the wake of the 2011 earthquake, Christchurch underwent rapid depopulation of its urban core and a corresponding expansion of new housing developments in the surrounding satellite towns through large-scale 'greenfield' developments. Following the publication of the (Greater Christchurch Public Transport Futures MRT Interim Report, 2021), three transport infrastructure solutions have been proposed: (i) heavy rail using existing networks, (ii) street running limited-stop routes, i.e., buses, (iii) street running corridor focused routes, i.e., trams. The interim report does not provide fine-grained information about the built environment, its suitability to successfully support Transit Orientated Development, or how this might inform choosing a particular infrastructure proposal. Furthermore, the Christchurch City Council CCC does not have TOD-specific planning regulations that might ensure quality design and successful built outcomes. Much of this reluctance to intermesh public transport proposals with TOD urban design principals can be explained by: (i) the early stage in the transport feasibility study, (ii) the absence of inner city track infrastructure for public transport since the removal of trams in 1953 (iii) the reluctance of developers to commit to high-density developments given the perceived preference for detached housing and private car ownership. The central issues of urban density and walkability that underpin any successful TOD project have been addressed to a limited extent by [REDACTED] 2009 study "Christchurch Public Space Public Life" and Christchurch City Council 2015 "Christchurch Central Recovery Plan" – both these documents focus on the inner city, where designers have been given a tabula rasa for extensive shovel ready building and landscape projects follow the earthquake. Still, it is noted that the respective western and northern transport links proposed in the (Greater Christchurch Public Transport Futures MRT Interim Report, 2021) will necessarily be inserted into the city fabric around existing commercial, industrial, heritage and suburban areas. The apparent lacuna in TOD planning and rules for Christchurch highlights the need for further investigation into the local conditions of each transport node; for if the general formula of (low population density = high government investment) holds in the case of Christchurch, then there is the risk of getting the scale, urban form or funding the model wrong if developers piggy-back off increased property values and the removal of height restrictions without informed public & community consultation.

1.4.2

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

Transport?

For more information about Transport see [page 31 of the Consultation Document](#).

There are three proposed transport modes for TOD following the publication of the (Greater Christchurch Public Transport Futures MRT Interim Report, 2021) three transport infrastructure solutions have been proposed: (i) heavy rail using existing networks, (ii) street running limited-stop routes, i.e., buses, (iii) street running corridor-focused routes, i.e., trams. I'm throwing my weight behind horse number three - It's a winner! Why? • Street running corridor wins value capture option and population support increase. It has other advantages as it is the only option that creates a walkable TOD network corridor where many of the stops are within an 800 m walkable distance from each other. • The choice is between fast (sub 30 min) access for commuter town vs finer grained urban corridors. • From the perspective of community building and New Urbanist values, recall • From [REDACTED]'s definition of TOD is "developments at strategic points along the regional transit system". • Street running corridor would be the preferred option as it brings more density and walkable suburbs that are otherwise isolated. • It will affect Scenario Change in Land Value Change in Population along the Corridor • Change in Employment along the Corridor. Defining what constitutes walkability, mix-use, and density in one place is complex and may be perceived differently in another. There is a risk of getting the scale, urban form or funding the model wrong if developers piggyback off increased property values and the removal of height restrictions without informed public & community consultation. The key is self-funding value capture through increased land prices, which can fund community services, social housing, and infrastructure. Besides questions of implementation and funding, there is often some choice between satellite access for commuter towns vs finer-grained

Item 3

Attachment B

3935

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 from healey, michael

urban corridors. From the perspective of community building and traditional (healthy) urbanism, a street-running corridor is preferred as it brings more density and walkability to otherwise isolated suburbs.

1.4.3

Parks, heritage or the coastal environment?

For more information about Parks, Foreshore and Heritage see page 32 of the Consultation Document.

I work as a heritage consultant in Christchurch. Canterbury Provincial Chambers (Stage 1) – \$20 million is woefully inadequate. By my reckoning, starting work on the stone chamber's restoration is firstly a tactical mistake. I intuited this after speaking to [REDACTED] last year; was it his recommendation or a capitulation to these mean times' economics? I cannot say for sure, but it was conveyed to me that the stained glass windows were not intended for reinstatement. Still, in a rather sentimental gesture that I appreciated, [REDACTED] intended to collect the despoiled cameos, repurposing them in a future clear-pane window. I was naturally disappointed not to be able to read Tennyson and Longfellow, whose poems, although now out of fashion, embellished the chamber in a room that I consider to be the soul of our city's early foundation, no doubt there are other issues along these lines we could discuss. My suggestion, plainly put, would be to restore this pièce de résistance after staging the smaller timber sections first. I suggest an advertising and public relations campaign, perhaps a public launch on the forthcoming New Zealand Heritage Week. The international heritage status of the building is our first obstacle; note the inclusion of the public archives already! I recall when the Prince of Wales visited recently, and I had the opportunity to spend some time with his architectural entourage from INTBAU, where I raised issues of windows, encaustic tiles, and potential royal patronage, amongst other things. Above all, the project would benefit from a business plan; I would share a vision to establish tenancing actions of the building with sympathetic trades in the heritage industries and education sector. Perhaps some of these proposals would maximize synergies and sow the public engagement that best serves our needs. I'm leading a working group feasibility study into the potential for inscribing the Canterbury Provincial Chambers as a UNESCO listing. I would request further consultation on this issue.

1.4.6

Other aspects of our capital spend or capital programme?

For information on other aspects like Drinking Water, Wastewater, Stormwater, Sport and Recreation and Climate Change see the Consultation Document from page 29.

Proposal 1 Permanent Hospitality - Arts Centre Architectural Intervention One of my significant reservations about Islamic architecture in New Zealand after being involved in some initial concept design on a project several years ago is the need for experienced craftspeople to execute such things as muqarnas, mashrabiya and plaster work with the required skill and detailing. I wish to propose a permanent architectural installation within the Christchurch Arts Centre. Given historical sympathies with Gothic architecture, an architectural intervention such as a muqarna embedded into the building fabric of the art centre may be both sympathetic and signal a permanent re-orientation in the hospitality of this building. There is a precedent for this in the contemporary interpretations of gothic grotesques already on site. I suggest a small-scale intervention such as replacement column capital or a squinch to be specified in masonry or ceramics. Such a project could be executed by an international master in residence (they have apartments for just this sort of thing on site), and the occasion could be used for training local stonemasons or allied craft persons who are already very skilled, as well as further workshops and community activation. This idea came to me when reflecting on the time I lived in an Orthodox monastery in the Sinai of Egypt known as St Catherine's; over the last 1400 years, a strong relationship had been formed between the mostly Greek-speaking monastics and the local Bedioun - so that a small mosque was built inside the stone walls of the monastery. It may be an excellent idea to liaise with the Princes School of Arts, which has interested alumni all over Australia, for a potential workshops program. Both organizations are aligned with the project goals. The conceptual goal would be to illustrate "they are us" through the affinity between architectural styles, one that might only be recognized by an educated eye, and thus create a point of meditation on shared heritage and historical exchange through the presentation of the installation.

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 place 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.

For more information about additional opportunities see page 46 of the Consultation Document.

1.5.1

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

Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

3935

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 from healey, michael

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.

For more information about the major event bid funding see [page 49 of the Consultation Document](#).

1.5.4

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?

Increase the bid funding. This means we will be able to continue to attract new major international sports, business and music events, but would also mean an additional rates increase of 0.42% in year one of the LTP, 0.04% in year two, and 0.14% in year 3.

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.

For more information about adapting to climate change see [pages 51 and 52 of the Consultation Document](#).

1.5.1

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.

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

1.5.2

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.

Yes - create a climate adaptation fund.

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.

For more information about our community outcomes and priorities see [page 15 of the Consultation Document](#).

1.5.1

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

I feel that CCC is not coherently targeted at creating spaces for (i) ethnic communities (ii) activating disused spaces through temporary urbanist interventions.

Potential disposal of Council-owned properties

For information about the potential disposal of Council-owned properties see [page 54-57 of the Consultation Document](#).

3935

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 from healey, michael

You can find more detail from [page 215 in Volume 1 of the Draft Long Term Plan](#).

1.5.1

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

Agree with all with the exception of Mataroa Reserve

1.5.2

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

I Approve

[Future feedback](#)

1.6.2

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?


We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes.

Name
High Street Tempoary Urbanism.pdf

Item 3

Attachment B



3935





IDEAL CITY: THE INVENTION OF MEMORY AND THE SECRET HISTORY OF US

Given the inevitable combination of long-term developer interest and existing by laws that condition the built environment, the project area will likely develop a medium density infill over the respective block. The character of the project area is intended to be determined by both its mixed retail zoning and the overlay for an innovation precinct. The development for the once vibrant south-east is projected to have a slow turn around. It is proposed here to develop a strategy of utilizing the largely vacant lot of land with a series of short to medium term tactical interventions designed to direct the future use of the area toward a vision of an autonomous precinct.

The key move in enabling this vision is the closure of the street to vehicular traffic. This is justified but the utility of tying together the various areas of the block and anchoring them a pedestrian boulevard; a choice made easy by the fact the project area is a traffic dead zoned that is bypassed by the main car and cycle routes.

The major two practical outputs would be the attraction of small businesses into the area, principally through pop-up hospitality and retail, secondly the place-making exercise of attracting public in numbers to an art precinct.

A number of practical interventions have been chosen and await testing in the design process, it is clear that the project area shares a common problem with vacant lots insomuch as it lacks an edge condition to define it against the surrounding urban fabric. One of the principally objectives of this project is to strike the right balance of creating boundaries as place-holders and objects of urban character, whilst retaining permeability for pedestrian movement and flexibility for programming the project area.



This design process is intended to develop an architectural grammar comprising of flexible and modular elements that when combined in creative ways will bring the character of and creative overlay or palimpsest that will activate and unify the various tactics and interventions

Principal drivers have been the creation of a series of rules that establish people centred bill of rights. Two of these rules are a legacy of the 2011 Christchurch earthquake:

Rule 3

“The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to public space where creative and temporary intervention is given a permanent mandate by council by-law in the street scape. • An area of permanent display of pop up and urban intervention if to be permitted, encouraged, and incentivized by creative grants”

Rule 4


“The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to preserve and protect their heritage and engage in the process of creating cultural memory in continuity with the past • The site shall sensitively approach connecting to build heritage items and retain their scenic catchment. • The possibility of commemoration lost heritage should be explore, interpretive signage and retention of partial heritage fabric.”


It is considered important to memorialise a new overlay that synthesizes innovation and tradition. One way that this will be explored is by situating ‘outsider’ history into the public sphere by naming marking the lost cultural memory of the city.

Pursuant to this, the semiotic of the architectural intervention take on special importance. They need to express the temporary and utopian qualities of the dreamer and poet and the formal classicism in plan express the aspirations of the project as a place holder.

The re-purposing of post-modernist tropes borrowed by from Russian theatre design and constructivist paper architecture into the temporary architecture of the pop-up is an exploration that is underlie this needs to synthesize innovation and history or rather overlay them in creative tension.

3935






February 2011 earthquake that resulted in a reported 80 per cent of the central city's buildings being demolished fundamentally reset the course of Christchurch.




The government's response to the February 2011 earthquakes was to develop the Blueprint for the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan. The Blueprint set the course for unprecedented government investment and intervention in the central city through the establishment of 'anchor projects' such as a library, bus terminal, justice precinct & convention centre.



While the eastern part of the former city was being acquired and repurposed, the central city has been quietly shifting west, through sustained private investment and intervention around Cashel Mall and along the edges of Ōtakaro, the Avon River.



Although the space created as a consequence of the 2011 earthquake has provided opportunities at a variety of urban scales, more fine grained urban interventions in Christchurch's once vibrant inner south-east have failed to attract small business owners due to the lack of foot traffic, whilst large properties are left vacant as the owners wait on 'early colonizers' to make the first move.



Constitution of Utopia

1 The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to the public expression of otherness and alternative community.

The site will regularly celebrate diversity and become an inner-city locus for street festivals.

- Tenancy guidelines will be created that promotes businesses that bring diversity of identities into the area.

2. The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to direct representation of their micro communities' interest at a municipal level

- Local representative bodies for the community will be constituted from, tenants, stall holder, lessees, body corporates, and engaged public interest groups to promote the interests of the communities.

3. The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to public space where creative and temporary intervention is given a permanent mandate by council by-law in the street scape.

- An area of permanent display of pop up and urban intervention if to be permitted, encouraged, and incentivized by creative grants.

4. The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to define themselves against the urban fabric that alienates and excludes them.

- The site shall be designed in such a way as to institutionalized street art as part of its architectural facade.

5. The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to act and enforce interventions in the urban fabric that are commensurate with the scale and culture of the said community.

- The site shall be designed in such a way as to institutionalized street art as part of its architectural facade.

6. The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to challenge and contest local by-law that erase complexity to the detriment of cultural productivity and pleasure.

- A special planning committee for cultural activities shall be formed to liaise with the council and be given clear parameters as to how autonomously the precinct can directly intervene with an aim towards responsible autonomy.

7 The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to a walkable scenographic experience. • The site shall be designed in such a way as to create a dramatic and memorable experience for the user where a variety of key vistas and journeys are possible.

3935

8 The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to and environmentally sustainable future. • The site shall employ non-toxic and recyclable materials.

- The site shall reduce the dependency on fossil fuels by employing shelter that reduces the need for cooling in summer.
- The site shall, as far as possible stop cars from entering into it other than service vehicles.

9 The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to innovate and start new business without the penalty of commitment to long term leases.

- The site shall have a affordable rental market space that is connected the Ara institute of technology and the Christchurch Polytechnic so there is integration between the market and the tertiary institutes that are nearby.

10 The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to a permeable urban fabric and to resist and subvert through architecture the colossal

- The scale and program of the site shall run against the recent tendency in Christchurch to build large anchor projects.

11 The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to assert the life of the pedestrian and outdoor activities over that of cars.

- Enclosure of the street, excepting cycles should be encouraged.
- Laneway access should be increased and activated.

12 The occupants of the precinct/city have the right clean and quite transit • Bicycle lanes should be established in a way without disturbing the flexible programming or pedestrian experience.

- Informal high context rules should be articulated and reinforced through passive surveillance

13 The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to congregate in the open whilst enjoying shelter from inclement weather.

- A variety of design options should be considered in order to keep the site running and attractive throughout different parts of the year.
- These will include extensive verandas, arcades, covered street sections.


14 The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to preserve and protect their heritage and engage in the process of creating cultural memory in continuity with the past


- The site shall sensitively approach connecting to build heritage items and retain their scenic catchment.
- The possibility of commemoration lost heritage should be explore, including (AR) technology, interpretive signage and retentive of partial heritage fabric.

15 The occupants of the precinct/city have the right to express their cultural and personal diversity in safety without fear of discrimination or any form of violence.


- The site shall be designed to promotes a sense of safety through passive environmental design option







3935



TACTICAL INTERVENTIONS


3935



STAGE/PERFORMANCE SPACE




STREET MAKEOVER




URBAN BEACH/MARKET




THEATRE/MEDIA SPACE



URBAN GAMES



URBAN GARDEN



PROPOSED PROGRAMMING








- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 1. speakers corner | 6. flexible modular scaffold | 12. hospitality seating | 18. urban games |
| 2. amphitheatre | 7. stage seating | 13. hospitality rentals | 19. smash palace |
| 3. projector/videodrome | 8. market stage | 14. heritage gardens | 19. new build |
| 4. resident creative | 9. changing rooms/toilets | 15. heritage buildings | |
| 5. wheel chair accessible ramp | 10. urban beach | 16. urban garden | |
| 6. flexible modular scaffold | 11. street playground | 17. painted pavement | |

SITE AXONOMETRIC




20 m

EAST ELEVATION - BUILDINGS




20 m

EAST ELEVATION




20 m

SOUTH ELEVATION - BUILDINGS



20 m


SOUTH ELEVATION



20 m


amphitheatre

NORTH ELEVATION-BUILDINGS



20 m

NORTH ELEVATION



20 m

WEST ELEVATION-BUILDINGS



20 m


WEST ELEVATION




The first intervention and the keystone of the precinct is a street makeover and road repair. The section of High street that the project area is situated is currently a motor vehicle and cycle 'dead zone' that has largely been by-passed by designated lanes in the surrounding streets. It is proposed to close off the High street to non-essential vehicles and program a child-friendly out door hospitality district with a contained play area that would enable patrons with young families to supervise their children and have time-out. A general culture of street activities and urban games is encouraged in this precinct. The strategies of road repair and street make over represents the most immediate, cost-effective and impactful interventions, and should precede and other interventions. The politics of urban intervention is considered important. It is problematic that 'tactical urbanism' is an accomplice of developers who would otherwise not invest in the area. In a critical sense it contains the seed of its own destruction if it does not offer anything else than a precursor to future mixed retail development. In this sense the positive value and unique character of the street needs to be recognized and upheld. One key example is 'Smash Palace', it is the one post-earthquake outdoor bar and has been 'holding the fort' within the project area, and has provided a home to radical politics and outsider identities and very much fits the aesthetics of tactical intervention. To maintain protect and amplify the unique character and culture of the street is important.



"The citizen of the precinct/city have the right to the public expression of otherness and alternative community" (Rule 1)



HIGH STREET MAKEOVER & ROAD REPAIR



HIGH STREET MAKEOVER & ROAD REPAIR

3935





HIGH STREET MAKEOVER & ROAD REPAIR

3935



demographic of inclusivity

One of the key finding of this study is that urban renewal projects of-ten suffer from the homogenization of late-capitalisim. One symptom of this is the fetishization and infantilization of youth-culture, often at the cost of alienating older members of the community. This project wishes to ignore this artificial distinction by creating an area where both innocence and experience and come together and co-habit. This is achieved through cross-programing and layering of contrary strate-gies such as make-out spot, voyeurs platforms, chess stadia and tradi-tionally geriatric games such as bocce.

“The cizitens of the precinct/city have the right share in-ter-generational knowledge and experience.” Rule 15



Potential heritage rooftop intergration

- 1. court
- 2. out door seating
- 3. make-out nook
- 4. hospitality rentals
- 5. rooftop ramp access.

3935



MATERIALITY

The entire project area is designed as a temporary to semi-permanent intervention (with a life span of 3-10 years depending on the area. Accordingly the materials employed are designed to be easily set out and cost-effective, and can easily be removed, or repaired without requiring further excavation of foundations. All of the zones in this projects are build on open gravels that sit on top of demolished hard-fill dating to the 2011 earth quake. The ground treatment over the project employs stabilized fine gravels and astro turf with underlying gravel stabalization mating with a geo-textile base. With standing structures being made from such systems as scaffold and rendered light timber framing, and in some cases metal tube and u-beams. The attempt is to create a look and feel of something symbolically substantial in structure and in feel, whilst keeping in mind the life span of the project.










URBAN GARDEN & GAMES CONCEPTUAL AXON

3935








3935



URBAN GARDEN & GAMES PLANTING



CHES CLUB CAGE FIGHTING



MEDIA ARTS PRECINCT

"The poem is a plank
laid over the lions den"





James K. Baxter 1926-72 Poet

Poets Corner. A sound shell and frame provide a semi-sheltered soapbox for the ranter and poet. Prior to the 2011 earthquake the central city speakers platform was widely popular.




Bruno Lawrence 1941-1995 Actor

Performance Stage. A circular wheel chair assessable stage, flanked by brise-soleil and platform that can function for rigging lights and filming. The stage provide internal seating with rear access so the performance would create an intimate enclosure with the actors turned from the intersection to the north.



Paul Maunder 1945- Director/Activist

Cinema. A partially covered two-tiered open air cinema will project onto an adjacent concrete wall - creating a sheltered and intimate experience yet visible from the High street.



Jane Campion 1954- Screenwriter

Artist in Residence. A local artist will be provided with a 'pop-up studio' and community lounge, and promote public engagement with the arts and contribute to a growing body of work produced by residents.

3935




DA ЗДРАВСТВУЕТ
III-я ИНТЕРНАЦИОНАЛ

КИНО


"HIS MASTER'S VOICE"

REG. U.S. PAT. OFF.




10 m

MEDIA ARTS SOUTH ELEVATION



10 m


MEDIA ARTS EAST ELEVATION



3935

10 m

MEDIA ARTS NORTH ELEVATION




10 m


MEDIA ARTS NORTH ELEVATION









MEDIA ARTS AMPITHEATRE RENDER






10 m

SOUTH ELEVATION - STAGE




5 m


WEST ELEVATION - STAGE



EAST ELEVATION - STAGE







WEST SECTION - STAGE



3935

The stage area is constructed from scaffold with a plywood facade. Stability is provided by being anchored to concrete ballasts and being supported by a row of underlying shipping containers that act as a wind break. The stage is designed to be wheel chair accessible via a 1/16 ramp that exits onto the street, and is provided with two stair that face into the precinct. The second level is shielded from the sun and rain by a water proof shade sail. The overall aesthetic borrows from early Russian constructivist theatre set design and is designed to be able to be taken apart and recycled in other configurations.

WEST SECTION - STAGE



AXONOMETRIC - STAGE




3935

STAGE RENDER


3935



The bazaar is designed to function as tenanted weekend market with a small music stage and a sanded area 'urban beach' that offers further options for urban games. This is planned as the final of the 6 phases and represents an semi-permanent option with anchored metal framed modular construction and plumbed toilet facilities which are otherwise lacking in the area.



BEACH & BAZAAR PLAN







3988

Te Mahere Rautaki Kaurera

OUR DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2024–2034

Submission form

We'd like your feedback on the Draft Long Term Plan 2024–34 and the matters we have raised in our Consultation Document.

Tell us what you think by Sunday 21 April 2024.

ccc.govt.nz/longtermplan

*200 m
6400 Lanes*

3988

Item 3

Attachment B

How to make a submission

We'd like your feedback on the Draft Long Term Plan 2024-34 and the matters we have raised in our Consultation Document. **Tell us what you think by Sunday 21 April 2024.**

There are several ways you can give feedback:



Online: (preferred)
ccc.govt.nz/longtermplan



Email:
CCCPlan@ccc.govt.nz



Fill out a submission form available from libraries and service centres and pop it in our submissions box. (To ensure we receive last-minute submissions on time, from Tuesday 16 April please hand deliver them to the Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street).



Post a letter* or form to:
Freepost 178 (no stamp required)
Long Term Plan Submissions
Christchurch City Council, PO Box 73016,
Christchurch 8154

* Your submission must include your full name and email or postal address. If you wish to speak to your submission at the public hearings, please also provide a daytime phone number. If your submission is on behalf of a group or organisation, you must include your organisation's name and your role in the organisation.

Social media

Informal feedback, which is not counted as a submission, can be made in the following ways:

- Go to our Facebook page facebook.com/christchurchcitycouncil and include **#cccplan** in your post.
- Tweet us your feedback using **#cccplan**

Talk to the team

Alternatively, you can give us a call on (03) 941 8999, provide your details and a good time for us to call, and one of our managers will be in touch.

Hearings

Public hearings will be held from early-May 2024 (exact dates will be confirmed closer to the time).

Submissions are public information

We require your contact details as part of your submission. Your feedback, name and contact details are provided to decision makers. Your feedback, with your name only will be available on our website. However, if requested we will make submissions including contact details publicly available. If you feel there are reasons why your contact details and/or submission should be kept confidential, please contact the Engagement Manager by phoning (03) 941 8999 or 0800 800 169.

ccc.govt.nz/longtermplan


3988

Te Mahere Rautaki Kaurera

Submission form

OUR DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2024-2034

We'd like your feedback on the Draft Long Term Plan 2024-34 and the matters we have raised in our Consultation Document. **Tell us what you think by Sunday 21 April 2024.**



Your details

We require your contact details as part of your feedback – it also means we can keep you updated throughout the process. Your feedback, name and contact details are given to the mayor and councillors to help them make a decision.

Your responses, with names only, go online when the decision meeting agenda is available on our website.

If requested, responses, names and contact details are made available to the public, as required by the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

If there are good reasons why your details and/or feedback should be kept confidential, please contact our Engagement Manager on 03 941 8999 or 0800 800 169 (Banks Peninsula).

First name*

JE RAWN

Last name*

FRENCH

Email*

Street name
and number*

Suburb

Town/City


Postcode

*Name required, plus **either** email **or** street name and number



I would like to speak to the Council about my feedback.

Please provide a phone number so we can arrange a speaking time:



If you are responding on behalf of a recognised organisation, please provide:

Name of organisation

Your role

3988

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 assets. 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?

- ☒ **Deliver what we have proposed in the Draft Long Term Plan** (e.g. maintain existing levels of service and invest in our core infrastructure and facilities that keep Christchurch and Banks Peninsula running).
- ☒ **Explore other ways to bring down our proposed rates increases across the Draft LTP** (e.g. reduce or change some of the services we provide, review our grants funding, increasing fees and charges for some services).
- ☐ **Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations** (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).
- ☐ **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 LTP 2024-2034?

TOTAL REVIEW ACROSS THE SERVICES PROVIDED - CONCENTRATE ON CORE ACTIVITIES AS USED TO BE THE CASE WITH COUNCILS GENERALLY. DO THE BASICS & DO THEM WELL. NO FAILS!! DON'T EMBARK ON VENTURES THAT PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS CAN DO & DO MORE EFFICIENTLY.

Major event bid 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?

- ☒ **Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the Draft LTP, as proposed.**
This expenditure is included in the proposed rates increase. While it may not have an impact on rates, it could have implications for our ability to attract major and business events in the short term.
- ☐ **Increase the bid funding.** This means we will be able to continue to attract new major international sports, business and music events, but would also mean an additional rates increase of 0.42% in year one of the LTP, 0.04% in year two, and 0.14% in year three.

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

I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF WE MAKE ANY MONEY (THE COUNCIL) OUT OF EVENTS HELD IN HAGLEY PARK - I HOPE WE DO!! THIS SHOULD BE HANDLED BY PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS - NOT COUNCIL STAFFERS.

DEC 2020

3988

Thursday December 10 2020 The Star

test Canterbury news at starnews.co.nz

NEWS 5

Salary rises 'unsustainable'

• From page 1

This trend has also occurred alongside a relatively small increase in staff from 2516 in 2012 to 2793 in 2020.

The revelation comes at a time when the city council is attempting to cut costs and tailor its budget in response to the financial fall out of the Covid-19 pandemic.

City councillor James Gough believed the rise in salaries was "completely unsustainable," and that the trend needed to be "urgently reviewed."

"We need to be reducing rates and reducing borrowing and to achieve that the council needs to actually spend less, and wages are a huge component of that," he said.

"If they [the city council] don't, watch this worrying and unsustainable trend continue - and the person who picks up the tab is the ratepayer, and quite frankly that's unacceptable."

Deputy Mayor and chairman of the city council's finance and performance committee Andrew Turner said the council was already working to find "savings and efficiencies" as it progressed towards developing its Long Term Plan for the coming decade.

"Our job as elected members is to set the levels of service and consider ways of delivering those

BY THE NUMBERS

City council employee wage brackets

Less than \$60,000	1159
\$60,000-\$79,999	600
\$80,000-\$99,999	431
\$100,000-\$119,999	328
\$120,000-\$139,999	162
\$140,000-\$159,999	61
\$160,000-\$179,999	17
\$180,000-\$199,999	11
\$200,000-\$219,999	8
\$260,000-\$519,999	6



James Gough



Andrew Turner

levels of service. If you can deliver the levels of service with less staff and that results in savings then great," he said.

"Rather than focus on who is getting paid more than \$100,000 and less than \$100,000, we should focus on the total wages bill and how we can resource more effectively."

Taxpayers' Union spokesman Louis Houlbrooke said it seemed as though the \$495,000 salary



Dawn Baxendale



Louis Houlbrooke

of city council chief executive Dawn Baxendale had created a culture of high wages within the city council.

"With the salary of the CEO it seems to trickle down into the culture of the entire organisation," he said.

City council chief executive Dawn Baxendale has actually taken a 10 per cent cut to her \$495,000 salary in response to the pressures of the pandemic and only last week announced she would be implementing sweeping changes to the organisation's executive leadership team in a bid to cut costs.

The new structure will halve the number of general managers from six to three while also disestablishing 13 positions and creating eight new roles. It will save between \$600,000 to \$700,000 a year.

Furthermore, there was no annual remuneration review this year which can result in pay rises.

Item 3

Attachment B

3988

Item 3

Attachment B

More investment in adapting to climate change

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 how we address climate risks? The early investment would bring forward a rates increase of 0.29% to 2024/25 from 2027/28.

- ☐ Yes – bring \$1.8 million forward.
- ☒ No – don't bring \$1.8 million forward.
- ☐ Don't know – not sure if we should bring \$1.8 million forward.

Should we create a Climate Resilience 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.

- ☐ Yes – create a Climate Resilience Fund.
- ☒ No – don't create a Climate Resilience Fund.
- ☐ Don't know – not sure if we should create a Climate Resilience Fund.

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

NZ IS A THIN / LONG COUNTRY. IT IS
VERY WINDY. WHAT WE DO IN NZ HAS
NO OR LITTLE AFFECT ON CLIMATE CHANGE.
WE SHOULD LOOK MORE TOWARDS CLIMATE
RESILIENCE – IE NO ELECTRIC BUSES + CARS
FOR A COUNCIL STAFF, WHICH ARE NOT GREEN!!
BUT CLIMATE RESILIENCE IS NOT A PRIORITY.

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.

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

DON'T SPEND COUNCIL (RATE PAYERS) MONEY
WHEN IT IS NOT NEEDED. TARRAS BIADAT
BIKE LANES + REDUCING THE SPEED LIMITS
AROUND TOWN. CARS ARE HERE TO STAY!! HOW
ELSE CAN A WOMAN (FOR EXAMPLE) DROP HER
CHILDREN AT SCHOOL / KINDERGARTEN AND THEN
GO TO WORK. BUS / CYCLE – NOT!!

3988

Potential disposal of Council-owned properties

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

YES - SELL IT. ALL - BUT DON'T
WASTE THE PROCEEDS ON FRIVOLOUS
EXPENDITURE - USE IT TO KEEP RATES LOW.

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

GREAT IDEA - BUT DON'T WASTE THE
PROCEEDS

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

NO COMMENT.

RATE ACCORDINGLY.

Anything else?

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

- RATE INCREASES SHOULD BE IN LINE WITH INFLATION. NOT WORK OUT WHAT YOU NEED AND
 - REDUCE / LIMIT STAFF WAGES - PROMOTE EFFICIENCY
 - NO ADVERTISING / SIGN WAITING ON COUNCIL VEHICLES - YOU DON'T NEED TO PROMOTE THEIR BUSINESS. - WASTFUL EXPENDITURE !!
 - DON'T GIVE "TREE TECH" A MONOPOLY ON ALL COUNCIL WORK - I ASSUME THEY HAVE GROWN SUCCESSFUL ON COUNCIL TREE/GARDEN DUTIES.
- Thank you for your submission.

- CALL THE LIBRARY & OTHER IMPORTANT BUILDINGS / SERVICES BY THEIR EUROPEAN NAME
- NO TABAKI AIRPORT.
- REMOVE THE BIKE LANES IN PARK TERRACE THEY HAVE A HUGE IMPACT ON TRAFFIC FLOW.

471

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 27/03/2024

First name: Lynette Last name: Harris-Hogan

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.
Fri 10 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.
Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.
We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.
Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

Yes

Average rates - multiple-choice

Don't know

Changes to how we rate - comments

Save the Arts Centre

Fees & charges - comments

Save the Arts Centre

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

No

Operational spending - comments

Save the Arts Centre

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital programme - comments

Save the Arts centre

471

Capital: Parks, heritage or the coastal environment - comments

Save the Arts Centre

Areas to reduce costs to provide savings - comments

Save the Arts Centre

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Increase the bid funding. This means we will be able to continue to attract new major international sports, business and music events, but would also mean an additional rates increase of 0.42% in year one of the LTP, 0.04% in year two, and 0.14% in year 3.

Event bid funding - comments

Save the Arts Centre

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Don't know - not sure if we should bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Don't know - not sure if we should create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

Save the Arts Centre

Strategic Framework - comments

Save the Arts Centre

Disposal of 5 Council-owned properties - comments

Save the Arts Centre

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

Save the Arts Centre.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

Item 3

Attachment B

471

#	Name	Received via Arts Centre campaign
471	Lynette Harris-Hogan	Please continue funding the Arts Centre it is our home, where we meet every week to educate Christchurch folk on communication and leadership giving them confidence to contribute to the Christchurch community in so many valuable ways . THANK YOU .

Item 3

Attachment B

2776

Submission on Long Term Plan (2024 – 2034)

To: Christchurch City Council,
53 Hereford St,
Christchurch 8013

From: David Ferguson, Chair, Orton Bradley Park Trust
[REDACTED]

Ian Luxford, Park Manager, Orton Bradley Park
[REDACTED]

Council Connection

Firstly, we would like to thank the Christchurch City Council for their support over the years. It has been invaluable in ensuring that the Park is maintained and open 365 days a year.

Orton Bradley Park is unique! It performs the role of a public park, but is operated as a charitable trust formed under an Act of Parliament. The trust board includes two Community Board representatives and the Area Head Ranger, so the Council makes a strong contribution to governance of the Park, as well as contributing financially.

All operational costs, asset replacement, public services and facilities, development, bio-diversity management and heritage protection are managed by the Park Board and staff.

The Park provides excellent 'bang for buck' as a charitable trust with strong community volunteer involvement; if the Council were to operate the Park it would cost many multiples of the current contribution.

Funding History

Pre-amalgamation the Park received an annual grant of \$65,000 (under the Sustainable Communities' fund). Post-amalgamation this grant was reduced to \$50,000.

In 2012, an MOU was signed with the CCC ensuring that the grant became a budgetary line item removing the need for annual applications. The grant was set at \$50,000 and has not been reviewed since. An additional \$2,500 towards biodiversity management has been received over the past two years.

In the past three years, two major developments have occurred:

1. In association with the Rod Donald Trust and Te Hapū Ngāti Wheke, Orton Bradley Park Trust contributed towards the purchase of the 500ha Te Ahu Pātiki block of land at the head of the Te Wharau catchment (through the sale of the Park's waterfront sections). This has resulted in the protection and guaranteed public access from sea-level to the highest point on Banks Peninsula (919m elevation gain over 6km).
2. We became a recipient of a Jobs for Nature grant to undertake pest and weed control in the Te Wharau catchment (covers Te Ahu Pātiki, Orton Bradley Park and some neighbouring properties). Possum, mustelid and rat traps have been installed

2776

throughout this 1200ha catchment, and major weed control work has begun.
Unfortunately, this funding ends on July 2024.

Funding Request

In order to maintain the current level of service of a key community facility, the Orton Bradley Park Board requests the following:

A) An annual grant of \$85,000 under the Biodiversity Fund to maintain the biodiversity gains achieved over the past 3 years.

What has changed to justify this increase?

- Insurance costs have risen from \$14,000 in 2012 to \$24,000 in 2018, to \$33,000 in 2024 (**additional \$19,000 from when funding level set**)
- Rates paid to CCC/Ecan continue to increase. From \$18,500 in 2012 to the current \$32,062 per year (**additional \$13,562 from when funding level set**)
- General operational and compliance costs have increased markedly due to legislation changes to Health and Safety and outdoor education/adventure provision.
- General manual labour projects are no longer undertaken by Correction Department work groups due to Health and Safety compliance and department staffing issues. This has resulted in the Park Board having to pay wages for this work.
- Our very important volunteer workforce is aging and is no longer able to achieve what they once were; again putting increased pressure on park staff.
- Increased bio-diversity planting and protection (83ha of QE II reserve plus another 40ha of amenity planting and stock excluded areas) has increased staff requirements for weed and pest management. Over the past three years we have planted 20,000 native plants, fenced 3km of stream tributaries and caught over 2500 possums, 950 rats, 300 mustelids plus other pest animals.
- Visitor numbers have increased, putting increasing pressure on infrastructure and services. 2018 Council data indicate that on average 1950 vehicles enter the park each month – At an average of three people per vehicle this would indicate in excess of 70,000 people a year are visiting the park, up from the 30,000 that data indicated in 2005 (plus approx. 5000 attending the Park's annual Spring Fair).
- Since 2012 the average compound CPI increase of 2.5% per annum means that general goods and services are 34% more expensive now than they were in 2012. The CCC has made no adjustments to the grant to reflect this change.

B) Capital Projects grant of \$25,000 per annum

- Sewerage and water infrastructure is in desperate need of repair in order to avoid serious health risk issues that may impact the Park's ability to operate.
- Maintenance of roading, signage and large tree removal has been deferred given lack of funds, and a programme is needed to regain infrastructure standards expected of the Council's own public parks.

2776

Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to speaking to this presentation at the public hearings. We wish to speak at the same time as Te Ahu Pātiki Charitable Trust.

Item 3

Attachment B

2783



Submission from Te Ahu Pātiki Charitable Trust to Christchurch City Draft Long Term Plan 2024/2034

Christchurch City Council
53 Hereford Street
Christchurch 8013

From:

Sarah Wilson
Co-Chair
Te Ahu Pātiki Charitable Trust
CC60087
www.teahupatiki.org

Kia ora koutou

Re: Draft Long-Term Plan 2024/34 Submission

Te Ahu Pātiki Charitable Trust is the kaitiaki guardian of Te Ahu Pātiki, 500 hectares of whenua on Te Pataka o Rakaihautū Banks Peninsula. Te Ahu Pātiki is a newly created public conservation park in the heart of Whakaraupō Lyttelton Harbour. It includes the summits of Mt Herbert/ Te Ahu Patiki and Mt Bradley, the two highest peaks in the wider Christchurch area. The park is protected by a QE11 Covenant, and its track network is gazetted with Herenga ā Nuku as part of the Te Ara Pātaka track network.

The purchase and subsequent processes to safeguard this whenua were enabled through the efforts of many organisations and individuals. The 'Buy the Hill' campaign was a shining example of the collective will to see this special whenua protected. Over \$950,000 was raised from crowdfunding, demonstrating the level of public support for increasing the quantity of conservation land on the Peninsula.

The Te Ahu Pātiki Charitable Trust has been operating since March 2022. The Trust is committed to working collectively to achieve the ultimate goal of fully restored and

Item 3

Attachment B

2783

thriving indigenous forest across the whenua. We have received, and continue to receive, support from the Council, ECAN, community groups, and likeminded organisations across the rohe.

We work closely with, and are supported by, a number of organisations including Banks Peninsula Conservation Trust, Pest Free Banks Peninsula and Whaka-ora Healthy Harbour to name but a few. We recognise that pests, weeds and the movement of people are not contained within boundaries. It is with this in mind that we are submitting to the CCC LTP. We could not sustain our pest and weed control, both vital to the successful growth of the forest, without funding assistance. We are a public park with free access.

We are grateful for the assistance we have received thus far and urge the Council to continue to fully support the interlocking initiatives across the rohe. This is the quickest, surest and most sustainable way to achieve climate change resilience and a green liveable city.

Key Reasons Why Continued Support is Critical:

- Banks Peninsula (including the Port Hills) is uniquely placed geographically and ecologically as a biodiversity hotspot. Because biodiversity is mobile, Banks Peninsula acts as a seeding node, and a storehouse of carbon for Greater Christchurch and the wider Canterbury area.
- Banks Peninsula (including the Port Hills) contributes significantly to CCC's aspirations for a Greener Liveable Climate Resilient City.
- Biodiversity is a public good and all current and future generations of Christchurch residents benefit from its protection and enhancement.
- Acknowledgement with thanks for the biodiversity-focused funding that has been contributed by CCC to date to Te Ahu Pātiki. Thanks also for the contribution to our current Fire Risk Analysis Plan development project.

Specific responses to directions signalled in the Draft LTP 2024/2034:

- We support Council working towards a **green liveable** city and advocate that all goals relating to climate resilience, protecting and regenerating the environment (especially indigenous biodiversity), water bodies, and tree canopy, apply to all of Banks Peninsula (including the Port Hills) as well as urban Christchurch.
- We support the following strategy documents that underpin the Draft LTP especially where nature-based solutions and enhancing indigenous biodiversity have been given preference: Ōtautahi Climate Resilience Strategy; Ōtautahi Urban Forests plan; Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū/Banks Peninsula Destination

2783

Management; Banks Peninsula Community Board Plan 2023-25; and Whaka-Ora/Healthy Harbour Plan.

- We are concerned that the proposed removal of the Environmental Partnerships Fund (EPF) will have a significant negative impact on the ability of community-led organisations to deliver conservation outcomes for the benefit of current and future generations of Christchurch City residents.
- We are concerned that the 21 partner Port Hills-focused Te Kakahu Kahukura (TKK) programme will lose funding at a time when it is most needed. Post another Port Hills fire the important role of this community-driven programme in supporting landowners has never been clearer. If appropriately resourced this community-led programme can support ecological recovery from fire damage; proactively plan for fire risk mitigation of existing and future indigenous biodiversity across the Port Hills; and establish an ecologically robust Port Hills forest that is a biodiversity hub for Christchurch City, with significant climate resilience benefits. We are all interconnected and need support to collectively mitigate against fire risk.
- We are concerned that Council's grant via the EPF to the Pest Free Banks Peninsula (PFBP) elimination and feral ungulate programmes have been discontinued. When removing funding we have to consider the effect on the ground: reincursion of animal pests will occur and the investment of CCC – not to mention the incredibly hard work of so many in our communities - will have been for nought. This negative impact will also be felt for years on land owned by the Council. Te Ahu Pātiki is currently battling a feral pig invasion. Feral pigs are significant biodiversity and agricultural pests. We are working alongside Graham Corbishly and the work of the Feral Pig Committee of PFBP and have had great success with trapping and specialist hunting so far. However, the Council needs to work alongside others to commit to eradication of feral pigs not just control efforts. While this will require significant resource (estimates are up to \$500,000 across agencies) it is far more cost effective than the ongoing annual cost of maintaining suppression (in the order of \$120,000 - \$180,000 per year just to hold the current gains).
- We are concerned that the removal of an EPF grant supporting the Banks Peninsula Conservation Trust's operational costs means their organisational focus has to shift towards securing new funding to "keep the lights on". This puts pressure on the BPCT's ability to provide the leadership support and facilitation for collaborative community-led programmes like Te Ahu Pātiki, TKK and Pest Free Banks Peninsula.

2783

- We are concerned that the draft LTP is not explicit about the need to control weeds which threaten local ecosystems. If adequate ongoing internal resourcing for Council to meet their obligations to control these threats on Council land is not available, incursion of plant pests will potentially undermine the investment CCC (and many others) have already made in achieving biodiversity gains over many years.

In Support of Specific requests for additions to the LTP:

- We request the reinstatement of the Environmental Partnerships Fund (or a similar grant vehicle) to continue funding at the same level as the LTP 2021/23 for the following:
 - The continuation of an annual contribution of \$30k to support the Te Kakahu Kahukura programme.
 - The continuation of an annual contribution of \$50k to support the Pest Free Banks Peninsula elimination programme.
 - At a minimum, the continuation of an annual contribution of \$40k to support feral ungulate removal on Banks Peninsula. Strategically, a much greater investment in feral pig eradication would be prudent and should be considered. Investment is twofold:
 - 1. City Council staff should continue to support the eradication of feral goats as well as identification of key areas for feral pig control on Council and adjoining land;
 - 2. The LTP should invest in complete removal of feral pigs by contributing \$100K spread over 3 years toward the joint effort (matched by ECAN, DOC and landowners).
 - The continuation of an annual contribution from the Environmental Partnerships Fund of \$30k towards BPCT operational costs so they can continue to facilitate these strategically important collaborative programmes.

Te Ahu Pātiki Charitable Trust **requests to be heard in support of this submission.** We would be pleased to appear at the same time as the PFBP Project Management Group.

Sarah Wilson

Co-Chair

Te Ahu Pātiki Charitable Trust

1527

[REDACTED]

From: Rob Beechey [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 15 April 2024 8:41 am
To: CCC Plan
Subject: Fwd: LTP Draft Submission

[REDACTED]

Dear Phil Mauger and Councillors.

Before I composed my response to the LTP draft, I thought, what's the point?
How receptive will the council be to my concerns? However, being an eternal optimist here goes.

Your Strategic Priority to MANAGE RATEPAYERS MONEY WISELY rings hollow as you burden we residents year after year with outrageous increases twice the inflation rate. The compounding impact is criminal. The 13% you are threatening us with this year doesn't go away. It remains baked in forever.
Are you not aware of the everyday hardships the current population is facing today? What sacrifices did you make to accommodate the council's 10.3% wage increase? Any at all?

Have you ever recklessly thought to replace the current Strategic wording with "To Achieve a Zero Rate Increase?"
What would stop you adopting this vision where your entire team questions every projects commitment to this new strategic priority?

I'll tell you why this is currently un-achievable, it's because you don't operate as a team. You are a collection of individuals promoting your own political and community baggage at the ratepayers expense.

This disunity is holding Chch to ransom. I believe the current model is seriously broken. I know there are some very good people here determined to minimise rate increases. However, there are others who should take a very hard look at themselves by getting over their selfish indulgences.

Public apathy is when only 40% of us turn up to even vote. Elections will come and go and great opportunities will be missed.

A disunited council has consequences.

The second point I wish to make is your Strategic Priority to "REDUCE EMISSIONS AS A COUNCIL AND A CITY to achieve a NetZero goal!" Why?

This is just political theatre and is the very baggage I refer to. Wasting millions of dollars on over-engineered cycle ways and interfering with traffic flows in the name of climate alarmism has no place in local govt. I suspect sanity was outvoted by political extremists.

My third point I plucked from your strategic priorities was to "Champion Ōtautahi-Christchurch?"

Who gave you the right to rename Christchurch Ōtautahi without public consent?
"Christchurch" was created by the early European settlers that carved out a city reminiscent of what they left behind. The naming of every new build in Maori is an affront to our early pioneers.
Christchurch is not geysers land. Move to Rotorua if that's what you want. Have you ever thought of adopting the ship names that brought these early settlers to our shore?
The obliteration of our true history is pure political interference and has no place in council.

1527

In summery, the current council model is broken. Talent selection through an election process stopped working years ago and a 13% increase bears testimony to this.
Reference to emissions reduction and climate alarmism ideology is a political distraction and has no place in local government. Stop rewriting our history and start honouring the pioneers that built Christchurch.
I look forward to your response.

Regards
Rob Beechey
A Christchurch Ratepayer.
Fifth generation kiwi with seventh generation grandchildren.



886

Canterbury Cricket Trust

Submission Christchurch City Council – Long Term Plan – Funding for Events in Christchurch

1. Events are extremely important to the City, they are fundamental to our image, our sport and recreation, our culture and our people.
2. As importantly, they are an economic benefit to the City and they must be pursued and promoted and vigorously support our cities exposure for tourism and our cities businesses.
3. Our exposure on the international stage is vital to the City's wellbeing, its' tourist industry and those in business that take risk in relying on the tourist and retail dollar.
4. We are concerned, however, that cricket and other partners who provide the services and support for these events are required, at the moment, to fund or, at least, underwrite these events. It is unacceptable, unsustainable and untenable for those responsible for promoting sport, thereby providing recreation and wellbeing for our young participants, to be left to fund or underwrite events that the City should, and has, until this long-term plan, been responsible for.
5. By way of example, Cricket has had to underwrite \$80,000 to try and seek the scheduling of a proposed English Cricket test in Christchurch in November / December 2024. As we have reiterated this is simply not sustainable.
6. Quite apart from the fact that that it is not the sports and various organisations objectives, these third parties are not for profits and often charitable; such commercial funding arguably does not come within the objects, often charitable, of these organisations.
7. Cricket needs funds for the growth and development of its game. This is at the community level for school children and participants and clubs. It should not be funding or underwriting facilities and events and, in other words, subsidising the City to do its job, like other councils around the country are currently doing.
8. It is strongly urged that the City funds events from its own resources. Sports in particular must have its own money for its kids, its youth, its participants to enable growth of the sport and promote health and culture.
9. There are multiple examples of the City pursuing expenditure where its priorities are concerning. These need to be critiqued and reconsidered in many respects.
10. In the meantime, we would urge and encourage the Council to adopt its alternative option for funding bids for major events. This would comply with its previously stated policies that are set out below. The City should fund these events rather than compromise its future vitality and promotion. A 0.42% increase in rates should not deter the city from complying with its previously stated obligations.
11. Why would the City not invest in events, when its return on investment will provide \$650M over the next ten years. This for a modest increase in the rate levy.
12. We would remind the Council of its previous intentions when a decision to build a multi-use arena was made.
 - Strong communities;

Saunders Robinson Brown

Item 3


Attachment B

- Celebration of identity through arts, culture, heritage and sport;
- Livable city;
- Vibrant and thriving central city;
- Prosperous economy
- Modern and robust city infrastructure and community facilities.

13. The latest proposal where there are no funds in the budget for events seems to fly in the face of these outcomes. The city resolved to strengthen its appeal as a vibrant city in the following manner:

- The livability of Christchurch and its reputation in a 21st Century “things to do” city;
- Ability to compete with other cities and attract major events and concerts;
- Keeping expenditure in the city;
- The return of private sector investment confidence in the city;
- The attraction and retention of young people to the city who are currently choosing to work and study elsewhere; and
- Return of city and retail pride

We have done the hard work to provide and plan for these facilities. Now let's use them. Businesses have invested in the CBD in anticipation of having events now and not having to wait another three years in terms of the Council's considered options.



Lee Robinson
Chair
Canterbury Cricket Trust

1287

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 10/04/2024
First name: Felicity Last name: Price

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Thu 2 May eve Thu 2 May pm Fri 3 May am Fri 3 May pm Sat 4 May am Sat 4 May pm Mon 6 May pm Mon 6 May am Tue 7 May pm Tue 7 May eve Wed 8 May am Wed 8 May pm Thu 9 May Thu 9 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.
Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.
We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.
Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments
No. There is no allowance for continuing to fund valuable city assets such as the thriving Arts Centre, which is not only great for tourists and locals but also valuable to the city's heritage and history.

Average rates - multiple-choice
No

Average rates - comments
You should allow for continued funding of the Arts Centre at \$1.8m pa, meaning a dollar a month increase for each ratepayer - cheap at the price.

Changes to how we rate - comments
No

Fees & charges - comments
No

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice
No

Operational spending - comments
You should prioritise continuing to fund the city's valuable Arts Centre asset - if the City Council were to end up

1287

running it, it would cost ratepayers a lot more than the \$1.8m pa funding sought.

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital programme - comments

The Arts Centre is just as valuable to the city as Te Kaha and libraries so the Council should allow funding for it. Whatever the Council has set aside for heritage should also take into consideration the Arts Centre's funding needs - especially since it has been restored at only a very minimal cost to the Council - much, much less than the Cathedral which is probably never going to be restored.

Capital: Transport - comments

No

Capital: Parks, heritage or the coastal environment - comments

Yes, the Council should put some funding into the Arts Centre - the city's most valuable operational heritage asset, taking up a whole city block and comprising the biggest heritage restoration in NZ.

Capital: Libraries - comments

No

Capital: Solid waste and resource recovery - comments

No

Capital: Other - comments

No

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Don't know.

Areas to reduce costs to provide savings - comments

If you fail to fund the Arts Centre you will end up spending a lot more each year than the \$1.8m needed - the Council will still have to find \$1.2m insurance money and pay (or lose) \$200,000 rates.

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Increase the bid funding. This means we will be able to continue to attract new major international sports, business and music events, but would also mean an additional rates increase of 0.42% in year one of the LTP, 0.04% in year two, and 0.14% in year 3.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

No - don't bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

No - don't create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

The Council needs to focus on the here and now, not climate change.

Strategic Framework - comments

A thriving city needs to look after its community assets such as the Arts Centre, which attracts a million visitors a year, local and international. Without funding from the Council the Arts Centre will fail and a significant community asset will be lost.

1287

Disposal of 5 Council-owned properties - comments

No comment

Disposal of Red Zone properties - comments

No comment

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

No comment

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

This consultation process makes it hard to include popular community assets that the Council is refusing to continue funding. I can only reiterate that the city Council needs to set aside \$1.8m pa to keep the Arts Centre the thriving creative community hub that it is today and not embark on a lengthy legal process to change the Arts Centre Act to find a new owner. Only the lawyers will benefit from that, and Government could well decide the Act should stay as is and refuse to assign ownership to any other entity other than the Arts Centre Trust, which the National Government created in 2015.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

Item 3

Attachment B

2200

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 19/04/2024
First name: Janna Last name: Robinson

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Thu 2 May eve Thu 2 May pm Fri 3 May am Fri 3 May pm Sat 4 May am Sat 4 May pm Mon 6 May
pm Mon 6 May am Tue 7 May pm Tue 7 May eve Wed 8 May am Wed 8 May pm Thu 9 May Thu 9
May pm Fri 10 May Fri 10 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

I think so

Average rates - multiple-choice

No

Average rates - comments

I think considerable money is being spent on unsuitable projects around wastewater.

Fees & charges - comments

I'm not sure I agree with charging for parking at Hagley Park. It is a public park for the use of everyone. However, there are a number of people who park around there for work and do not use the park. If paid parking is brought in, then I would hope it would be affordable parking for office hours only.

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

Yes

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital programme - comments

There needs to be a focus on funding that provides a return on investment to city. My concern with some of these

2200

waste water projects is they are not fit for purpose and the Council needs to look at the bigger picture. Some of these alternatives are worse than the current situation. for example, the waste water project for Akaroa, the independent BECA report has shown that the current plan is not fit for purpose. If so much money is going into these projects, where is the long term plan and strategy? To me it seems like a waste of money and is not suitable for a changing climate and updated modelling. This plan will not benefit the people of Akaroa long term.

Capital: Transport - comments

I'm agreeable with the priorities. Unfortunately you wont get anyone agreeing to ride public transport until its user friendly and accessible. At the moment, it is much easier to drive a car. Also its great to try and limit people using cars, but many parents need their cars to pick up their kids after school/day care. Riding a bus to do that is not practical and then to try and get them home after that. Most families have both parents working to afford to live so some thought should be given to this when increasing cycle lanes and bus lanes and reducing roads for cars. We dont have the population for fully subsidised public transport. Also cycle lanes are a great idea but they should not be at the expense of roads. The new cycle lane by Hagley park is unacceptable. There is a huge area of land within Hagley park for bikes (and a much safer option than the road) and you have removed an entire lane off Kilmore St so traffic is backed up and bottlenecked. That cycle lane is not in the interests of people working in the city.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Explore other ways to bring down our proposed rates increases across the Draft LTP (e.g. reduce or change some of the services we provide, review our grants funding, increasing fees and charges for some services)

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Increase the bid funding. This means we will be able to continue to attract new major international sports, business and music events, but would also mean an additional rates increase of 0.42% in year one of the LTP, 0.04% in year two, and 0.14% in year 3.

Event bid funding - comments

I dont think it should increase the rates to do this. I think funding should be cut to some of these other projects that are not a sustainable option eg akaroa waste water

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Don't know - not sure if we should bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Don't know - not sure if we should create a climate adaption fund.

Disposal of 5 Council-owned properties - comments

yes if they are no longer used for purpose they should be sold

Disposal of Red Zone properties - comments

agree although I would expect some new investment to be made

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

agree

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

wastewater programme is prioritised that is sustainable and fit for purpose. The current proposal for Akaroa is not. I agree that wastewater needs to be addressed over there but the BECA report shows the Council plan is not suitable.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

T24Consult Page 2 of 3

2200

Link	File
No records to display.	

Item 3

Attachment B

1532

Item 3

Attachment B

Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust

<http://www.estuary.org.nz/>



Christchurch City Council


Estuary Trust Submission

Christchurch City Council's draft Long Term Plan, Te Mahere Rautaki Kaurera 2024-34

The Avon Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust

1. The Avon Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust (AHEIT, The Estuary Trust) is a charitable society registered in 2003. It was formed as a result of community requests over many years for the formation of an organisation that included committed representation from statutory bodies, tāngata whenua and other agencies.
2. The vision of the Trust is
Communities working together for
Clean Water
Open Space
Safe Recreation, and
Healthy Ecosystems that we can all enjoy and respect

*Toi tū te taonga ā iwi
Toi tū te taonga ā Tāne
Toi tū te taonga ā Tangaroa
Toi tū te iwi*
3. Further details about the Trust, its Constitution, the Memorandum of Understanding between the Christchurch City Council, Environment Canterbury and the Trust, and the Trust's Estuary Management Plan, please visit our website at www.estuary.org.nz


Kit Doudney
Chairperson, AHEIT

NOTES; The Estuary Trust would like to speak to the submission at the public hearings.
Contact details for the Estuary Trust are; info@estuary.org.nz



1532

The Trust's submission

We thank Christchurch City Council for their ongoing support of the Estuary Trust's work.



1. Stormwater drainage direct to the Estuary/Ihutai

We strongly urge the city council to accelerate work to improve the quality of stormwater draining directly into the Avon Heathcote Estuary/Ihutai.

We note (from Page 30 of the Draft LTP document) that council spending will address stormwater works for the Ōtākaro Avon River and the Ōpāwaho Heathcote River. This will help resolve some water quality issues in the estuary.

But there are several watercourses which drain surface water (runoff) direct to the estuary without the benefit of treatment. Contaminants damage the marine life of the estuary and severely limit the quality of mahinga kai and biodiversity.

We understand council have started prioritising the work that needs to be done, but the Estuary Trust sees a need for urgent remediation if water quality in the estuary is to at least be maintained and in the longer term improved. A joint approach with Environment Canterbury may be needed; the regional council has special regulatory and protection roles and access to specialist services.

One such watercourse is the Estuary Drain. This is a creek along the edge of the former city council landfill site at Bexley. It flows through a culvert under the State Highway on Anzac Drive (just north-west of the Bridge Street/Dyers Road roundabout). A recent study has shown it to be highly polluted. A long-term solution is required in order to stop contaminants entering the estuary.

NOTE: There is also the issue of bank erosion exposing the waste from the old landfill, which could be causing leaching of contaminants and waste being eroded and transported into the estuary.

There are other watercourses such as the Linwood Canal, the drains across the Linwood Paddocks and streams in McCormacks Bay and Moncks Bay which need similar attention.

2. Wildlife Protection

We ask the city council to investigate and implement increased legal protection for the wildlife of the Estuary/Ihutai.

Currently there are three measures which indicate that the community values the estuary and wants it protected.

1. The waste-water treatment ponds at Bexley are blessed with the status of being a gazetted Wildlife Refuge and as such are protected under the Wildlife Act. But there is no similar protection for the estuary itself.
2. The East Asian-Australian Flyways Partnership. The international community has recognised the importance of our estuary by bestowing the status of "A Wetland of International Significance"; just one of 4 in New Zealand. This is an honour but it brings no automatic regulatory protection.

1532

3. In its District Plan the Christchurch City Council regards the estuary and its environs as a "Site of Ecological Significance" (SES/LP14). Again, this seems to be an honour rather than a protective measure. Even though the estuary has this status, the City Council itself has been investing in feasibility studies for a walking/cycling track along the western edge of the estuary near the Wildlife Refuge – if the City Council were to regard its own District Plan designation seriously then it should never have started these feasibility studies.

But those three measures do not actually constitute legal protection for the tidal flats and body of the estuary.

As an example - currently the indigenous birdlife of the estuary is at risk because of human activity in the estuary. Of particular concern is the constant disturbance of wading birds by dogs. The Estuary Trust regularly receives reports of dogs disturbing birds, particularly on the tidal flats at low tide. There is confusion about whether dogs are allowed on those flats – in some areas they are and in other areas they are not. It is difficult for Christchurch City Council to enforce dog bylaws when there are inconsistencies in signage and policies.

Revised dog bylaws and policies may resolve this issue but there are other recreational, commercial or transport threats which also need to be managed so the estuary is better protected. For example, kayakers, horse-riders, walkers, trail bikes and so on are frequently seen intruding into areas where birds seek sanctuary. An increased, formal level of protection would send a clear signal to potential users that the estuary is precious and cannot be tampered with.

3. Development of the Linwood paddocks as a tidal wetland

We request that the project that we believe is already underway by Council is accelerated to develop the paddocks into a key tidal wetland connected to and benefitting the ecology of the Estuary in the same way that we have been working with Council in the Charlesworth Reserve, adjacent to the paddocks. The Estuary Trust is willing to help the Council on the ground by facilitating community involvement. Work done now will be a significant contribution to the future resilience of the city in the face of climate change.

4. Other wetland restoration zones

We strongly urge the Council to proceed as quickly as possible with wetland restoration in the Bexley wetlands (especially the area formerly known as Pacific Park) and in the lower Ōpāwaho/Heathcote Rivers (where saltmarsh and saltmeadow should be protected and enhanced).

There are opportunities in those areas to start protection and restoration activity. The Estuary Trust is also willing to help the Council on the ground in these areas. Work done now will be a significant contribution to the future resilience of the city in the face of climate change.

5. Fly-tipping mitigation at the Mugford stream gravel carpark – build a fence

The Estuary Trust suggests the construction of a fence between the graveled rest area and Mugford stream to reduce the amount of household rubbish dumped in the area. Once the fence is built the ideal would then be to carry out planting between the fence and the stream to make the area aesthetically pleasing and enhance the aquatic environment of the stream.

1532

6. Estuary Edge Predator Control

We ask the City Council to increase the Regional Parks budget by \$40,000 per annum for predator control work on the Estuary/Ihutai edge.

Since September 2021 the Estuary Trust has managed predator control in ecologically vulnerable areas of the estuary edge. This has been funded by Jobs for Nature, but funding finishes in September 2024. A professional pest control company was contracted to do this work and to date, more than **3,900 pest animals** (mustelids, hedgehogs, rats and mice) have been trapped. Early results show pied stilts have resumed nesting at MacCormacks Bay and there are increased numbers of teal chicks reaching maturity.as well.

An extra \$40,000 per year would cover the basic costs of recruiting, training and supervising small teams of volunteers to continue the trapping in areas where predators threaten rare species. The Estuary Trust can donate sufficient traps for this work.

7. Estuary Rangers

We are concerned about increasing amounts of human activity around the Estuary edge. In general we welcome the growing popularity of the estuary and its edges as places for recreation. However, this is coming at an environmental cost. Our own research has shown widespread ignorance and avoidance of simple regulations regarding dog control and human access to restricted places. In some cases, this can be put right by informal comments by uniformed Council staff such as rangers, in other cases it needs strict enforcement where offending is serious and persistent.

For these reasons we urge the City Council to appoint at **least two rangers** with specific roles related to the Estuary. We acknowledge that this idea will need further research by the Council, but we strongly believe that given current trends this will become a critical issue within the next 3 to 5 years.

8. Continued funding for community organisations

We request that Council continues to allocate funding for organisations such as the Estuary Trust. We work in close collaboration with various community organisations which collectively provide an invaluable contribution to public education, biodiversity awareness and protection and ecological enhancement programmes.

We wish to be heard.

Yours sincerely,



Kit Doudney
Chair, Avon Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust Board
info@estuary.org.nz

2989

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 19/04/2024

First name: Lee Last name: Robinson

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Thu 9 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

No, there is too much capital expenditure of a wasteful nature (e.g Akaroa wastewater as one example) and not enough focus on funding that has an investment return to our city, - Events, Arts Centre as but two examples.

Average rates - multiple-choice

Yes

Average rates - comments

I would have preferred the sensible business approach where you sell down shares of assets in tough times, repay debt and re-invest when you're back in clover.

Changes to how we rate - comments

No.

Fees & charges - comments

No.

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

No

Operational spending - comments

See above. The Akaroa wastewater system has been on the table for 10 years, various groups have been advocating for a review of the proposal and saying it is not only unaffordable but does not achieve its purpose, only for this to fall on deaf ears with Council staff. Now 10 years later BECA have provided an independent report that

2989

vindicates the community's concern. The proposal should be put on hold and completely reviewed with a focus on alternatives which would be far more effective and less costly.

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital programme - comments

See above regarding wastewater in particular.

Capital: Transport - comments

No.

Capital: Parks, heritage or the coastal environment - comments

No.

Capital: Libraries - comments

No.

Capital: Solid waste and resource recovery - comments

See above.

Capital: Other - comments

Just focus on those that provide the city a return.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Explore other ways to bring down our proposed rates increases across the Draft LTP (e.g. reduce or change some of the services we provide, review our grants funding, increasing fees and charges for some services)

Areas to reduce costs to provide savings - comments

See above.

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Increase the bid funding. This means we will be able to continue to attract new major international sports, business and music events, but would also mean an additional rates increase of 0.42% in year one of the LTP, 0.04% in year two, and 0.14% in year 3.

Event bid funding - comments

If we don't invest in events in this city we do not receive the visitor numbers we need (e.g Australian Cricket Test circa \$1 million returned to the community, English Cricket Test circa estimated \$3-4 million returned to the community. Presently Cricket itself has had to underwrite \$80k to secure the English Test which is money that should be going to the community Cricket game and assisting our young kids to get out and play their sport. It's the city's role to invest in events not sporting organisations.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

No.

2989

Strategic Framework - comments

No.

Disposal of 5 Council-owned properties - comments

We support a sell down of certain assets or a share of them to repay debt and re-invest later when things are in better shape.

Disposal of Red Zone properties - comments

Agree.

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

Agree.


Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

No.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
	Letter to seek submissions

2989

Lee and Marian Robinson

[REDACTED]

Thursday, 18 April 2024

Dear Akaroa friends,

As you know the submissions for the Christchurch City Long Term Plan (LTP) are due in by Sunday 21st April.

As you also know, a number of us have been involved with Friends of Banks Peninsula (FOBP) since 2016 in response to the Council's plan to move the wastewater treatment plant to the top of Old Coach Road and to irrigate treated wastewater to land in the Inner Harbour.

The application by the Council for consent has been with ECan for some months and was put on hold by the Council pending it providing further information in support of its application.

The new wastewater system for Akaroa has already cost \$13.9million, and now the LTP budgets a further \$93.5million to complete it. This makes it one of the most expensive projects in the LTP and one of the biggest contributors to the 13% rate rises planned.

The scheme will serve less than 1000 properties in Akaroa, limit the future growth of the town and make it much more vulnerable to sewage overflows during extreme climate changes storms and sea level rise.

On the 8th April the Council received an independent report from BECA who have vindicated our concerns about the proposed system and alerted us to additional issues. For your information we have attached a copy of our response to the BECA Report and a copy of a presentation we made to Mayor Phil Mauer and Councillor Sam Macdonald on Wednesday 17th April. At this stage the BECA Report is not ours to circulate.

The BECA Report has determined the following matters;

1. That the scheme applied for has been designed based on incorrect assumptions about the total wastewater flows and is too small to cope with all of Akaroa's wastewater at times when our leaking pipe network is subject to high levels of stormwater infiltration.
2. This undersizing means the new system will overflow both raw and treated sewage into Akaroa during times of heavy rain or prolonged wet weather.
3. These overflows will occur at the Terminal Pump Station – where the sewage from Akaroa is to be pumped up the Takamatua Hill to the proposed new treatment plant at the top of Old Coach Road
4. Both raw and treated sewage will overflow into the tidal mouth of the Grehan Stream which runs between the Boat storage area and the Skatepark and from there to the shallow mudflats of Childrens Bay.
5. As we all know, this area is susceptible to flooding, and as the sewage overflows are most likely during times of heavy or extreme rain, if they occur on an incoming tide, may well mix with flood waters inundating our recreational areas.
6. The volumes of these overflows could amount to 1000's of cubic meters, and in the case of the treated wastewater overflows could last for months when the irrigation field is too wet to take up the water.

Saunders Robinson Brown

Item 3

Attachment B

2989

2

7. **REMEMBER;** the whole purpose of the proposal was to shift the treatment plant from its current location at Takapuneke and remove treated wastewater from the harbour both of which are culturally repugnant to the Iwi.
8. However, the new undersizing of the new system means wastewater (both raw and treated) will still enter the harbour, and if it proceeds as planned have real impacts on both public health and the environment of the Akaroa township itself.
9. Simply increasing the capacity of the system is not a straightforward matter. It will require raw sewage buffer storage at the boat store area – right beside all our recreational facilities, probably the acquisition of more land for treated wastewater storage at the irrigation fields. This will all add to the costs and makes no sense.
10. Operating costs for this complex new system have not been broken out in the LTP or made public, but will be substantially more than the current gravity fed system with its simple harbour outfall, as wastewater will be pumped for kilometres and the irrigation fields and storage systems will need constant monitoring and management.
11. Currently at least 70% of water passing through the wastewater system during wet weather conditions is still infiltration, and this is after the Council has completed its pipe improvement work in 2021 and 2022. It now has no plans or budget for further reduction work. This infiltration is the cause of all the capacity issues with the proposed system.
12. Failing to reduce the infiltration contradicts the recommendation made by Councillors in 2020 when they agreed to proceed with the Inner Harbour system that infiltration levels be brought down to 20% . No reason has been given as to why Council is not working to further reduce the infiltration, and very few Councillors will be aware of this.

WE URGE you to make a submission to the LTP by Sunday 21st April asking for the Council to withdraw its consent application or put it on hold and direct the funding into fixing the leaking pipe network in Akaroa before proceeding further. Fixing the pipe network will make Akaroa much more resilient in future, and stop untreated sewage leaching from these pipes onto our beaches affecting water quality in summer -quite apart from actual overflows in wet weather.

If there are indeed valid reasons why the badly leaking pipe network cannot be fixed, then the Council must come up with a better plan for foreseeable overflows than dumping raw and treated sewage into the Grehan Stream and Childrens Bay.

The Council is strapped for cash and planning huge rate rises. This is not the time to plough on with a project that is so clearly off the rails and facing even more cost escalation.

We hope you can make your submission to the council on the LTP on or before Sunday 21st April.

Either email the Council via: CCCPlan@ccc.govt.nz or go to the Have Your Say section on their website. The relevant place to make your submission on the Akaroa Wastewater system is on Capital Programme Screen 4 of the online questions and under the last box at the bottom asking about *Other aspects of our capital spend or capital programme?*

Your submission must include your full name and an email or postal address, and please ask to be heard. We will talk to you about this later.

Regards
Lee and Marian Robinson

Saunders Robinson Brown

2989

#	Name	Received via Arts Centre campaign
2989	Lee Robinson	Sell assets, repay debt meet your responsibilities and then invest again when the pressure is off. Run this City like a business not an agency without an effective strategic plan. Events, the Arts Centre and a host of other projects are at risk because all the Council can prioritise is rate increases to supplement its poorly thought out priorities. The Akaroa waste water proposal, at a cost of \$100m for 1000 connections and with a real risk that it won't solve the problem (Beca report to council 8/4/24) is a case in point. The councils current hold on the funding for the Arts Centre will compromise significantly that magnificent asset for this City. Council, reestablish your priorities! Act like a business.

3325

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 20/04/2024

First name: Adele Last name: Geradts

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Wed 8 May am Wed 8 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

More money needs to be set aside for climate change; it's good to see money going into roads and transport infrastructure, but better working together with Ecan and transport providers is needed. Many new city areas are more than 2km from a bus stop.

Average rates - multiple-choice

Yes

Average rates - comments

People must have good roads, regular rubbish removal, parks and services like Libraries and pools (These provide places for communities to meet and interact).

Changes to how we rate - comments

We do need to ensure that the rate costs are fairly distributed to those with vacant land in the CBD. They need to get on with their rebuilding or sell it and let someone else build. For the Visitor accommodation in residential areas we need to be mindful that more people will be looking at making extra money in this complex financial climate. I would like to ensure that a family that might Airbnb their home at Xmas (or at a time that they are on holiday) are not unfairly rated as a business. However, more people are going to be looking at renting a room out for visitors short term to help cover costs; people will need to be advised how their rates could be affected.

Fees & charges - comments

Parking at parks should be free, timed, i.e. 90 minutes or 180 minutes, so others can enjoy the space - Don't introduce parking charges.

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

3325

Yes

Operational spending - comments

Libraries, pools, parks and service centres all are important to the social well being of the city. front facing staff need to be engaged and welcoming to the public you cant down size your staff and provide the same service.

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

Yes

Capital programme - comments

You have the right things, but I think the spending is wrong. Less should be spent on Te Kaha, and more should be spent on libraries, solid waste, and resource recovery. I would have Te Kaha receiving \$100 million, the rest coming from other Canterbury councils, as they will benefit equally from the venue. \$920 million on parks, heritage and coastal \$190 million on libraries \$190 million on solid waste and resource recovery

Capital: Transport - comments

There are many areas in the city that do not have public transport or easy access to public transport. For example, to get to Halswell quarry (a large park with great views of Christchurch, an asset to the city and community), the nearest bus stop is on Halswell Road near Village Lane, then it's a 2.5Km walk. In and around the halswell quarry in the last 5 years and ongoing with hundreds (thousand?) of homes built or being constructed now. All of these homes are over 2km from that bus stop. There are many new areas in Halswell also not well serviced by public transport.

Capital: Parks, heritage or the coastal environment - comments

We need a fenced Dog park in Halswell. As a dog owner myself, my dogs can be reactive or easily distracted by other dogs or rabbits at the quarry, so while there is a off the leash area at the quarry, it's not suitable for many dog owners who are training their dogs or who have poor recall with their dog. I do use the dog park in Rolleston which is a 20minute drive away, and go to the Groynes which is also about 20 minute drive both have fenced dog parks but both are very busy in the weekends.

Capital: Libraries - comments

Our libraries and librarians are fantastic and need more support to continue doing their job.

Capital: Solid waste and resource recovery - comments

We need to be spending more on Solid waste and resource recovery, and we need to have better recycling, better composting and better use of what we reclaim. A lot of that comes from the education of the public.

Capital: Other - comments

Our three waters should be a priority. I would like to see our drinking water with less or no chlorine, but to do that, I understand we need to make the water across the city safe for everyone to drink. The long-term goal should be to get back to our artesian water.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Increase the bid funding. This means we will be able to continue to attract new major international sports, business and music events, but would also mean an additional rates increase of 0.42% in year one of the LTP, 0.04% in year two, and 0.14% in year 3.

Event bid funding - comments

the events industry is in turmoil post-pandemic and due to the financial situation of the world (not just NZ). A good example is the A and P show not running in 2024 due to financial losses; it hopes to be back in 2025, but without support from the public, sponsors and companies, I don't think that will be the case. The economic impact of the A and P show on Christchurch is huge, with over 100 exhibitors, many from out of town, coming and staying in Christchurch for at least 3 nights. Another example of an event with a huge impact is the Armageddon expo at Te

3325

Item 3

Attachment B

Pae, with over 100 exhibitors from around the country coming to Christchurch for three nights. Events that appeal to the public are affordable to attend and provide enjoyment, and entertainment for families is important for Christchurch and many related businesses in the accommodation and hospitality areas. Major events like SailGP expose Christchurch to the world but are not affordable events for people to experience. I would look at how an event, be it sporting or entertainment (like the show or Armageddon), is accessible for the average family to attend and buy tickets. If not, then I don't think the council should bid on or support it coming to Christchurch.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

Climate change is happening right now, and we need to adapt and prepare now because ten years from now, we will be in real trouble without funds and plans in place for the next ten or twenty years.

Strategic Framework - comments

Our vision is a strong one - A place of opportunity for all...open to new ideas, new people, new investments and new ways of doing things – a place where anything is possible. but we need to ensure we are honouring that ideal and working positively towards it. Our strategic priorities need to be at the centre of all future planning and decision-making. Be an inclusive and equitable city which puts people at the centre of developing our city and district, prioritising wellbeing, accessibility and connection. here we need Events and public transport for everyone to enjoy. Champion Ōtautahi–Christchurch and collaborate to build our role as a leading New Zealand city. we need affordable housing and affordable entertainment. Build trust and confidence in the Council through meaningful communication, listening to and working with residents. Snap send solve is awesome but issues are not always followed up by the council and then residents chase things but feel they are not heard. There needs to be more follow-up on things from the council side. More checking that things have been fixed. Actively balance the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations, with the aim of leaving no one behind. Community advocacy and support networks are vital in helping those struggling, and there will be more people in need with the current financial and housing crisis still an issue in Christchurch affordable housing. Reduce emissions as a Council and as a city, and invest in adaptation and resilience, leading a city-wide response to climate change while protecting our indigenous biodiversity, waterbodies and tree canopy. Here, I think more money is needed and stronger rules over tree canopy retention are needed. One example, Sparks Road in Halswell, had many mature trees felled for housing, and while the developer may have to replant trees in their sections, it will take 30 years or more to regain that tree canopy. Many of those trees were on or near the boundary where fences are now placed, those mature trees could have been saved and incorporated into the landscape with a little planning. Manage ratepayers' money wisely, delivering quality core services to the whole community and addressing the issues that are important to our residents. Libraries, pools, parks, rubbish and 3 waters are important and need to be maintained at the current or higher levels.

Disposal of 5 Council-owned properties - comments

Council-owned properties should only be disposed of if they are not needed for community purposes. Potentially for schools, parks or new service centres. I believe that complete investigations should be done and full community consultation and engagement sought (not just this consultation).

Disposal of Red Zone properties - comments

The residential red zone land should not be rebuilt. Selling that land to anyone is a bad idea in the long term (maybe even tomorrow). We could have another large earthquake, or series of earthquakes and the same problems will happen again. I believe the Red Zone Land should become parks or reserves, but never housing again.

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

I support the gift as long as the Yaldhurst Rural Residents Association is in a strong financial position to take on the hall in the long term. Memorial halls should be protected as part of our heritage; ideally, the council is the best place to preserve our past. The community who live around it knows it and loves it, so they will care for it.

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

The long-term plan needs to be ambitious and bold. Climate change is happening, and we need to prepare; we need our tree canopy now and into the future. We need parks, libraries and events that provide entertainment and

3325

social connection. We need strong community groups that can provide advocacy for residents. We need affordable housing, good three waters and increasing rates now (even in these harsh economic times), which will, in the long term, be better for the whole of Christchurch in 10 years. Otherwise, we are just pushing the costs down the road, and things will cost more, and the rates will need to rise even higher in 10 years than the amounts discussed here. Let's be bold, make the hard choice today, and prepare for tomorrow.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice
Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

Item 3

Attachment B

3872

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: Richard Last name: Smith

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Thu 2 May eve

Thu 2 May pm

Fri 3 May am

Fri 3 May pm

Sat 4 May am

Sat 4 May pm

Mon 6 May pm

Mon 6 May am

Tue 7 May pm

Tue 7 May eve

Wed 8 May am

Wed 8 May pm

Thu 9 May

Thu 9 May pm

Fri 10 May

Fri 10 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.
Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.
We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.
Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Capital: Other - comments

Regarding the CCC consent applying to move the Akaroa wastewater treatment plant to the to of Old Coach Road and to irrigate treated wastewater to land in the Inner Akaroa Harbour, I request that the Council withdraw its consent application or put it on hold and direct the funding into fixing the leaking pipe network in Akaroa before proceeding further. Fixing the pipe network will make Akaroa much more resilient in future, and stop untreated sewage leaching from these pipes onto our beaches affecting water quality in summer - quite apart from actual overflows in wet weather. I request to be heard on this point please at any hearing.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

2669

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 18/04/2024

First name: Lin Last name: Klenner

Please provide the name of the organisation
you represent:

Better for Brighton Group

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

Don't know

Capital: Transport - comments

• We are supportive of the Council's funding allocation for Brighton Mall Upgrade and New North South Corridor Oram Ave as this is integral to the success of New Brighton's regeneration. • We support funding for the Pages Road Bridge upgrade as we believe it is important that this gateway to New Brighton enables easy access, is welcoming and encourages visitors. We are also supportive of increasing the funding for this project to ensure it can be delivered in a timely manner and as communicated with the community.

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

• We support the Council's continued funding of ChristchurchNZ's Urban Development Team to continue leading New Brighton's regeneration and supporting the community and private sector to get involved. • We support the Council's initiative to implement a rates differential on vacant land as a means to encourage development. We'd also be supportive of any move to extend this to derelict buildings. • We believe the Better for Brighton Group to be a good mechanism to uphold the vision for the area and help guide decisions to ensure the best outcomes are realised. We appreciate CCC staff support for this. • We support ongoing funding, as offered in previous years, for Life in Vacant Spaces to enable them to continue delivering their services across the city and in New Brighton.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

No.

Attached Documents

2669

Link	File
No records to display.	

Item 3

Attachment B

2850

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: Neil Last name: Cooper

Please provide the name of the organisation
you represent:

Greater New Brighton Community Leadership
Group

What is your role in the organisation:

Advisor

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Mon 6 May pm Mon 6 May am Tue 7 May pm Tue 7 May eve Wed 8 May am Wed 8 May pm Thu 9
May Thu 9 May pm Fri 10 May Fri 10 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

This submission concentrates on the greater New Brighton area and the work that is proposed to be done here by the Council for the benefit of the local community.

Average rates - comments

As this submission does not consider all proposed actions by the Council, we will comment only on those aspects that will impact on the greater New Brighton community.

Changes to how we rate - comments

We support the proposed changes to the new rating on unimproved ground, especially in relation to the New Brighton area, as this category of properties in the New Brighton area has a major and detrimental impact on the way in which the suburb is perceived, and hence on the decreased interest in the wider community in visiting or investing in the area. Even more importantly, we would support the extension of this new rating system to cover derelict properties ie properties where there may be a building on it but which is predominantly unused and often in a poor state of repair.

Capital programme - comments

We strongly support the allocation of spending in the transport area, and particularly in relation to proposed work in the greater New Brighton area.

2850

Capital: Transport - comments

See separate submission on the New Brighton Mall that accompanies this submission.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

Strategic Framework - comments

We support the vision, community outcomes and strategic priorities. However, as is often the case, the devil is in the detail. In relation to this proposal, the understanding of the vision, community outcomes and strategic priorities as applied to the greater New Brighton area, have a hollow ring. Too often, the Council has proposed major works to overcome many of the issues that plague the local area. And all too often these promises have been broken or never carried through to achieve what has been promised. The 2015 strategic plan in particular made many promises for the area - and next to none have come to fruition. As a result there is considerable skepticism in the community. Promises have been made before - and never carried through. Why should the community believe the new round of proposals? Let's seriously consider what is needed in the New Brighton area and then make it a priority to deliver it!

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
	CLG response to CCC LTP 2024-34

Item 3

Attachment B

2850

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2024-2034
SUBMISSION FROM THE GREATER NEW BRIGHTON COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP GROUP (CLG),
RESPONSIBLE FOR THE GREATER NEW BRIGHTON PROJECT

20 April 2024

SUBMISSION FORM

BACKGROUND TO THIS SUBMISSION

This submission comes from the Greater New Brighton Community Leadership Group (CLG), who are responsible for developing a project that meets the expectations of the majority of the greater New Brighton community. The funding for this project (approx. \$2.5M) comes from a grant awarded by the Christchurch Earthquake Appeal Trust.

The grant was first awarded in October 2019 and was discussed at various meetings held within the greater New Brighton area. In April 2020 a Community Leadership Group was appointed with the task of identifying a project that the majority of the greater New Brighton community would accept. This work started by reviewing in excess of 20 consultation documents and proposals from the community that had been generated since the 2011 earthquakes, to determine the major themes. These themes were further clarified by another round of public consultation.

In February 2022 a concept design called the Village Green Concept was unveiled to the community at two community meetings. The village green is to cover about 1,200m² of currently undeveloped land on the southern side of the New Brighton Mall closest to Marine Parade. It will include an approx. 450m² area of artificial turf, a stage, a number of beach-hut like structures for community use and as sites for community and other vendors at market days. The proposal is that this will generate a new energy and life for the community and, together with a major new developer who has plans to upgrade the surrounding properties and create a new and vibrant hospitality and retail hub, and other attractive sites such as the childrens' playground and the hot pools, bring a new vibrancy to the suburb.

Further displays and social media posts on the proposed concept followed. A formal survey of opinions was circulated in April 2022 and over 600 responses were received. 71% of respondents responded positively to the option "Awesome – let's get on with it". A further 19% supported the option "It's fantastic but could use some tweaks few tweaks". Only 21 responses (3.5%) rated it as "I'm not a fan". The overall response was seen as overwhelmingly in support.

Since that time the CLG has tweaked the design in light of feedback as well as providing more detail of the project. Currently the CLG is undertaking a civil engineering report and starting to determine costs for various aspects of the project.

Over the last couple of years, a private developer, Martini Investments, have purchased a large number of properties at the beach-end of the New Brighton Mall. It is their intention to develop key hospitality and retail sites in this area. Martini Investments are prepared to license the undeveloped area of approx. 1,200 m² for the CLG to develop their community project on.

The intention is that the proposed Village Green concept will provide a new public space intended to support the activation of the Mall and offer a new space for locals and visitors to use and love. The space will enable everything from markets to events and community functions to impromptu relaxing. We want an exciting space where you will find great places to eat, play, rest and shop. We want the space to be attractive, clean, friendly and uniquely New Brighton.

Item 3

Attachment B

2850

Item 3

Attachment B

The activation of this space is also designed to work in with the on-going Council rejuvenation of the Mall space. The local councillor is working with these groups to support the changes.

The three sectors (commercial, community and Council staff), together with the local Councillor for the area, have actively engaged with the ChristchurchNZ Urban Delivery Team who are coordinating the various parties to ensure an effective and efficient project development is able to occur. This combined group operates under the Better For Brighton Group banner.

Once the Village Green project has final community approval and the physical building work is completed (eg huts, stage, grassed area, sun shades, security and lighting etc) the project will be handed to Life in Vacant Spaces (LiVS) to manage and generate a successful community space.

It is hoped that a final proposal for the Village Green Project will go to the local community by July 2024.

SUBMISSION CONTACT DETAILS

Organisational contact details:


Greater New Brighton Community Leadership Group

My role: Advisor to the CLG

Personal contact details:

First name: Neil

Surname: Cooper



I confirm that I would like to speak to the Council about this feedback.

RATES

It is our belief that the proposed amendment to create a rates differential on vacant land should be made, as the current eyesore created by much of this land is a major deterrent to positive changes and increased patronage within the greater New Brighton area.

However, an even more effective action would be to extend the provisions for these rates to land which is in a dilapidated or run-down state, particularly where there is no current activity on this site. Much of the run-down, unused land in New Brighton would then be captured by the new rate and would hopefully inspire some action to improve the general appearance and usefulness of the area.

COMMUNITY OUTCOMES AND PRIORITIES

The greater New Brighton community has, arguably, been the least favoured community in the wider Christchurch City area. For various reasons, past proposals – including a plan agreed in 2015 for a major upgrade to the New Brighton area – has failed to materialise.

Currently the community are distrustful of promises or even indications of proposals to upgrade the facilities. Council owes it to this relatively disadvantaged community to carry through with proposals for a major upgrade. This is particularly important now, given the current convergence of community

2

2850

and commercial interests to upgrade the New Brighton Mall, together with work that City Council staff are working in conjunction on.

Many promises have been made to this community in the past. It is now time for positive action that is carried through to fruition.

FUNDING FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW BRIGHTON MALL AREA

Currently in the draft LTP plan there is funding for two capital projects:

- Brighton Mall Upgrade – a total of \$3.9 million over 4 years from Financial Year 2025 to Financial Year 2028
- New North South Corridor Oram Ave – a total of \$14.6 million split into Financial Year 2026 (\$5.5m) FY 2029 (\$9.1m)

Other funding currently in the plan which will also have an impact on the local community are:

- Transport – Pages Rd Bridge upgrade
- 3 Waters – key water infrastructure renewals and upgrades
- Parks & Recreation - consider spaces like Rawhiti Domain and our new playground
- ChristchurchNZ funding to coordinate the New Brighton Regeneration Project.

If any of this funding is not approved it will seriously diminish the effectiveness of the major commercial and community initiatives to improve the economic, social and general well-being of the greater New Brighton community.

KEY POINTS FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

1. We are supportive of the Council's funding allocation for the Brighton Mall Upgrade and the New North South Corridor Oram Ave as this is integral to the success of New Brighton's regeneration.
2. We support funding for the Pages Road Bridge upgrade as we believe it is important that this gateway to New Brighton enables easy access, is welcoming and encourages visitors. We are also supportive of increasing the funding for this project to ensure it can be delivered in a timely manner and as communicated with the community.

Further Points which support overall regeneration of New Brighton

- We support the Council's continued funding of ChristchurchNZ's Urban Development Team to continue leading New Brighton's regeneration and supporting the community and private sector to get involved.
- We support the Council's initiative to implement a rates differential on vacant land as a means to encourage development. We'd also be supportive of any move to extend this to derelict buildings.
- We believe the Better for Brighton Group to be a good mechanism to uphold the vision for the area and help guide decisions to ensure the best outcomes are realised. We appreciate CCC staff support for this.

2850

- We support ongoing funding, as offered in previous years, for Life in Vacant Spaces to enable them to continue delivering their services across the city and in New Brighton.

Other Council projects that will have a positive impact on the regeneration of the greater New Brighton area

A key intention of the current plans to regenerate the greater New Brighton area is to make the area an attractive and welcoming part of the city – rather than the unattractive, dirty, eye-sore that so many people see it as. The hot pools and childrens' playground are both highly popular relatively recent additions to the area – but those who visit these sites or the beach rarely come into the Mall area itself. It is not difficult to see why: empty shops, massive graffiti, "low-rent, low-quality" shopping options at best, are not likely to attract customers, let alone repeat customers.

It is not just local community members that the project is aiming at attracting. Visitors from other parts of the city as well as other domestic and international visitors would normally be attracted to a beach environment. However, the routes in and out of the area are currently few and unattractive.

The regeneration project is designed to turn this current state around.

- (#68173) **Otakaro Avon River Corridor Route**, or City to Sea Pathway. Plans for the 11km shared-use pathway that will travel through the heart of the Ōtakaro Avon River Corridor (OARC) will link into the Estuary Edge pathway, creating a world-class link from the city right down to the Southshore spit.
- (#26601) – the **Major Cycleway Programme, the Ōtakaro-Avon Route** links New Brighton to the Central City, via the Rapanui-Shag Rock MCR. This project has gone through some initial route optioneering, and the potential routes identified travel along, or parallel to, Pages Road. This links into the bridge and brings people along Seaview Road, to the mall and foreshore.
- **Waitaki Street stormwater basin**; work was delayed due to consenting issues, and is just getting underway now. This will help address regular flooding that occurs in the Pages Road section of the regeneration area. This basin will improve the quality of the water entering the Ōtakaro Avon River and begin preparing Christchurch to address the future threats from sea-level rise. This project will also increase the ecological values of the ŌARC and create valuable habitats for our coastal and wetland native flora and fauna.
- **Surface flooding programme** – the current frequent and major flooding of many of the streets leading to New Brighton creates a poor image of New Brighton before anyone even arrives there. We would support the establishment of a new capital programme fund of \$20 million per year, starting in FY 27, for addressing and resolving regular surface flooding at sites identified against a priority matrix established by Council in FY 25 and FY 26.

CLG would support funding for all of these projects.

2503

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 20/04/2024

First name: Lin Last name: Klenner

Please provide the name of the organisation
you represent:

New Brighton Community Gardens

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Thu 9 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Average rates - multiple-choice

Yes

Capital programme - comments

We would really appreciate if you could keep the Sustainability Fund in the budget and Increase the Strengthening Community Fund to allow for inflation and increased demand.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Deliver what we have proposed in the Draft Long Term Plan (e.g. maintain existing levels of service and invest in our core infrastructure and facilities that keep Christchurch and Banks Peninsula running).

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

WE need to install passion and compassion into our kids, who will need to deal with a lot climate wise and really make this a priority in everything we do.

2503


Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

The gardens would like to thank the engagement team, community board members and councilors for taking the time to talk to us and our wider community, provide information in person and online or via email. Its much appreciated.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
	NB GARDENS LTP

Item 3

Attachment B

2503

Dear Councilors,

We are writing this submission in **support** of the work of the **New Brighton Community Gardens** and also in recognition of the many other charities that are receiving the **Strengthening Community Fund**.

Furthermore, we urge you to **keep the Sustainability Fund**, currently cut out of the budget, not only in it but ensure that educational programmes like our school programs are funded in the future.

You see most community groups are run on the back of a few who put their own life, family and friends on hold to keep up with the needs and demands society presents to them, finding a balance is incredibly hard when you are on the front line not only seeing the need but it becomes much harder when you see the difference and the successes the work you and the people around you create. Changing habits is hard, but somehow we are doing it every day.

There is a lot of talk about nice-to-haves, overspending and wasting of money.

Trust me none of that happens here (and I am sure in other community groups as well) we turn the coins, half it and if needed powder it up to make it last. Think heat pumps \$1000 goes in and \$3000 comes out.

In our case, we, together, that includes you who voted on these funds, created, over almost 20 years (That anniversary is coming up fast) a peaceful and welcoming space where people can breathe and think and just be in a world often too complicated to handle even for the strongest of us. Just imagine what that feels like to the ones struggling already with health, Age, disability, social issues, loneliness, mental issues or people simply going through a rough patch. What about the people who always have it together, the truth is we all need a space to breathe and come together.

Add to this is the growing food aspect, knowing how to grow food, prepare and cook food, know of, keep and get its nutritional value. (Vitamin C halves within 1 day of harvesting so those imported strawberries might not be as nutritiously valuable as the handful of cranberries/raspberries straight from the bush).

Let's talk about the sustainability fund, perhaps we need to change it to a **Regenerative fund** because truth be told things are not looking good. **All our school programs throughout the year depend on this fund** and the number one thing we do is inspire them and their parents to do better, reconnect them to the ground they walk on and inspire them to become change-makers in every aspect of their life. It starts with a nibble on a fresh carrot...

We need you to continue your support for charities like ours. By working together, making sure sufficient Funding is put aside for the Strengthening Community Fund and Funds like the Sustainability Fund are left in the budget, so we can continue inspiring the next generation to do better than us.

You and your votes are part of this, and together we can build a community that is a little more healthy, caring, and supportive, and where everyone has the opportunity to thrive and learn how to regenerate our environment.

"Thanks for taking the time to read this"



Item 3

Attachment B

95

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 19/03/2024

First name: Anton Last name: Wilke

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Thu 2 May eve

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

Save the Arts Centre! As key center of tourism and culture, and one of the largest collections of heritage buildings in the southern hemisphere, this space is a unique slice of our community, made even more so since the quakes.

Driving visitation across a wide part of the CBD and aligning with the botanic gardens, Worcester boulevard, botanic gardens, Hagley Park and the Avon River - the Arts center is a quintessential part of the Christchurch experience - any reduction in funding will be wildly detrimental to a proud city still reestablishing its unique narrative.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

3873

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: Angela **Last name:** Curl

Please provide the name of the organisation you represent:

Transport, Society and Environment Group,
Department of Population Health, University of
Otago Christchurch

What is your role in the organisation: Senior
Lecturer

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Mon 6 May pm Mon 6 May am Tue 7 May pm Thu 9 May Fri 10 May Fri 10 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

• Our submission focuses specifically on the aspects of the Long Term Plan relating to transport as this reflects our collective expertise. • We broadly support the strategic directions for transport laid out in the plan and the investments allocated to them. We would like to see further increases in funding to support this important activity class. • We particularly commend Christchurch City Council for following best practice directions for transport planning, including in a holistic focus on social, economic, environmental, and cultural aspects of the impacts of transport systems. We suggest that there is too much capital spending allocated to road maintenance. Capital investment in transport should be focussed on pedestrian and cycle infrastructure. Existing cycle infrastructure has increased the rate of cycling - this will reduce the need for road maintenance in the longer term, have substantial health and wellbeing benefits and mitigate climate change.

Average rates - multiple-choice

Yes

Average rates - comments

Rates are needed to ensure we invest in the future through active transport, public transport, and climate action.

Fees & charges - comments

We support the proposed introduction of parking charges at the Botanic Gardens and Hagley Park. Parking charges could also be introduced and/or increased at other locations around the city to encourage active and public transport, relative to car use, having numerous benefits for the health and wellbeing of residents.

3873

Item 3
Attachment B

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

Yes

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital: Transport - comments

Reductions in funding and delays to major cycleways are not consistent with the commitments to a green and liveable city. We call for more funding to be reinstated for major cycleways.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed. This expenditure is included in the proposed rates increase. While it may not have an impact on rates, it could have implications for our ability to attract major and business events in the short term.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

The focus on climate change adaptation is important, but there needs to be a clearer focus on and investment in climate mitigation. • We encourage the Council to give further consideration to how equity considerations will be operationalised in the relevant Measures of Success. The currently listed Measures of Success are at an aggregate level and could still be met even if provision became more inequitable. For example, the plan notes the need to enhance access to public transport networks, with increased priority in underserved areas. Relevant measurement metrics include increasing infrastructure provision for public and active modes, and improving customer satisfaction with public transport facilities. Neither of these measures includes an indication of the prioritisation of underserved areas. We support the focus on underserved areas, and more broadly on customers with currently unmet needs, and would like to see these included in assessment metrics.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

339

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/03/2024

First name: Mary-Louise Last name: Hoskins

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Wed 8 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in **Section 1** so we can contact you.

Feedback

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

Please continue to support our Arts Centre - do not discontinue your funding for this precious and significant centre. So much has been spent getting the centre back on its feet after the trauma of the quakes, and a magnificent job was done. Something for all Cantabrians to be extremely proud of. I frequently go there, to the movies, the cafes, the art gallery... I am aware of the health innovation hub which is only just getting established and is of great value not only to our city but to the nation. When I visit during a specific event, such as the sculpture expo, the place is always humming. It would be a disaster to see this place go backwards. Already there are sections of the complex which cannot be refurbished due to funding constraints. That hopefully will all get done in the fullness of time. The centre management have taken all the measures that they can to ensure it is operated efficiently. Now it is up to the Council to back it. Don't let the citizens of ChCh down on this.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

1873

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 17/04/2024

First name: Marjorie **Last name:** Manthei

**Please provide the name of the organisation
you represent:**

Victoria Neighbourhood Association Inc

What is your role in the organisation:

Membership Coordinator & Secretary

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Tue 7 May eve Wed 8 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in **Section 1** so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

Consultation with our members focussed on specific topics of most relevance to our residents' group and aspects that members were confident to comment on. From current and past consultations on these aspects, we can confirm our priorities are public transport, control of the proliferation of unhosted Short Term Accommodation, environmental issues (including climate change action) and incentives to use vacant sites productively.

Average rates - multiple-choice

Don't know

Average rates - comments

See explanation provided with previous question. Our focus was on specific topics, rather than the quantum expenditure.

Changes to how we rate - comments

VNA members AGREE with the City Vacant Differential and the Business Differential for unhosted short-term accommodation. Specifically, we SUPPORT extending the Vacant Differential to the other locations mentioned in the Draft LTP and SUGGEST that it be further extended to cover large vacant residential sites as well (e.g. Durham St - Bealey Ave corner). We STRONGLY SUPPORT the Business Differential for unhosted STA, and WOULD ALSO SUPPORT additional ways to decrease the number of unhosted offerings within residential neighbourhoods. The current rules are unlikely to do this, given the difficulty in monitoring the number of nights/year for each property and the low percentage that have (or are likely) to register. We know from experience in our own neighbourhood that the impact of unhosted STA is immediate and noticeable, e.g., reduction in the number of actual neighbours, with the corresponding reduction in a sense of community, safety and commitment to the neighbourhood. There are now many small apartments where we have no idea who is there at any given time, or they are empty in between the

T24Consult Page 1 of 4

1873

visitors. We did not consult on the rates postponement and remission for charities proposals.

Fees & charges - comments

Not everyone we consulted with commented on this proposal. However, those who did were NOT IN FAVOUR of parking charges in the Botanic Gardens or Hagley Park. The reasons given were that the expected revenue would be relatively small, with an insignificant impact on rates. The impact on low income residents, however, could be prohibitive, making it less attractive for these residents to enjoy what are popular public spaces.

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

Don't know

Operational spending - comments

See explanation provided with the first question. We did appreciate the graphic depiction of operational spending, however ("Day in the Life of Your Rates, p 25). An effective way of reminding us of what our rates need to cover.

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital programme - comments

Comments from our members relevant to this question include: (1) The Transport spend SHOULD INCLUDE reinstatement of the Shuttle or its equivalent. We are very disappointed that the agreement signed between the former Mayor and CEO of ECan to investigate a 6 month trial has been scrapped, seemingly without even consulting with elected representatives of each body. We know that ECan holds the responsibility for this, but we also know that CCC covered the costs of the original Shuttle and could do so again. We have said several times that the Shuttle does not need to be free, if that is a stumbling block. The important ingredients are (1) a known loop route to regularly-used services (2) 10 - 15 minute schedule and (3) easily identifiable buses and bus stops, as before. The benefits include (1) moving central city residents and visitors into and around the CBD without relying on cars, thus reducing congestion and emissions (2) helping to achieve several Strategic Priorities and two Outcomes in particular ("green, liveable city" and "thriving prosperous city") and (3) catering for the increasing number of people living in and near the Central City, likely to increase even more as intensification ramps up. Please note that in all our consultations on Life in the Central City, the Shuttle has been the highest priority; only two members have ever disagreed.

Capital: Transport - comments

Please see comments above about the importance of reinstating the Shuttle or its equivalent. VNA members also have supported the cycleway initiatives, but several commented that some are over-engineered. Making them a bit simpler would save money without reducing the expansion or addition of more cycleways. Residents in our neighbourhood who are regular cyclists are particularly supportive of the Park Tce initiative and hope it is permanent. We're also aware that research suggests more roads / wider roads do not solve the problem of congestion (just the opposite) and it certainly does not reduce emissions. We URGE the Council to take any actions within its responsibilities to improve public transport and reduce reliance on private vehicles.

Capital: Parks, heritage or the coastal environment - comments

We did not consult on this aspect, although we acknowledge its importance.

Capital: Libraries - comments

As above, although residents in our neighbourhood are very supportive of Turanga. Quite a few VNA members, however, explained that they seldom use it because they're unable to walk there (carrying books), parking is too difficult and no bus goes close enough to it. Hence, our call to reinstate the Shuttle!

Capital: Solid waste and resource recovery - comments

Did not consult on this topic.

Capital: Other - comments

Comments re climate change included: (1) disappointed with CCC's perspective that climate change expenditure and action must be balanced by "what we can realistically deliver and what ratepayers can afford"--we can't afford to be timid or slow; (2) How can the same body agree to spend so much on additional seats for Te Kaha, which will

1873

seldom be full, but reluctant to take actions that could make a real difference? and "they should be ashamed" and (3) the Climate Resilience Fund should start asap, but CCC must also acknowledge that taking action to reduce / mitigate, not just adapt to the effects.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

Areas to reduce costs to provide savings - comments

Putting money from rates into facilities such as Te Kaha, which will be used by a small proportion of ChCh residents and seldom full, continuing to expand motorways.

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed. This expenditure is included in the proposed rates increase. While it may not have an impact on rates, it could have implications for our ability to attract major and business events in the short term.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

Please note that we did not fully consult on this topic, so the above responses are based on comments on those who commented on this either informally or as one of their own priorities.

Strategic Framework - comments

The Strategic Priorities that match the VNA's objectives include "inclusive & equitable....prioritising wellbeing, accessibility and connection"; "addressing issues important to residents" and "balancing needs of today's and future generations". The Outcomes that match are "collaborative, confident city" and "green, liveable city".

Disposal of 5 Council-owned properties - comments

It seems logical to dispose of sites not being used as intended or for the others reasons given on page 55. Without being familiar with the particular sites, we would SUPPORT disposal but ONLY if the local communities are consulted in a meaningful way, including consultation about sites not used as reserves or parks (which are the ones specifically mentioned in the Plan as requiring consultation).

Disposal of Red Zone properties - comments

See above.

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

We did not consult on this.

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

After our formal consultation, we received unsolicited comments from members about the Arts Centre. Everyone who contacted us (approximately 25 members) said the CCC MUST continue to fund the Arts Centre. It is an important asset for the city, but is also close enough to our neighbourhood to be of particular relevance to our members. We URGE CCC to confirm ongoing funding at the current level, to ensure long-term viability.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

T24Consult Page 3 of 4

1873

Link	File
No records to display.	

Item 3

Attachment B

2589

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: Timothy Last name: Seay

Please provide the name of the organisation you represent:

Save the McDougall Campaign

What is your role in the organisation:

Manager

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.
Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.
We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.
Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in **Section 1** so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

yes

Average rates - multiple-choice

Yes

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

Yes

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Deliver what we have proposed in the Draft Long Term Plan (e.g. maintain existing levels of service and invest in our core infrastructure and facilities that keep Christchurch and Banks Peninsula running).

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

2589

The Amalgamation of Christchurch's Cultural Assets

The present display of art in Christchurch demonstrates how completely inadequate space at the Christchurch Art Gallery is to give the visiting public a balanced perspective of the city's art collections and present plans for their future when the Museum redevelopment is completed will not provide for the proper and efficient use of the wonderful facilities that will be available.

The Christchurch Art Gallery is largely devoted to displaying extreme contemporary art. A proportion of contemporary art needs to be shown but it must be balanced with a measure of more traditional artwork. All the city's privately run galleries only show contemporary art and it is proposed the McLeans Mansion when completed will display art from the contemporary collections of James Wallace. The strong interest in contemporary art by a younger generation does not mean that other generations and art connoisseurs should be deprived of the opportunity to see more traditional artwork.

The Robert McDougall Art Gallery presents a real opportunity to provide this. Acknowledged as being the best neo classical style gallery in the country, the McDougall, instead of becoming the future home for the city's historical art collection, as has happened to the old galleries in every other city in the world that has built a new art gallery, has instead been leased to Canterbury Museum for 50 years for their use. The problem with this is that the Museum does not have an art collection selected on the basis of its artistic merit and only has 50 oil paintings of a public art gallery standard. Much of its collection and frames is in need of conservation and are not in an exhibitable state so they will probably end up using it to display visiting exhibitions of contemporary art by local amateur artists which is what the Museum has displayed in its own dedicated gallery spaces ever since Anthony Wright, became its director in 1996. They are also likely to use it as a museum to display 3 dimensional artefacts. This will be disastrous as it was designed specifically as a 2 dimensional art gallery and is not suitable to be used as a museum to display 3 dimensional objects.

With Canterbury Museum's redevelopment project now well underway, this is the time the Council should start considering how best to utilise the city's cultural facilities in the most appropriate and cost effective way when the project is completed. These facilities are Canterbury Museum, Christchurch Art Gallery, McDougall Art Gallery and the Akaroa Museum and their respective collections.

In recent years works borrowed from the Museum's collections for collaborative exhibitions have been displayed at the Christchurch Art Gallery alongside works from the city's art collection. This has worked well because the Christchurch Art Gallery, being a contemporary gallery, has sufficient floor spaces to enable 3 dimensional items from the Museum collections to be displayed. It will also be important that works from the Christchurch Art Gallery can freely move to the McDougall now that it has been leased to the Museum. So, it will be important in future for the city's cultural collections to be able to be easily displayed in the different spaces.

And the same is true for their storage. The Christchurch Art Gallery was only built to half the size required and as a result has had a critical storage problem for years. It has had to overcome this by turning existing spaces used for other purposes into storage space. It can't

2589

do this any longer and I note in the Capital Expenditure Plan the Council has allowed for the expenditure of \$8M in 2028/29 for additional storage for the gallery - presumably an outside storage facility. With the Museum building a huge new storage facility under the entire land area of the McDougall and also a lot of its own buildings, this expenditure would not be necessary if the city's cultural facilities and collections were under the same ownership. The obvious solution to the Christchurch Art Gallery's storage problem would then be to return the city's historical collection to the McDougall for storage and display which would enable the display of the city's historical and contemporary collections to be separated for the benefit of the viewing public.

The real problem then for the efficient display and storage of the city's cultural assets is that its art collection and galleries are owned by the Christchurch City Council while the Museum and its collections are owned by a charitable trust run by the Canterbury Museum Trust Board. The problem with this arrangement for the Council is that, while together with the three regional Councils, they have control through the Museum Trust Board of how the Museum is run, they don't have ownership of the Museum. And this is despite them meeting 86% of their entire annual operating costs and so far having contributed \$ 78M of its capital costs for the present redevelopment. It is this arrangement that has created two owners of the city's cultural assets.

The problems for the Council from having control of the Museum but not ownership arise from not being able to freely move collection items between the city's different facilities and not being able to efficiently employ skilled staff across the different facilities.

With separate ownership, when a collection item is moved on loan to another institution as part of a loan agreement, the borrowing institution has to pay the additional transit insurance costs. If Canterbury Museum borrowed 50 historical paintings from the Christchurch Art Gallery, a separate loan agreement would have to be drawn up and signed by each party. As the paintings are owned and deemed to be assets of the Christchurch City Council, Canterbury Museum would have to meet the additional cost of the insurance for the period of the loan which would probably be restricted to around 12 weeks. If the Museum was owned by the Council no loan agreement or additional insurance would be required.

With all the city's cultural assets under Council ownership it would be possible to reduce staff costs by reducing the duplication of the roles of specialist staff. As the total staff compliment would be less than 200 only one Director would be required and management roles for positions such as finance, building services, public relations, promotion and fund raising could be shared across all facilities. Likewise, functions such as promotions, fundraising, conservation work on collection items and registration could be shared. And when contracting ancillary services, the same contractors could be employed for maintenance and cleaning.

For the city in future to be able to efficiently display and utilise its cultural assets to best advantage it will be necessary to bring them under a single owner. To do this the Christchurch City Council would have to ask the Government to support the introduction to Parliament of a new Act repealing the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act, 1993, and replacing it with a new Act passing ownership of Canterbury Museum to the Christchurch City Council. This would require the approval of the three current regional councils which is unlikely to be a problem as they would no longer be required to financially support the Museum. The

2589

Government would be likely to approve such a request as they are fully aware of the financial position faced by all councils at the moment and wish to assist them where they can.

This would return the Museum to being owned directly by local Government based in Christchurch as it was originally when it was established in 1867 and owned by the Canterbury Provincial Council. Just prior to the Provincial Council ending in 1876 management was passed to Canterbury College and in 1947 to the present Canterbury Museum Trust Board which is made up of representatives from all four Councils, Canterbury University, Canterbury Pilgrims and Early Settlers, Royal Society of New Zealand, Friends of the Museum and Ngai Tahu. While the four councils share the Museum's operating costs in proportion to their populations only the Christchurch City Council provides the Museum with any capital funding. And the five other organisations do not collectively represent the citizens of Christchurch.

It must be in the best interests of the city's ratepayers for the Museum to come under the ownership of the Christchurch City Council. They pay for 86% of the Museum's entire annual operating budget and have been the largest contributor to the present redevelopment project with \$ 78M (compared with the Government's \$ 35M) and could yet end up having to meet at least another \$ 100 M towards the redevelopment allowing for the present shortfall of \$ 45 in the estimated cost and inevitable cost overruns. Given this it must be in the best interests of its ratepayers to bring the assets of Canterbury Museum onto its balance sheet. The land and buildings of the Museum are presently valued at \$72 M based on a 2020 valuation, and with possibly \$ 250M being spent on them during the redevelopment project, it would probably be possible to bring them onto the Council's balance sheet at around \$ 350M. It would certainly bolster its balance sheet.

One has to wonder why the Council continues to spend so much money on the Museum without actually owning it. How can it possibly be in the best interests of the city's ratepayers to continue to spend this amount on such a large asset that they do not own? With the Council likely to have to meet most of the remaining cost of the project this is surely the time to bring this asset onto their balance sheet so it can make the most of the city's wonderful future cultural assets.

Over the 157 years since Canterbury Museum's inception, the majority of the items that form its collections, which the Museum believes are worth around \$1B, have been either gifted or bequeathed primarily for the benefit of the citizens of Christchurch and wider Canterbury community. Why then should such a large proportion of the cultural property of the region continue to remain under the custodianship of an independent trust when it should more rightly be under the ownership and governance of Christchurch City Council?

Item 3

Attachment B

3010

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: Jan Last name: Cook

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Changes to how we rate - comments

I support the proposal to apply the business differential to unhosted short term residential accommodation. This is fair to other accommodation businesses and will encourage property owners to make residences available for long-term residential rental. I do not support the Special Heritage Cathedral Targeted Rate. The Council should not commit any more funds to the Cathedral restoration, because the costs greatly outweigh any benefits. I support the Special Heritage Arts Centre Targeted Rate. The Arts Centre is an important part of the City's culture and the cityscape

Fees & charges - comments

I support the proposal for parking charges at Botanic Gardens and Hagley Park. It is reasonable for motorists to pay for parking in central city areas at peak times. The Gardens and Park are well serviced by buses and cycleways as alternative transport. The charge should not apply on Sundays or public holidays or in the evenings, or for disabled parking.

Capital: Other - comments

Capital Programme. ID 596. WW Akaroa Reclaimed Water Treatment and Reuse Scheme. I oppose the budget for this scheme. While I understand the desired objective to end the discharge of wastewater to Akaroa Harbour, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the proposed scheme will not have the capacity to safely deal with the volume of wastewater, both treated and untreated, during prolonged wet weather. The reason for this is the high level of infiltration of stormwater and ground water into the sewer network. This coincides with an inability to safely dispose of the treated wastewater when land irrigation areas are already saturated. The proposed Scheme does not meet the Infrastructure Strategy, outlined on page 17 of the LTP Consultation Document relating to sustainability, affordability, and climate resilience. Poor data quality has not enabled good decision-making. The Scheme does not meet the objectives of the Integrated Water Strategy 2019 to eliminate, or minimise the effects of, wastewater overflows. At a time when 13.24% rate rise is being proposed is not prudent or responsible to spend \$93.5 million (on top of \$13.9m already spent) for this Scheme, unless there is absolute certainty that it can deliver the desired benefits. I request that the Akaroa Reclaimed Water Treatment and Reuse Scheme is put on hold. I request that funds are diverted to repair of the sewer pipe network to enable climate resilience and to avoid the current and future effects on water quality at Akaroa's beaches and surrounding areas.

T24Consult Page 1 of 2

3010

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

Item 3

Attachment B

3036

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 20/04/2024

First name: John W. Last name: Thacker

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in **Section 1** so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

Capital spending on transport seems high The bus service from Rapaki to Governors bay to Sign of The Takahe needs to be reinstated, The existing bus stop is there in Governors Bay. Re Sport funding;- Major funding will be needed if the Huge Metro sports complex opens !! User pays should prevail. Maybe this complex could be sold to private enterprise otherwise it will be another chain around the Ratepayers neck!

Average rates - multiple-choice

Yes

Average rates - comments

More levies should be introduced to make Sports bodies more accountable all around. Facilities need more input of cash from them to ensure being more independent of council.

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

Yes

Operational spending - comments

We do not need any more sports facilities our city has more than enough to maintain.

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Explore other ways to bring down our proposed rates increases across the Draft LTP (e.g. reduce or change some of

3036

the services we provide, review our grants funding, increasing fees and charges for some services)

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed. This expenditure is included in the proposed rates increase. While it may not have an impact on rates, it could have implications for our ability to attract major and business events in the short term.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Disposal of 5 Council-owned properties - comments

This would be the most sensible thing to do. The money could be used for loaning to the Arts Centre or others mentioned in this submission.

Disposal of Red Zone properties - comments

Yes it could be sold the money could be used to go towards heritage projects. McLean's mansion for example.

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

Yes sounds as though the local community could make this work for their area.

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

There are so many areas requiring funding. The Arts Centre / Orana Park / Ferrymead / Provincial buildings many more. Lets hope our Te Kaha will deliver the goods! Lets make it pay for itself! Christchurch must retain its image as 'The Garden City' There are many small things tat can be done to improve this image.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

3665

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: Sue **Last name:** Church

Please provide the name of the organisation you represent:

Friends of Banks Peninsula

What is your role in the organisation:

Secretary



Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.
Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.
We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.
Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in **Section 1** so we can contact you.

Attached Documents

Link	File
	Friends of Banks Peninsula CCC LTP 2024 submission
	2024_04_21 Analysis of April 2024 Beca Pdp report on revised design flows

3665

FRIENDS of Banks Peninsula Inc.
PO Box 56, Duvauchelle, 7545, New Zealand



To: Christchurch City Council
From: Friends of Banks Peninsula
Date: 21 April 2024

SUBMISSION TO CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2024-34

The Friends of Banks Peninsula wishes to be HEARD in support of this submission.

This submission relates only to LTP 2024-34 line item 596 WW Akaroa Reclaimed Water Treatment & Reuse Scheme.

The Friends of Banks Peninsula opposes the funding for the WW Akaroa Reclaimed Water Treatment & Reuse Scheme item 596.

The total budget projected for this project is \$93,524,000. We understand that \$13.9 million has already been spent. This makes a total project cost of \$107 million. The number of property connections that this project serves is fewer than 1000. The cost per property is therefore over \$100,000.

- This is one of the most expensive projects in the LTP for the smallest number of beneficiaries.
- The system as currently proposed will not achieve its objective of eliminating discharge of wastewater to Akaroa Harbour and will create additional risks to public health and adverse environmental effects in Akaroa and in Robinsons Bay
- It will make Akaroa less resilient to climate change.
- The plan to irrigate to native trees on steep, slip prone land, and with no capacity headroom, is high risk, and there is no fallback plan if any aspect of the project goes wrong or fails to perform as expected.
- Costs have escalated rapidly, and will continue to rise as design inadequacies are identified.
- The desired benefits of the scheme must be balanced with the costs and risks.

The Council lodged its resource consent application for this scheme with ECAN in June 2023. The application number is CRC235038.

On 8 April 2024 the Council received a report that it had commissioned from Beca Ltd re-evaluating the wastewater flow modelling underpinning the system sizing. We attach a copy of our response to this report and a presentation made to Cr Sam MacDonald and Cr Tyrone Field on Wednesday 17th April.

In summary, the Beca report has determined the following matters;

1. That the scheme applied for has been designed based on incorrect assumptions about the total wastewater flows. It is too small to cope with all of Akaroa's wastewater at times when the leaking pipe network is subject to high levels of stormwater infiltration.
2. This undersizing means the new system will overflow both raw and treated sewage into Akaroa during times of heavy rain or prolonged wet weather.
3. These overflows are anticipated to occur with a frequency greater than 1 in 5 years for raw wastewater and greater than 1 in 3 years for treated wastewater, based upon previous weather patterns over many years and excluding emergency overflows due to extreme unforeseeable events.

Based on other information we have obtained including the Council's response to ECAN's Request for Further Information, LGOIMA requests, the metered wastewater flow data and our local knowledge of the area we identify the following:

4. The raw and treated overflows will occur at the Terminal Pump Station to be located in the current Boat Store area beside the Akaroa Freedom Camping area.

3665

5. Both raw and treated sewage will overflow into the tidal mouth of the Grehan Stream which runs between the Boat storage area and the Skatepark and from there to the shallow mudflats of Childrens Bay.
6. The area is susceptible to flooding. The sewage overflows are most likely during times of heavy rain and if they occur on an incoming tide or during storm surges, may mix with flood waters, inundating the Recreation Ground and associated recreational areas.
7. The volumes of these overflows could amount to 1000's of cubic meters, and in the case of the treated wastewater overflows could last for months when the irrigation field is too wet to take up the water.
8. The proposed system will not achieve the cultural objectives of eliminating wastewater from Akaroa Harbour and if it proceeds as planned will have impact on both public health and the environment of the Akaroa township itself.
9. The Council now needs to seek the views the community about what is an acceptable level of overflow risk, if any.
10. Simply increasing the capacity of the system is not a straightforward matter. It will require either a much larger pump or raw sewage buffer storage at the Terminal Pump Station and many more storage tanks in Robinsons Bay – likely to trigger the need for additional land acquisition. This will all add to the already extremely high costs.
11. There are additional risks with the irrigation fields, where steep land prone to slips and winter saturation has been earmarked for year-round irrigation, and without sufficient geotechnical analysis.
12. The Council has identified to Friends of Banks Peninsula that at least 70% of water passing through the wastewater system during wet weather conditions is still infiltration. This is after the Council has completed its pipe improvement work in 2021 and 2022. It now has no plans or budget for further reduction work. This infiltration is the cause of all the capacity issues with the proposed system.
13. Failing to reduce the infiltration contradicts the recommendation made in 2020 by Councillors, when they resolved to proceed with the Inner Harbour system, that infiltration levels be brought down to 20%. It also fails to meet the conditions of consent CRC204086 extending the current harbour outfall until May 2030. No reason has been given as to why Council is not working to further reduce the infiltration.
14. Operating costs for this complex new system have not been broken out in the LTP or made public, but will be substantially more than the current gravity fed system with its simple harbour outfall. Wastewater will be pumped for kilometres to an elevation of 300m, and the irrigation fields and storage systems will need constant monitoring and management.

We therefore request that:

15. The Council withdraws its consent application CRC235038 and removes all funding for the WW Akaroa Reclaimed Water Treatment & Reuse Scheme item 596.
16. Funding is instead allocated to fixing or replacing the leaking pipe network in Akaroa to reduce the level of infiltration to less than 20% in accordance with Council's 2020 recommendation. Less than 20% must be clearly defined as meaning less than 20% in extreme wet weather events or daily, not annual average or monthly averages that mask the susceptibility of the network to infiltration and overflows. Improving the pipe network to this level will help the Council achieve its climate resilience goals by substantially reducing the risk of network overflows during the more frequent extreme storms anticipated due to climate change. It is also likely to improve water quality at the town's beaches by preventing untreated sewage leaching into groundwater.
17. After the pipe network has been fixed and the infiltration levels established through measurement, including during prolonged wet winter weather, a new treatment plant and treated wastewater disposal system are designed based on measured flow data.
18. Should the Council find valid reasons why the badly leaking pipe network cannot be improved to this level, then this needs to be clearly communicated to the public. The Council would then need to develop and consult on a plan setting out the Average Recurrence Interval for each type of overflow and providing an acceptable solution for managing such foreseeable overflows.

3665

The Council is planning substantial rate rises, new fees and cuts to services. We submit that this is the time for prudence with its largest projects, and that it is not appropriate to proceed with the extremely expensive Akaroa Reclaimed Water Treatment & Reuse Scheme which will not achieve its stated objective, carries an increased risk of sewage overflows, compromises climate resilience, and already faces further cost escalation. A fundamental principle in the construction of any new infrastructure should be that it is more resilient, not less, to the climate change future we face.

Contact Person: Sue Church

Secretary, Friends of Banks Peninsula



Item 3

Attachment B

3665



**Evaluating
BECA Ltd: Akaroa Wastewater Scheme
Design Flow Basis Update Report

Report to Environment Canterbury**

21 April 2024

Item 3

Attachment B

3665

Executive Summary

Christchurch City Council submitted the resource consent application for its Akaroa Treated Wastewater Irrigation Scheme to ECAN in June 2023.

Friends of Banks Peninsula has been involved with the wastewater proposals since 2007, on working parties, keeping abreast of all technical developments and making substantive submissions. We obtained a copy of the application and carried out an analysis of the wastewater daily flow modelling, concerned that the proposed storage requirement was so much less than that presented to the public during the last round of consultation in 2020. Our analysis identified that the wastewater flows had been underestimated and the storage undersized. Both ECAN and Christchurch City Council were provided with a copy of our report in September 2023.

Christchurch City Council commissioned consultants Beca Ltd to review the flow modelling. Their Design Flow Basis Update Report was released on 8 April 2024 and made available to Friends of Banks Peninsula. We have now conducted an analysis of the Beca Update Report and compared it to the consent application to identify differences, and assess their implications for the proposed system design. The Update Report:

- confirms that the wastewater flow modelling in the application had been underestimated and for the reasons identified in the Friends of Banks Peninsula report;
- identifies that even if the maximum spare storage capacity provided by the application is constructed and fully utilised, there would still be treated wastewater overflows into the harbour more frequently than 1 in 5 years, whereas the application had been predicated on there being no overflows;
- discusses several different ARI (Average Recurrence Intervals) when different components of the system would be unable to cope with wastewater flows. This has drawn to our attention the inconsistencies in different parts of the proposed new wastewater system and the lack of any ARI threshold for the irrigation system as overflows were not anticipated;
- identifies that additional raw wastewater buffering is needed at the Terminal Pump Station to meet the Council's 1 in 5 year ARI for raw sewage overflows into Grehan Stream;
- flags that the irrigation rates have increased from those previously adopted to avoid increasing the risk of land instability. Our analysis also identifies that some of the irrigation areas now included were formerly excluded due to having a history of saturation and have yet to be geo-technically assessed;
- advises that the Council should now consider providing appropriate margins when sizing the infrastructure for the wastewater system for flows above the level predicted by the updated modelling to cope with anomalies in the model and the weather; and,
- advises that extreme weather events are more likely as the climate changes.

Given the substantive issues raised, the Council will now need to decide whether it is going to provide extra storage and/or irrigation capacity, accept more frequent overflows, or further reduce the high levels of infiltration into Akaroa's ageing pipe network. This infiltration during and following rainfall is the cause of the high wastewater flows and the resulting capacity issues.

We conclude that installing a fixed capacity land disposal system is incompatible with the current network infrastructure with its badly leaking pipes. These must be repaired or replaced to the fullest extent possible, in line with the recommendation made by the Council when it approved the irrigation scheme proposal in 2020. The current application should be withdrawn and reconsidered once all possible steps have been taken to reduce infiltration and the remaining extent of it is known. The system can then be properly sized with a consistent ARI that has been determined through an assessment of environmental effects, cost/benefit analysis and appropriate public consultation. This will provide Akaroa and the ratepayers with a system that is sustainable and resilient for the conditions expected in the years ahead.

Evaluating Beca Update Report on ATWIS consent application April 2024

i

3665

Table of Contents

1	Summary of findings in the Beca Update Report	1
2	Storage requirements and overflows	2
2.1	Storage requirement	2
2.2	Extent of the overflows	2
2.3	Dealing with the overflows	3
2.4	Increasing storage	3
3	Irrigation field and rates	3
3.1	Irrigation rates	3
3.2	Potential use of less suitable areas	4
3.3	Stand down period after heavy rain	5
4	Raw sewage overflows	6
4.1	Terminal Pump Station capacity	6
4.2	Terminal Pump Station buffer tank	6
4.3	Treatment Bypass for High Flows	6
5	Climate Change	7
5.1	Increased extreme events	7
6	Capacity margins	7
6.1.1	Storage margin	7
6.1.2	Irrigation field margin	8
7	Forecast population changes	8
8	Environmental effects of overflows	9
8.1	ARI design	9
8.2	Effects of Raw Wastewater overflows	9
8.3	Effects of Treated Wastewater overflows	10
9	Inflow and Infiltration	10
9.1	I&I reductions	11
9.2	Retentate	11
9.3	Why has infiltration not been dealt with	11
9.3.1	Council decision to reduce infiltration to 20%	12
9.3.2	ECAN Consent decision CRC204086 extending current harbour outfall	12
10	Risks that need to be addressed	13
10.1	Consenting risks	13
10.1.1	Assessment of Environmental Effects and revised conditions	14
10.2	Other potential risks that need to be re-examined	14
10.3	Management risks	15
11	Conclusion	15

1 Summary of findings in the Beca Update Report

Christchurch City Council has supplied Friends of Banks Peninsula with a new report produced by Beca Ltd¹ re-assessing the design flows of the Akaroa Wastewater Scheme. This report released in April 2024 identifies substantive differences in the design flows, sizing of infrastructure and anticipated overflows from those in the Consent Application CRC235038 lodged with ECAN in June 2023, and from the responses given to ECAN in their subsequent requests for further information.

We summarise the differences in the table below, and then in the following sections discuss each in more detail.

Table 1 Summary of differences between consent application and updated modelling

Difference	Consent application including RFI	New Modelling Report
Storage requirement	12,000m ³ would suffice with no overflows	20,000m ³ - 24,000m ³ , which still results in overflows
Extent of overflows	No overflows of treated wastewater	Overflow events could last weeks or months
Managing overflows	Overflows not anticipated	Identifies need to determine a management approach to overflows
Irrigation rate	Two different irrigation rates used in different appendices –original rates and new higher rates	Higher irrigation rates applied
Irrigation field size and use	Different field sizes used in different appendices, 35.7ha and 40ha	Consider use of 5ha previously earmarked as less suitable
Stand-down period after heavy rain	Inconsistency between management principle and storage modelling	Acknowledgement of long tail of increased groundwater after heavy rain but inconsistency remains
Raw sewage overflows	No mention of raw sewage overflows	Acknowledged that Terminal Pump Station capacity of 65l/s means raw overflows expected more frequently than 1 in 5 years
Raw sewage buffer tank at Terminal Pump Station	Not considered in application	Suggests a 330m ³ raw buffer storage needed at the TPS to cope with inflows to meet 1 in 5 year overflow design criteria.
Bypass Flows	Committed to “no bypass” approach	Consultants understand Council is exploring Treatment Bypass for High Flows
Increase in extreme storms due to climate change	Acknowledged increased likelihood of extreme rain events but no provision made to cope with them.	Acknowledged increase in unpredictable “black swan” events around NZ but excluded them from modelling.
Capacity Margins	Storage margin 8,000m ³	Margin now exceeded, revised margins needed.
Forecast Population	Modelling based on Akaroa winter population of 840 and summer peak of 4557 Excluded Takamatua and Ōnuku from system	Revised to winter population of 882 and peak summer of 3706. Consideration of including the Takamatua and Ōnuku populations in the system
Environmental effects of overflows and unexpected events	No ARI (average recurrence interval) mentioned in application. No consideration of effects of overflows, as not anticipated	Various ARI scenarios (2 year, 5 year, 10 year) used for different parts of the system
Drinking water retentate reduction	Storage modelling based on 75% reduction in drinking water retentate	Acknowledges some retentate reductions achieved and assumes no further

¹ Beca Ltd, Akaroa Wastewater Scheme Design Flow Basis Update Report, April 8 2023

Difference	Consent application including RFI	New Modelling Report
I&I reductions	Storage sizing predicated on reducing I&I by 20%	I&I reductions considered achieved and no further repairs planned

2 Storage requirements and overflows

A critical component of the ATWIS system are large storage tanks designed to hold treated wastewater when there is more coming through the system than can be safely irrigated. If the storage is insufficient then treated wastewater will have to overflow somewhere – either by being drawn down and over-applied at the irrigation field or disposed of to a water body.

2.1 Storage requirement

The consent application stated that

There are no direct discharges from the ATWIS to water (fresh or coastal) – all treated wastewater will be irrigated to land.²

It identified that 12,000m³ would provide sufficient storage to preclude treated wastewater overflows stating:

“modelling determined that storage capacity of approximately 11,250 m³ would be needed so the scheme can irrigate and / or store all wastewater treated at the WWTP without requiring any bypass discharges of treated or untreated wastewater from the scheme to an alternative receiving environment. Initial storage capacity of at least 12,000 m³ will be developed, but consent is sought in respect of all ten tanks, which would provide a cumulative total potential storage capacity of up to 20,000 m³. The additional capacity would provide substantial storage above the modelled volume to account for unforeseen events.³

The storage is to be provided on two platforms on the Upper Robinsons Bay irrigation field, at an elevation of approximately 150m. Extensive earthworks over approximately 2ha are required to construct the platforms.

The modelling in the Update Report, tested on various scenarios, now informs that there would be insufficient capacity to preclude all overflows. Even if the storage is increased to 24,000m³ overflows could be reasonably expected every few years. At 20,000m³, as applied for, overflows are expected between 11-21 years over the 51year period analysed.⁴

This confirms the conclusions reached by Friends of Banks Peninsula in its report supplied to CCC and ECAN in September 2023 that the storage provided in the application had been grossly undersized. The cause identified was that the original flow modelling had not taken into account the long tail of elevated infiltration into the wastewater network that occurs after prolonged rain in the Akaroa catchment.⁵

2.2 Extent of the overflows

The Update report does not attempt to define what an overflow event is, but makes clear it could last for several days or even months. In the 1978 example given in the report the 20,000m³ storage limit would have reached capacity, separate overflows would have occurred four times, the longest lasting for over a month.

Based on actual flow data from 2022 and 2023, overflows would have totalled 8,446m³ in 2022 and

² CRC235038 consent application p7

³ CRC235038 consent application p17

⁴ Beca Design Flow Basis Update Report Table 6-2 p34

⁵ Friends of Banks Peninsula, Evaluating Water Storage Requirements for Akaroa Treated Wastewater System Using Actual Flow Data, p 5

15,433m³ in 2023.

This is very different from the occasional temporary network overflows currently experienced which may last for a few hours or a day. The prolonged overflows occur because large volumes of treated wastewater are coming through from the plant, but cannot be irrigated out, so overflow.

2.3 Dealing with the overflows

Because the consent application assumes the storage will be sufficient it does not anticipate overflows of the treated wastewater, and therefore does not describe any mechanism through which they will be handled or provide any conditions to manage them.

The report advises that this matter does need to be addressed stating:

Further operational and planning considerations are needed to determine a management approach for overflows in terms of storage drawdowns, discharge rates, how overflows will be reported and discharge locations etc⁶

What is meant by “storage drawdowns” is not made clear – but could potentially mean irrigating outside of the permitted irrigation parameters or disposing to a nearby waterbody.

2.4 Increasing storage

Although the Update Report includes scenarios with 24,000m³ of storage, it does not give consideration as to whether this could be provided on the sites currently acquired by the Council for the wastewater project.

As noted above, the consent application indicated that that 12,000m³ of storage would be constructed initially, and includes a proposed condition that between 8,000m³ to 12,000m³ of tank storage be constructed in the Robinsons Bay Valley Irrigation site. The application included provision for up to 10 tanks providing 20,000m³ of storage on large platforms to be excavated on a ridgeline at approximately 150m altitude on the site.

Later in response to ECAN’s RFI, the Council stated that:

Up to 20,000m³ of storage will be provided depending on the results of I&I reduction measures, but it should be assumed that the full 20,000m³ of storage capacity will be available.⁷

It is not apparent where additional storage could be placed on the Robinsons Bay site, as all the potential storage locations assessed in 2020⁸ are now allocated as irrigation areas, and the Geotechnical assessment warns not to overload the upper current tank platform due to instability concerns.⁹

3 Irrigation field and rates

Irrigation is to be provided on two sites at Robinsons Bay, the larger in the Upper Robinsons Bay valley and the smaller on Hammond Point – the headland between Takamatua and Robinsons Bay.

The application identifies 35.7ha of areas considered suitable for irrigation – 31.9 on the Upper Robinsons Bay land and 3.8 on Hammond Point. An additional 5.0ha are identified on the Upper Robinsons Bay land as possible irrigation areas but less suitable.

The application was based on irrigating to the 35.7ha of more suitable land.

3.1 Irrigation rates

It was unclear in the original application what set of irrigation rates was to be used. The rates given

⁶ Beca Design Flow Basis Update Report p34

⁷ RFI, p4

⁸ CH2M Beca Ltd, Akaroa Wastewater Summary of Disposal and Reuse Options 17 July 2020, Appendix L

⁹ CRC235038 consent application Appendix Q p 14

in Appendix F and used by PDP to calculate the storage requirement were the same as those published in 2020 when the Inner Bays Scheme was approved by Council. These rates appear to have been set in conjunction with the Technical Experts group (a body of engineers drawn from Council, consultants, Ngāi Tahu and the community) which met several times in 2017.¹⁰ Three sets of rates were used (2.75mm/day in mid-summer, 2.1mm/day in spring and autumn and 1.5mm/day in winter). The Update Report states that:

Based on site conditions (soil type, slope and hill facing direction) a minimum winter application rate of 1.5mm/day (increasing in the shoulder and summer season) was originally adopted as appropriate to not heighten the risk of land instability.

However, the PDP storage calculation had been based on having 40ha of irrigable land available (at the time that work was done there was expected to be 2.9ha in Takamatua). Later consultants Aqualinc, after walking over the Upper Robinsons site, made substantive changes to the proposed irrigable areas, removing some, adding others and taken together this reduced the total suitable irrigable area to 35.7ha. They circumvented the issue of a smaller total field size by increasing the irrigation rate 12% to enable the same volume of water to be disposed of into the reduced area.

This was clarified in response to ECANs RFI and these are the rates that have been used by Beca and PDP for the revised modelling in the Update Report, but there has been no discussion of how these higher rates may affect land stability.

3.2 Potential use of less suitable areas

The Update Report makes clear that

One of the key parameters for the irrigation modelling is the tree dripper irrigation area, which has been determined using guidance from the USEPA around land treatment of municipal wastewater – key recommendations being:

- *Exclude land with slope of greater than 19 degrees unless a site-specific geotechnical assessment confirms land as suitable.*
- *Exclude land with slope of greater than 15 degrees for land downslope to coastline*
- *Exclude land with identified instability within or downhill of area*
- *Exclude land that, if it became unstable, could pose risk to downslope residences and infrastructure.*

Assessments of the available irrigable land for the scheme have been made by various geotechnical and irrigation specialists with consideration of the above guidance, however the irrigable areas adopted (Table 6-1) have been taken from the recently lodged resource consent application for the scheme⁵¹¹.

In highlighting these matters, the Update Report does seem to cast some doubt on the increased irrigation rate and the suitability of irrigation areas identified in the consent application. The application does include in the 35.7ha several areas high on the upper eastern side of the Upper Robinsons Bay site that do not appear to have had any form of geotechnical assessment. These areas may have been ruled out in earlier versions of the scheme as prior to the purchase of the land, PDP had been informed by the land owner that

“land on the upper slopes gets saturated during winter and remains so, indicating poorly draining materials.”¹²

Also included in the 35.7ha are areas that have downslopes of greater than 19°, irrigation between and around the two tank platforms and areas with existing slips below.

¹⁰ Beca Report, November 2019 Appendix A

¹¹ Update Report P32

¹² Beca Report, 2017, Appendix N p2

3665

Nonetheless, the Update Report also considers the extent to which irrigating on the additional 5ha of less suitable land would reduce the storage requirement. These areas have also not been geotechnically assessed.

3.3 Stand down period after heavy rain

In their response to ECAN's RFI, Council are unequivocal that:

Irrigation would be delayed following the end of extreme rain events and restart subject to the return of favourable conditions...a fundamental principle of the scheme is that no irrigation will occur where land conditions are likely to result in surface ponding.¹³

However, neither the storage modelling in the consent application nor the Update Report has taken this into account. In both cases, it is assumed that irrigation will only cease when there has been more than 50mm of rain on a single day, and will recommence on the next dry day.

This is despite the Update Report now recognising that:

The Akaroa network demonstrates a long "tail" of increased flow following rainfall events due to an elevated groundwater table and subsequent increased groundwater infiltration. This effect is pronounced in winter when rainfall is more frequent and the effect of multiple events in succession is cumulative.

The same effect applies to the drainage of the land in Robinsons Bay after prolonged rainfall.

For example in August 2023, 7 days after irrigation would have recommenced using the >50mm cut off and recommencing the next dry day rule, the ground on the Upper Robinsons Bay site was saturated with extensive surface ponding still evident in most of the areas identified for irrigation. Had irrigation not resumed over these 7 days, an additional 3,748m³ would have built up in the storage (or overflowed in insufficient capacity) as the long tail from Akaroa drained through the wastewater network.



Figure 1 Irrigable Area 4 August 2023

No margin has as yet been incorporated into storage calculations to cope with the fundamental principle that no irrigation will occur where land conditions are likely to result in surface ponding.

This is a significant omission which needs to be addressed, as this situation will occur after prolonged wet weather when the storage is the most under pressure.

¹³ ATWIS – ECan Request for Further Information and Applicant's Response, Qiii., emailed to FOBP 16/01/2024

4 Raw sewage overflows

As well as Treated Wastewater overflows, the Update Report has drawn attention to the frequency with which raw sewage overflows will occur because of limits in the new system.

4.1 Terminal Pump Station capacity

The Terminal Pump Station (TPS) is designed with a maximum capacity of 65 L/s. The Update Report states that this is likely to result in overflows happening more frequently than 1 in every 5 years¹⁴. The 2015 consent for the TPS explains that such overflows will occur via an emergency overflow pipe into the Grehan Stream – which is between the TPS and the skatepark, one of Akaroa's busiest recreational areas. Overflow spills due to capacity exceedance are likely to occur during times of high rainfall when this area is subject to flooding, and when storm surges on a rising tide could also push the overflowing sewage upstream towards the recreation ground and town.

4.2 Terminal Pump Station buffer tank

The Update Report suggests that if the pumping capacity is not increased, then an additional raw sewage buffer storage tank will be required to meet the 1 in 5 year threshold, and this will need to hold 330m³. This is a significant structure equating in size to a 100sqm 1 storey house.

We are unclear why the pipe network upgrades are being designed to a 1 in 10 year ARI but the Terminal Pump Station to a 1 in 5 ARI.

Beca had identified to the Council that the total capacity of the wastewater network when designing for a 1 in 10 year event is 3,562m³ per day.¹⁵ We note that even this is less than the capacity of the current network to deliver wastewater to the current WWTP. For example on 23 July 2023, the PS616 flow meter just prior to the treatment plant measured flow of 4,019m³ and there were no overflows recorded that day at the WWTP itself. Even with a buffer tank this constraint on the TPS capacity needs to be looked at closely. The amount that would have overflowed on 23 July 2023 would have exceeded a 330m³ buffer tank. If other overflow points in the network were improved, this would have resulted in even more reaching the TPS and overflowing into the Grehan Stream.

4.3 Treatment Bypass for High Flows

Bypassing treatment during times of heavy flow was an extremely controversial issue in the community when first mooted in 2016. By the time it formally consulted with the community in 2017, the Council committed that all wastewater passing through to the irrigation fields would be fully treated. This commitment is re-iterated in the current consent application:

The applicant has committed to a 'no bypass' approach to wastewater treatment, meaning that all wastewater conveyed to the WWTP will either be treated as it arrives, or if inflows exceed 14 L/s (equivalent to the peak summer mean daily flow) raw wastewater will be stored in the wet weather flow storage tank (~2,000 m3) for future treatment.¹⁶

The Update Report suggests that this commitment may be dispensed with stating:

It is also understood that Council will explore a high flow bypass for the treatment train which will pass higher daily volumes to the irrigation system and storage when required.¹⁷

This indicates that the raw wastewater storage buffer tank that forms part of the consent application is too small to contain all the incoming wastewater. The Council has not explained in the application how it arrived at the 2,000m³ sizing for the raw buffer tank. In 2022 it had been advised by GHD in an Options Analysis report for the new WWTP that this buffer tank would need to be at

¹⁴ Update Report P26

¹⁵ Beca, Water Balance Model Summary Letter, 27 Jan 2022, p1

¹⁶ CRC235038 consent application p13

¹⁷ Beca Update Report, p33

least 4,500m³.¹⁸

5 Climate Change

Both the consent application and the Update Report acknowledge that more extreme rainfall events are likely due to climate change, but neither provide information on how the system can be designed to cope with them. All of the risks associated with insufficient capacity and the associated overflows are exacerbated by extreme rainfall events.

5.1 Increased extreme events

The consent application states that:

In general terms it is expected that the Banks Peninsula climate will be warmer with more frequent extreme rainfall events.¹⁹

but did not consider that these would add any increased risk or affect the ability of the storage and irrigation system to cope.

The Update Report acknowledges that extreme storm events are expected to occur with increased frequency and can strike randomly at any time, and that the probabilistic approach taken to model wastewater flows cannot forecast these extreme “black swan” events. They have classified the storm in July 2023 as a “black swan” event, and appear to have terminated their model validation on 22 June 2023, thereby excluding the prolonged wet weather in July and this event from their model validation.

In our view the July storm was not a black swan event. Whilst on the 22 July 2023 the 24 hour rainfall was a record, the total rainfall for the 8 day rain event of 268mm is significantly lower than in 1978 when 366mm fell in a 9 day event in April. July 2023 was not an extreme outlier. Within the 51 year sequence considered by PDP, three other years (1973, 1978, 2012 and 2013) all had events that exceeded the total rainfall of the July 2023 event, so July 2023 provides useful information for contributing to the probabilistic approach. Leaving it out means that Beca has failed to consider the most significant data point in the measured wastewater flow data available since the working meter was installed in 2017. For example, in assessing the storage requirement, the actual flows for 2023 show that over 30,000m³ would be needed to avoid overflows.

6 Capacity margins

The Update Report recommends that an appropriate margin above that predicted by the revised modelling should now be considered when sizing the infrastructure for the wastewater system²⁰, to cover weather and usage anomalies that the modelling does not account for, but it does not suggest how large this margin should be.

6.1.1 Storage margin

The Consent Application originally provided an 8,000m³ (66%) capacity margin for the storage, because although 12,000m³ was considered sufficient with no overflows anticipated, the consent applied for up to 20,000m³. That 20,000m³ capacity has been shown to be insufficient, so there is no margin on the storage.

Friends of Banks Peninsula recommends that in terms of the storage capacity, at least 40,000m³ is required. The graph below from the Update Report compares storage requirement using the modelled flows (in orange) with the storage requirement based on the measured flows (in blue). This shows that in 2023, approximately 32,000m³ of storage would have been required. In addition as

¹⁸ GHD, Preliminary Process Design of Akaroa WWTP Options Analysis Report, 27 June 2022, p4

¹⁹ CRC235038 consent application p85

²⁰ Beca Update Report, p36

3665

noted above, the storage modelling in the Update Report does not take into account **the fundamental principle that no irrigation will occur where land conditions are likely to result in surface ponding**. It appears that as yet no data has been collected on how long the land remains saturated after prolonged winter rain. On the basis of the photographs taken 7 days after the July 2023 event had ceased, at least another 4,000m³ of storage would have been needed. If a further margin matching the original 8,000m³ is added on top of this, it suggests that storage of close to 44,000m³ would be needed to cope with the actual wastewater flows measured over the past 6 years. We note this calculation still uses the higher irrigation rates which Beca seems to imply may affect land stability.




Figure 2 Modelled versus Measured flow graph from Update Report

6.1.2 Irrigation field margin

The Consent Application was based on irrigating 35.7ha of land classified as “suitable” and had as a margin 5ha of additional land identified as “less suitable”.

The Update Report has now considered the use of this 5ha of “less suitable” land and found that even with irrigating to these areas, the storage capacity of 20,000m³ would result in overflows more frequently than 1 in 5 years. (No evidence has been provided that irrigating areas already identified as “less suitable” at times when the land is wettest, and potentially saturated and using the higher irrigation rates is feasible without causing run-off and/or increasing land instability).

7 Forecast population changes

The Update Report has made significant adjustments to the current and forecast populations for Akaroa. However, as it acknowledges, population does not have a great impact on the system capacity, and wet weather flows from rainfall are multiples of peak day population flows.²¹

In other words, the system capacity is being driven by the infiltration levels, not by the population levels, and as the infiltration peaks in winter and the population peaks in summer, at this stage of the system design, population levels are largely irrelevant to capacity design.

²¹ Beca, Update Report, P36

8 Environmental effects of overflows

The Update Report makes clear that both Raw and Treated wastewater overflows must be planned for and managed. The current consent application does not provide either management or conditions for overflows, so this is new assessment work that now needs to be added to the application.

8.1 ARI design

The consent application is silent on the overall ARI (average recurrence interval) for the system design. Essentially it has assumed an infinite ARI as it does not countenance any aspects of the system being overloaded by an extreme event.

The Update Report mentions various different ARIs for different aspects of the system. It states that the network capacity is designed for a 1 in 10 rainfall event.²² For the Terminal Pump Station it states that the Council aiming to achieve a 1 in 5 ARI.

Earlier documents, such as BECA's Water Balance Summary letter²³ suggest that CCC's selected design storm was a 1 in 10 year ARI. This applied to the network and all the components in the train, including pumping capacity and raw wastewater storage prior to the WWTP. Deciding this is critical to the sizing of all the components of the system and where and what type of overflows will occur. There is no point in sizing facilities for the treated wastewater that exceeds what the network can deliver, when it will already have overflowed as raw wastewater. In order for the system to cope with an overall design criteria of 1 in 10 ARI, the Terminal Pump Station would need to increase from 65L/s to 91L/s and the raw wastewater buffer storage at the WWTP would need to increase from 2,000m³ to at least 4,500m³.

The treated wastewater storage volume also needs to be addressed to determine what would fit with the 1 in 10 ARI if this is the design criteria chosen.

The ARI threshold chosen is one of the most critical elements of the system, underpinning all aspects of design, and the cost/benefit choices that must be made by the Council. There has as yet never been any consultation or discussion with the community enabling their views on this matter to be ascertained.

8.2 Effects of Raw Wastewater overflows

The effects of raw wastewater overflows are set out in the Water NZ Good Practice Guide.

*Discharge of untreated wastewater into a receiving environment poses a public health risk. This is because untreated wastewater contains elevated levels of contaminants, pathogens, viruses, bacteria, and protozoa that can cause serious diseases and health problems (Beca et al. 2020)... WWO events can also have negative environmental effects, through the potential to impact receiving water quality, habitat quality and aquatic communities.*²⁴

As noted above, the discharge point into the Grehan Stream adjacent to the Terminal Pump Station is approximately 50 meters from where this stream flows across the beach and enters the shallow bay, but it is tidal at this point, so could also flow upstream on an incoming tide or storm surge. Facilities in the immediate area include the Akaroa Playcentre, the SkatePark, BMX track, the mini golf, the Akaroa Boat Ramp slipway, kayak launching, the Boat Store, the Freedom Camping area, the Akaroa main car and bus park, the recreation ground and the tennis, croquet and bowling clubs. All of these facilities are heavily used by local residents and visitors in both summer and winter.

The area is already prone to flooding, with the water overflowing from Grehan Stream inundating

²² Beca, Update Report p36

²³ Beca, Water Balance Model Summary Letter, 27 Jan 2022, p1

²⁴ Water NZ, Good Practice Guide: Addressing Wet Weather Wastewater Network Overflow Performance, p7

the recreation ground as far as Rue Jolie and the Bowling Club many times in living memory²⁵.

8.3 Effects of Treated Wastewater overflows

The consent application states:

Treated wastewater has the potential to significantly affect public health where there is a risk of public exposure to and contact with the wastewater. Exposure to contaminants of concern to human health including pathogens can result in significant illness in the community, and in extreme cases public health emergencies. Wastewater networks, treatment and disposal is therefore critical to maintain public health and avoid the potential for serious adverse effects on the public from contacting wastewater, or from wastewater contaminants in the receiving environment.

Due to the risks with exposure to treated wastewater, Christchurch City Council has opted not to put a general purple pipe re-use system into commercial and domestic premises in Akaroa, or even to use the treated water for flushing public toilets. It is only prepared to provide a purple pipe for sub-surface irrigation of the recreation ground.

If the treated wastewater includes bypass flows it will be of a lower quality and is more likely to contain pathogens such as e coli and viruses.

Because the consent application stated that the system was sized to eliminate the need for any **bypass discharges of treated or untreated wastewater from the scheme to an alternative receiving environment** there is no description of where and how the treated wastewater is to be overflowed. In its response to the ECAN RFI, the Council has indicated that the discharge would to the harbour via the purple pipe supplying treated wastewater to Akaroa and discharged via Terminal Pump Station. Potentially this also changes the status of the application.

Such overflows in the heavily used recreational area of the Childrens Bay foreshore and recreation ground do therefore pose a risk to human health, and over time and with large quantities of overflow it is likely to negatively impact on waterways and coastal marine areas.

The purpose of the land irrigation system is to preclude treated wastewater from entering Akaroa Harbour, however, under the current design there is a very high potential for frequent and large overflows of both and treated and *additional raw* sewage entering waterways and the harbour, meaning this objective is not being met.

9 Inflow and Infiltration

All of the issues set out above are a direct result of the very high level of infiltration of storm water and groundwater into the Akaroa sewer pipe network.

The amount of infiltration in the network is already the driving the need for raw sewage and treated wastewater storage tanks and the need to use overly steep and saturated land for irrigation.

The Update Report has now identified that frequent raw and treated wastewater flows are to be expected and will still occur (with a lower frequency) if the proposed system is augmented with:

- a large raw sewage buffer tank at the Terminal Pump Station;
- a large increase in the treated wastewater storage at Robinsons Bay (and the earthworks to create the platforms); and,
- treatment bypass flows at the WWTP.

It is not at all clear that the Council has sufficient land to provide additional storage or more buffering tanks, meaning the environmental effects if this system proceeds as per the application will be much more than minor.

²⁵ Peninsula Projects, Akaroa Harbour Settlement Study Areas, Historical Flooding Research and Mapping Report, 2008 p17-42

9.1 I&I reductions

The Consent application states:

Reducing I&I directly influences the volume of raw wastewater storage and the treatment capacity, storage volume and irrigation area needed. I&I reduction will also help to reduce the risk and frequency of network overflows in Akaroa.²⁶

It goes on to state that a \$3.2million programme to substantially reduce I&I commenced in 2019.

The flow modelling underpinning the storage and irrigation field sizing in the consent application was based on the assumption that storm and ground water infiltration would be reduced by 20%.²⁷

The Update Report states:

The proposed I&I network improvement work began in 2020 and is now complete.²⁸

It reports that a review of recent flow meter data has shown a significant reduction in baseflow in the order of 20-25%.

Regardless of whether this is the case, the flow figures show that the level of Rain Derived Infiltration remains a critical problem for the Akaroa wastewater system. In recent communications with the media, the Council has confirmed that I&I levels in June 2022 and July 2023 (after the I&I work was completed) were 70% and 69% respectively. Such high levels of Rain Derived I&I present a double problem for the land-based irrigation disposal system, because wastewater volumes increase massively exactly when the land is the wettest and irrigation not possible, driving the peak capacity storage volumes. It is also likely that infiltration levels are higher than stated. Council have calculated the I&I levels by deducting estimated monthly population, commercial and retentate flows from the measured wastewater flows. These estimates include annual average flows for commercial properties that do not take into account the seasonal variations in Akaroa and therefore likely to be inflated during winter.

The current high levels of infiltration mean that the system proposed by the consent application needs to be overhauled to provide much more storage for both raw and treated wastewater and probably more land for storage and irrigation to avoid triggering large and frequent overflows of raw and treated wastewater in times of heavy or prolonged rain.

9.2 Retentate

A component of the I&I that has been identified more recently is retentate from the filtering at the drinking water plant that is disposed of to the wastewater network. This contributes to the baseflow of wastewater, and is not the cause of the huge rainfall induced spikes.

The Consent Application flow modelling was based on this being reduced by 75%²⁹

However in their updated modelling, Beca have decided not to include potential reductions *due to uncertainty of the level of reduction that can be achieved*³⁰, but do identify this as an area that could still be optimised.

Some work has been done to fix overflows in the drinking water processing system, which will have in turn reduced the amount of water being processed and therefore the retentate, and this will have contributed to the base-flow reductions noted above.

9.3 Why has infiltration not been dealt with

There is no explanation given in the Consent Application or the Update Report as to how the

²⁶ CRC235038 consent application p24

²⁷ CRC235038 consent application, Appendix F, p7

²⁸ Beca, Update Report, p31

²⁹ CRC235038 consent application, Appendix F, p7

³⁰ Beca, Update Report, p12

3665

proposed infiltration reductions were decided upon, or why reductions in line with both the Council's decision to proceed with the application and the ECAN consent giving approval to the continued operation of the current system have not been included.

9.3.1 Council decision to reduce infiltration to 20%

In December 2020 the Council resolved to proceed with the Inner Harbour option³¹. It recommended that inflow and infiltration be reduced to less than 20%. However, as noted above, the Consent Application is predicated upon reducing the I&I by 20% and the retentate by 75%.

This is a substantial difference as shown in the diagram below.




Figure 3 Difference from reducing I&I by 20% and to 20%

Had the Council recommendation been followed, the total volume of the wastewater would have been reduced by 51%. With the reductions set out in the consent application the total volume is only being reduced by 21%.

More critical however, is what is meant by the reduction. Is it an average over the whole year, or is it the amount that can infiltrate during the critical times of heavy rain? As already explained, annual averages are meaningless in the context of a wastewater system with fixed limits coping with flows, as the system needs to be sized to cope with the maximum flows, or at least the maximums to a set ARI level. Averaging in 0% infiltration over a dry summer with massive infiltration in a wet winter masks the system's vulnerability to large rain events.

Neither the Consent Application nor the Update Report discuss this point. Nor is any information available as to why, in preparing the Consent Application, the recommendation of the Council to reduce infiltration to 20% was not followed.

9.3.2 ECAN Consent decision CRC204086 extending current harbour outfall

Furthermore, the current consent issued by ECAN to Christchurch City Council extending the existing harbour outfall until May 2023 includes Condition 6 which states:

- a. The volume of inflow and infiltration from the Akaroa wastewater network exiting the

³¹ CNCL/2020/00176 Christchurch City Council minutes 10 December 2020, Item 33, p18

Akaroa Wastewater Treatment Plant shall reduce to: Below 50 percent inflow and/or infiltration by 31 October 2022; and

- i. Below 40 percent inflow and/or infiltration by 31 October 2025.*
- b. The inflow and infiltration percentage shall be determined as follows:*

% Inflow and Infiltration = 100 x (Inflow and Infiltration Flows/WWTP Flow)

Where:

- Inflow and Infiltration Flows = WWTP Flow – Legitimate Wastewater Flow.*
- The WWTP Flow shall be as measured at the WWTP outfall flowmeter.*
- Legitimate Wastewater Flow = Commercial Flow + Residential Flow + Water Treatment Plant Backflush Flow.*
- The Commercial Flow shall be measured as the boundary water meter flow for commercial properties connected to the Akaroa wastewater network. Where the meter read dates do not align with the period of assessment, the average daily flows from the most recent meter reads must be used.*
- The Residential Flow shall be calculated as the permanent Akaroa population (refer to Statistics New Zealand for the most recent census data) multiplied by a factor of 240 litres per person per day.*
- The Water Treatment Plant Backflush Flow shall be calculated as 10% of the total water abstracted from streams and bores to supply the water treatment plant until permanent metering is commissioned at which point the flowmeter data shall be used.³²*

The condition has clearly not been met, as even using its annual averages, Christchurch City Council has not achieved the requirement to reduce infiltration below 50% by 31 October 2022, and as the consent application makes clear, it never had the intention to do so.

In setting the condition, ECAN is silent on what is meant by “below 50%” and whether this means an annual average or a daily figure. The requirement to use daily flows for the Commercial and Residential Flows would imply a daily limit.

10 Risks that need to be addressed

The work to update the modelled flows has raised a large number of significant issues around the sizing of the system. These now present the need for an updated Assessment of Environmental Effects to determine how they will be dealt, which is likely to involve increased costs to provide additional capacity in the system, and conditions which may be difficult for the Council to meet if it does not carry out further I&I reduction work.

The issue of an increase in extreme events due to climate change has been flagged.

That so many issues have been raised with the consent application regarding the sizing of the system, raises the question as to whether there are other areas of the proposal that also require more critical scrutiny. We attempt to identify some of these below.

10.1 Consenting risks

The Inner Bays system proposed in 2020 was classified as a non-complying activity because it included provision to overflow treated wastewater to a freshwater body when the storage capacity was exceeded. The Consent Application has suggested that it be classified discretionary because no overflows were anticipated. As the Update Report now identifies that overflows will occur unless the storage is massively increased, this may affect the consent classification.

³² <https://www.ecan.govt.nz/data/consent-search/consentdetails/CRC204086/CRC204086>

3665

10.1.1 Assessment of Environmental Effects and revised conditions

The Council now needs to make a decision on how it is going to address the undersizing, including the expectation of an increased frequency of extreme storms. Will it:

- provide additional pump capacity, raw sewage buffering at the TPS and WWTP, treated wastewater storage and/or a greater irrigation area?
- propose a shorter ARI threshold enabling more frequent overflows?
- undertake to achieve much more extensive I&I reductions, particularly in wet weather periods?

A new or updated Assessment of Environmental Effects is needed once these options have been considered and costed.

Once the decision has been made on how to address the undersizing issue and the Assessment of Environmental Effects completed, then the Council will need to put forward appropriate conditions.

These conditions need to be meaningful and stipulate the ARI level for raw and treated wastewater overflows and the minimum specification for each component to ensure that stated ARI level is met. These would include:

- pump instantaneous and daily capacities
- WWTP instantaneous and daily capacities
- raw sewage buffer storage to ensure the full volumes can be met without overflows exceeding the stated ARI level for raw wastewater
- irrigable area
- irrigation management plan setting out how the field will be managed to avoid effects such as ponding, runoff and demonstrating how it is still able to irrigate the anticipated full volume of water
- consequent storage volumes for treated wastewater to meet the stated ARI level for treated wastewater.

10.2 **Other potential risks that need to be re-examined**

A new wastewater system requires a very substantial investment of funds and must be safe, efficient and sustainable well into the future. It must be as risk-free as possible because the need for sewage collection and treatment cannot be 'switched off' if a system fails.

In addition to the capacity matters above the following risks are also not addressed by the AEE supplied with the current application or through meaningful conditions to ensure there are capacity margins should problems be encountered in the future:

- Irrigation field areas damaged by slips caused by extreme weather
- Irrigable areas are less able to take up water than expected, or prove geotechnically unsuitable when further assessed
- The system fails to take up nutrients at the rate forecast and leaching of nutrients into the stream exceeds the permitted limits.

The application is also silent on the need for pumping stations at the irrigation field. The storage tanks are located approximately 50m higher than the WWTP, so cannot be gravity fed. A pump station of significant size will be needed at the Robinsons Bay Valley site to pump the water to the storage tanks.

Approximately ⅓ of the 35.7ha of land identified as suitable irrigation areas and almost all of the less suitable 5ha that may now be required, are above the storage tanks, and up to 150m higher.

3665

Another pumping station will be needed to pump the stored water up to these areas for irrigation.

Both pumping stations will require earthworks to excavate platforms, a power source and may have effects such as noise, odours and emergency discharges in case of failure, and will require landscaping.

10.3 Management risks

The system proposed is much more complex than Akaroa's current gravity fed wastewater system with its harbour outfall disposal. There are many more components that could fail including the many pumps, long distance pipes, wastewater storage tanks and the irrigation field with its many lines, drippers, and control systems.

The application provides for monitoring of the wastewater quality, irrigation, fresh, ground and harbour water quality and soil quality, but gives no information on the effort involved in carrying out the monitoring or the daily work and daily decisions involved in managing the irrigation fields.

We understand that the Council is now providing an adaptive management and mitigation strategy to support the ATWIS application.

The application states that:

If monitoring indicates an environmental effect that requires intervention to avoid, remedy or mitigate it, a range of options are available to the consent holder in response. These may include but are not limited to:

- *Further reducing inflows into the WWTP by reducing I&I into the wastewater network*
- *Introducing additional treatment steps to the WWTP process*
- *Extending the area of land irrigated on the Robinsons Bay Valley site to include the 'less suitable' land identified in site mapping*
- *Extending the area of land irrigated by purchasing additional land in the inner harbour area*
- *Adjusting the irrigation regime to, for example change the irrigation application rate, alter the scheme configuration, or change the dose / rest / dose pattern, duration or frequency.*

Most of these remedies or mitigations would require extensive costs and purchasing more land could prove very difficult. It has already taken the Council nearly 9 years since the harbour outfall was declined to develop the current proposal. Any mitigation proposed must address how issues such as overflows due to lack of storage or irrigation area would be managed in the intervening period when more land was being sought or the system expanded in other ways to prevent many years of ongoing environmental effects while solutions are sought.

11 Conclusion

The issues identified in the Beca Update Report indicate that substantial changes are necessary to the ATWIS design and identifies that overflows and the ARI must be considered in the system design.

Latest modelling work demonstrates that unless it is substantially modified, the proposed system will be demonstrably less resilient and prone to overflows (both raw and treated) than the current system, resulting in an increased impact on the environment and creating a public health risk.

It is hard to see how the Council can make decisions on how it will address these issues and prepare an AEE within the timeframe of the current consent, and allocate the necessary budgets through its LTP process to fund the increased infrastructure identified.

Friends of Banks Peninsula has previously recommended that the existing harbour outfall should be retained and used solely as the emergency overflow for treated wastewater. This would provide a mechanism for dealing with large overflows in times when it was too wet to irrigate, while minimising adverse effects on human health and the freshwater or coastal areas.

3665

However, now that it appears the system may also be subject to large raw wastewater overflows at Childrens Bay, we conclude that the fixed capacity land disposal system proposed is incompatible with the current network infrastructure with its badly leaking pipes.

We therefore conclude that the current application should be withdrawn and reconsidered once all possible steps have been taken to reduce the infiltration and the remaining extent of it (properly measured and during peak infiltration times) is known.

Appropriately sized infrastructure and ARI conditions can be then be developed, in consultation with the community to provide Akaroa and the ratepayers with a system that is sustainable and resilient for the conditions expected in the years ahead, and not subject to ongoing failures.

Item 3

Attachment B

3402

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 20/04/2024

First name: Sue Last name: Church

What is your role in the organisation:


Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.
Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.
We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.
Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in **Section 1** so we can contact you.

Attached Documents

Link	File
	Sue Church CCC Long Term Plan submission 2024

3402

Christchurch City Council Long Term Plan 2024-34 submission – Sue Church

1. **Akaroa Reclaimed Water Treatment & Reuse Scheme** - LTP 2024-34 line item 596

I request the Council withdraws its resource consent application as updated reporting provided by CCC now clearly reveals that the new and vastly expensive proposal will make the current issue of wastewater overflows into the harbour far worse than the existing wastewater scheme. The proposed scheme will leave Akaroa with a broken pipe network, create a risk of overwatering of the slip prone slopes in Robinsons Bay, and leave the whole scheme far less resilient to climate change than what is currently in place.

My concerns and comments about the project include the following:

Cost

The cost is currently \$107M (\$94m in LTP budget and \$13m already spent) equating to more than \$100,000 per connection. This is the Councils fourth largest capital expenditure project in the LTP budget. The cost is likely to rise even more in light of the new information requiring additional work to be undertaken to render the scheme viable.

Sewerage overflows into harbour

The new proposal relies on raw sewerage overflows being released into Grehan Stream in the middle of the townships recreational area and emergency treated wastewater overflows into Childrens Bay when capacity is exceeded during wet weather events, with each overflow occurrence having the potential to be ongoing over a prolonged period of time. This is not stated in the Councils resource consent application, but has been exposed in a recent Council commissioned report from BECA. These discharges will be into a shallow Bay in the township instead of retaining the existing harbour outfall for emergencies to provide a safe mechanism for emergency overflows.

Broken pipe network resulting in oversizing of scheme

The broken wastewater pipe network must be fully repaired to enable a much smaller scheme to be designed. It makes no sense to build a wastewater treatment plant to process mainly stormwater. Instead of following the Council resolution from 2020 directing staff to reduce the I&I from 60% to 20%, they have worked on reducing it by 20%. The huge difference in figures then equates to massive amounts of stormwater inundating the wastewater system – the result of which requires a huge wastewater scheme to be built that is mainly treating stormwater. The poor state of the pipe network will get worse over time increasing the I&I and storage requirements even more. Raw sewage will continue to seep out of the network into the environment all around the town. Councils current evidence of I&I reduction to date is incorrect. No guarantee of I&I reduction means no accurate figures to calculate appropriate storage capacity, or site capacity of irrigation fields.

Issues on the Robinsons Bay site

- Storage requirements have been vastly undersized as revealed in the latest BECA report.
- Irrigation rates have increased from those previously adopted as appropriate. New irrigation sites have been selected on high up slopes with steep drop off, with inadequate geotechnical assessments having been undertaken.
- Nothing has been put in place to protect the archaeological site.
- Council plan to plant 40,000 kānuka but this is not the biodiversity forest the community expected. Kānuka is one of the most highly flammable native trees and is susceptible to myrtle rust.

There are many potential failure points in the proposal that have not been suitably mitigated and I believe the project in its current form should be halted. It will not achieve the cultural objective of removing wastewater from the harbour, and opens up many risks to both the environment and community.

3402

Better ways need to be sought to deal with wastewater issues. If the Bromley wastewater plant ever had to become a land based scheme the cost would have the potential to bankrupt the city.

2. Request for adequate funding in LTP for drainage maintenance on Banks Peninsula

In July 2022 huge rainfall caused extensive flooding in Robinsons Bay Valley and the main deep drain that runs about 150m between our property boundary and the road overflowed flooding a section of our paddock and down the road. It overflowed as the drains capacity had reduced dramatically over the last few years as it filled up with debris over time and has not been maintained by the Council. A request to CCC to dig out the drains resulted in the following expensive and ineffective actions:

- A City Care engineer and Fulton Hogan engineer spent several hours in the Valley looking at the whole drainage system. They then declared there was not much money in the budget to deal with it.
- Sometime later eight staff arrived from Christchurch and spent 3 days weed-eating the entire Valley roadside and two more days clearing away grass and sticks. They informed me they were not contracted to dig out the drains, even though they could see that was what was required. Within a few weeks the grass had all grown back.
- Several weeks later a CCC worker was sent to GPS and record all of the drains in the Valley.
- July 2023 brought more heavy rain, flooding on road and into our paddock again scouring out under our fence line. More complaints led to nothing.

Still nothing is resolved and I do not expect the Council will be prepared to reimburse us for any damage to our fence where posts are being undermined by the flooding. It seems CCC are happy to use private properties such as ours and two neighbours further down the road to divert excess stormwater instead of at least trying to provide maintenance or upgrades to the existing drainage system. All the money that has been spent on this so far has not actually solved the problem. I suspect a small digger and truck to take away the soil is all that is required.

I request that the Council ensure there is adequate funding in the LTP budget for the upkeep in the drainage system on Banks Peninsula.

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.

3180

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 20/04/2024

First name: Craig Last name: Church

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Capital: Other - comments


Akaroa Reclaimed Water Treatment & Reuse Scheme - LTP 2024-34 line item 596 I ask CCC to halt the planned wastewater scheme in Akaroa until better options are provided to the community. The massive budget blow out and poorly designed scheme that will still release sewerage into the harbour is not sensible. Fix the broken pipe network first, and then design a scheme to process the actual wastewater, not huge amounts of storm water. Planned irrigation rates to land in Robinsons Bay have increased in quantity despite geotechnical reports waring against overwatering. The increase in extreme weather events has not been factored into figures despite there being so much more knowledge about the effects of climate change and the need for resilience with large infrastructure projects. CCC did not publically notify this consent application when they could have, instead handing that decision over to ECAN. It seems to be a deliberate attempt to keep the community from inputting into this process when local residents have inputted many sensible ideas into the proposal over the last eight years. Local knowledge is invaluable, and there are now no CCC staff from the original team working on this project. Many different consultants are being used who seem to have no idea of the history behind it all. The number of major mistakes in the resource consent application shows that staff have no depth of understand surrounding the intricacies of the scheme. I request that CCC withdraw their resource consent application as the \$100,000 needed for each connection is certainly not good value for the ratepayer dollar considering the many issues that have not been addressed.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

2689

Chris & Annette Moore



To: Christchurch City Council Long Term Plan Submission
Date: 21 April 2024

This submission relates only to LTP2024-34 line item 596 WW Akaroa
Reclaimed Water Treatment and Reuse Scheme

**We oppose the the massive funding increase for the WW Akaroa
Reclaimed Water Treatment & Reuse Scheme item 596.**

We were shocked to read in The Akaroa Mail that Council is now planning to spend well in excess of \$100 million on this project. The project covers less than 1000 connections which must make it the most expensive wastewater project ever undertaken in New Zealand. **A project that has no guarantee of success. A project that will have overflows of raw and treated sewerage going into Akaroa Harbour near Childrens Bay.**

We are aware that Council are struggling to find the funds to carry out major capital works and normal operational expenses so here is the opportunity to put a hold on this project and look at what should and could be done to re-evaluate, resize, revamp and recast the total project. Council staff should also take this opportunity to relook at other options that have become available during the last 4 years.


While this is being undertaken, Council should allocate funds to fix the aging and leaking pipe network in Akaroa to reduce the level of stormwater infiltration to under 20% as per the Council Resolution back in 2020. This work was started but seems to have been put on hold. When this work is completed, it will result in a much smaller system being required at significantly less cost than what is currently being proposed.

We urge Council to put a hold on this project as a matter of urgency.

We wish to be heard by the LTP Hearing Panel

Thank You

Chris & Annette Moore



Item 3
Attachment B

2398

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 20/04/2024

First name: Fiona Last name: Turner

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Capital: Other - comments

Akaroa Reclaimed Water Treatment & Reuse Scheme – LTP 24-34 line item 596 My home is situated in Robinsons Bay, with the wastewater site on the boundary of two sides of my property. I have major concerns about the current proposal due to the escalating costs of the project, the environmental risks it creates and the fact it does not resolve the cultural issues it was attempting to overcome. I ask the Council to withdraw its current resource consent application and reconsider its options. The cost is currently \$107M and expected to rise in light of the information. The whole scheme is vastly oversized as it has to treat so much stormwater and ground water. The broken pipe network in Akaroa must be fully repaired to enable a much smaller scheme to be designed. Designing a scheme that overflows raw sewerage into Grehan Valley Stream and treated wastewater into Childrens Bay is not acceptable and certainly not a good investment of Council funds. Despite all of the planning to date no backup 'Plan B' has been factored in if this scheme fails. After eight years of planning I have still not been provided with any reassurances about this safety of this scheme right on my boundary. Latest reports provided by the Council now reveal increased irrigation levels above the recommended rates, which will increase the risk of land instability and increase the nutrient load of the freshwater stream at the bottom of the site. Extra irrigation sites have now been identified on high up plateaus that have steep drop offs and are slip prone, and the need has now been identified for even more giant storage tanks close to my home than previously thought. The Council have not contacted me about the required work right on my boundary, nor the necessary fencing work. The new scheme is making the issue worse that what they are replacing, and there appear to be many potential failure points in the proposal that have not been suitably mitigated. I have seen the huge emotional toll this project has taken on my community, and both the personal time and expense that has gone trying to ensure resilient solutions are put in place. With the new proposal far less resilient to climate change than the existing scheme I ask the Council to withdraw its current consent application and explore new options.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

2995

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 20/04/2024

First name: Ronnie **Last name:** Davey

Please provide the name of the organisation you represent:

Citizens Advice Bureau Christchurch Area

What is your role in the organisation:

CABCHA Board Chair

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Wed 8 May am

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in **Section 1** so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

No. We believe there should be a stronger focus on Funding Community non-profit organisations such as CAB. We have experienced a huge decline in CCC funding over the last 15 years (60K in 2009 to 15K this year) and yet we continue to receive referrals from government organisations and City Council. If the council expects that by 2034 there will be an additional 32,000 people living in Christchurch and expecting to see the population age, CAB and other non-profits community support organisations need to be able to access local government support. If the long term plan removes/reduces these funding portals, the knock on effect will have a detrimental impact on already marginalised communities.

Average rates - multiple-choice

Don't know

Changes to how we rate - comments

Any changes to the wording of the remissions for charities policies should benefit and not cost non-profits renting from council properties. Many organisations do not own property, rely on council properties to be very affordable (if not free) and are already struggling to provide their services to the community.

Fees & charges - comments

Access to parking for community areas, such as gardens and parks should not charge. This will impact marginalised groups who can't afford high cost activities. These gardens are already funded and should remain free of charge and accessible to all without extra costs.

2995

Item 3

Attachment B

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital programme - comments

Te Kaha should not be included with these other fundamental priorities. It is not a must have.

Capital: Transport - comments

CAB clients and many of our volunteers rely on public transportation and safe cycle/walk ways. Our full-time (9am-5pm) information service is run from three Christchurch-based branches in New Brighton, at the Fendalton Library and in Hornby with a weekly service at The Loft in the Eastgate Mall. All are located on major bus routes.

Capital: Libraries - comments

Libraries are crucial to maintaining a civil society. This day and age there is an even more urgent need for reliable information from credible sources. We help people know what their rights are and how to access the services they need. All our services are free, impartial, non-judgemental, accurate, and verifiable. This service is available to all regardless of the information they seek, their issue or problem; demographic profile (age, gender, ethnicity, nationality, immigration status etc.); geographic location; mobility; language; literacy or income. Information can be provided to clients face-to-face, by telephone, email, and online chat. Our free CABCHA clinics provide access to generalist and specialist lawyers, immigration advisors, technology clinics, JPs and workshops aimed at migrants but open to all. We recently upskilled eight volunteers as tenant advocates to support clients who require advocacy due to the gap left by Tenancy Services closing their Christchurch office. We facilitate access and connection to a wide variety of government and non-governmental organisations with over 1,500 of our calls focusing on accessing community services. Keeping non-profit funding portals well-funded and in the long term plan is essential.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

Areas to reduce costs to provide savings - comments

CAB data shows that not only is our service needed but we also provide an excellent return on funding. A recent 'Impact Lab Report' <https://www.cab.org.nz/assets/Documents/About-us/20222110-CAB-GoodMeasure-Report-DIGITAL.pdf> commissioned by CAB, linked to 1,073 relationship-related inquiries over two years, demonstrated that for each dollar of funding CAB receives returns \$13.20 of measurable good to New Zealand, a massive social return. However, CAB must remain independent and isn't allowed to get commercial sponsorship. Local governmental support and funding is essential for CAB to keep supporting the community. The long term plan must robustly fund the portals for non-profits to be able to provide for the communities.

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed. This expenditure is included in the proposed rates increase. While it may not have an impact on rates, it could have implications for our ability to attract major and business events in the short term.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Strategic Framework - comments

Need for increased support for vulnerable people. CAB advocacy for individuals in the community who have been digitally excluded is well documented (https://www.cab.org.nz/assets/Documents/Face-to-Face-with-Digital-Exclusion-/FINAL_CABNZ-report_Face-to-face-with-Digital-Exclusion.pdf). Currently our volunteers engage every day with clients who are experiencing a wide variety of issues because they can't afford access, don't have the technology or are struggling to navigate digital systems. We advocate for improvements to be made by the

2995

government to ensure universal access. In addition, our data shows us that Covid and the increase cost of living has hit communities hard. Last year we had 40 calls regarding lack of access to food and requiring information about foodbanks. 20% of those calls came from Māori. We aim to continue to be in locations where the most vulnerable in communities can access our services to access the support needed to be resilient in the current climate, however local funding is needed long term. Recent data shows a strong need for our service. Between April 1, 2023 and March 31, 2024 over 15,000 people in Christchurch and Selwyn district accessed our service, a 30 % increase on last year. We have also seen an increase in complexity of the issues our clients present with. The average time our interviewers spend with a client is currently 18 minutes. However, a total of 2,480 hours was spent helping clients with in-depth interviews. In that time frame the top categories of client issues have related to Conditions of Work, Relationships and Rental Housing. Our clinics continue to be well utilised, particularly our legal clinics. Access to legal services is in high demand within the community with almost 5,000 clients attending those clinics over the last year. The use of our specialist clinics, particularly immigration, has increased.

Disposal of 5 Council-owned properties - comments

Council properties to be disposed of should not be sold for commercial developers for profiting.

Disposal of Red Zone properties - comments

Council properties to be disposed of should not be sold for commercial developers for profiting.

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

Excellent.

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

There is an ongoing need for migrant support. Increasing equity, wellbeing, empowerment, community resilience is needed for at risk, often marginalised and culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) communities. CAB provides language support services so that clients can get the information they need in their native tongue. During the last 12 months over 1000 clients from CALD communities accessed our service, with top enquiries relating to legal and government services. When Work Connect and Skills Connect ended their programme for new migrants, CABCHA began a monthly CV writing workshop and translated more pamphlets into other languages to help fill that gap. In addition, the MBIE funding cuts for migrant programmes have not been supplemented locally to support new migrants. Ensuring the Strengthening Communities Funding remains and is well funded is imperative to support this growing population. The Citizens Advice Bureau service is dynamic, innovative and responsive to community need. CAB has been in Christchurch for 54 years and has been ongoingly innovative to address needs. Our service organisation is one of the few that: provides the opportunity for individuals to share their concern on ANY issue; provides well researched information; invites discussion about the various options, and encourages clients to choose options to suit. We have built relationships with specialists for our free clinic services. These weekly or twice weekly clinics include: General Law, Immigration Legal, Employment Law, ACC, JP and Tech Support clinics. Our monthly CV workshop is aimed at migrants and clients re-entering the workforce. All of these well attended clinics have been set up in response to community needs. CAB has special access to other specialists as well to help clients who are facing particularly challenging situations. For example, our volunteers have direct access to local WINZ managers for each CABCHA office and a special number we use to access Immigration NZ allowing CAB to side-step long queues. Ensuring that the funding portals are available in the long term will mean that CAB can continue to help the community understand their rights and explain any recent changes in government policies/services. Citizens Advice Bureau connects with other bodies and organisations to create new opportunities and enhance effectiveness. CAB NZ Bi-cultural organisation is imbedded in the Kaupapa of our organisation <https://www.cab.org.nz/what-we-do/our-kaupapa/>. We have been engaging with the community for over 54 years and have support and encouragement for our work from National organisations such as MBIE, MSD, Department of Internal Affairs, Inland Revenue and Immigration NZ. Locally we have a long list of organisations that support our services. Our services have been well utilised and we have been vital in giving support to clients in times of need, especially through periods of community stress such as Covid, the Christchurch Earthquakes and other natural disasters. To ensure we can continue to provide these services, the long-term plan must include funding for organisations like CAB.

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

2886

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: David Last name: Fleming

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Fri 10 May

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in **Section 1** so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

This is the time for sustainability until our economy recovers and businesses and resident ratepayers can afford rate increases to finance future development expenditure. Not - withstanding essential maintenance must be maintained for the current welfare of our residence and business infrastructure.

Average rates - multiple-choice

Yes

Average rates - comments

Yes - Conditional that all waste expenditure within Council be identified and eliminated where-ever possible to minimise and reduce rate increases.

Changes to how we rate - comments

Every rate payer should pay an equal share the of benefits they receive from CCC amenities. Only leveridging residents and business for the cost of these benefit can be considered as unfair

Fees & charges - comments

no

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

No

Operational spending - comments

Focus on the needs of the majority. Too much emphasis listening to the minority groups. ie cyclists to the detriment

2886

of the majority of road users without consideration of the impact. ie businesses and others.

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital: Solid waste and resource recovery - comments

What consideration has been given to the disposal of waste by using waste as a fuel to generate energy.

Capital: Other - comments

Akaroa Waste Water Proposal I ask for the Council to withdraw its consent application or put it on hold and direct the funding into fixing the leaking pipe network in Akaroa before proceeding further. It is vital that the pipe network is fixed as it is not acceptable to have raw sewage leaching onto beaches.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Explore other ways to bring down our proposed rates increases across the Draft LTP (e.g. reduce or change some of the services we provide, review our grants funding, increasing fees and charges for some services)

Areas to reduce costs to provide savings - comments

Stop the cycleways until the Council can afford the expenditure. Focus on essential livelihood priorities.

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Increase the bid funding. This means we will be able to continue to attract new major international sports, business and music events, but would also mean an additional rates increase of 0.42% in year one of the LTP, 0.04% in year two, and 0.14% in year 3.

Event bid funding - comments

Must put emphasis on expenditure being focussed on real opportunities which will materialise.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

No - don't bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Don't know - not sure if we should create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

Any impact this will have on world change is very, insignificant. Currently the emphasis should be placed on essential priorities

Strategic Framework - comments

Our idealistic plans for the future should be parked until the economy recovers.

Disposal of 5 Council-owned properties - comments

All properties that have not shown returns above the rate to borrow funds for essential services should be sold. Any likely capital appreciation being taken into account.

Disposal of Red Zone properties - comments

As above.

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

Makes good sense but with a caveat that the building is maintained and doesn't become an eye saw.

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

T24Consult Page 2 of 3

Item 3

Attachment B

2886

Good summary for the public. But please consider the opinions of the silent majority. These are the rate payers that are contributing to our society and getting things done without making any fuss and being vocal,

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice
Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

Item 3

Attachment B

2615

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 16/04/2024

First name: Virginia Last name: Wright

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Wed 8 May pm Thu 9 May Thu 9 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

No. I think it's a mistake to remove the \$1.5 million dollar Screen CanterburyNZ Production Grant from the long term plan. As one who has benefited from it I can attest to its positive benefit on both sides: when submitting to the NZFC for the feature documentary with the working title 'fiftyone', now called 'project fiftyone' was a deciding factor in our favour in the competitive round in which we were allocated funding to make the film. It's a Christchurch story of healing and humanitarian work in the wake of the Mosque attacks in 2019 that brings some light back into that tragic day. Without the grant it would not have been made. We returned the dividend to the region as required and we added a significant premium of cultural capital. We are proud to be part of the generated return of \$12.5 million dollars on the initial investment of \$1.5 million dollars. This money stayed in the region through crew salaries, transportation, accommodation, hospitality and other businesses. Given that as an investment it generated the desired return and more I would like to see it returned to the Long Term Plan. (As an aside I've heard a lot of talk about The Cleaner, a high-end drama series also shot in Christchurch that would not have come to our region at all if not for the grant. It puts our post-earthquake Christchurch on the map in a way that nothing else can, domestically and internationally, which also brings cultural capital as well as tourism gains.)

Average rates - multiple-choice

Yes

Average rates - comments

Core services such as rubbish removal and staying on top of our water infrastructure are vital and need protection, I would not like to see Chch removing dozens of rubbish bins from public places as Auckland City Council are in the process of doing. Keep our streets clean, and keep our water clean, stay on top of all three water entities

Fees & charges - comments

I am opposed to anything that adds to the cost for people who may be seeking things they can do with their families that are free. Visiting the Botanical Gardens for example, and being able to park there with kids and babies as is currently possible. Even a free first two hours would be preferable.

2615

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

No

Operational spending - comments

I would like to see more priority given to reducing water leakage - it should be below 10% if at all, and as soon as possible.

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital programme - comments

I reiterate my comments about keeping the ScreenCanterbury/NZ Grant. It pays for itself and more in the return to our regional economy. That return not being in a straightforward hard Cash deposit in the bank makes it more difficult to grasp how successful it is in economic terms but the more than \$5 for every \$1 dollar invested argues strongly that it should be retained.

Capital: Transport - comments

keep up the good work on cycle ways, as an occasional bike rider to get around the more cycleways I can access without having to share space with cars, the more likely I am to get on a bike

Capital: Libraries - comments

Just make sure they remain free of charge to access and to borrow books from.

Capital: Solid waste and resource recovery - comments

Keep up the good work on the compost/green waste collection. I've just spent time in Auckland and they are way behind on this front. Christchurch can be proud.

Capital: Other - comments

As stated above and earlier in my submission: I reiterate my comments about keeping the ScreenCanterbury/NZ Grant. It pays for itself and more in the return to our regional economy. That return not being in a straightforward hard Cash deposit in the bank makes it more difficult to grasp how successful it is in economic terms but the more than \$5 for every \$1 dollar invested argues strongly that it should be retained.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

Areas to reduce costs to provide savings - comments

Given that the return on the \$1.5 million investment has thus far been \$12.5 million through jobs for people in the screen industry who live and work in Christchurch and Canterbury, as well as in general spending through outside crew and cast staying in the region, then keeping the initial investment in order to keep that money flowing into the council coffers makes sense. Removing the grant is effectively removing \$11million of the money available to the council to meet its costs. (\$12.5 m minus the initial investment of \$1.5m).

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed. This expenditure is included in the proposed rates increase. While it may not have an impact on rates, it could have implications for our ability to attract major and business events in the short term.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

2615

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

The need for the so-called climate adaptation fund would decrease if the council did their core business to a high standard with the environment top of mind: managing things like our three waters, and in particular reducing water leakage from broken pipes etc., reducing sewage leakage from broken pipes etc. and reducing pollution to our water supplies by staying on top of environmental considerations when reviewing applications for development whether for building, business, or industry.

Strategic Framework - comments

Keep the less privileged members of our community in mind at all times when reviewing what might be cut and don't cut things that add in any way to the financial burden of bringing up children with access to community assets whether that be swimming pools or libraries. Be smart with what gets cut and what doesn't. For example cutting the production grant at first glance may seem to add up economically (save \$1.5million) but in fact takes a significant chunk of money out of the economy (the \$11million left over once the \$1.5million has been covered).

Disposal of 5 Council-owned properties - comments

I am not in favour of selling green spaces into private ownership where that is likely to bring in its wake the loss of those spaces. As Christchurch's population continues to grow all green spaces should be protected.

Disposal of Red Zone properties - comments

As someone whose property was red-zoned it seems risky to decide now (that our memories are fading) that what was deemed unsafe then should no longer be so, remediation or not.

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

Great

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

As a member of the local screen production industry who grew up in Auckland and who at different times in my career have had to commute to Auckland to work I reiterate what I have stated previously. I think it's a mistake to remove the \$1.5 million dollar Screen CanterburyNZ Production Grant from the long term plan. As one who has benefited from it I can attest to its positive benefit on both sides: when submitting to the NZFC for the feature documentary with the working title 'fiftyone', now called 'project fiftyone' was a deciding factor in our favour in the competitive round in which we were allocated funding to make the film. It's a Christchurch story of healing and humanitarian work in the wake of the Mosque attacks in 2019 that brings some light back into that tragic day. Without the grant it would not have been made. We returned the dividend to the region as required and we added a significant premium of cultural capital. We are proud to be part of the generated return of \$12.5 million dollars on the initial investment of \$1.5 million dollars. This money stayed in the region through crew salaries, transportation, accommodation, hospitality and other businesses. Given that as an investment it generated the desired return and more I would like to see it returned to the Long Term Plan. (As an aside I've heard a lot of talk about The Cleaner, a high-end drama series also shot in Christchurch that would not have come to our region at all if not for the grant. It puts our post-earthquake Christchurch on the map in a way that nothing else can, domestically and internationally, which also brings cultural capital as well as tourism gains.)

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

Item 3

Attachment B

2465

20 April 2024

Christchurch City Council
P O Box 73016
Christchurch, 8154
cccplan@ccc.govt.nz

Nicky Snoyink – Regional Conservation Manager
n.snovink@forest&bird.org.nz



Christchurch City Council 2024-2034 Long Term Plan submission

Introduction

1. Forest & Bird wish to be heard in support of this submission.
2. Forest & Bird is New Zealand's leading independent conservation organisation. It has played an important role in preserving New Zealand's environment and native species since 1923. It is independently funded by private subscription, donations, and bequests. Our mission is to protect and restore New Zealand's unique ecological values, flora and fauna, and natural habitat through the sustainable management of indigenous biodiversity, natural landscapes, rivers, lakes, and coastal environments.
3. Christchurch City Council (CCC) has, as a core function, a responsibility to sustainably manage the natural and physical resources in its rohe. This is to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; to safeguard the life supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and to avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effects of activities on the environment. CCC has a function to maintain biodiversity.
4. When nature thrives, our communities thrive. The CCC Biodiversity Strategy 2008-2035 includes the goals to conserve and restore indigenous biodiversity in Christchurch and Banks Peninsula, ensure priority species are protected and restored, ecosystems are protected and restored and pests to be managed to minimise their impact on biodiversity.
5. Our Forest & Bird strategic objectives are as follows:

Climate Centred: Ensuring our country does everything we can to keep the climate safe for all life on Earth. The impact of climate change will be at the centre of everything we do.

Economy that Supports Nature: A Community that recognises that the long-term economy is dependent on a healthy environment for nature's intrinsic and lifegiving values.

2465

Vibrant Landscapes: Stable, healthy ecosystems full of native animals and plants.

Energised Water, Rivers and Wetlands: Rivers, streams and freshwater that run clean, healthy and are teeming with life.

Oceans Alive: Protected and preserved marine life and ecosystems.

6. These are not dissimilar to the Goals set out in the CCC Biodiversity Strategy. The local Forest & Bird Branch (North Canterbury) has worked with CCC for many years to support the Council in weed management and increasing biodiversity on some Council owned land.

Submission

7. Forest & Bird seeks that the Council consider managing and increasing biodiversity across all aspects of its functions to allow for a more strategic and coordinated approach. Forest & Bird were dismayed by the dis-establishment of the Council's Natural Environment Team. Ensuring that in-house ecological expertise is properly resourced will limit the amount spent on external consultants and ensure that biodiversity can be monitored and enhanced across all Council functions.
8. **Council needs to seriously consider re- establishing a team that would bring together properly resourced in-house ecologists and relevant policy staff in order to achieve the goals set out in the Biodiversity Strategy, and in particular increase climate resilience with nature being central to achieving resilience. This oversight would not be simply focused on Parks but include 3 Waters, Drainage etc.**
9. Forest & Bird seeks that a dedicated and on-going funding is allocated to meet Council obligations set out in the RMA (1991) and to properly achieve the goals set out in the Council's Biodiversity Strategy.
10. Nature is in crisis, and coupled with increasing climate disruption there has never been a more important time for the Council to champion the Biodiversity Strategy and ensure this is properly monitored. Central government Jobs for Nature funding provided some additional resources for Council, it is understood that this funding assisted in increasing weed management for example.
11. **Forest & Bird seek that funding for the work that was achieved as a result of the Jobs for Nature funding is, at the very least, maintained so this much needed work can continue.**

2465

12. Increasing tree planting is a laudable goal, however Forest & Bird considers that protecting and enhancing rare and threatened ecosystems that exist on private land is vital. It is difficult to recreate if these ecosystems are lost or degraded.
- 13. Forest & Bird submits that Council take the opportunity for the strategic purchase of threatened ecosystems when opportunities arise. For instance saltmarsh and wetland ecosystems and regenerating forests. . These are integral in managing the impacts of climate disruption as well as protecting and enhancing threatened species that exist within them.**
14. The identification of Significant Natural Area (SNA) work needs to be on-going, despite central government direction. Adequate policies and rules, along with actively working with landowners to ensure the protection and enhancement of these special areas is vital in addressing the biodiversity crisis.
- 15. Forest & Bird seeks that Council ensure the SNA programme is properly resourced towards increasing biodiversity and supporting landowners towards that end.**

Thank you for the opportunity to submit.

Jen Miller on behalf of:

Nicky Snoyink

Canterbury West Coast Conservation Manager

2868

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024
First name: Jonty Last name: Coulson

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Thu 2 May pm Fri 3 May am Sat 4 May am Sat 4 May pm Mon 6 May pm Mon 6 May am Tue 7 May
pm Tue 7 May eve Wed 8 May am Wed 8 May pm Thu 9 May Thu 9 May pm Fri 10 May Fri 10 May
pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

No. Not enough money and policy is devoted to climate mitigation and adaptation. The longer we leave climate policy, the more expensive it will be to put it in place, and the more our communities will suffer in the meantime. The Long Term Plan (hereafter LTP) falls woefully short of meeting our cities emissions targets, which are already based on outdated science. The LTP should focus on a just and equitable transition to a low-emitting city structure, including higher density housing, resilient urban planting and focus on active transport. Too much money is allocated to road and sport field maintenance. Road maintenance would be better spent investing in active transport and public transport infrastructure. This is especially true to cycling, where the benefits on public health and safety are numerous, and costs are low. Sport field maintenance could better be spent on improving biodiversity funding through actions such as increased regenerative planting and support for biodiversity funds.

Average rates - multiple-choice

Yes

Average rates - comments

In the climate crisis it is vital that governing bodies continue to invest in climate mitigation and adaptation. This funding must come from somewhere. Furthermore, the city council has a responsibility to ensure the wellbeing of all its citizens, not just the those who do pay rates. By keeping rates low whilst responding to the climate crisis, the council would be making those least responsible for the crisis bear the brunt of the effects. It is also important to consider future generations in the LTP. Lowering rates and reducing investment into civic infrastructure will negatively impact young people and future generations as they grow up in Christchurch, especially with the current cost of living crisis.

Changes to how we rate - comments

Rates changes should prioritize filling homes over fueling an unbalanced economy. To do so, the entire city should

2868

be covered by the City Vacant Differential (CVD) program as a disincentive to land banking. I also support the proposed changes to the rating of a visitor accommodation in a residential unit, ensuring houses are more readily available to first-home buyers.

Fees & charges - comments

Introducing parking charges is a powerful way to encourage a mode shift, as people will realize the value of biking and public transport. As a result, I support the proposed parking charges at the Botanic Gardens and Hagley park. Increased revenue generated can be spent on other climate positive projects. Disabled parking should not incur charges and should be enforced however, as many have disabilities which may prevent full use of public or active transport.

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

Yes

Operational spending - comments

Rates should increase with increased levels of service, which Christchurch needs to meet its climate goals. The increased funding through rates, climate conscious CVD plans and parking charges will be able to appropriately fund climate mitigation and resilience - including the stormwater activity plan, in which not enough funding has been provided for basic mitigation projects. In light of Christchurches current climate reponse, I support further increases in rates, as well as more exploration of other avenues of generating council revenue. We need to better support future generations in this city, and investing in infrastructure is always cheaper sooner.

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital programme - comments

Too much money is being spent on Te Kaha stadium, which will have very little long term community value, but will encourage unnecessary flights and construction projects with negative environmental impacts. I am also shocked at the lack of investment into biodiversity and biodiversity related funds. Speaking as a biologist, the biodiversity crisis has the potential to harm human existence moreso than the climate crisis, the city council should consider this in their funding allocations. It is also imperative that cycleway plans are prioritized. The Nor'West Arc, Northern Line, Wheels to Wings and South Express Cycleways must all be finished by 2025. Furthermore, Bike lanes along memorial avenue must be built by 2025 as students from Cobham, Burnside primary, Burnside high, and other schools in the area are currently at high risk of collision. Generally, active transport should recieve more funding due to the positive health effects.

Capital: Transport - comments

The delays to the Major Cycle Routes program are irresponsible for current and future generations. Christchurch houses the two electorates where the most amount of people cycle to work, and the highest for people who cycle to study. This shows a demand for cycle routes within the city. As well as the cycle lanes outlined above, the full Local Cycle Network, and Cycle Connections programs should be returned to the LTP. Other active and public transport policies and spending should be implemented. This includes restricting urban sprawl, reducing road funding, providing better public transport including increased support for a mass rapid transit corridor, and allocating funds to safer speeds projects. I also support the continuation of the safer speed plan, including a blanket reduction of in-city speeds to 30km/h. As the CCC has stated road resurfacing will be more expensive going forward, safer speeds and traffic reduction are the best ways to reduce wear and tear and save money for other climate-focused projects.

Capital: Parks, heritage or the coastal environment - comments

Sports fields currently have \$100 million worth of funding in the LTP, where biodiversity only has \$2 million. Against the backdrop of the biodiversity crisis this is unjust, and funding must be reallocated to support biodiversity. The biodiversity fund should be increased tenfold from the proposed \$400,000, and the community partnership fund should be reinstated and given increased funding. Alongside implementing this, the council should robustify it's biodiversity related workforce, including more waterway ecologists and moving biodiversity management out from under the parks team to allow a primary focus on biodiversity outcomes. Increased tree cover within the city is also vital to reducing urban surface temperatures whilst beautifying the city.

Capital: Libraries - comments

I support any and all investment into public libraries as spaces as accessible and welcoming as possible.

2868

Capital: Solid waste and resource recovery - comments

Waste management practices must consider patterns of ingrained racism and classism in urban design. Waste management plants are often located near marginalized or low income communities, further harming already vulnerable communities.

Capital: Other - comments

The cutting of numerous climate emergency response fund projects is counter to the council's goal of safeguarding its residents. As a result the cycle connections along Aldwins road, Cashmere road and Simeon street all need to be reinstated. I also support the Surface Flooding reduction program, and the proposed spending of \$964 on wastewater infrastructure, which will support both increased housing density and climate adaptation. The four pilot programs in the stormwater activity plan must all be funded in every year of the LTP, with project completion by 2025. These are: "Conduct Multi-Value Analysis on Stormwater Treatment Methods and Technologies for Consideration in Future Projects", "Installation of Stormwater Treatment Devices to Reduce Metal Contaminant Discharge and Monitoring of Effectiveness", "Undertake Analysis of Stormwater Outfall Blockage and Discharge Potential Risks with Respect to Climate Change Effects and Identify Mitigation Solutions", and "Identification of Properties At-Risk of Above Floor Flooding"

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

Areas to reduce costs to provide savings - comments

It is vital for the city council to understand that spending money now means saving money in the future. As a result cost reductions cannot come from cuts to climate change, biodiversity or active transport programs. All of these will have positive returns in the long term. The council should instead extract value from existing assets such as the parking charges to botanic gardens and Hagley park mentioned earlier. Other examples include a congestion charging area during hours of peak traffic, and altering the use of the Tarras airport site to a less ecologically damaging project. Increased levies should be applied to luxury transport such as domestic and international flights to and from Christchurch Airport. Cruise ships should also be more heavily taxed, as they are intensely environmentally and socially damaging, whilst spending at local businesses is low.

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed. This expenditure is included in the proposed rates increase. While it may not have an impact on rates, it could have implications for our ability to attract major and business events in the short term.

Event bid funding - comments

Events that occur in Christchurch should prioritize local bands and businesses over international. This will minimize emissions and establish Christchurch as a center for New Zealand Culture. It also seems hypocritical to increase events funding whilst dropping funding for businesses such as the arts center, which occupy a similar niche of improving cultural wellbeing within the city.

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

I am disappointed that this question refers only to the process of climate adaptation. Science shows that adaptation is worthless if a certain level of mitigation is not reached, and we are not on track to reach this mitigation. As a result, this submission is written under the knowledge that mitigation is a form of climate adaptation. The city council should however recognize the importance of climate mitigation in its communication and policy. The current investments in climate change by the city council are nowhere near enough. The climate resilience fund should be massively increased, to respond to the scale of the problem at hand. On a similar vein, the council's sustainability fund should not end in 2025. The fund must instead continue with increased funding, to greater enable the people of Christchurch to understand, relate to, and respond to the climate crisis. The city council should also implement a serious mitigation plan, including reducing car and truck travel dramatically, whilst levying greater fees for international travel through the airport and cruise ships. Other avenues for transport emissions mitigation come through safer speeds

2868

plans and encouraging active transport through the construction and maintenance of more bike lanes, as outlined previously in this submission. Furthermore, the city council must take a more proactive stance on climate justice, including reparation and recognition of indigenous communities on the front lines. Ultimately the council must take the climate crisis seriously. My life, and the life of everyone else who lives and will live in Christchurch, is at stake. Heat waves disproportionately affect children and the elderly, flooding disproportionately affects low-income areas. Under the currently forecast warming, these extreme weather events will worsen significantly, with drastic ramifications for the city. The council is not responding to this with the urgency it merits.

Strategic Framework - comments

The city council's vision on climate change is utterly lacking. I am disappointed that some of the city's decisionmakers are so clearly prioritizing short term economic growth over a resilient and equitable future. Unless this is addressed it will have irreversible negative impacts on current and future generations. As previously stated in my submission (where relevant), I believe more funding and support should be provided for: - Climate Mitigation and Adaptation - Centering public and active transport - Creating a robust biodiversity plan with increased funding and emphasis on naturally regenerating forest. - Enabling Tino Rangatiratanga and Te Tiriti o Waitangi to be a core part of decisionmaking processes.

Disposal of 5 Council-owned properties - comments

I oppose the sale of 26 Waipara street if and when it occurs. This area should be used to create a shared path along the Cashmere stream.

Disposal of Red Zone properties - comments

A proper Port Hills Red Zone plan should be developed before disposal occurs, with focus being placed on how the land can be used to create or enhance native plantings and regenerative forest growth, or mitigate fire risk in the area.

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

I think it's lovely :)

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

It is important to me to see increased visibility of LGBTQ+ support in Christchurch. The primary way the council could represent this is through the installation of a permanent Rainbow Crossing. I would also like to see increased funding for queer-focused events year round, not just during pride month. I am consistently struck by the positive cultural and environmental impacts of Zealandia in Wellington. I would love to see a similar investment in native biodiversity and naturally regenerating planting here in Christchurch. As a result I advocate for efforts to rewild the red-zone. I believe the best use for the land would be to see it turned into a predator-free sanctuary akin to Riccarton Bush. I also want to see the arts centre supported, with funding reinstated in the LTP. The Christchurch theatre scene supported me throughout my highschool and university years, with many of my friends still supported both financially and artistically by the institution. It is a vital aspect of Christchurch's post-earthquake artistic scene, and should be treated as such. I would also like to point out that the Long Term Plan is difficult to engage with for younger audiences. Having run and been privy to LTP workshops at university and with school strike for climate, I am disappointed that there is no abbreviated format aimed at younger submitters, with even the consultation document being 60 pages. I am also disappointed to see climate change being underrepresented in the plan as a whole. I would like to see more though given to the formatting of the plan and the submissions document, to clearly represent the scale of the threat of climate change. Finally - I support the submissions of Greater Otautahi, UC Climate Action Club, Generation Zero Otautahi, Joseph Fullerton, UC Greens, and School Strike For Climate Otautahi. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank all in the city council who are working on this project. I am glad to city that council staff care so much about engaging the people of the city. THANK YOU FOR ALL THE WORK YOU DO!!!

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

3954

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: Andrew Last name: Metherell

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Wed 8 May am

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Capital programme - comments

See comments on specific elements. As a resident of Halswell, I think it is important Council plans suitable investment for the major growth that is happening. My submission has a focus on issues relating to Halswell. That includes supporting and front footing development of road networks (including for pedestrians and cyclists), not just relying on ad-hoc developer works which are leaving gaps and isolated communities, and ensuring community facilities remain right sized for the rapidly growing population.

Capital: Transport - comments

New footpaths – Project 75051 Cashmere Road footpath (Halswell Quarry to Sutherlands Road), approximately 650m My number one personal concern, shared by many in my immediate community is asking the Council to construct a footpath on Cashmere Road between the Halswell Quarry, and the existing path just east of Sutherlands Road. It is not clear of any budget is allocated for this, and if it is it appears it won't be achievable in the budget in the next few years. I would suggest this is higher priority than footpath renewals. This is an "urban" road, flanked by residential properties who rely it for access, and connecting residential subdivisions and public reserve areas. It is apparent that a footpath has not and will not be provided as part of adjacent development, and it is up to Council to fund it. We are forced to use the narrow gravel and overgrown grass berm on a daily basis, within cm of passing vehicles. This section of road is curving, goes over a small hill, and has narrow traffic lanes, and has poor road marking. It is subject to sun strike, speeding vehicles, has almost no lighting, and has poor drainage (often ponding in places). There is zero standard infrastructure provision for pedestrians, and zero room for error by drivers or pedestrians. A footpath is desperately needed as there are many residents relying on it for direct access to the wider community, and others in the area use it for recreation and dog walking, particularly to access the Halswell Quarry and Te Kura wetlands. Our experience is feeling very nervous, and being totally reliant of drivers to see us, and make good driving decisions. Unfortunately, many don't and are happy to either whizz by at speed, or cross over the yellow centreline and hope no one comes the other way. This may have been (barely) acceptable when considering priorities 10 years ago when there was almost no development in the area and minimal traffic, but now there is a large and growing residential community. I consider Council lack of action on this required project is totally inconsistent with the Council proposed level of service for safety of pedestrians.. If it wasn't so unsafe, I would encourage Council staff and Councillors to walk along this section of road, think would you be happy with a young child walking to school on it, and then consider if it is worth the risk of leaving it as is, or including as a specific project line item in the capital budget. Even if you don't walk it, take a look on google, and I hope you will come to the

T24Consult Page 1 of 2

3954

conclusion it needs to happen, and quickly. New Footpaths - Others I consider Council should look to front foot planning of road upgrades in growth areas so that adhoc sections of footpath are not done, resulting in poor walking access until such time as every section of land has been developed. Even a temporary footpath, with costs recovered through development contributions would be better than no footpath connections. QUARRYMANS TRAIL The programme includes some longer-term funding for the Quarryman's Trail Cycle Connections (project 41845), but it is not clear what that covers. I use this cycleway the missing connections which I consider should be prioritised are: • Extension of the Quarrymans Trail along Sparks Road, to connect to Sutherlands Road and Halswell Shops. I consider this is a fairly urgent requirement. The current trail requires cyclists to use a narrow road shoulder along the very busy Sparks Road which is very inconsistent with the trail connecting to the CBD. Recent addition of section of basic shared path east of Milns Road on the south side Sparks Road seems like a really poor outcome considering the huge investment in the existing section between Halswell and Hoon Hay. The current seemingly low number of users on the section alongside Sparks Road will be because it serves a small portion of the Halswell catchment considering the growth areas around Halswell Quarry and south Halswell. This is even more important given the MOE is not planning a Halswell High School, increasing demand for cycling from Halswell to Hillmorton. Halswell Quarry is also a destination for mountain bikers and road cyclists use the area, so the extension will support safety. • Simeon Street connection from Quarrymans Trail to Little River Cycleway – this is the natural route to connect between trails, but there is no safe crossing of Milton Street or Coronation Street, and cyclists currently have to make a very difficult crossing. I suggest improvements will also support safe access to Barrington Mall.

Capital: Parks, heritage or the coastal environment - comments

Halswell Quarry Reserve Halswell Quarry reserve is a major asset to the south west of Christchurch. My family use it several times a week and it is unique to Christchurch. It is becoming more and more popular, and I consider it is important it continues to receive suitable funding consistent with its use to maintain and develop the park facilities. No specific line item is included for capital improvements, which could include the need for upgraded toilet facilities, trails, and lighting, so I hope that it includes sufficient operational budget available.

Capital: Other - comments

Halswell Swimming Pool The capital budget does not indicate any plan for improving access to an all year round swimming pool from the growth suburbs of the southwest of Christchurch. This is becoming more of a requirement to support equitable access to these type of facilities noting Pioneer Pool is several kilometers away and services a huge catchment, and Hornby is too far from Halswell, and will also have a huge catchment. I suggest funding is considered in the short term to test the medium term need for a fully enclosed and modern swimming pool complex in Halswell to ensure there is adequate access to all year round swimming pool for residents of the Halswell growth suburbs to support health and wellbeing, and reduce the likely overuse of other existing facilities.


Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

In line with my general concerns around new footpath provision in Halswell to address existing and future safety issues, I suggest the following additional Levels of Service provisions. Transport - Safety, Access and Environment Level of Service – Access (p106). Pedestrian Infrastructure for Access There is a target about being within 15 minutes of four of five basic services. However, this does not mention provision of the footpath infrastructure to further support this. I suggest an additional Level of Service target is provided relating to removing gaps in the footpath network to ensure urban zoned households dwellings are connected to key destination types by safe and direct infrastructure for walking. This should help Council prioritise addressing gaps in footpath infrastructure particularly where households are already within 15 minutes of many of the basic services but cannot safely access then by walking. Transport - Safety, Access and Environment Level of Service – Safety (p108). Pedestrian Infrastructure for Safety The Level of Service measures rely on measures of historical crashes for pedestrians. Whilst this is measurable, it won't necessarily assist in targeting of the missing pedestrian infrastructure to further improve crash rates given the somewhat random nature of crashes. A possible additional Level of Service could be added that supports Council planning for and delivering footpath infrastructure on roads with pedestrian and vehicle use and a higher risk of crashes through absence of infrastructure eg., "reduce roads in the urban environment with no pedestrian infrastructure".

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
	Cashmere Road

3954

Cashmere Road – Section Missing Footpath between Halswell Quarry and Sutherlands Road (650m)



3954

Photos of Cashmere Road between Halswell Quarry and Sutherlands Road – No Footpath Available



Item 3

Attachment B

3954



Item 3
Attachment B

3954



Item 3
Attachment B

3954



Attachment B Item 3

3954



Item 3
Attachment B

1597

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 16/04/2024

First name: Jensen Last name: Alcock

Please provide the name of the organisation
you represent:

Mainland Canoe Polo (MCPA)

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Mon 6 May am Wed 8 May am Wed 8 May pm Thu 9 May

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital: Parks, heritage or the coastal environment - comments

I submit on behalf of Mainland Canoe Polo (MCPA), the regional sports organisation for the exhilarating sport of canoe polo. Our plea is simple yet urgent: prioritise funding for the development of canoe polo courts and facilities at Roto Kohatu. Canoe polo is more than just a sport; it's a dynamic activity that fosters water confidence, promotes kayaking skills, sharpens ball-handling ability, and cultivates teamwork. We run weekly school leagues, club leagues, and various tournaments. We currently have 30 teams playing in three different weekly competitions. However, our current situation is dire. We've reached a critical juncture where our current facilities are unable to keep pace with the growing interest and participation in our sport. Following the earthquakes, we successfully transitioned from an indoor winter pool to an outdoor summer lake. This transition brought certain advantages, such as better access to two courts. However, the growth of our sport has outstripped the capacity of these facilities. With only two courts we face constant pressure during competitions and training sessions. We're forced to cap team numbers, shorten game times, and restrict training sessions, hindering the growth of our sport. We are forced to travel to the North Island for major tournaments due to our insufficient capacity to host them locally. The lack of adequate infrastructure reflects poorly on our community. While other regions like Hastings boast world-class facilities, we struggle to provide even the basic necessities for our players. The absence of changing rooms forces our athletes to undress in public view - an embarrassing and unacceptable situation particularly for school aged and female players. Lack of storage space for kayaks further hampers our ability to thrive. We're encouraged by the Council's commitment to funding sports and recreation activities. However, the allocated budget falls short of addressing our pressing need. While hundreds of millions are earmarked for other sports fields and facilities, we find ourselves overlooked, with a mere fraction allocated to Roto Kohatu (ID65241), a very popular water sports and recreation venue with immense potential. We're not asking for special treatment; we're simply requesting equitable support to meet the demands of our growing community. We urge the Council to prioritise the development of canoe polo facilities as outlined in the Roto Kohatu management and development plans. By investing in our sport, you're not only supporting physical activity, but also attracting sports events, fostering high-performance athletes, and facilitating a pathway to national

1597

representation. Your support today will shape the future of our sport and empower generations to come.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	

Item 3

Attachment B

3618

Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 21/04/2024

First name: Chrys Last name: Horn

What is your role in the organisation:

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission at a hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Thu 2 May pm Fri 3 May pm Mon 6 May pm Tue 7 May pm Wed 8 May pm Fri 10 May pm

Please select the hearing date(s) above that suit you best. You can select more than one date.

Hearings will be held in the Council Chambers at 53 Hereford Street.

We'll be in touch to arrange a date and time and will try to accommodate your preferences.

Please make sure you've provided your telephone number in [Section 1](#) so we can contact you.

Feedback

Have we got the balance right - comments

No - I'd like to see more focus on projects that help us mitigate and adapt to Climate Change and less on projects that are going to keep us trapped into spewing out emissions, and setting ourselves up for a worse future than necessary. The balance between road renewals and active and public transport is not good balance. I'd like to see more money spent earlier on in the Long Term plan getting the cycle network around the City built. Cycles have little impact on the quality of the roads and cycle facilities will have a good long life as long as they aren't driven on by cars or trucks, or dug up. They are an excellent investment which allow people to cut car running and car parking costs significantly without having to risk their lives doing so. In addition, as has been found overseas, the more trips are completed by bicycle or on foot, the less road wear and tear we will have and the more we are moving towards meeting our emissions targets. This LTP also needs to invest more in climate mitigation work. The current investment will not meet our existing goals for climate targets. There is no better time than the present to be investing in reducing climate emissions This LTP fails to meet the bare minimum levels of investment in climate mitigation. There is little to no scope for future requirements, and it has been consistently noted that the current investment will not even meet our existing goals. There must be a concerted effort to properly allocate capital to these ends. The GNS report released to Council in December 2023, indicated that: "Christchurch could see 14 to 23 centimetres of sea-level rise over the next 30 years. However, in places where land is subsiding at about 8 millimetres per year, such as parts of Brighton Spit and parts of Lyttelton Harbour and Koukourarata Port Levy, sea levels could rise by 38 to 47 centimetres – twice as much over the same 30-year timeframe." (GNS Science Consultancy Report 2023/81) The Council really needs a climate resilience fund – ratepayers are going to feel better about having some money ready to go on this. It is clear that Council is going to have to deal with significant costs in the years to come with respect to climate change impacts. Planning for this financially needs to be starting NOW and not after the horse has bolted when people are going to be feeling even worse about rates affordability. While we would hope that Council would not be footing the full costs property losses it is clear that there is at least \$3.2B in council infrastructure which could be affected by climatic events. This is a serious burden that should be shouldered from now on rather than being deferred onto people struggling even more than we are already.

Average rates - multiple-choice

Yes

3618

Item 3

Attachment B

Average rates - comments

Much as the rates bill increase is not something I look forward to, I also feel that my rates dollars go a long way and have a big effect on my quality of life as a resident. I value our community centres, our libraries and the money that goes into community development in my local community. These expenses all contribute to community resilience and provide all Christchurch residents with access to low cost activities. I also see a need for infrastructure improvements and want to be drinking safe, clean water and seeing investment in cycleway facilities and public transport which can help ratepayers change to lower cost transport modes. Personally, I save a lot of money by using my bicycle as my main form of transport and exercise hence saving on car running and parking costs and on health and mental health related costs. The funding model for infrastructure is not working and I recognise that there is significant work to be done there. In the meantime, we all lose, as a community if we don't maintain free or low-cost activities and services that help connect residents and give them access to things like libraries, community activities, and quality green spaces as well as the core services such as water and transport infrastructure. I see no profit in doing what has been done for the last decades where Local Governments across New Zealand have kept rates low by underinvesting in infrastructure. The cost of building infrastructure will never be lower than at present and we need to be taking steps to get on with the work that is needed to meet the needs of both present and future residents (most of which are the same people).

Changes to how we rate - comments

I'd like to hear more about the idea of Land Value Rating. It would be good to see the council put this out for consultation. In particular it should help us get better use of valuable city centre land so that we have a city that revolves around people rather than the needs of cars. Currently a huge proportion of public space in the City prioritises the needs of the most inefficient form of mass transport – private motorcars. I note this space is used for mass car parking and congestion that there is and that we will never build our way out of (private motor cars). I strongly support the City Vacant Differential (CVD) programme and agree that it is a good idea to extend it beyond the City Centre. I think it could be used across the whole city, particularly in commercial areas, to discourage landowners from land banking and from just leaving sites as wastelands that are unsightly and unsafe. I would also like to see sections that are being used as car parks being excluded from remission and in my view, it would be good to increase the multiplier to 6 (from 4.523) I completely support the changes to the rating of visitor accommodation in residential units that is proposed. We need affordable housing in our central city for residents and it seems wrong that investors buy new housing and let it out as short-stay accommodation. Not only does this limit the supply of housing for residents, it also increases rents and property prices.

Fees & charges - comments

I'm glad to see parking charges proposed for the Botanic Gardens and Hagley Park. These areas are easy for most people to access using Public or active transport if they do not want to pay the costs. I Possibly there could be some concessions for those who have mobility passes. I must say \$4.60 for three hours seems very cheap. This, like all car parking around the City, could and in my view should be increased so that people start to consider different transport options (e.g. park and ride) for getting into the city. Car parking is considerably more expensive in other cities. I don't think we should be afraid of putting up charges for parking in Christchurch. Another option would be to increase excess water use charges – some that could be gradually increased over the 10 year plan. Even just getting back to charging for an average water use above 700litres per day would be sensible.

Operational spending priorities - multiple-choice

No

Operational spending - comments

Please do not cut back on services that families use most such as swimming pools and libraries. In New Zealand people need to have good water skills as well as needing options for cooling down in an increasingly hot climate where local waterways are graded as no longer swimmable. Both Libraries and pools provide that. As I have previously mentioned we need also to be prioritising infrastructure that helps us all live more comfortably, cheaply and healthily. We need trees in our city, we need a LOT fewer cars, we need more cycle infrastructure, good ways of prioritising public transport and a well planned city that provides for people rather than cars.

Capital programme priorities - multiple-choice

No

Capital programme - comments

Te Kaha continues to be a travesty and a waste of money. We need at least some money in the budget for new footpaths to connect up footpaths in places where they don't already do so. As a resident of Halswell, I am aware that Halswell Road between Dunbars Road and Hendersons road has no footpath but does have people walking. Likewise places down Sparks road come to mind with similar issues. The delays to the Major Cycle Routes (MCRs)

3618

Item 3

Attachment B

programme are unacceptable and irresponsible. The current cycleways have significantly increased cycling. Please make sure that this successful network which is clearly excellent value for money is completed quicker rather than slower. Not only do many many people commute to work everyday, I also see a lot of families out and about on their bikes at weekends – Those families don't get into the City where the cycle counters are, but they do many short trips in the local area. Can we look at testing potential new cycleways and footpaths with cheaper builds. The footpath connections noted above in Halswell don't need to be tar sealed – just having some hard fill and small gravel would be a good start. Likewise the approach that has been used for the cycleway on Park Terrace and Rolleston Avenue works well and feels safe (although one has to be careful of pedestrians wandering into them without looking first. Using the methods seen on this cycleway could get cycleways put in more quickly and for less initial capital spending.

Capital: Transport - comments

Ensure that the rollout of the Major Cycle Routes programmes, is continued without delay. Cycleways give residents choice about how they can travel at a time when petrol and car running costs are increasing, and our collective health is suffering from lack of physical activity, increasing heat because of our carbon emissions, and air pollution created by motorised vehicles. An important focus is on finishing the partially complete projects of the Nor'West Arc and Wheels to Wings cycleways. Please give a higher priority to progressing the Ōtakaro-Avon River and North-East Cycle Routes, which would serve areas that have little existing infrastructure. The Southern Lights cycleway will connect up a community that has already shown high willingness to change mode from car to bike and as such is a good investment for the city as a whole. I also request that the following Local Cycle Network and Cycle Connections projects in my local ward be reinstated to the LTP 2024/2034: Halswell Ward: 44710 – Local Cycle Network – Halswell to Hornby 17059 – Cycle Connections – Little River Link Hornby Ward: 41849 – Cycle Connections – South Express 44697 – Local Cycle Network – South West Outer Orbital 44712 – Local Cycle Network – Springs Road Riccarton Ward: 41847 – Cycle Connections – Nor'West Arc 44695 – Local Cycle Network – Inner Western Arc 44698 – Local Cycle Network – Burnside to Villa I'd like to see similar initiatives in other wards reinstated too - but I personally know less about them.

Capital: Parks, heritage or the coastal environment - comments

Please allocate more funding to implement the biodiversity strategy (less than 50% of actions are currently being implemented). Evidence shows there are tangible benefits to increasing tree cover in urban streets and creating green urban pathways. Lining our streets with trees and other plants and increasing the number of green corridors, as part of the Urban Forest plan will have the effect of reducing urban surface temperatures and increasing appearance and value. They are also an attractive asset to local communities and can provide significant social and visual benefits to the overall appearance of any given street.

Capital: Libraries - comments

Libraries are important as public places that give people access to a wide range of services including computers, books, classes, air conditioning, and other related activities. They are a lot more than "buildings with a few books in them". I support the rebuild of the well used South Library and will miss it as an important meeting place while it is being rebuilt.

Focus for 24-34 LTP - multiple-choice

Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

Areas to reduce costs to provide savings - comments

As I've said earlier - please invest more in infrastructure that supports the capacity of Christchurch residents to be able to choose to change the way they live to be more climate and environment friendly. Invest in infrastructure that holds us all in behaviour patterns that work against our collective long term interests. Likewise invest in community development which helps people to help themselves more and to be more resilient - something that is becoming increasingly important as our climate and local environment changes and deteriorates.

Event bid funding - multiple-choice

Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed. This expenditure is included in the proposed rates increase. While it may not have an impact on rates, it could have implications for our ability to attract major and business events in the short term.

Event bid funding - comments

We shouldn't be encouraging people to travel across the world in high carbon emitting tin cans to meet here (sigh).

3618

Bring forward \$1.8m for CAPP - multiple-choice

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Create climate adaption fund - multiple-choice

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

Adapting to climate change - comments

This LTP fails to meet the bare minimum levels of investment in climate mitigation. There is little to no scope for future requirements, and it has been consistently noted that the current investment will not even meet our existing goals. There must be a concerted effort to properly allocate capital to these ends. The GNS report released to Council in December 2023, indicated that: "Christchurch could see 14 to 23 centimetres of sea-level rise over the next 30 years. However, in places where land is subsiding at about 8 millimetres per year, such as parts of Brighton Spit and parts of Lyttelton Harbour and Koukourarata Port Levy, sea levels could rise by 38 to 47 centimetres – twice as much over the same 30-year timeframe." (GNS Science Consultancy Report 2023/81) The Council really needs a climate resilience fund – ratepayers are going to feel better about having some money ready to go on this. It is clear that Council is going to have to deal with significant costs in the years to come with respect to climate change impacts. Planning for this financially needs to be starting NOW and not after the horse has bolted when people are going to be feeling even worse about rates affordability. While we would hope that Council would not be footing the full costs property losses it is clear that there is at least \$3.2B in council infrastructure which could be affected by climatic events. This is a serious burden that should be shouldered from now on rather than being deferred onto people struggling even more than we are already.

Strategic Framework - comments

The LTPs strategic priorities look good

Gift of Yaldhurst Memorial Hall - comments

Support

Anything else about the LTP24-34 - comments

No - sorry it is getting late and I've done all I can do this time around

Agree to future contact for consultations - multiple-choice

Yes.

Attached Documents

Link	File
No records to display.	