

11. Consideration of the Council's Long-term Plan LTP 2024-34

Reference Te Tohutoro: 24/904734

Responsible Officer(s) Te Pou Matua: Peter Ryan, Head of Corporate Planning and Performance

Accountable ELT: Bede Carran, General Manager Finance, Risk & Performance / Chief Member Pouwhakarae: Financial Officer

Confidentiality

Section under the Act:	The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.
Sub-clause and Reason:	s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.
Plain English Reason:	Contains commercially sensitive information.
Report can be reviewed for potential release:	25 June 2024 Finalisation and release of the Councils Long Term Plan 2024-34

1. Purpose and Origin of the Report Te Pūtake Pūrongo

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to enable Audit and Risk Management Committee (ARMC) to review, and provide advice to Council on, the process and supporting documentation for preparation of the draft LTP 2024-34.
- 1.2 The report also provides ARMC with an overview of any remaining risks to the LTP project.
- 1.3 Consideration and review of the Long-term and Annual Plan processes before adoption by the Council is specified in the ARMC Terms of Reference.

2. Officer Recommendations Ngā Tūtohu

That the Audit and Risk Management Committee:

1. Receives the information in the Consideration of the Council's Long-term Plan LTP 2024-34 Report.
2. Advises the Council that in the Committee's opinion an appropriate and fit for purpose process has been followed in the preparation of LTP information.
3. Notes that the Long-term Plan 2034-34 documents (including the report to Council) will be released when published in the Council Agenda for its meeting commencing 25 June 2024.

3. Executive Summary Te Whakarāpopoto Matua

- 3.1 Under the Local Government Act 2002 a local authority must have an LTP in place at all times. The structure, timing, information provided, and consultation processes are defined by this

legislation. LTPs are usually audited by the Office of the Auditor-General through Audit NZ, and normally both draft and final LTPs are published with the Audit NZ opinion.

- 3.2 As part of its Terms of Reference, ARMC is asked to consider and review Councils' Long-term and Annual Plan processes prior to adoption by the Council. This report and supporting attachments are provided to ARMC to inform this review.

4. Background/Context Te Horopaki

- 4.1 The purpose of this report is to support the Audit and Risk Management Committee (ARMC) in reviewing the process and significant forecasting assumptions, and other supporting documentation used in developing the final LTP 2024-34, and to subsequently provide advice to Council that, in the Committee's opinion, an appropriate process has been followed in the preparation of this information.
- 4.2 Note that approval of the final content of the LTP 2024-34 falls to the Council.
- 4.3 The draft LTP 2024-34 was developed under the direction of the councillor's Letter of Expectation (**Attachment A**) which set out clear guidelines on both LTP process and content.
- 4.4 The key process expectations were that draft LTP documents would be available for July 2023, and that a joint development process between Council, staff and stakeholders would occur July-December 2023.
- 4.5 The draft LTP was adopted by the Council on 15 March 2024 (meeting initiated 14 February 2024.) The draft LTP was reviewed by ARMC and found to be fit for purpose.
- 4.6 The Council then consulted with the community on the draft LTP 2024-34 via a Consultation Document and underlying information adopted on 15 March 2024.
 - 4.6.1 The Consultation Document and the underlying information were made publicly available and members of the public were given the opportunity to present their views and preferences in response. The consultation was open from 18 March to 21 April 2024. It complied with all legal requirements.
 - 4.6.2 Opportunity for members of the public to present at public hearings was available from 2 May to 13 May 2024. These hearings were recorded and remain publically available [Christchurch City Council Live - YouTube](#).
 - 4.6.3 All submissions, written and oral (including those presented at public hearings), have been analysed to identify the matters raised, the reasons for those comments and the overall themes that emerged from the consultation process.
 - 4.6.4 The result of this work was provided to elected members for their workshop of 21 May to assist with their deliberations. The Thematic Analysis of the Long-term Plan 2024-34 Submissions and Hearings is **Attachment B** of this report.
 - 4.6.5 The Thematic Analysis provides a summary of key issues identified by a significant number of submitters in response to the questions asked in the Consultation Document. The first part of the report provides an overview of the key themes and messages that have come through in submissions. The latter part of the report provides detailed submissions analysis for some of the issues that were most popular with submitters. Also included is a breakdown of the number of submissions received, by Community Board, age and gender.
- 4.7 Since conclusion of the Hearings, staff held numerous public workshops with councillors (21, 23 {public excluded}, 24, 28 and 30 May 2024), provided responses to issues and questions

- raised, and received guidance on matters raised. The public workshops were recorded and remain available [Christchurch City Council Live - YouTube](#).
- 4.8 Guidance was provided by Elected Members via a set of draft Mayor's Recommendations **(Attachment C.)** This guidance was then built into the LTP 2024-34 adoption documents for Audit NZ review, including expectations for rates increases.
- 4.9 The guidance largely reflects community feedback on the draft LTP, or changes to Council's operating environment since adopting the draft in February/March.
- 4.10 The Council report and updated adoption documents will be made available on the public agenda by 20 June 2024 for Council consideration. An advance working copy of these documents will be made available (under separate cover) to the Audit and Risk Management Committee in **Attachment G**. These documents may differ from the actual documents that will form the report to Council for the adoption of the final LTP 2024-34.
- 4.11 This is to ensure that the ARMC report does not pre-empt the Council report in terms of public release. The full ARMC report and attachment can be made public once the Council agenda goes live.
- 4.12 Staff do not anticipate any significant or material changes between the ARMC meeting (20 June) and the expected release date of the Council LTP report and agenda on the same date.
- 4.13 The process for preparing information for ARMC included a series of detailed management sign-offs, including the Executive Leadership Team, that provide assurance around compliance with the Council's relevant statutory, financial, and legal obligations. The management signoffs for Process, and Significant Assumptions signoffs, form **Attachments D and E**.
- 4.14 The Letter of Representation between Christchurch City Council and Audit NZ for the audit of the Christchurch City Council Long-term Plan Consultation Document forms **Attachment F**, to be provided under separate cover.
- 4.15 Audit New Zealand have agreed to provide a verbal update on their review of the final Long-term Plan 2024-34 at the ARMC meeting of 20 June.
- 4.16 The Council meeting to adopt the LTP 2024-34 is scheduled for 25 June 2024, with an additional available date of 27 June 2024.
- 4.17 The LTP is currently on track for adoption by Council on 25/27 June, provisional upon ARMC and Audit NZ advice.
- 4.18 Within one month following adoption of the LTP council must make the plan publicly available. This will include publishing online via our public website, providing access to hard copies of the plan via our libraries and services centres, and providing digital and/or hard copy prints to the Mayor and Councillors, to the National Library of New Zealand, Department of Internal Affairs, Parliamentary Library, The Auditor General, and Governor General.
- 4.19 Responses to submitters will be prepared and sent, and the staff responses to submissions and the Thematic Analysis will be also published to the public site.
- 4.20 **Risks to the LTP project**
- 4.21 The LTP project is currently on track to adopt a final LTP in late June. However the overall project is currently flagged Amber (meaning management is required) due to the risks set out below.
- 4.22 It is noted that the later adoption of the draft LTP and Consultation Document, combined with a record number of public submissions, have made timeframes materially tighter than usual.

- 4.23 Staff identify three potential process risks which may impugn successful adoption of the final LTP by the end June 2024:
- 4.24 **Risk 1: Failure to adopt a final LTP by due date** – as with any LTP there is a high level of complexity in the finalisation process, including advice on proposed changes, financial updates, investigation of legal matters and the adoption process itself. There is always a risk that one or more of these factors may occasion a delay in the process.
- 4.25 In this instance timeframes are tight. While the risk is currently assessed as low, it is acknowledged and identified as requiring close management.
- 4.26 **Risk 2: Audit review for final LTP** cannot be completed in time to enable the final LTP to be adopted on either 25 or 27 June.
- 4.27 The final LTP cannot be adopted without the Audit NZ report. Council's arrangement with Audit NZ was to provide the full proposed LTP (excluding councillor amendments) by 7 June. This was to enable Audit NZ to have the period 4-20 June to complete its review. This was accomplished, and incorporated the guidance provided by councillors at the 21-30 May post-consultation workshops, which are based on the draft Mayor's Recommendations.
- 4.28 Audit NZ have since advised that the final review process will include a 'hot review' by the Office of the Auditor-General, and likely a review by the Opinion Review Committee (ORC).
- 4.29 Audit NZ have flagged three focus areas for their review, two related to CCHL's dividend and the third regarding New Zealand Transport Agency's funding assistance under the General Policy Statement (GPS).
- 4.30 **Risk 1** that the increased dividend now factored into the proposed final LTP does not compromise CCHL or its subsidiaries capital structure.
- 4.31 **Risk 2** that the value of these assets has not been decreased.
- 4.32 In respect of Risk 1 and Risk 2, Council staff have worked with CCHL and Audit NZ to clarify and provide clear evidence on these matters. CCC staff have met with the CCHL Valuer to determine if the change of dividend flow has any significant impact in terms of Risk 1 and Risk 2. The advice is that it does not impact value. This advice has been provided to Audit NZ.
- 4.33 At this stage the risk arising from these two issues is considered low.
- 4.34 **Risk 3 - Government Position Statement (GPS)** on potential changes to transport funding.
- 4.35 Staff have met with Audit NZ to demonstrate that the proposed LTP is well-aligned with the direction signalled by the draft GPS. At this meeting Audit NZ advised that unlike some councils, Christchurch has developed its transport programme largely in line with the decisions currently flagged by central government.
- 4.36 Audit NZ have advised at the time of preparing the report that they are unable to assess whether the changes signalled will be material or otherwise. Council has forwarded additional financial information for this issue to be clarified.

Councillor proposed amendments

- 4.37 More generally it should be noted that councillors have proposed amendments to the guidance, to be considered as part of the adoption process on 25 June 2024.
- 4.38 Audit NZ has provided initial advice in relation to amendments. That advice is to the effect that until adopted by Council, amendments are not formally part of the LTP and do not fall within the scope of their review at present.
- 4.39 However, if the collective effect of amendments supported by Council (ie adopted within the LTP) is considered to be material under LGA 2002, Audit NZ may be required to reserve their

review, subject to consideration of those amendments. If that were to occur Council could not adopt the LTP until the audit review is re-issued.

Implications of late adoption

- 4.40 In line with legislation, Council would normally adopt its final LTP in late June, followed by the rates strike in early July. If any of the risks 1-3 crystalised, it may mean that the LTP would need to be adopted in the next financial year.
- 4.41 While technically Council can seek an extension to its LTP adoption, there are adverse consequences and outcomes of significant delay.
- 4.42 The first is that until the new LTP is adopted and the new rate struck, the rate which could be collected would be significantly lower than what is currently proposed in the CD and Draft LTP. New rating units would also be excluded from rates assessments.
- 4.43 CCC rates are co-issued with Environment Canterbury (ECan) and ECan would potentially need to reset its rates collection dates to align with Council's recalibrated rates collection dates.
- 4.44 At present, because of the resulting differential between the first instalment and subsequent three instalments, Council's rating system and supporting technology cannot currently support a significantly late rates strike.

5. Financial Implications Ngā Hīraunga Rauemi

Capex/Opex Ngā Utu Whakahaere

- 5.1 Cost to Implement – within existing budgets.
- 5.2 Maintenance/Ongoing costs – considered core business/within business as usual.
- 5.3 Funding Source – existing budgets.

6. Considerations Ngā Whai Whakaaro

Risks and Mitigations Ngā Mōrearea me ngā Whakamātautau

- 6.1 Risks have been considered and are addressed through the following attachments:
 - 6.1.1 LTP 2024-34 - Management Sign-off for Process – **Attachment D**
 - 6.1.2 LTP 2024-34 - Management Sign-off for Significant Assumptions – **Attachment E**
 - 6.1.3 Letter of Representation from Audit New Zealand - **Attachment F** (to be provided under separate cover.)

Legal Considerations Ngā Hīraunga ā-Ture

- 6.2 Statutory and/or delegated authority to undertake proposals in the report:
 - 6.2.1 The Council must, at all times, have a long-term plan; must use the special consultative procedure in adopting a long-term plan; the long-term plan must be adopted before the commencement of the first year to which it relates(i.e. 1 July 2024), and continue in force until the close of the third consecutive year to which it relates (s.93(1-3)) Local Government Act 2002).
- 6.3 Other Legal Implications:
 - 6.3.1 There is no legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision, other than that which has been considered as part of the final Long-term Plan management process and sign-offs.

Strategy and Policy Considerations Te Whai Kaupapa here

- 6.4 The desired outcome is that the Committee is able to advise Council that in their opinion an appropriate process has been followed in the preparation of the LTP information, is on the basis that:
- 6.4.1 The activities, levels of service and capital programme outlined in the Long-term Plan align with the [Christchurch City Council's Strategic Framework](#), and
- 6.4.2 The LTP is assessed as being of low significance according to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy;
- 6.4.3 The decision is consistent with Council's Plans and Policies.
- 6.5 This report supports the [Council's Long Term Plan \(2021 - 2031\)](#):
- 6.6 Internal Services
- 6.6.1 Activity: Performance Management and Reporting
- Level of Service: 13.1.1 Implement the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan programme plan - Critical path milestone due dates in programme plans are met.

Community Impacts and Views Ngā Mariu ā-Hāpori

- 6.7 The decision affects all wards/Community Board areas.
- 6.8 The views of all Community Boards have been sought and incorporated into the adoption of the Consultation Document and draft Long-term plan, with subsequent submissions and presentations to Council as part of the LTP Hearings process.

Impact on Mana Whenua Ngā Whai Take Mana Whenua

- 6.9 The decision for ARMC does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land, a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore the decision posed in this report does not specifically impact Mana Whenua, their culture, and traditions.
- 6.10 The decision for ARMC does not involves a matter of interest to Mana Whenua and could impact on our agreed partnership priorities with Ngā Papatipu Rūnanga.
- 6.11 Through the Te Hononga Committee the Council directly engages with iwi – Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, and six of the Papatipu Rūnanga who fall within the Council catchment as mana whenua of respective rohe: Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Wairewa Rūnanga, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, Ōnuku Rūnanga and Te Taumutu Rūnanga.

Climate Change Impact Considerations Ngā Whai Whakaaro mā te Āhuarangi

- 6.12 There are no specific or material Climate Change impact considerations in relation to this report, however the LTP reflects the Council's current Climate Resilience Strategy and demonstrates significant focus on climate adaptation and climate resilience.

7. Next Steps Ngā Mahinga ā-muri

- 7.1 The Council is due to meet on 25 June 2024 (and 27 June 2024 if required) to consider and formally adopt the final Long-term Plan 2024-34.
- 7.2 Within 1 month after the adoption of its long-term plan CCC must make the plan publicly available (to comply with s.93(10)). This will include publishing online via our public website, providing access to hard copies of the plan via our libraries and services centres, and providing digital and/or hard copy prints to the Mayor and Councillors, to the National Library of New Zealand, Department of Internal Affairs, Parliamentary Library, The Auditor General, and Governor General.

- 7.3 Responses to submitters will be prepared and sent, and the staff responses to submissions and the Thematic Analysis will be also published to the public site.

Attachments Ngā Tāpirihanga

No.	Title	Reference	Page
A	Letter of Expectation	24/140762	18
B	Thematic Analysis of the Long-term Plan 2024-34 Submissions and Hearings	24/894172	27
C	Mayor's Recommendations	24/1026467	83
D	LTP 2024-34 - Management Sign-off for Process	24/1020591	88
E	LTP 2024-34 - Management Sign-off for Significant Assumptions	24/1018009	103
F	Letter of Representation from Audit NZ (under separate cover)	24/427235	122
G	Long-term Plan 2024-34 adoption report (under separate cover)		127

In addition to the attached documents, the following background information is available:

Document Name – Location / File Link
Christchurch City Council Live - YouTube - includes recordings of LTP 2024-34 Public Hearings and Information/Workshop Sessions.
Long Term Plan 2024 to 2034 : Christchurch City Council (ccc.govt.nz) – for published LTP documents, community submissions and responses.

Signatories Ngā Kaiwaitohu

Authors	Boyd Kedzlie - Senior Corporate Planning & Performance Analyst Amber Tait - Performance Analyst Adelaine Hansson - Performance Analyst Ron Lemm - Manager Legal Service Delivery, Regulatory & Litigation Tim Ward - Senior Corporate Planning & Performance Analyst
Approved By	Peter Ryan - Head of Corporate Planning & Performance Bede Carran - General Manager Finance, Risk & Performance / Chief Financial Officer

22 March 2023

Christchurch and Banks Peninsula Long Term Plan 2024-34: Councillors' Expectations

Dear Dawn,

As indicated, I have prepared this letter setting out Councillors' expectations to help inform the work that you and your staff will undertake to support development of the Long-Term Plan (LTP) 2024 – 2034.

Part A makes clear Councillors' expectations around LTP content – the major strategic issues that the LTP needs to address. **Part B** is designed to provide clarity and certainty to both governance and staff around how the LTP process will unfold.

Context

Christchurch is a fantastic city that is on the move. It is the place where we all call home, and where we want to do our part to make it an even better place to live, work, play and invest.

Christchurch has faced more than its fair share of challenges over the past decade, including those arising from earthquakes, floods, fires, water supply security concerns, terrorist attacks and the current pandemic recovery. The human, financial and environmental costs to our city have been great.

We now face significant change to our sector flowing from Government reforms, as well as the ongoing impacts of long term challenges faced by our community such as climate change, increasing inequality, rising cost of living and affordability issues. Our Council must also confront the immediate challenge of rising inflation, skills shortages and supply chain disruptions on our operations and capital projects.

Amongst the changes will be the implementation of Three Waters reforms from 1 July 2024. This means that the LTP 2024-34 will not include Three Waters and will reflect a post-reform Council in line with the Government's direction. We anticipate considering a range of scenarios as part of the development process.

However, the large investments over the past decade, our location as the gateway to the Antarctic and South Island, and our status as our nation's second largest city mean we are

22 March 2023

well-placed to respond to these challenges. This will help us put Christchurch 'on the map' as the best place to live, work, invest and play in New Zealand.

Councillors are determined to realise their vision for Christchurch as 'a city of opportunities.' Our city must continue to thrive and grow sustainably by attracting new businesses, people and investment. We want to provide, encourage, enable and improve the services that are essential for sustainable growth, resilience, liveable neighbourhoods, safe and healthy natural environments, and to support diverse cultural interests, activities and events. This should occur within the context of increasing partnership with mana whenua and greater collaboration with neighbouring councils and government agencies. The Greater Christchurch Partnership and Canterbury Mayoral Forum will offer opportunities for this collaboration to increase.

Overall, we are expecting sound, evidence-based advice and options to help us make informed choices in the best interest of our city, our environment and our residents.

Part A - Key themes of the LTP 2024

We recognise that the joint development approach between Councillors and staff which formed the basis of the LTP 2021 was very successful and we want to build on that approach.

Councillors have worked well with ELT on a Strategic Framework which lays the foundation for LTP 2024. We expect that the Framework will set out our commitment to working in partnership with Ngāi Tahu to achieve meaningful outcomes that benefit the whole community. The Framework sets out the strategic priorities that will be our focus for work programme planning and investment over this Council term. We are aiming to finalise the Framework by the end of March 2023 in order for it to underpin all subsequent LTP work. We are currently discussing the following draft strategic priorities:

- Put people at the centre of developing our city and district, prioritising wellbeing, accessibility and connection
- Champion Christchurch and collaborate to build our role as a leading New Zealand city
- Build trust and confidence in the Council through meaningful communication, listening to and working with residents

22 March 2023

- Reduce emissions as a Council and as a city, and invest in adaptation and resilience, leading a city-wide response to climate change.
- Manage ratepayers' money wisely, delivering quality core services to the whole community and addressing the issues that are important to our residents
- Actively balance the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations, with the aim of leaving no one behind

To achieve these outcomes we need to provide clear direction for the LTP at an early stage.

To ensure success this should include:

Genuine partnership with Mana Whenua

The draft Strategic Framework acknowledges Ngāi Tahu rangatiratanga over its takiwā and commits the Council to partnering with mana whenua to achieve meaningful outcomes that benefit the whole community.

The LTP presents the first key opportunity this Council term to advance the Council partnership with Papatipu Rūnanga and to discuss meaningful outcomes. The Mayor and Councillors expect that the LTP programme will enable authentic partnership and active dialogue with mana whenua.

Joint Development between Councillors and staff

It is expected that the joint development process used in the 2021 LTP will be continued and refined. This ensures that the views of Councillors and Community Board plans are taken into account from an early stage, and that debate and direction-setting is based on transparent, objective and accurate staff advice. Early engagement across our communities is also a key part of the approach. There must be sufficient time set aside for pre-engagement to occur in a transparent and measured way. The purpose and scope of pre-engagement will need to be agreed over coming weeks between Councillors and staff.

Listening to our customers, communities, and businesses

There is a wealth of feedback from our community in the Resident and Point of Contact Surveys, as well as other sources. These highlight areas of high satisfaction as well as areas where improvement is needed.

It is important that a diversity of voices is heard, that we actively listen to what our communities are saying and that the LTP provides options for addressing those community ambitions and concerns, including those voices that are not part of our current way of

22 March 2023

thinking. The LTP should provide certainty for our community on what we will do in response to the feedback they give us.

There is also a need to identify opportunities to work more closely with businesses and community groups to unlock the potential of our city. Feedback will need to be balanced with financial sustainability and deliverability during LTP decision-making as we will be confronting some hard choices.

Committing to a Climate Resilient City

Christchurch is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and has a significant role in the district's greenhouse gas emissions reductions efforts, and protecting our natural environment. It is essential that the Infrastructure Strategy, Asset Management and Activity Plans all include meaningful actions to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions, increase our resilience to more frequent and extreme weather events, and reduce our community's overall vulnerability to the impacts of climate change.

Continuous Improvement

Given the dynamic nature of Council's operating environment it is critical that the organisation continues to learn and improve. Council expects to see innovative thinking applied to the financial and infrastructure strategies, activity plans, business reviews, S17a service delivery reviews, and in particular the Letters of Expectation with our group of companies, and for these to inform the LTP. It is critical that staff provide advice during the LTP process that reflects new and innovative ways to achieve outcomes for our community.

Infrastructure Strategy

The Infrastructure Strategy (IS) needs to inform many of the key LTP documents. It must contain a strategic view of our key infrastructure opportunities and challenges, including residual earthquake damage to infrastructure, and options to address these. It should include opportunity cost assessments for councillors to consider when evaluating options. The preferred option must be supported by an investment proposal, which should be well progressed early on in the LTP process so that it can frame the development of the capital programme and be closely aligned with the Financial Strategy and Strategic Priorities. The IS will also help to shape and inform the Consultation Document.

The IS must be understood as a strategy: it should give high level direction for the future of our infrastructure planning and investment; lead the development of the asset plans, the

22 March 2023

capital programme and capital prioritisation process. This will include a clear view of essential asset management and renewals as well as more discretionary projects. It should avoid being 'backcast' (a simple retrofit to existing asset plans.) The IS will both inform, and be informed by, activity plans and asset plans through an iterative process.

The 30-year horizon for the IS makes it high level enough that it will not hinder the ability to defer programmes to later years, if required by deliverability challenges. It is therefore important that the proposed capital programme is clearly visible to Community Boards and residents as part of the LTP engagement process and extends beyond the traditional ten year view. Projects should be available by ward over the life of the LTP.

Council expects that the overall direction of the IS (and ideally its preferred option) to be available for asset plans and activity plans to reference while they are being co-developed. It is expected that staff will have considered other Council's IS and asset planning documents in light of the feedback from the Auditor-General after the LTP 2021.

Financial Strategy

The long-term financial management approach needs to focus on keeping rates and other fees and charges affordable over time, while at the same time balancing the need for fit-for-purpose services and our residents' quality of life. It must also present a clear picture of the Council's long term strategic approach to debt ensuring we are taking a whole life costing and intergenerational approach.

Rating approach

Councillors wish to signal a clear expectation that rates increases will be contained and they must always be justifiable. It is timely for Council to undertake an assessment of our rating base and approach and how well it is understood.

More broadly, the Financial Strategy should:

1. Provide the economic context, interest rates and inflation projections and debt profile within which are proposed options for rates setting.
2. Be clear on the role and performance of CCHL and the CCTOs, and their contribution to Council's financial resilience over time.
3. Provide an assessment of the impact of the RMA reforms as best can be assessed at this point in the reform programme. Based on observations from the last LTP process.

22 March 2023

4. We would also like staff to consider the following:

- the capital programme be proposed at a level that responds to actual need and that is demonstrably deliverable and affordable in each year of the LTP.
- alleviate an unacceptably high capital programme 'bow wave' with inevitably large carry-forwards each year, which has the potential to drive unnecessarily high rates increases (note that while we do not borrow for what we are not delivering, that work is built into our plans and therefore rates increases).
- as the capital programme changes, any related opex implications must be clearly called out and evidence based – including whole-of-life costing implications.
- Activity budgets should be available when activity plans are reviewed by Councillors. These could be draft budgets for activities that are not changing markedly, but with indicative budgets for activities where any major change is proposed.
- Impacts to Levels of Service arising from budget changes must be transparent to Councillors in activity plans.
- Adjustments to (or deletion of) capital projects/programmes or Levels of Service must be transparent in LTP documents, including the CD.

Part B - The LTP Process

It is essential that both Councillors and staff have a clear and mutually agreed understanding of how the LTP process will unfold. The advice below is informed by what worked well during the LTP 2021 process. It also reflects improvements based on the LTP 2021 process review, which included input from senior managers and councillors, as well as the Office of the Auditor-General.



22 March 2023

Restoring trust and confidence

The LTP process needs to provide ample opportunities for a full range of issues to be canvassed. Residents, business and communities of interest and other key stakeholders must be broadly engaged on key issues and options so we hear the many and varied voices of our community as we consider those issues. This places an obligation on Council and staff to ensure that accurate, easy to assimilate information on options (and their impacts) is available to all our stakeholders to help inform their views. We want a two way conversation that is:

- collaborative and meaningful
- designed to deliver real benefits for the city equitably and at reasonable cost for all generations
- communicated clearly so the community is aware of the responses and the reasons for the decisions we have made.

In addition to early work with mana whenua partners, Councillors expect the LTP process to create better connections with disenfranchised communities, and to consider stakeholder-specific assessments. We also want to see more youth-focused engagement (by youth for youth). Where relevant, there should also be more project-based engagement to encourage and support community involvement and more submissions.

Consultation Document

The Consultation Document (CD) is the flagship and main public document of the LTP. It is led by the Mayor and will set out the key issues being considered, and the options available in response to those issues. The right CD will encourage and support community involvement. It will be important to retain clear accountability for the Consultation Document (CD) development within the Communications and Engagement Unit, so it is written in plain and consistent language rather than technical jargon, with the options to be considered by the Council and community are articulated clearly and accessible to all.

The Consultation Document will be supported by a range of related tools and communication streams to ensure that all people in our community can participate and contribute. There will continue to be an option to submit through easy to use online surveys.

The Joint Development Process

This was successful in 2021. Councillors felt that they had clear oversight of the LTP strategies and plans, as well as sufficient time to scrutinise them and provide feedback.

22 March 2023

The overarching objective of the plan (that the suite of LTP documents are available in draft form by 1 July 2023) remains. Councillors should also be engaged early on levels of service to ensure they understand the issues and options they consult on. It is essential that there is a measured and transparent programme of presentations on activity and asset plans to Council between July and December 2023 that allows for questions and the opportunity to circle back if needed. Staff should find meaningful ways to enhance transparency during this process.

This programme of presentations should be set and agreed with elected members now so that there is clarity for both the managers presenting and for the councillors. Focus areas for activity plan presentations include:

- clear line of sight from high level outcomes (Strategic Framework, including climate resilience and other relevant Strategy documents) to proposed levels of service and capital projects.
- a capital prioritisation process that has a focus on community need, deliverability, affordability and climate resilience across all capital portfolios.
- Levels of Service that are consistently SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound) and which will provide transparency of non-financial performance across services. We note there are legislatively prescribed LOS, and in addition we wish to focus our efforts on a reduced suite of LOS that are most critical and meaningful.

It is also expected that once the strategies and plans are in draft form on 1 July 2023 they will be available to councillors on the BigTinCan. All of these refinements were valuable in the 2021 process.

Other Issues

Rather than proscribing the more detailed elements of the LTP Programme, the *LTP 2024-34 Programme Plan* (approved by the Executive Leadership Team and Council in June 2022) remains the approved LTP process. Please report progress against this programme plan monthly to the Finance and Performance Committee, including any risks or impediments to the project and its key work streams.

Councillors need a clear stocktake of on-hold Annual Plan and LTP proposals from the last triennium, so that we can confirm whether this work should form part of the 2024 LTP.

22 March 2023

Community and Stakeholder Engagement

Community Boards need to develop their Plans early in the triennium and they need to be aligned with the Council's strategic framework. This will assist the ability to integrate Community Board Plans at an earlier stage in the LTP process. This reinforces the need for a timely sign off on the strategic framework by the new council.

As stated, early engagement and partnership with Ngāi Tahu/ Ngā Papatipu Rūnanga must be programmed specifically into the LTP programme plan.

In addition, I welcome staff advice on the potential to have early conversations with the community, to help support the development of an LTP that closely matches the priorities of residents whilst recognising intergenerational impacts. Particular attention needs to be given to how we reach a greater diversity of residents in our early engagement, and during the formal consultation period.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this expression of expectations on behalf of Councillors. I hope it will help guide the organisation as you implement the LTP process.

Regards

Phil Mauger

Mayor

Long Term Plan 2024 – 2034

Submissions Analysis

May 2024

Item 11

Attachment B

How to use this document

The purpose of this document is not to provide analysis on everything that submitters commented on, but rather to provide a summary of key topics and issues identified by submitters and responses to the specific questions we asked submitters.

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

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

A note of Schools Strike for Climate submissions

Many of the questions asked in our online form were transferred across to the school strike for climate submission form, however in almost all instances they were tweaked at least slightly. This ranged from removing response options (particularly 'don't know' options) to changing the wording which fundamentally changed the question.

For this reason, where appropriate two tables have been provided in this report, one sets out the responses from the CCC forms and one combines the data from the two sources.

Summary of what we heard

The feedback received on the Long Term Plan (LTP) reflects the perspectives and priorities within our community, revealing a nuanced landscape of values and aspirations. Over recent years we have seen many examples of 'one person's nice to have is another person's must have', and the feedback we received on the draft LTP once again reinforces this. Submitters commonly told us that we haven't got the balance right, but their reasons for this were varied.

On one hand there were submitters voicing the opinion that we hadn't gone far enough to reduce costs, rates increases were too high, and we hadn't exercised the fiscal restraint or responsibility that they expect of us. In their view, we should be looking at either reducing services or finding efficiencies within our services and cutting 'wasteful' spending. However, when presented with the opportunity to provide feedback on areas where we should be looking at finding further savings or efficiencies, many of these submitters did not provide any specific examples of spending that they thought was wasteful or areas where we could reduce services or make savings.

On the other hand, there were submitters who voiced their strong desire to see us do more to prioritise the future of the city. They called for us to accelerate work and funding for preparing for and responding to the impacts of climate change, urging us to take this seriously. Many wanted us to accelerate work on public and active transport, invest in growing the tree canopy, implement a range of measures to help drive behaviour change (including further increases to car parking charges) and enable intensification across the city. Others highlighted the importance of the services that we provide, noting that they were pleased to see that we hadn't proposed cuts to services to find savings. They talked about the importance of community facilities, spaces and places; libraries were mentioned by many not only because of the services they provide but also because of the sense of connection that they build and foster.

Submitters were united in their calls for us to focus investment into core infrastructure. However, they were at odds about what constitutes 'core infrastructure'. For some it means investing more into the quality of our roads and footpaths, while for others it means accelerating progress on infrastructure that supports active and public transport. They were however united in their support for investing in our water infrastructure. For many the focus was on doing whatever it takes to get the chlorine out of our water, while others wanted us to focus on delivering a stormwater network to manage increased flooding risk. The importance of our green spaces was recognised by many, with many submitters calling for us to bring forward planned investment in our sports parks and facilities to allow more people in the city to be more active, more often.

Submissions revealed strong support for community grants and funding, with many submitters reminding us that this funding is crucial to the work that many organisations do for and with our communities. Submitters who wrote in support of the Arts Centre highlighted the value that the centre brings, citing its cultural significance, heritage value, and community-building role. Orana Park also garnered significant backing, with submitters urging additional funding due to its tourism, conservation, and educational contributions. Feedback on contestable funds called for maintaining and even increasing support for sustainability, biodiversity, and heritage preservation initiatives. Regarding the Anglican Cathedral, most submitters opposed further council funding, preferring support for the Arts Centre or expecting the church to secure additional funds for the restoration project.

Generally, feedback on this LTP highlighted the competing priorities, opinions and values that our residents and communities have. Finding the right balance in the final LTP will require careful consideration of these varied viewpoints. Our residents and communities care deeply about their future and the future of the city and have told us that they want to see us deliver an LTP that is affordable but doesn't ignore or forget about the things they really care about.

Table of Contents

Who did we hear from?	6
Why do we collect demographic information?	9
At a Glance What we've heard from the community	10
Have we got the balance right?	14
Rates, Fees & Charges, & Other Revenue.....	17
Rates.....	17
Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms	17
City Vacant Differential	18
Charging Visitor Accommodation as a Business	18
Fees & Charges	19
Charging for Parking at Key Parks.....	19
Car Parking Charges	20
Disposal of Council Owned Properties and Red Zone Land.....	20
Disposal of five Council owned properties	20
Disposal of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties	20
Our Proposed Operational Spending.....	22
Libraries	23
Transport	23
Community Grants and Funding.....	24
The Arts Centre	24
Orana Park.....	25
Other Contestable Funds.....	25
Screen Canterbury Grant.....	25
Anglican Cathedral Funding	26
Resource Recovery	26
Resourcing.....	26
Our Proposed Capital Spending	27
Transport	28
Cycleways.....	28
Public Transport Infrastructure.....	29
Roads	29
Three Waters	30
Taumata Arowai Requirements.....	30

Parks..... 30

 Sports Grounds & Facilities and the Sports Field Network Plan 30

 Tree Canopy 31

Libraries 31

Te Kaha 31

Event Bid Funding 33

Investing More in Adapting to Climate Change 35

Additional Savings & Efficiencies 38

Yaldhurst Memorial Hall 38

Appendix One: Summary of number of comments by category 39

Appendix Two: Summary of Key Issues by Community Board 41

Who did we hear from?

Community Board*	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated**	4300	61%
Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū Banks Peninsula	203	3%
Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood	448	6%
Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton	439	6%
Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood	504	7%
Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central	510	7%
Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote	636	9%
Total	7040	100%

Ward*	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated**	4300	61%
Banks Peninsula	203	3%
Burwood	93	1%
Cashmere	319	5%
Central	213	3%
Coastal	227	3%
Fendalton	173	2%
Halswell	200	3%
Harewood	193	3%
Heathcote	202	3%
Hornby	64	1%
Innes	202	3%
Linwood	128	2%
Papanui	95	1%
Riccarton	175	2%
Spreydon	115	2%
Waimairi	138	2%

*Indicative only. These numbers have been prepared using the suburb information provided by submitters.

**Not stated includes submitters who did not provide a postal address, those who provided only a street name or suburb, and any submitters who used a PO Box address.

Who did we hear from?

Location	Number of Submitters	%* of Submitters
Christchurch City	2740	39%
Elsewhere in Canterbury		
Selwyn	118	1.7%
Waimakariri	89	1.3%
Hurunui	10	0.1%
Ashburton	10	0.1%
Timaru	8	0.1%
Waimate	1	0.01%
Elsewhere in New Zealand		
Northland	6	0.1%
Auckland	37	0.5%
Waikato	5	0.1%
Bay of Plenty	9	0.1%
Gisborne	1	0.01%
Hawkes Bay	3	0.04%
Taranaki	3	0.04%
Manawatū-Whanganui	10	0.1%
Wellington	21	0.3%
Nelson-Tasman	9	0.1%
Marlborough	1	0.01%
Dunedin	16	0.2%
Queenstown Lakes	3	0.04%
Southland	5	0.1%
Outside of New Zealand		
Australia	11	0.2%
United Kingdom	6	0.1%
Canada	1	0.01%
USA	1	0.01%
Hungary	1	0.01%

Who did we hear from?

Number of Submitters by Age

Age	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated	3476	50%
Under 18 years	44	1%
18 – 24 years	217	3%
25 – 34 years	570	8%
35 – 49 years	991	14%
50 – 64 years	973	14%
65 years and over	759	11%

Number of Submitters by Gender

Gender	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated	3543	50%
Male	1299	18%
Female	2141	30%
Non-binary / another gender	58	1%

Number of Submitters by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
NZ European	2897	41%
Māori	218	3%
Pacific Peoples	47	1%
Asian	135	2%
Middle Eastern, Latin American & African	31	0.4%
Other European	311	4%
Other	211	3%

Who did we hear from?

Number of Submitters by Submission Method

Ethnicity	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Online	6683	95%
Email	196	3%
Over Counter	110	2%
Post	48	1%
Other	4	0.1%

Why do we collect demographic information?

It is important that we understand both who we have and have not heard from when we consult on issues that affect everyone in the city. We include a standard set of demographic questions across our consultations that help us better understand this. These questions are optional; submitters do not have to answer them to make a submission.

Where possible, we align the questions we ask with the information that StatsNZ collects via the census. This ensures that we are capturing the information that is consistent with the national approach to reporting on demographics, but also enables us to benchmark and understand whether we have heard from a representative group of submitters.

At a Glance | What we've heard from the community

What we asked the community		What the community told us		
Have we got the balance right?	What do you think of our proposed plan? Have we got the balance right? Have we prioritised the right things? If not, what changes would you like to see?	<p>The majority of submitters told us that we haven't got the balance right, wanting us to focus on either finding further savings and efficiencies to bring the projected rates increase down or accelerating work on some projects or programmes. Responses to this question highlighted the differing views, opinions and priorities of our residents and diverse communities, and reiterates the need for the Council to land an LTP that acknowledges and responds to these diverse opinions.</p> <p>For many, changes to community grants and funding, or the omission of grants and funding, equates to not getting the balance right. For others, this looks like delaying projects or not placing enough urgency on climate adaptation and resilience. In other instances, submitters told us that they didn't think we had gone far enough to reduce costs, and that the proposed rates increase is too high and will put an unreasonable level of pressure on households.</p> <p>Some submitters told us that to get the balance right, there are some aspects of the plan that they would like us to make changes to, including focusing more on specific areas or services including heritage preservation, climate adaptation and resilience, 'core' infrastructure, more investment in the eastern suburbs, reducing borrowing, and community grants and funding. Others thought that we needed to focus on looking after what we already have before pursuing new capital projects, facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>There was a strong relationship between wanting to see funding for the Arts Centre included in the LTP and a perception that we haven't got the balance right. Many of these submitters told us that omitting funding for the Arts Centre, in their opinion, equates to not having the balance right. This was echoed by submitters addressing other community grants and funding, including Orana Park, contestable funds such as the sustainability and biodiversity fund, and the Screen Canterbury grant.</p> <p>Similarly, those who want to see us invest more in climate adaptation and resilience are more likely to feel that we haven't got the balance right, reinforcing their desire to see us do more in the climate adaptation and mitigation areas, and to see us do it sooner than we have planned.</p>		
What should we be focusing on?	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).	19.96%	<p>Submitters were divided on what we should be focusing on for the 2024 – 2034 LTP. Of the submitters who provided feedback on this question (n = 2,245) 35% thought that we should be exploring other ways to bring down our proposed rates increase, 37% thought we should be accelerating work on some projects and programmes with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations, and 20% told us that they want us to focus on getting on with delivering what we have proposed in the draft LTP.</p> <p>This was reflected in the feedback from submitters on a range of issues, where they were often divided into two camps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Those who are concerned about the cost of living and the impact that increasing rates will have on their ability to meet increasing financial pressures across the board and, in some instances, stay in their homes. In their view, we should be looking at either reducing services or finding efficiencies within our services and cutting 'wasteful' spending.Those who wanted us to focus on retaining the services that they value and doing more to prepare the city for the future. Many asked us to accelerate work on different work programmes, noting their disappointment that this work had been pushed back in the draft LTP.
		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).	35.14%	
		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).	37.37%	
		Don't know	7.53%	

What we asked the community		What the community told us		
Our proposed rates increase	Given that both the Council and residents are facing significant financial challenges, should we be maintaining our existing levels of service and level of investment in our core infrastructure and facilities?	Yes	51.25%	The feedback on whether we should be increasing rates at a time when both the Council and households are under increased financial pressure indicates a split opinion on rates increases: one group supports rates increases to maintain services and invest in the city's future, emphasising the need to prioritise climate resilience, while another group opposes them due to financial challenges, expressing concerns about affordability and fairness, particularly for those on fixed incomes.
		No	32.04%	
		Don't know	16.71%	
Changes to how we rate	Do you have any changes on our proposed changes to how we rate?	<p>Generally, submitters were supportive of the proposed changes to how we rate. The two proposals that we received the most feedback on were changes to the city vacant differential and charging visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business.</p> <p>City Vacant Differential 294 submitters provided written feedback on the proposed changes to the City Vacant Differential. 53% of those who provided feedback supported the proposed changes, 3% opposed the proposed changes and 39% provided other suggestions.</p> <p>Mostly submitters were supportive of our proposal to extend the City Vacant differential to additional areas of the city. In some instances, submitters wanted to see if extended to cover the whole city and the multiplier increased from 4.523 to 6. Those who opposed the change tended to feel that it is overly punitive or punishing, and we should be supporting landowners instead of penalising them for not developing their land.</p> <p>Charging Visitor Accommodation as a Business 363 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to rate visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business. 77% of these submitters were supportive of our proposal, 7% of these submitters opposed the move to rate them as businesses, indicating that they feel the approach is heavy handed and unfair, and citing concerns about the impact it would have on visitor accommodation and tourists visiting the city. 10% provided other suggestions or ideas.</p> <p>In general submitters were supportive of our proposal to rate visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business. They thought this was a fair and equitable approach, with many noting the impacts of residential units being used for visitor accommodation on housing supply. The impacts on 'Mum and Dad' investors was a concern for many, who reiterated that this should only be applied to homes where the home is only used for short term accommodation, ensuring that people renting out a single room in their home are not charged business rates.</p>		
Our proposed operational spend	Are we prioritising the right things?	Yes	35.34%	<p>Much of the feedback on our proposed operational spend was submitters reinforcing that they want to see us maintaining our current levels of service. In some instances, submitters simply highlighted the importance of maintaining services, while feedback from others told us that they would like us to look for other ways to cut costs that won't have an impact on the level of service we provide to our residents and communities.</p> <p>There was a smaller cohort of submitters who suggested that we should be looking at cutting services to reduce costs, with many indicating that there are aspects of our proposed spend are wasteful. Others mentioned the process that Central Government agencies are currently going through to reduce costs and thought that the Council should be doing the same.</p>
		No	39.48%	
		Don't know	25.19%	

What we asked the community		What the community told us		
Our proposed capital spend	Are we prioritising the right things?	Yes	38.14%	<p>Of the 443 general comments on our capital programme, 56% of them were submitters suggesting changes that they would like to see us make to the programme. Submitters talked about a range of changes they would like to see us make to the programme, which included more focus on specific services (transport and three waters were commonly mentioned), focusing on looking after what we've got before we add anything new or start other major capital projects, pausing capital projects until there is less pressure on the city's finances, or removing projects and programmes that they don't consider to be worthwhile.</p> <p>In some instances, submitters highlighted the importance of maintaining what you have, indicating that generally they supported our proposed capital investment.</p> <p>Key areas that received a number of comments from submitters included active and public transport, roads, Taumata Arowai requirements, sports grounds & facilities and the Sports Field Network Plan, our tree canopy, libraries and Te Kaha.</p>
		No	43.48%	
		Don't know	18.38%	
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.	68.94%	<p>69% of submitters who indicated a preference want us to leave the bid funding for major and business events at the current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed. 31% thought that we should increase the bid funding.</p> <p>Feedback from submitters indicated that they consider this a nice to have at a time when households are under increased financial pressure. Submitters noted that many of them wouldn't be able to afford to attend the events, so they don't want to see more ratepayer money spent on bidding for them.</p> <p>In other instances, submitters suggested that they would rather see event bid funding reduced or removed all together. There are concerns about the amount being spent on attracting these events, which benefits a small proportion of the population. Some submitters indicated that if attracting more major events is important to certain business sectors, they should be contributing to bidding for them. Others felt that our neighbouring districts should be contributing.</p> <p>Those who supported the additional bid funding tended to discuss the economic benefits of attracting more major events or point out that we've invested so much in building these new facilities that we need to be able to attract the events to make them a success.</p>
		Increase the bid funding.	31.6%	

What we asked the community		What the community told us		
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 our grasp of the climate risks?	Yes	51.63%	Much of the feedback we received on these two proposals urged the Council to take climate change and climate risk seriously, and do more to support mitigation, adaptation and prepare us for what the future may bring. 778 submitters provided written feedback on our climate proposals; 45% were comments in support of accelerating adaptation or creating a climate fund, 11% were comments opposing the proposal, 30% were submitters suggesting alternative ideas or proposals and 15% were general comments.
		No	33.72%	
		Don't know	14.65%	
	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?	Yes	57.78%	Many submitters raised the urgent need for climate action - they want to see us take it seriously and commit to investing in climate resilience and adaptation. In some instances, they raised the potential opportunities that could come with investing in climate resilience, including an opportunity to attract residents, businesses, and new sectors to Christchurch. Overall, there was a strong push from these submitters for the Council to prioritise climate change mitigation in our long-term planning, including investments in biodiversity, climate adaptation, and sustainable infrastructure. They feel that the focus should be on spending to prepare now rather than dealing with costly damage to our infrastructure and communities in the future.
		No	27.93%	
		Don't know	14.29%	
Additional savings and efficiencies	Are there any areas where you feel we should be reviewing the level of service we provide in order to manage our costs?	We asked submitters whether there were any areas where they thought that we could find additional savings or efficiencies. 332 submitters provided us with feedback on this question. In many instances submitters told us that our spending was wasteful, that we need to cut our costs, focus on the basics and find ways to reduce costs. However, when presented with the opportunity to provide feedback on areas where they think we could find savings and efficiencies, few were able to pinpoint specific examples. Where submitters did provide feedback on specific areas, they often overlapped with projects, programmes, funding or services that other submitters had told us are very important, again reinforcing that one person's 'must have' is another person's 'nice to have'. Specific examples commonly mentioned by these submitters included climate change, cycleways, staff costs, Te Kaha, events, cuts to community funding and service cuts.		
Disposal of Council owned land & properties	What do you think of our proposal to start formal processes to dispose of five Council-owned properties? What do you think of our proposal to dispose of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties? What do you think of our proposal to gift Yaldhurst Memorial Hall to the Yaldhurst Rural Residents' Association?	The message from most submitters who commented on our proposal to begin the process of disposing of five Council-owned properties was simple – just get on with it. 1156 submitters provided feedback on beginning the process of disposing of five council owned properties, 57% of these submitters supported moving forward, 12% opposed, 21% provided alternative suggestions and 9% made general comments. Those who were in support agreed that if they were surplus to requirement, then we should sell them and use the profits to ease the financial pressure that the Council is facing in the coming years. Those who opposed beginning the process to dispose of these properties tended to generally oppose the sale of Council land and assets. In some instances, submitters indicated that they would prefer we used this land for growing the city's tree canopy, providing more social or affordable housing, or creating community focused spaces such as food forests and shared gardens. The property at 26 Waipara Street was an issue for some, due to its potential future link between Cracroft and a shared path along Cashmere Stream. 1128 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to dispose of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties. 58% of submitters who provided feedback supported us to move forward with this process. Those who did not support us beginning the process of disposing of these properties either outright opposed the sale of Council land and assets, believing that we should retain it for a future use, or expressed concerns about the sale of red zoned land. 1231 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to gift the Yaldhurst Memorial Hall to the Yaldhurst Rural Residents Association. The vast majority (79%) of submitters supported gifting the hall to the resident's association. Submitters generally thought that it was a good solution, particularly if it removed any onus on the council to or expectation that the Council will repair and restore the hall.		

Have we got the balance right?

We asked submitters whether we have struck the right balance with our draft LTP, and what they think our focus for the 2024 – 2034 LTP should be. Submitters were divided on whether we have the balance right and had differing opinions around what we should be focusing on. 35% thought that we should be exploring other ways to bring down our proposed rates increase, 37% thought we should be accelerating work on some projects and programmes with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations, and 20% told us that they want us to focus on getting on with delivering what we have proposed in the draft LTP.

This result highlights how divided our residents and community are, and the differing values and priorities that the Council must grapple with.

Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

Which of the following do you think should be our focus for the 2024 - 2034 Long Term Plan?		
Total number of responses: 2,245		
Response	Count	%
Deliver what we have proposed in the Draft Long Term Plan.	448	19.96%
Explore other ways to bring down our proposed rates increases across the Draft LTP.	789	35.14%
Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations.	839	37.37%
Don't know	169	7.53%

School Strike for Climate

Which of the following do you think should be our focus for the 2024 - 2034 Long Term Plan?			
Total number of responses: 2,293			
Response	Count		%
	CCC Form	School Strike*	
Deliver what we have proposed in the Draft Long Term Plan.	448	1	19.58%
Explore other ways to bring down our proposed rates increases across the Draft LTP.	789	2	34.49%
Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations.	839	45	38.5%
Don't know	169	NA	7.37%

*School Strike for Climate Question: What should be our focus for the 2024 - 2034 Long Term Plan? (Don't know response option was removed).

Of the 1236 comments on whether we have struck the right balance with the draft LTP, around 25% signalled that we've got the balance about right, 43% told us we haven't struck the right balance, and 20% indicated that they'd like us to do something different.

Feedback from the 43% who told us we haven't got the balance right tended to reflect the results from the question about what our focus should be – they either wanted us to focus on ways to reduce costs and thought we hadn't gone far enough in the draft LTP, or they were disappointed about some of the decisions made in the draft LTP, many of which were related to decisions about community grants and funding.

We received a large number of submissions on funding for the Arts Centre, both through our online form and the short form created by the Arts Centre. There is a strong relationship between wanting to see funding for the Arts Centre included in the LTP and a perception that we haven't got the balance right. Many of these submitters told us that omitting funding for the Arts Centre, in their opinion, equates to not having the balance right. This was echoed by submitters addressing other community grants and funding, including Orana Park, contestable funds such as the sustainability and biodiversity fund, and the Screen Canterbury grant.

Similarly, those who want to see us invest more in climate adaptation and resilience were more likely to feel that we haven't got the balance right, reinforcing their desire to see us do more in the climate adaptation and mitigation areas, and to see us do it sooner than we have planned. They provided many examples of things they would like to see throughout their submissions, including accelerated work on completing the major cycleways and providing local cycleways connections, more investment in public transport infrastructure and more funding towards enhancing biodiversity and ecological restoration.

On the other hand, there is a cohort of submitters who would like to see us do more to bring down the proposed rates increase which, in their view, is going to put an unacceptable level of pressure on households and ratepayers. Many of these submitters feel that the proposed rates increases are unsustainable, and we need to go further in terms of looking for ways to reduce costs. Feedback from some indicated that they didn't feel we had gone far enough when looking at savings, or that the Council should have taken more of the savings options put forward by staff.

Those who tended to think we have the balance about right often noted that they were happy to see that we had not reduced services that they value to bring costs down, and that we had struck the right balance at a time when everyone is facing increased financial pressure, including the Council which was acknowledged by some submitters. Others thought that we had struck the right balance in terms of the priorities that we identified for this LTP. Others acknowledged that if we want to see improvement in big ticket infrastructure, then we need to be willing to prioritise it and pay for it.

Submitters who told us that they'd like to see us do something different tended to want us to do more or less of something. They had a wide range of suggestions on how they'd like to see us adjust the balance, such as focusing more on specific areas or services including heritage preservation, climate adaptation and resilience, 'core' infrastructure, more investment in the eastern suburbs, reducing borrowing, and increasing? maintaining? community grants and funding.

Other submitters indicated that they would like us to focus on maintaining what we have before we add anything new, typically focusing on the capital spend and whether aspects of the capital programme could be adjusted, removed or the focus changed in specific areas of the capital programme. Transport was the aspect of the capital programme where submitters suggested the most change. Some wanted to see us focus less on cycleways and more road and footpaths, others wanted to see us shift our focus away from the safer streets work programme, while others urged us to get on and complete the major cycleways earlier than planned and invest more in public transport.

Overall, the feedback on whether we have struck the right balance highlighted the differing values, opinions and priorities of our residents and communities, and reinforces the need for Council to land an LTP that acknowledges the needs, wants and varying opinions of our diverse communities.

Rates, Fees & Charges, & Other Revenue

Rates

We asked submitters whether they think we should be maintaining our existing level of service and level of investment in our core infrastructure and facilities when both the Council and residents are facing significant financial challenges. Of the submitters who provided a response to this question, 51% agreed that we should be maintaining our levels of service and level of investment in core infrastructure, 32% disagreed and 17% didn't know.

Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

Given that both the Council and residents are facing significant financial challenges, should we be maintaining our existing levels of service and level of investment in our core infrastructure and facilities, which will mean a proposed average rates increase of 13.24% across all ratepayers and an average residential rate increase of 12.4%?		
Total number of responses: 2,597		
Response	Count	%
Yes	1,331	51.25%
No	832	32.04%
Don't know	434	16.71%

School Strike for Climate

Given that both the Council and residents are facing significant financial challenges, should we be maintaining our existing levels of service and level of investment in our core infrastructure and facilities, which will mean a proposed average rates increase of 13.24% across all ratepayers and an average residential rate increase of 12.4%?			
Total number of responses: 2,643			
Response	Count		%
	CCC Form	School Strike*	
Yes	1,331	40	51.87%
No	832	6	31.70%
Don't know	434	NA	16.42%

*School Strike for Climate Question: Should the Council increase rates to maintain existing services? (Don't know response option was removed).

Written feedback provided in response to this question highlighted that many would rather see rates go up, maintaining services and proposed levels of investment, than see us reduce the overall rates increase through cutting services and reducing investment in the future of the city. Submitters who supported maintaining our services and current levels of investment often noted that it was a significant increase, but felt that it is an investment in the future of the city and the

kind of city that they want to live in. Continuing work to build climate resilience and reduce our environmental impact was a priority for many, and they acknowledged that this comes with a cost. There was a sense of urgency from these submitters, with many suggesting that there are projects we just need to get on with that cannot wait.

In many respects, this feedback echoes what submitters told us when thinking about whether we have the balance right. There are services and support that we provide that our residents and communities value, and maintaining these is important to them.

On the other hand, a third of submitters indicated that they don't think we should be maintaining our existing levels of service and investment when both the Council and residents are facing significant financial challenges. For many, they are worried about the impacts that further rates increases will have on their ability to pay their rates when the costs of other household expenses are also increasing. In some instances, these submitters noted that they are concerned that they will no longer be able to afford to live in their homes as they are on fixed incomes that are not increasing at the same pace or level as rates and other living expenses. These submitters regularly commented that they feel an increase so far above CPI/inflation is unjustified and unfair. Others noted that the compounding level of increase across the period of the LTP is significant and were worried about what it will mean for their household and finances long term.

In some instances, submitters suggested that we split the proposed rates increase over the period of the LTP to flatten it out more, or look at changes to our rating system to make it more equitable.

City Vacant Differential

294 submitters provided written feedback on the proposed changes to the City Vacant Differential. 53% of those who provided feedback supported the proposed changes, 3% opposed the proposed changes and 39% provided other suggestions.

Those who supported the proposed changes tended to feel that it is a good way to encourage productive use of land in the city, and to discourage 'land banking'. Others simply supported the move as a mechanism to reduce rates for the average household. Those who opposed the changes tended to feel that it is overly punitive, or see it as a revenue-gathering exercise as opposed to a genuine mechanism for behaviour change.

Many submitters provided other suggestions as to how they would like to see the City Vacant Differential applied. Generally, these submitters tended to support extending the City Vacant Differential so that it covers more of the city, or the whole city. Many of these submitters also suggested that we should increase the multiplier from 4.523 to 6 if we really want to see behaviour change. Some submitters suggested that where vacant sites are being used for activities such as car parking, they shouldn't be eligible for a remission as they do not consider car parking to be a productive use of land.

Charging Visitor Accommodation as a Business

363 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to rate visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business. 77% of these submitters were supportive of our proposal, with many noting that

they are operating as a business so should be rated appropriately. 7% of these submitters opposed the move to rate them as businesses, indicating that they feel the approach is heavy handed and unfair, and citing concerns about the impact it would have on visitor accommodation and tourists visiting the city. 10% provided other suggestions or ideas.

Many submitters reiterated that this should only be applied to homes where the home is only used for short term accommodation, ensuring that people renting out a single room in their home are not charged business rates.

Fees & Charges

We received a range of feedback our proposed fees and charges. In many instances, submitters supported a move to user pays, which they feel will help reduce pressure on rates and ratepayers and ensure those who benefit from the services are the ones who pay for them. Changes to the balance between rates and user funded fees and charges were raised by many when asked about our rates proposal or other areas where we could look for additional savings or efficiencies.

Charging for Parking at Key Parks

Submitters were divided on our proposal to introduce parking charges at key parks. 1088 submitters provided feedback on this proposal; 30% support introducing parking charges at key parks, 43% oppose introducing parking charges, 19% proposed alternatives, and 8% made general comments.

Those who supported the proposed charges generally advocated for a user pays approach and acknowledged that it would help to manage demand and deter people from using them as all day parks, which impacts genuine park visitors and users. Some noted they supported the move as long as it was affordable and didn't prohibit access, while others supported introducing parking charges alongside promoting and supporting access via public and active travel.

Those who opposed the proposed charges felt that access would be unfairly impacted, and that our parks and greenspaces should be available for anyone to use, regardless of whether they can afford to pay for parking. They thought that introducing parking charges at these parks would put an unfair barrier to access in place, particularly for young families. Others simply expressed that they thought it was the Council being greedy for relatively little economic gain and chasing further revenue to fund unnecessary spending.

In some instances submitters put forward alternatives, signalling that they understood the need to manage demand on the parking spaces but would like to see us implement a solution that would manage demand but not restrict access to those who may not be able to afford the parking charges. Alternatives suggested included introducing time limits as opposed to charges, keeping charges low, providing an up-front period that is free with charges that kick in after that, or charging during the week but keeping the weekends free.

Car Parking Charges

225 submitters provided feedback on our car parking fees and charges. 44% of these were submitters suggesting alternatives.

In some cases submitters thought that we should be increasing car parking charges to encourage people to consider using other modes of transport. This commonly went hand in hand with a desire to increase and accelerate spending on cycling and public transport.

Others called for more proactive enforcement of bad parking behaviour and easier ways for residents to report bad behaviour.

Disposal of Council Owned Properties and Red Zone Land

Disposal of five Council owned properties

The message from most submitters who commented on our proposal to begin the process of disposing of five Council-owned properties was simple – just get on with it. 1156 submitters provided feedback on beginning the process of disposing of five council owned properties, 57% of these submitters supported moving forward, 12% opposed, 21% provided alternative suggestions and 9% made general comments.

Those who were in support agreed that if they were surplus to requirement, then it made sense to get rid of them, particularly if it will help to ease the financial pressure that the Council is facing in the coming years. Those who opposed beginning the process to dispose of these properties generally tended to oppose the sale of Council land and assets. They felt that we should be retaining these properties for future use.

In some instances, submitters indicated that they would prefer we used this land for growing the city's tree canopy, providing more social or affordable housing, or creating community focused spaces such as food forests and shared gardens. The sale of the land at 26 Waipara Street was a concern for some, who view it as an important potential future link between Cracroft and a shared path along Cashmere Stream.

Disposal of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties

1128 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to dispose of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties, 58% of submitters who provided feedback supported us moving forward with this process. They were supportive of the Council finding ways to reduce the pressure on our finances in coming years.

Those who did not support us beginning the process of disposing of these properties either outright opposed the sale of Council land and assets, believing that we should retain it for a future use, or expressed concerns about the sale of red zoned land. For some, the rights of former red zone property owners were of concern, with submitters wanting to see the land first offered to its previous owners, and if the land was sold the history of the earthquakes and their displacement

acknowledged. Others wanted to see any sale of the land include conditions around responsible development, environmental protection, and community consultation. Some submitters advocated for ecological reserves or green spaces rather than commercial development. There were suggestions by some submitters that Port Hills red-zoned properties should be replanted with native and/or fire-resistant plantings. In some cases, submitters were concerned about the liability associated with the sale of red zone land.

Item 11

Attachment B

Our Proposed Operational Spending

We asked submitters whether they think that we were prioritising the right things within our proposed operational spending. 35% agreed that we've got it about right, while 39% thought that we needed to make some changes.

Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

Are we prioritising the right things?		
Total number of responses: 2,295		
Response	Count	%
Yes	811	35.34%
No	906	39.48%
Don't know	578	25.19%

School Strike for Climate

Are we prioritising the right things?			
Total number of responses: 2,337			
Response	Count		%
	CCC Form	School Strike	
Yes	811	8	35.04%
No	906	34	40.22%
Don't know	578	NA	24.73%

*School Strike for Climate Question: Are we prioritising the right things? (Don't know response option was removed).

Much of the feedback on our proposed operational spend was submitters reinforcing that they want to see us maintaining our current levels of service. In some instances, submitters simply highlighted the importance of maintaining services, while feedback from others told us that they would like us to look for other ways to cut costs that won't have an impact on the level of service we provide to our residents and communities. Finding efficiencies within the services and staff costs were commonly raised by these submitters.

There was a smaller cohort of submitters who suggested that we should be looking at cutting services to reduce costs, with many indicating that there are aspects of our proposed spend are wasteful. Others mentioned the process that Central Government agencies are currently going through to reduce costs and thought that the Council should be doing the same.

This sentiment was echoed by those who generally opposed our proposed opex spending, expressing opinions that the Council is wasting ratepayers' money, is inefficient, doesn't have a commercial mindset, and that staff salaries are too high. Others focused their feedback on specific services or programmes that they feel are wasteful.

On the other hand, those who supported our proposed opex spending were generally supportive of retaining our existing levels of service, others were pleased with our planned spend on specific purposes. In some instances, submitters pointed out that cutting services would have a disproportionate impact on those in our community who do not have the means to access these services elsewhere. The importance of maintenance was also highlighted by some submitters, particularly with respect to our physical assets such as libraries, parks, and rec and sport facilities.

Libraries

The important role of libraries and the level of appreciation that residents have for our library system was a common theme in feedback from submitters on our proposed operational spend. Many submitters highlighted the services and value that our libraries provide, and how important these are to them. Others noted the important social benefits libraries provide alongside the typical day to day library services. The common theme throughout feedback from these submitters was how much they value the libraries and how disappointed they would be if we were to reduce the level of service they provide.

Other submitters provided feedback that they thought we could take another look at opening hours for our libraries, with some suggesting that they probably don't need to be open seven days a week. In some instances, they pointed out the changing online environment, and whether libraries would be as important as the presence of the internet and 'online' world continues to grow. Annual membership fees or the addition of other new fees, including reintroducing fines for overdue items, were suggested by some submitters as a way to maintain our current libraries service while reducing the operating costs to ratepayers.

Transport

Many submitters provided feedback on aspects of our transport operational spending, the most prominent of these was feedback on our safe streets and neighbourhoods work programme.

Submitters were divided on the safer streets and neighbourhoods work. In some instances, submitters expressed that they feel it is wasteful spending and this is an area we could look at in terms of reducing spending, while other submitters highlighted the importance of the programme in making our streets safer for all users, requesting that we continue to invest in this work or invest even more in projects that support this.

Those who opposed work on the programme tended to feel that it was unnecessary and is making it harder for vehicle users to travel. In their view, we could save a significant amount of money by simply cutting the programme while making travel in the city easier. In many instances, these submitters were frustrated about the changes that have already been made to some of our streets, and do not want to see any more of these changes in other areas of the city. In some cases

submitters mentioned that slowing vehicles would equate to more transport emissions, which is the very opposite of what the Council is trying to achieve by providing transport choice.

Those who supported retaining the programme or asked us to accelerate or expand the programme highlighted their concern about speed associated safety hazards, and noted the difference it has made to the communities where speed lowering measures have already been implemented. Often this feedback went hand in hand with feedback about improving access to active and public transport, with many noting that making our streets safer is an important step in enabling more travel choice.

Community Grants and Funding

Many of the submissions that we received on the LTP were driven by proposed changes to, reductions in, or requests for additional community grants and funding. While the submissions often focused on different aspects of community grants and funding, these submitters were united in their desire to clearly communicate the importance of the community grants and funding that the Council provides.

The Arts Centre

We received 4158 submissions that addressed funding for the Arts Centre, through both our online form and the short form created by the Arts Centre. 99% of these submitters wanted council to provide support for the Arts Centre in the LTP. For the majority of these submitters, the omission of funding for the Arts Centre in the draft LTP was unacceptable. However, their submissions focused on the need to keep the Arts Centre open and thriving, as opposed to the mechanism for providing that support.

For many who live both in the city, and elsewhere in New Zealand, there are fond memories associated with the Arts Centre, whether it is an important milestone in their life such as a wedding, attending a concert or show, or attending university at the centre. Many submitters spoke of their memories of the Arts Centre and the value that the Arts Centre brings as a cultural asset, and the importance of the programmes that the Arts Centre runs.

Other submitters discussed the heritage value of the Arts Centre buildings, noting how unique they are, with some submitters saying they feel the Arts Centre is more iconic than the Cathedral. There was a feeling from many of these submitters that we have invested so much in restoring these buildings, that not providing the operational funding to keep the Arts Centre running would undermine all the investment in the restoration of the buildings.

The community aspect of the arts centre was raised by many submitters, who spoke of the Centre's ability to bring people together, foster community and connection, and the importance of it as a space for the arts community.

In some cases, submitters pointed out the financial risk to the Council if the Arts Centre Trust was to dissolve. They pointed out that the Council would be the most likely candidate for taking over the Centre, which would come with a large legal bill as well as ongoing operating costs more than what the trust are requesting.

A few submitters supported the move to remove funding for the Arts Centre from the LTP. These submitters tended to feel that the Arts Centre should be doing more to try and reduce their costs and overheads, and that there are revenue opportunities available to the Arts Centre that are not currently being taken up.

Orana Park

1013 submitters provided feedback on funding for Orana Park, 98% of these were in support of the Council providing the funding requested to help Orana Park. Submitters voiced a view that Orana Park is a crucial asset for tourism, conservation and education in Christchurch, urging the Council to protect this work and the animals in their care. Many spoke of their fond memories of visiting Orana Park when they were children and with their children and grandchildren. Several emphasised the economic and educational value Orana Park brings to the city, with specific mentions of its contributions to tourism, conservation breeding programs, and wildlife advocacy. Submitters who raised the importance of the conservation work undertaken by the park want to see this continued, while others feel that we have an obligation to protect and look after the animals who live at Orana.

Regardless of why they want us to provide additional funding to the park, submitters were united in their call for the Council to provide additional funding to Orana Park, to ensure its ongoing sustainability and continued positive impact on the community. Some pointed out the support that other zoos across New Zealand receive from their local councils, noting that they would like to see Orana Park provided with a similar level of support.

Other Contestable Funds

Submitters provided a range of feedback on other contestable funds, most notably the sustainability and biodiversity fund. 50 submitters provided feedback on other contestable funds (many of which were organisations), 63% of these submitters provided other ideas or requested alternatives.

Several submitters told us throughout their submissions that they don't think we are doing enough to support biodiversity, ecological restoration and sustainability, and called for us to maintain the biodiversity and sustainability funds and the environmental partnership fund. In some instances, they thought that we should increase the level of funding provided through these funds. Groups and organisations who currently receive funding from these funds spoke of the work it enables them to do, and the difference this work is making. Many feel that if these funds are removed, it will jeopardise the progress being made, and we will go backwards.

Screen Canterbury Grant

A number of submitters provided feedback on the Screen Canterbury grant, pointing out the value this has brought to the city and the screen industry, and asking the Council to reinstate the \$1.5 million grant. Submitters highlighted that the \$1.5 million grant had returned \$12.5 million for the city. These submitters pointed out that our community outcomes point towards us wanting to

become a cultural powerhouse but feel that not including the Screen Canterbury grant in the LTP is actively working against achieving this outcome.

Anglican Cathedral Funding

Feedback from the vast majority of submitters who commented on further funding for the Anglican Cathedral was clear - they do not want to see the Council or ratepayers provide any further funding to the Cathedral restoration project. Many of these submitters indicated that they would rather see the money invested in supporting the Arts Centre, which they feel is more iconic. In a number of instances these submitters noted that they didn't support the initial \$10 million of funding that the Council provided for the Cathedral project and expressed their opposition to any further funding being provided. Many thought that it was appropriate that the church find the additional funding required to complete the project.

A small number of submitters indicated support for additional funding for the project, with many saying we've invested so much in it already that the project must be completed.

Resource Recovery

365 submitters provided feedback on our operational spend on resource recovery. A number of these submitters requested that we extend the service we currently provide, many of which were focused on ways that we can build more sustainable practises into the service.

Submitters called for more focus on waste reduction, including education programmes to support this, promoting reuse and repair, incentivising responsible demolition, and adopting more environmentally friendly disposal methods. Many submitters wanted us to introduce additional services that would enable more materials to be recycled or reused, instead of going to landfill.

Others highlighted their disappointment about the recent national standards implemented by the Government, pointing out that they feel it has made the service worse not better. They are disappointed that material that would have previously been recycled or composted is now going to landfill, which feels like a step backwards instead of a step forwards.

Resourcing

In a number of cases, submitters felt that optimising spending on staff and reducing the number of staff would be a quick and easy way to reduce Council spending. There was strong sentiment from some submitters that salaries need to be reduced, and we need to focus resourcing on 'the basics'. Other submitters indicated that they feel that there is excessive bureaucracy and inefficiencies within the Council. Generally, the issues raised by these submitters reflected a desire for responsible financial management and to see the Council deliver services efficiently, reducing unnecessary costs.

Other submitters expressed their support, gratitude and appreciation for the work that Council staff do.

Our Proposed Capital Spending

We asked submitters whether they think we are prioritising the right things in our capital programme and spending. 38% told us they think we've got it about right, 43% told us that we aren't prioritising the right things and 18% didn't know.

Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

Are we prioritising the right things?		
Total number of responses: 2,323		
Response	Count	%
Yes	886	38.14%
No	1010	43.48%
Don't know	427	18.38%

School Strike for Climate

Are we prioritising the right things?			
Total number of responses: 2,366			
Response	Count		%
	CCC Form	School Strike	
Yes	811	9	34.65%
No	906	34	39.72%
Don't know	578	NA	24.42%

*School Strike for Climate Question: Are we prioritising the right things? (Don't know response option was removed).

Of the 443 general comments on our capital programme, 56% of them were submitters suggesting changes that they would like to see us make to the programme. Submitters talked about a range of changes they would like to see us make to the programme, which included more focus on specific services (transport and three waters were commonly mentioned), focusing on looking after what we've got before we add anything new or start other major capital projects, pausing capital projects until there is less pressure on the city's finances, or removing projects and programmes that they don't consider to be worthwhile.

14% of general comments were from submitters who supported the draft capital programme and think we've got it about right. These submitters highlighted the importance of maintaining what we've got and preparing for the future of the city.

13% were comments from those who opposed our proposed spending, which tended to either focus on a specific aspect of the programme or our general level of spending. Others didn't think we'd got the priorities right within the programme.

The remaining 17% of comments were general/other comments made by submitters.

Transport

Feedback on our proposed capital spend on transport reinforced that one person's 'must have' is another person's 'nice to have, and highlights the challenge that the Council must grapple with in terms of balancing these different views and needs within our capital programme.

Cycleways

Submitters were extremely divided on our proposed spending on cycleways. Of the 906 submitters who provided feedback on cycleways, 22% generally supported our proposed spend on cycleways, 33% opposed our proposed spending and 39% provided other suggestions or want us to do something different to what we have proposed.

Most submitters who provided other suggestions or wanted to us to do something different were requesting that we invest more in or accelerate work on cycling infrastructure, both the major cycleways and local cycle connections. Many of these submitters were disappointed to see that this work had been delayed in the draft LTP, and wanted the previous timelines reinstated and funding brought forward. Submitters noted that this infrastructure is extremely important in providing transport choice, however many thought that we should explore alternative ways of delivering it that may be more cost effective. The Park Terrace cycleway was used as an example of a pragmatic, relatively low-cost solution, with submitters suggesting we explore whether this approach is a viable alternative in any other area of the city. Other submitters noted the need to provide safe infrastructure in all areas of the city to ensure equitable access to safe transport options.

On the other hand there were some submitters who thought that we should scale back and further delay cycling infrastructure to try and reduce costs and rates increases. In this instance they weren't suggesting that we should never make the investment, but they did think that it wasn't an essential right now so the investment could wait. A few mentioned that they feel the cycleways are 'over engineered' and did not provide benefits that are commensurate with the amount that we spend on them.

Submitters who opposed our proposed spend on cycleways tended to oppose outright the development of cycleways at all, considering them to be a waste of money and unnecessary. Some accused the Council of proceeding with cycleways despite feedback from local communities that they don't want them in their area. Wheels to Wings was the most common example of this. They tended to feel that the level of use they receive didn't warrant the level of investment proposed, and that they are generally a nuisance to other road users.

In contrast to this, the submitters who supported our proposed spend tended to view it as essential, and supported the investment to provide residents with more travel choice and to make

cycling safer. Many highlighted the environmental benefits, talking about the green, environmentally friendly city that they wanted to live in, and the contribution that an improved cycle network would make towards our goals of reducing transport emissions and meeting our emissions targets. In some instances these submitters noted that they were concerned that the Central Government Policy statement would put this investment in jeopardy.

Some submitters highlighted that we also need to invest more in end of journey infrastructure, particularly cycle parking.

Public Transport Infrastructure

Making public transport more accessible and easier to use was front of mind for many submitters. 371 submitters provided feedback on our proposed investment in public transport infrastructure. 33% supported our proposed spend, 8% opposed and 48% made other suggestions.

Those who supported our proposed investment and the majority of submitters who made other suggestions acknowledged the need to make public transport more accessible, quicker and easier to use, and highlighted its importance in the transport choice picture. In some instances, submitters wanted to see us bring planned work forward or ensure that work still happens in light of changing Central Government priorities, while others were focused on providing services to areas where there is currently poor access (areas in the Southwest of the city were raised most commonly). Many of the comments about transport choice went hand in hand with submitters commenting on the provision of cycling infrastructure.

Those who opposed our proposed spending on public transport tended to fall into two camps: submitters who thought that we were spending too much on roads and not enough on public and/or active transport; and those who thought any investment in public transport infrastructure would be a waste of money as it is underutilised.

Roads

458 submitters provided written feedback on our proposed spending on roads. Around 14% of these submitters supported our proposed investment in our roads, 30% opposed and 45% made other suggestions.

Those who made other suggestions tended to have opinions at very opposite ends of the spectrum. In some cases, submitters thought that the balance was out as it was placing too much priority on investing in roads and not enough on investing in active or public transport. On the other hand there were submitters who thought the balance was tipped too far towards active and public transport, and we should be investing more in our roads.

Those who think that the balance needs to be tipped towards less investment in our roads noted that along with the environmental benefits of shifting some of this investment towards active and public transport, there would also be benefits of reducing the number of cars on the road, which would in turn reduce the wear and tear on our roads and reduce maintenance costs in the long term.

Those who think that the balance needs to be tipped towards more investment in our roads urged us to get on with improving the quality of the road surfaces and making it easier for road users to travel in the city. In many instances these submitters were highlighting issues in specific parts of the city, many of which are in the east. Prioritising the work required on the Pages Road Bridge was raised by many of these submitters, who reinforced its importance as a lifeline connection for many who live in New Brighton.

Those who opposed the proposed investment in roads provided a range of opinions and reasons for opposing our proposed spend. In some instances, they raised their opposition to specific projects that they deem to be wasteful; speed cushions, roundabouts and the 'beautification' of our roads are some examples. Others objected to the amount we are proposing to invest in our roads, indicating that they thought it was too car centric.

Those who supported our proposed spend were pleased to see us investing our roads.

Three Waters

Many submitters noted the importance of investing in our three waters network, while others questioned why we are investing in three waters now that Central Government has indicated that they will be taking a different approach to water reform. The term 'three waters' is in some respects facing an identity/reputation challenge, with many strongly associating it with the previous Government's water reform programme.

Taumata Arowai Requirements

133 submitters provided feedback on Taumata Arowai/Central Government requirements. The majority of the feedback that we got on our water infrastructure related to removing the chlorine from our water and, on a smaller scale, not introducing fluoride. Feedback from these submitters was clear – undertake the work required to get the chlorine out of our water. Many reflected on the quality of our water prior to chlorination and want us to get back to that level of quality, while others reminded us of the previous promises and commitments made by Council in terms of getting Chlorine out of the water.

Parks

Sports Grounds & Facilities and the Sports Field Network Plan

We received many submissions urging us to bring forward our proposed investment in the city's sports parks and fields. 313 submitters provided feedback on the funding for the Sports Field Network Plan, particularly the staging of the funding. A further 88 comments were provided on other sports grounds and facilities.

Many of the submissions on the Sports Field Network Plan originated from the football community. They requested that the \$85.6 million set aside towards the end of the 10-year period of the LTP be brought forward, enabling investment in establishing floodlit artificial playing turfs, and improving grass facilities. Many pointed out that the state of the current grass turfs was having an impact on

accessibility and playing time, and in some instances caused health and safety issues. Others noted that the facilities currently available was limiting development opportunities for players. Regardless of why they wanted the investment brought forward, they were united in their requests for better facilities to be provided sooner.

Of the further 89 submission points on sports grounds and facilities, 63% were submitters asking us to invest more in a range of sporting facilities, including a range of land-based turf and court facilities, as well as requests for additional canoe polo courts. As with the submissions on the Sports Field Network Plan, these submitters highlighted the importance of these facilities in supporting a range of sporting codes, enabling people to be more active, attracting events to the city and developing local athletes.

Tree Canopy

134 submitters commented on spending on the tree canopy. More than half (53%) of these comments supported investing more in growing the tree canopy across the city, highlighting how important it will be from an environmental perspective but also the impacts that it has on the look, feel, and liveability of our neighbourhoods. A further 34% of the comments were submitters putting forward alternative ideas, including accelerating the work, focusing on native, regenerative forests, and increasing the tree canopy in certain areas of the city.

Libraries

389 submitters commented on our proposed capital spend on libraries. 45% of these submitters supported our proposed capital spend on libraries, 19% opposed and 26% provided other ideas or suggestions.

Much of this feedback was focused on the number of facilities and the rebuild of the South Library. Submitters who opposed our investment in rebuilding this library questioned why so much needs to be spent on a rebuild when the current facility was still functioning. Those who supported the proposed investment in the rebuild highlighted the importance of this facility to the local community, and reinforced the need to replace the current facility with a new one that is fit for purpose and future proofed to continue providing the service that the community values so much for many years to come.

More generally, submitters were divided on whether we should be spending on any new or additional libraries. On one hand, submitters told us how much they value libraries, and supported investing more in our libraries network. On the other hand, submitters told us that they think we have too many libraries, and we don't need to invest any more in the network.

Te Kaha

542 submitters provided feedback on the investment we are making in Te Kaha. Around 52% of these submitters noted their opposition for the investment going into Te Kaha. Many acknowledged that it was too late to do anything about the spending but were disappointed that the level of spend required on Te Kaha meant that we were unable to make the level of investment

in areas that they saw as a higher priority. Many were disappointed that ratepayers were having to foot such a large bill for a facility that many wouldn't be able to access events at or weren't likely to attend events at, or in other instances were disappointed that so much was being spent on a facility to enable sports events, but cultural facilities were having to fight so hard for their survival.

Several submitters requested alternatives to our proposed spending on Te Kaha, many of which were submitters suggesting that funding should be sought from other parties to reduce the impact on Christchurch ratepayers. The most common suggestion was contributions from our neighbouring territorial authorities, however entities such as the Canterbury Rugby Union and the New Zealand Rugby Union were also mentioned by submitters.

Item 11

Attachment B

Released From Public Excluded

Event Bid Funding

We asked submitters whether they thought we should increase the level of bid funding, or leave it at the levels proposed in the draft LTP. 69% of submitters who indicated a preference said that they would prefer we left it at the levels proposed in the draft LTP, while 31% wanted us to increase the level of funding allocated to bidding for events.

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?		
Total number of responses: 1,934		
Response	Number	%
Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed.	1332	68.94%
Increase the bid funding.	600	31.6%

Comments from submitters who support leaving it at the levels proposed in the draft highlighted that many feel that now is not the time to be considering increasing the fund, which would further increase rates, putting more financial pressure on households. In some instances, these submitters suggested we revisit the proposal in a few years, when households are facing less financial pressure. There were concerns from others that the ratepayers fronting the cost for the additional bid funding won't be able to afford to attend the events, and the major benefactors would be the hospitality and retail sectors. Others questioned whether attracting more events really would be good for the city, citing environmental concerns (many using SailGP as an example), whether the economic benefits really are as good as stated, and whether the city has the infrastructure to support further large-scale events.

Of the 738 comments made by submitters on the additional bid funding, around 40% were submitters suggesting alternatives to our proposal. These tended to fit into two categories:

- Reducing the amount allocated to event bid funding in the LTP or removing it completely.
- Shifting the onus of funding any additional funding away from the ratepayer, instead suggesting that those who will benefit most from additional funding should contribute more.

Feedback from submitters who would like to see the event bid funding reduced or removed echoed the concerns discussed by those who support keeping the bid funding at the levels proposed in the draft LTP. Some submitters highlighted that they don't think that this should be a priority for Local Government or that it is a luxury, and that ratepayers shouldn't be subsidising attracting events to the city. Others felt that attracting events to the city should be the responsibility of those set to benefit the most from hosting them, with some submitters noting that they don't feel that they personally, or their household, get any benefit from the money invested in bringing these events to the city. Others felt that we have made our contribution in investing in the

facilities to attract these events, and now it should be over to the events industry to attract and host the events.

In some instances, submitters indicated that if we were to increase the level of event bid funding, they would like to see this done within the proposed rates envelope, making substitutions as opposed to adding it onto the proposed rates increase as an additional cost.

25% of submitters who provided a preference on increasing event bid funding supported increasing the level of funding proposed in the draft LTP. Many highlighted the economic benefits of attracting additional and bigger events to the city, while others focused on the need to make the most of the facilities that we are investing so much in providing. Many highlighted the vibrancy that events bring to the city, and discussed their desire to live in a vibrant, interesting city.

Item 11

Attachment B

Investing More in Adapting to Climate Change

We asked submitters whether they think we should bring forward an additional \$1.8 million currently proposed to commence in 2027/28, to accelerate our grasp of climate risks. 52% of the submitters who provided an answer to this question support bringing forward the \$1.8 million, 34% wanted us to maintain the status quo of the funding commencing in 2027/2028 and 15% didn't know.

Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

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?		
Total number of responses: 2,301		
Response	Count	%
Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.	1188	51.63%
No - don't bring \$1.8 million forward.	776	33.72%
Don't know - not sure if we should bring \$1.8 million forward.	337	14.65%

School Strike for Climate

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?			
Total number of responses: 2,353			
Response	Count		%
	CCC Form	School Strike	
Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.	1188	52	52.69%
No - don't bring \$1.8 million forward.	776	0	32.97%
Don't know - not sure if we should bring \$1.8 million forward.	337	NA	14.32%

*School Strike for Climate Question: Should the Council bring forward the \$1.8 million proposed for 2027/28 to accelerate how we address climate risks? (Don't know response option was removed).

We also asked submitters whether we should create a climate adaptation fund. 58% of submitters who provided an answer to this question supported establishing a climate adaptation fund, 28% opposed establishing a fund and 14% didn't know.

Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

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?		
Total number of responses: 2,288		
Response	Count	%
Yes - create a climate adaption fund.	1322	57.78%
No - don't create a climate adaption fund.	639	27.93%
Don't know - not sure if we should create a climate adaption fund.	327	14.29%

School Strike for Climate

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?			
Total number of responses: 2,339			
Response	Count		%
	CCC Form	School Strike	
Yes - create a climate adaption fund.	1322	51	58.70%
No - don't create a climate adaption fund.	639	0	27.31%
Don't know - not sure if we should create a climate adaption fund.	327	NA	13.98%

*School Strike for Climate Question: Should we create a Climate Resilience Fund? (Don't know response option was removed).

Much of the feedback we received on these two proposals urged the Council to take climate change and climate risk seriously, and do more to support mitigation, adaptation and prepare us for what the future may bring. 778 submitters commented on our climate proposals - 45% were comments in support of accelerating adaptation or creating a climate fund, 11% were comments opposing the proposal, 30% were submitters suggesting alternative ideas or proposals and 15% were general comments.

Submitters who expressed their support and many of those who suggested alternative proposals raised several issues.

Many raised the urgent need for climate action They want to see us take it seriously and commit to investing in climate resilience and adaptation. They raised the urgent need for this in areas like

New Brighton that are vulnerable to coastal hazards and sea-level rise. They called for accelerated action and funding for proactive action. They also stated that inaction now will most likely lead to bigger costs in the future, advocating for early investment in climate adaptation and mitigation to avoid future financial pressure.

In some instances they raised the potential opportunities that could come with investing in climate resilience, including an opportunity to attract residents, businesses, and new sectors to Christchurch. Action and investment is viewed as a chance for the city to lead the way in addressing climate change and creating a sustainable and attractive city. For many, investment in public and active transport and more intensive development went hand in hand with responding to climate change, taking climate action and developing Christchurch into a more resilient city.

Many young submitters emphasised the importance of community engagement and taking our residents and communities on the journey with us. They felt that we could do more to ensure that young people are included in the decision-making processes that will have a profound impact on their future.

Overall, there was a strong push from these submitters for the Council to prioritise climate change mitigation in our long-term planning, including investments in biodiversity, climate adaptation, and sustainable infrastructure. They felt that the focus should be on spending to prepare now rather than dealing with costly damage to our infrastructure and communities in the future.

On the other hand, there were also submitters who felt that we shouldn't be spending on climate change at all, or that it should wait until the city is under less financial pressure. In many instances they expressed strong opposition to additional spending on climate change initiatives, viewing any spending as a waste of money.

Others advocated for a focus on investing in essential infrastructure, suggesting that we should be focusing on a broader goal of resilience rather than attempting to change the climate.

There were also submitters who expressed scepticism about the effectiveness of climate change spending, instead emphasising the need for financial prudence and accountability from the Council.

Additional Savings & Efficiencies

We asked submitters whether there were any areas where they thought that we could find additional savings or efficiencies. 332 submitters provided us with feedback on this question.

In many instances submitters told us that our spending was wasteful, that we need to cut our costs, focus on the basics and find ways to reduce costs. However, when presented with the opportunity to provide feedback on areas where they think we could find savings and efficiencies, few were able to pinpoint specific examples.

Where submitters did provide feedback on specific areas, they often overlapped with projects, programmes, funding or services that other submitters had told us are very important, again reinforcing that one person's 'must have' is another person's 'nice to have'. Specific examples commonly mentioned by these submitters included climate change, cycleways, staff costs, Te Kaha, events, cuts to community funding and service cuts.

Yaldhurst Memorial Hall

1231 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to gift the Yaldhurst Memorial Hall to the Yaldhurst Rural Residents Association. The vast majority (79%) of submitters supported gifting the hall to the resident's association. Submitters generally thought that it was a good solution, particularly if it removed any onus on the council to or expectation that the Council will repair and restore the hall.

Around 11% of submitters provided alternative thoughts. Many of these submitters thought that we should look at selling the hall to the Resident's Association instead of gifting it. Others thought we should gift the hall but ensure there were protections in place to stop the Association selling the hall and land for a profit further down the track.

Appendix One: Summary of number of comments by category

Category	Sub Category	No. Of Submitters	Support	Oppose	Other	General Comments
Strategic Direction	Have we got the balance right?	1215	25%	44%	20%	11%
	Financial Strategy	24	8%	4%	63%	25%
	Infrastructure Strategy	43	24%	4%	58%	13%
	Community Outcomes & Strategic Priorities	537	25%	6%	47%	22%
	Performance Framework	50	25%	10%	37%	27%
	Our Treaty Relationships	49	22%	4%	59%	16%
	Climate Change	374	29%	13%	46%	11%
	Additional Savings & Efficiencies	332	0%	0%	0%	100%
	Other Policy Matters	49	10%	2%	57%	31%
Rates	Residential Rates	985	21%	30%	30%	20%
	Business Rates	56	9%	17%	62%	12%
	Remote Rural Rates	22	14%	27%	50%	9%
	Uniform Annual General Charge	9	0%	33%	67%	0%
	Rates Remissions	180	50%	12%	29%	9%
	City Vacant Differential	294	53%	3%	39%	5%
	Visitor Accommodation	363	77%	7%	10%	6%
	ECAN Rates	10	0%	0%	0%	100%
	Other	365	10%	4%	65%	21%
Revenue	Dividends	5	0%	0%	60%	40%
	Development Contributions	18	6%	0%	78%	17%
	Central Govt Grants & Funding	37	3%	0%	89%	8%
	Excess Water Charge	56	14%	5%	77%	4%
	Disposal of Council Owned Land	1156	57%	12%	21%	9%
	Disposal of Red Zoned Land	1128	58%	8%	25%	8%
	Other	52	4%	2%	83%	11%
Borrowing & Debt Management	Borrowing & Debt Management	75	9%	47%	31%	13%
	Rating for Renewals	4	25%	25%	50%	0%
Fees & Charges	Car Parking (Parks)	1088	30%	43%	19%	8%
	Venue Charges (Parks)	16	75%	13%	6%	6%
	Venue Charges (Libraries)	8	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Resource Consent Fees	15	73%	7%	13%	7%
	Building Consent Fees	17	47%	6%	18%	29%
	Libraries Charges	31	42%	6%	45%	6%
	Car Parking Fees (on-street & off-street parking)	225	22%	22%	44%	11%
	Community Halls & Spaces	11	64%	0%	36%	0%
	Other	161	16%	10%	60%	14%
Spending	Our Proposed Spending	625	12%	20%	46%	21%
	Te Kaha	542	5%	52%	25%	17%
	Capital Programme (General)	416	14%	12%	54%	19%
Grants & Funding	Strengthening Communities Fund	46	43%	9%	43%	4%
	Capital Endowment Fund	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
	Other Contestable Funds	50	16%	19%	63%	2%
	Events Ecosystem Funding	738	25%	26%	43%	6%
	ChristchurchNZ Funding (General)	96	13%	19%	54%	14%
	Funding for other CCOs	5	20%	40%	40%	0%
	Arts Centre Funding	4158	99%	0%	1%	0%
	Orana Park Funding	997	98%	1%	0%	1%
	Other Community Grants & Funding	99	33%	14%	46%	8%
	Requests for Additional Grants & Funding	115	1%	1%	97%	1%
	Other	87	7%	13%	65%	15%
	Other	87	7%	13%	65%	15%
Three Waters	Three Waters (Operations)	138	35%	16%	34%	15%
	Waste Water (Capital)	92	32%	23%	28%	17%
	Water Supply (Capital)	125	27%	7%	38%	28%
	Stormwater & Land Drainage (Capital)	152	30%	5%	52%	13%
	Waterways Quality & Compliance (Operations)	53	24%	4%	51%	22%
	Waste Water Treatment Plant (Insurance & Repairs)	44	16%	2%	41%	41%
	Taumata Arowai Requirements	133	7%	13%	65%	14%
	Other	130	17%	5%	39%	39%
Transport	Transport (Operations)	409	7%	27%	48%	18%
	Roads (Capital)	458	14%	30%	45%	11%
	Cycleways (Capital)	906	22%	33%	39%	6%

	Footpaths & Streetscapes (Capital)	190	27%	9%	55%	9%
	Public Transport Infrastructure (Capital)	371	33%	8%	48%	11%
	Carparking (Capital)	57	3%	12%	69%	16%
	Other	232	11%	10%	49%	30%
Resource Recovery	Resource Recovery (Operations)	348	23%	1%	55%	21%
	Resource Recovery (Capital)	150	53%	5%	28%	14%
	Ōtautahi Christchurch Regional Organics Processing Facility	32	44%	0%	53%	3%
Parks	Parks Maintenance	184	28%	7%	45%	20%
	Playgrounds & Play Equipment	42	20%	2%	73%	5%
	Sports Grounds & Facilities	88	23%	7%	63%	7%
	Parks Paths & Walkways	24	46%	4%	50%	0%
	Foreshore	84	32%	12%	44%	13%
	Biodiversity & Ecological Restoration	156	29%	6%	56%	9%
	Public Convenience	32	22%	0%	59%	19%
	Wharves & Jetties	20	20%	10%	45%	25%
	Heritage (Capital)	155	28%	20%	35%	17%
	Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Regeneration	68	35%	18%	40%	7%
	Other Red Zone Areas	23	17%	9%	65%	9%
	South New Brighton & Southshore Estuary Edge	28	36%	4%	46%	14%
	Tree Canopy	134	53%	2%	34%	11%
	Sports Field Network Plan	313	11%	20%	17%	53%
	Parks Spending (General)	256	42%	11%	39%	7%
	Other	245	12%	4%	54%	30%
Recreation, Sports & Events	Libraries (Operations)	636	32%	4%	32%	33%
	Libraries (Capital)	389	45%	19%	26%	10%
	Temporary Facility for South Library	22	45%	14%	27%	14%
	Community Facilities (Operations)	31	19%	0%	69%	13%
	Halls & Community Centres (Capital)	30	7%	0%	83%	10%
	Service Centres (Operational)	5	60%	0%	40%	0%
	Rec & Sport (Operations)	62	24%	5%	44%	27%
	Events	69	29%	14%	43%	13%
	Pools (Capital)	71	21%	15%	44%	20%
	Recreation Centres (Capital)	50	16%	16%	49%	20%
	Stadiums (Capital)	11	9%	18%	64%	9%
	Community Arts	97	38%	7%	45%	9%
Art Gallery & Museums	Art Gallery (Operations)	31	39%	0%	42%	18%
	Art Gallery (Capital)	26	50%	8%	38%	4%
	Museums (Operational)	18	50%	6%	28%	17%
	Museums (Capital)	16	44%	6%	38%	13%
Planning & Strategic Transport, Urban Design & Urban Regeneration	City Planning	208	5%	4%	57%	34%
	Population, Household & Business Growth	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
	Strategic Transport	301	12%	3%	43%	43%
	Coastal Hazards Adaptation & Adaptation Planning	76	30%	8%	46%	16%
	Urban Design	19	11%	0%	58%	32%
	Urban Regeneration	40	16%	2%	56%	26%
	Heritage (Strategic)	21	24%	5%	29%	43%
	Greater Christchurch Issues	8	13%	0%	38%	50%
Other/Special Interest Topics	Creating a Climate Fund	778	45%	11%	30%	15%
	Vertical Capital	25	20%	20%	32%	28%
	Social Housing	59	14%	12%	63%	12%
	Yaldhurst Memorial Hall	1231	79%	4%	11%	6%
	Asset Sales	69	33%	25%	35%	7%
	Tarras Airport	43	0%	57%	23%	20%
	Commonwealth Games	50	6%	79%	4%	12%
	New Brighton Suburban Master Plans / Oram Avenue	29	45%	3%	31%	21%
	Civil Defence and Emergency Management	23	12%	0%	76%	12%
	Public Transport	241	7%	3%	70%	20%
	Cathedral	217	12%	53%	11%	24%
	LTP Consultation	152	12%	6%	34%	48%
	Engagement & Communications (General)	59	0%	5%	55%	40%
	CCHL Matters	34	3%	0%	56%	42%
	Governance	153	0%	0%	0%	100%
	Staff Matters	288	0%	0%	0%	100%

Appendix Two: Summary of Key Issues by Community Board

Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū Banks Peninsula Community Board

Key topics and projects	What the community told us
More investment in adapting to climate change	There was a sense by many submitters that Banks Peninsula communities are particularly vulnerable to climate change and there was strong support for Council accelerating and investing in climate change adaptation measures e.g. coastal hazard adaptation plans, strengthening sea walls.
Biodiversity and ecological restoration	<p>There was strong support for restoration of plantings and a general appreciation of funding allocated in LTP, but there were some concerns that funding was insufficient or discontinued (e.g. Environmental Partnerships Fund) and a desire for sufficient Council resourcing.</p> <p>A wide range of benefits resulting from environmental restoration were mentioned, including reducing the impacts on Council infrastructure during adverse weather events.</p> <p>Other submitters felt there was insufficient mention of or funding towards pest control and other threats to native biodiversity, including on CCC-owned land.</p>
Capital spend on roading and Council infrastructure	<p>There was a sense that there is a lack of maintenance and capital spend on Banks Peninsula roads and other vulnerable infrastructure, as they're not considered a priority due to the low numbers travelling on them or using them.</p> <p>Some submitters feel that the LTP is too city-centric and many anticipated projects have been omitted from the draft plan e.g. Wainui slipway.</p>
Wharves and jetties	<p>There were mixed views about the Akaroa wharf project, with some submitters believing the cost is too high and asking whether it is feasible and even resilient to future events. Other submitters were supportive of the investment.</p> <p>It was noted that there were other wharves and jetties in need of urgent maintenance. The Governors Bay community was seeking funds towards reducing the balance of its community loan in regards to the jetty repair.</p>

Sail GP and Naval Point	<p>Sail GP event was contentious. Some submitters were supportive of hosting the event, citing wider economic and social benefit benefits. Other submitters were against the event mainly due to the cost of bidding/hosting, the environmental risks and impact on marine life, and thought the economic benefits were overstated and/or confined to certain business interests.</p> <p>There were mixed views about the Naval Point development and its cost, with some submitters discussing its need in relation to the future hosting of SailGP.</p>
Stormwater management	There is ongoing concern about sediment and contaminant flow into streams and the harbours, with general support for spending on erosion and sediment projects, although some submitters want more done to address concerns.
Wastewater projects	Submitters were concerned about wastewater issues, particularly the Akaroa Harbour wastewater project in regards to the cost, design, feasibility and potential overflows into the harbour. Alternative proposals were suggested, along with calls to pause the project while more work is done exploring options.
Civil defence and emergency management	Some submitters noted the self reliance of peninsula communities during adverse weather events, and requested funds supporting communication options and community preparedness and resilience. Other submitters recognised the isolated nature of the peninsula and its vulnerable infrastructure, such as the Fire service requesting resources allocated to constructing water ponds for emergency use.
District planning matters	A small number of submitters objected to the current Lyttelton Port noise overlays, telling us it was restricting development and requesting changes to district plan rules.
What the community board told us	
Investing More in Adapting to Climate Change	The board believes a climate resilience fund is imperative and that adaptation proposals (including the Coastal Hazards programme) should be extended throughout the peninsula and brought forward – and potentially affected communities (and infrastructure) identified and prioritised.
Biodiversity funding	The board requests the retention of all funds relevant to pest management, and continue to be accessible to the community. It supports the Biodiversity fund and proposed increase.
Additional savings and efficiencies	The board believes savings can be made on repairs & maintenance and capital programme works within the board area by using peninsula-based contractors. This would result in savings as well as increased responsiveness times for immediate issues.
Roading	The board advocates that peninsula rural roads are given a higher priority within the Council's minor safety works programme.
Parks and green spaces	The board supports 15 Reserve Committees within the board area. There is concern there appears to be nil funding for these committees (Regional Parks) past FY25/26 and seeks reassurance that there is funding beyond this period.
Three waters	The board is supportive of water supply infrastructure projects, but would like the Duvauchelle membrane filtration project brought forward.
Heritage	The board supports maintaining and continuing support of the historical aspects of the board e.g. Takapūneke Reserve, museums.

Additional funding

Specific projects mentioned include: funding for the Pigeon Bay seawall; addressing flooding in Port Levy and Little River; a plan for the reduction of heavy metals into Council infrastructure; incorporating energy efficiency into all Council facilities; and a destination management plan for the area and promotion of regenerative tourism.

Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Board

Key topics and projects	What the community told us
Organics processing plant	The ongoing impact of the organics processing plant on the Bromley community was noted by several submitters, and there was widespread support for its relocation to Hornby.
Wastewater treatment plant	Similarly, the impact of the wastewater treatment plant on Bromley residents was noted, with support for repairs/replacement being carried out without delay.
Ōtākaro-Avon cycle routes	There was general support for the Ōtākaro-Avon cycle routes being implemented without delay, and in some instances brought forward. A small number of submitters were opposed. There were suggestions that the cycle network could be incorporated into the red zone. Some submitters noted the east was poorly served by the cycle network.
Future use of red zone land	Many comments were made regarding the future use of red zone land in general, especially in regards to planting with natives and/or use as a food producing area. Other suggested uses centred around recreational, nature and community purposes.
Pages Road bridge renewal	There was widespread support for the planned improvements and without delay, regardless of government funding. The bridge was recognised as an essential access route for the community, particularly for evacuation purposes. A few submitters did not see the need for this bridge or felt it was too expensive.
New Brighton mall upgrade	There was strong support by submitters for the New Brighton mall upgrade and the associated Oram Ave extension (which is seen as an important part of the area's regeneration). Submitters felt it was long overdue.
More investment in adapting to climate change	There was general support for adapting to and accelerating climate change resilience measures, which was widely viewed as building resilience for some of the city's most vulnerable communities (due to the proximity to the coast).
Road safety improvements	There was strong support for safety improvements at the intersections of Aldwins/Ensors/Ferry Roads and Aldwins/Buckleys/Linwood Roads, commonly mentioned in relation to Te Aratai College. This included a mini-proforma from around a dozen submitters relating to the installation of safe speed platforms to slow people down. Other safety and pedestrian improvements near schools were supported or suggested.

Neglect of the east	There continues to be submitters who tell us that there is ongoing neglect of the east by the Council in terms of investment in infrastructure, maintenance and services e.g. condition of roads, earthquake repairs.
Southshore estuary edge	Submitters were generally supportive of proposed spending here, although many viewed it as urgently required due to ongoing erosion, with some suggesting that timelines should be brought forward.
Biodiversity and ecological restoration	There was sense from some submitters that biodiversity work needs to be appropriately resourced. Some submitters had concerns about the lack of plantings on and erosion of dunes, and thought further pest eradication was required along the dunes and coastline, including the estuary.
What the community board told us	
Capital programme deferral	The board accepts that the Council is in a difficult position due to Te Kaha and debt servicing. It proposes deferring some non-urgent capital projects to fund more renewals from rates (or to increase rates).
Top five board priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages Road bridge (mentioned above) • New Brighton Mall upgrade (mentioned above) • Southshore Estuary Edge (mentioned above) • Wastewater Treatment Plant renewal (mentioned above) • Marshland Hall Trust (mentioned below)
Marshland Hall	The board supports the funding required for the Marshland Hall Trust community facility business case and these should be included within LTP allocations.
Vacant land differential	The board supports the extension of the vacant land differential to include New Brighton, along with additional measures to encourage development.
Coastal hazards adaptation and emergency response planning	<p>The board notes the urgent need for integrated coastal hazards adaptation and emergency response planning, with additional funding sought. The board notes that along with Banks Peninsula communities, residents of this board will be most affected by sea level rise and tsunami events.</p> <p>While the board supports the upgrade of the Tsunami Warning System, it seeks funding to complete an evacuation plan, a response plan, and supporting community preparedness.</p>

Level of service increase in village areas	The board would like to see level of service increase in the Woolston, Queenspark and New Brighton village areas e.g. increased rubbish removal, weeding, infrastructure maintenance, back-flow valve maintenance, and improved beach access and tracks. It also notes there should be adequate funding to maintain the sand dunes at a low enough level in front of He Puna Taimoana: New Brighton hot pools.
Social housing	The board would like the amount of social housing in the east to increase to pre-quake levels (adjusted for population change).
Transport safety improvement	Specific transport safety improvement projects mentioned include: Ōtākaro-Avon cycle route tying into Aranui Streets for People; Burwood/Mairehau Roads intersection and corridor improvements; funding for Bromley roads and North Linwood streets; and street renewals and improvements (Hay Street, Ruru Road, Bower Ave, Maces Road, Wyon Street and Hulbert Street).
Recreation enhancement	The board wishes to ensure that funding for playground renewals is adequate for true like-for-like replacements. Specific recreation enhancement projects mentioned include: QEII Master Plan and accessible toilet/changing facilities; Burwood Park cricket facilities renewal; athletic track upgrade at Rawhiti domain; car park renewals at South Brighton Community Centre and Cockayne Reserve; and North Ramp retaining walls.
Three waters	Stormwater and flood management projects and funding remain of importance to the board, with a request for no reductions within the board area. Spencer Park was mentioned as an area that needs remediation. Other three waters projects mentioned include: Waitaki Storm Basin; Pūharakekenui - Styx Waterway Detention & Treatment Facilities; investigation of stop-banks for Spencerville through to Brooklands; funding for the Bexley Landfill remediation being brought forward; and Cygnet Street Pipeline as a separate line item.

Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board

Key topics and projects	What the community told us
Wheels to Wings cycleway	<p>Wheels to Wings cycleway remains very divisive due to the cost and its potential impact on other road users, as well as the impact on local residents and businesses. Harewood Road is seen by many submitters as an already busy road requiring two lanes in each direction, and no loss of on-street parking.</p> <p>Other submitters told us that there was an urgency for this cycleway to proceed and that alternative routes are not suitable. Some submitters suggested alternative routes for the cycleways (e.g. Wairakei Road, Sawyers Arms Road), or changes to the proposed timeframes.</p>
Memorial Avenue cycle lanes project	The Memorial Avenue cycle lanes project was requested by several submitters to be brought forward and completed by 2025 as the current state is not considered safe, especially for school students.
Sawyers Arms/Greers Road/Northcote Road intersection improvement	There was concern from some submitters that the Sawyers Arms/Greers Road/Northcote Road intersection improvement project has been removed from the draft LTP. This intersection is viewed as dangerous and dysfunctional, and improvements have been promised to the community for a number of years.
Lights at Harewood/Breens/Gardiners Roads	The continues to be requests from the community for traffic lights to be installed at Harewood/Breens/Gardiners Roads, including right turn arrows. Submitters told us this is a dangerous intersection and that lights would improve road safety.
Nunweek Park facility upgrades	<p>Many users of Nunweek sports park (including pro-forma from a range of sports) requested further investment from the council, including an upgrade to the toilet and changing room facilities, and improved drainage to sports surfaces.</p> <p>It was noted by many submitters that the northwest of Christchurch is lacking in sufficient sports fields and pitches/surfaces, and require facility upgrades.</p>
Orana Park funding	There was overwhelming support for Council to provide ongoing funding to support Orana Park's operations as it is considered a key asset and attraction for the city, and it was noted that other large Councils around the country financially support their zoos.
	What the community board told us
Borrowing & Debt Management	The board expresses concern about the Council's plan to fund its capital programme through debt, which is thought to be unsustainable. A staged phase approach to delivering the capital programme was suggested.

Additional savings	The board requests that the Council prioritise conducting a thorough levels of service review to ensure that operational spending is optimised. This includes reviewing the opening hours of some Council facilities. The board is uncomfortable with the consultation process around proposed car parking charges, when other cost-saving options were not presented to the public.
Disposal of Council-owned properties	The board supports the disposal of these surplus properties, and suggests there are further opportunities for such sales to free up capital and reduce operating costs.
Intersection improvement project	The board is particularly concerned that the Sawyers Arms/Greens/Northcote Road intersection improvement project has been removed from the draft LTP (impacting aspects of the wider network), along with 13 other transport projects within the board. This is viewed as an essential project, with any delay resulting in inflated costs in the future.
Maintenance budgets	The board has concerns there are assets owned by Council with no associated maintenance budget. These are often features of subdivisions, e.g. sculptures throughout the Northwood area. The result is that residents are left with broken or deteriorating assets next to their homes which impacts public perceptions of Council.
More investment in adapting to climate change	While supportive of climate change investment, the board has concerns on the lack of clarity on how a dedicated climate fund would be established, managed, governed, and the criteria for its utilisation. It suggests a separate consultation and deliberation process for this. Similarly, although acknowledging that the Coastal Adaptation Planning Programme work is vital, the board submits that this needs to be balanced against the immediate needs of our residents. If brought forward, the board seeks confidence the outcome would be a greater return on investment than if we waited until 2027/28.
Bid funding	Before making any decision about increasing the bid funding, the board encourages the Council to seek advice on any cost-neutral options for making the city more attractive to event organisers, and seek cost efficiencies from existing events to free up more event bid budget for Te Kaha.

Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board

Key topics and projects	What the community told us
Proposed Organics Processing Plant	There was general support for this new facility in Hornby, but some concerns were expressed about whether offensive odours can be effectively contained without impacting local residents.
Yaldhurst Memorial Hall	The gifting of this hall was widely supported by the community but there were some concerns about the ability of the residents' association to be able to finance its repair and operating costs without requiring future Council support.
Cycleways	There was general support for cycleways projects (South Express, Northern Line, Quarryman's Trail, Little River) – some submitters state they are needed to provide greater safety to cyclists and to provide missing cycle links to other areas and need to be completed earlier than planned for. Others note that cycleway projects included in previous LTPs have been omitted from the draft LTP. Cycleways in this board do not appear to be as contentious as cycleways in other boards.
Dog Park	There was strong support for a new dog park in Halswell (or elsewhere in the southwest). Submitters told us there was a need for this, with various locations suggested (including Carrs Reserve, Ridder Reserve and the domain). Some thought funding and completion timeframes should be brought forward.
Transport safety projects	There was general support for the proposed Clyde, Riccarton and Wharenui Intersection Safety Improvements, while some submitters requested transport projects be reinstated to the LTP (e.g. Sockburn Roundabout Intersection Safety Improvement).
What the community board told us	
Intersection improvement projects	The board requests Awatea/Springs/Amyes Road Intersection Improvements be brought forward due to its long overdue status and population growth in the area. The board considers Waterloo/Gilberthorpes/Parker Street Intersection Improvement needs to be investigated as a priority.
Foothpaths	The board seeks additional funding for footpaths e.g. in Halswell, which is a community board plan priority.
Sockburn Park	The board requests provision for the revitalisation of Sockburn Park (an area lacking in greenspace), which is community board plan priority.

Dog Park	The board suggests that the investigation into a new dog park in southwest Christchurch is brought forward to 2025/26, aligning with the community board plan priority.
Wharenui Pool	The board requests investigation of Wharenui Pool refurbishment, due to population increase in Riccarton and the delays in Parakiore opening.
Rates increases and additional savings	The board suggests rates increases should be less than 10%. It is proposed that savings could be made at libraries by reviewing opening hours and revisiting fines for overdue items. The board suggests Council explores other options for revenue, such as reviewing options to increase the financial return to ratepayers of CCHL without selling the asset.
Three waters – Taumata Arowai requirements	The board is supportive of measures to remove chlorine from the city's water supply.

Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board

Key topics and projects	What the community told us
Transport operations in Central City	Transport issues in the central city were an issue raised by some submitters (e.g. light phasing, speed restrictions, cycleways) – with some feeling the Council makes it deliberately difficult to drive within the central city. Some submitters avoid travelling into the central city for this reason. Others were supportive of these changes and measures.
Te Aratai cycle connection	There was strong opposition to the pausing of the proposed cycleway project connecting Te Aratai College to other cycleways. Submitters told us that this should be prioritised as it would provide a more affordable and safer travel option for families, and result in less traffic congestion down Aldwins Road.
Cranford Street	Some submitters commented on the congestion, design and safety aspects of Cranford St, particularly relating to buses, cyclists and children using the road. There were requests for improvements to Flockton Street to counter the Downstream Effects of the Christchurch Northern Motorway
Te Kaha operations	Many submitters had concerns about operating costs, noise and transport issues once the multi-use arena is operational. Some suggested pausing any changes to surrounding roads until after the arena is completed and needs can be assessed.
Park Terrace cycleway	Some submitters told us they were dissatisfied with the effect that this cycleway has had on traffic flows along Park Terrace/Rolleston Ave and Kilmore Street, due to the removal of one lane and would like traffic lanes reinstated. Other submitters applauded this project for having positive outcomes for cyclists, and some used this project as an example of how segregated cycleways could be implemented across the city at a lower cost than others.
Arts Centre	There was overwhelming support for Council to contribute adequate funding towards the Arts Centre's operations, with many referring to its importance as a central city treasure, as well as the cultural and cultural benefits this centre brings to the city.
	What the community board told us
Community facilities and associated greenspaces	The board supports funding to be included and retained for the following community spaces and projects: Phillipstown Community Hub, Papanui Youth Facility and Shirley Community Reserve (with support for funding to be brought forward for the latter). The board would like clarity about the additional budget for the parks-funded component of these projects - with a suggestion that this is visible as a separate line item.
Grants and funding	The board supports the funding of community grants and community development initiatives that support the board's community priorities e.g. CPTED, Petrie Park revitalisation, community partnerships etc.

Three waters	The board is particularly supportive of the considerable proposed investment in the Three Waters, emphasising that failing to continue to upgrade our infrastructure would have unacceptable consequences.
Urban forest plan	The board highlights its support for the Ōtautahi-Christchurch Urban Forest Plan, noting the importance of replacing and improving tree cover.
Christchurch Northern Corridor DEMP	The board acknowledges issues affecting the transport network in Papanui and supports the budget retained in the Christchurch Northern Corridor downstream effects management plan (DEMP). Some submitters also commented on the congestion, design and safety aspects of Cranford St, particularly in regards to buses, cyclists and children using the road.
Intersection improvement project	The Board is concerned to see the Greers/Northcote/Sawyers Arms Intersection Safety Improvement project does not appear in the draft LTP, and advocates for its inclusion, understanding there to be relevant interconnectivity with the projects for the Greers/Langdons Traffic Lights and Northcote Road Corridor Improvement.
Northcote Road corridor	The board believes there is an urgent need relating to the Northcote Road corridor being investigated for improvement following increased traffic flows, and opposes any reduction or removal in funding for this project.
Other transport improvement projects	Other transport improvement projects mentioned include: advocating for pedestrian safety on the Springfield Road corridor; improving efficiency along Langdons Road corridor; and advocating for street renewal along Flockton Street.
Cycleways	<p>The board perceives the draft LTP appears to be retreating from what is proposed in the current LTP, with negative impacts on local network connections. The board supports active transport measures and would like aspects of the Northern Line cycleway brought forward (e.g. signalised crossings for Harewood and Langdons Roads).</p> <p>The board supports the Council's previous commitment to delivering the Wheels to Wings cycleway and submits that previous processes and decisions should be honoured.</p> <p>The board supports the greenway cycleway to link Richmond to the central city.</p>
Storm water management	Surface flooding remains an issue and board priority, and the board supports the proposed surface flooding reduction programme and supporting affected communities, including through investing in flood preparedness and response. The board requests prioritisation of MacFarlane Park, St Albans Park and Edgware Village. Other streets mentioned for mitigation include Francis Avenue, Emmett Street and Harris Crescent.

Central city shuttle trial	The board supports a trial of the Central City shuttle in order to make it easier for people to travel around the central city – it was also noted by other submitters that previously Council had supported this and that demand is there.
Fees and charges	The board reluctantly supports proposed changes to fees and charges, including applying charges at the Armagh Street carpark so long as it remains accessible for all.
Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor	The board supports the ecological restoration of the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor.
Climate change	Climate change remains a top priority for the board and it supports advance investment in adapting to climate change, which is relevant to the Climate Resilience Strategy.

Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board

Key topics and projects	What the community told us
Lincoln Road and Cashmere/Dyers/Colombo Roundabout safety improvements	There were mixed views about traffic calming measures, including raised platforms/ road cushions and roundabout work. Some submitters told us these traffic calming measures were unnecessary or excessive, and too expensive (e.g. the proposed roundabout at Dyers/Colombo/Cashmere and the completed Lincoln Road raised platforms. Other submitters supported the Council's work in this area.
South Library rebuild	There were mixed views from the community about this. Many submitters were supportive of the planned rebuild and were looking forward to having a new facility. Some submitters opposed this due to the cost and some questioned why a rebuild was required if it was still able to be used in its current state. Others told us the rebuild could be delayed by a number of years.
Port Hills plantings and red zone	Some submitters mentioned that pine trees were not suitable on the Port Hills or throughout the peninsula for ecological reasons as well as the potential fire risk. There were suggestions by some submitters that in particular, Port Hills red-zoned properties should be replanted with native and/or fire resistant plantings.
Ōpāwaho Heathcote River Corridor	Several submitters were supportive of capital spend management plans in terms of biodiversity and flood management, although concerns remain about the impact of residential development on the hill and associated silt entering waterways. Some submitters request maintained or increased funding towards ranger/ecological staff.
Ōpāwaho River Route cycleway	Many submitters requested that the timeframe for the completion of sections of this cycleway network is brought forward.
	What the community board told us
South Library rebuild	While the board supports the funding allocated to the rebuild, the board seeks additional funding to provide ongoing library services during the rebuild (\$400,000 for a temporary facility, and a minimum of \$150,000 for a mobile service and public programming).
Port Hills Plan	The board supports funding is retained for the Port Hills Plan and encourages board input into developing this plan – ecological restoration of the hills, and reducing fire risk (emergency preparedness is a board priority). It requests future funding for active land management to reduce fire risk, including strategic use of paper roads as fire breaks.

Pest management	The board requests sufficient operational spending for Pest Plant Management along the river, and requests improved coordination amongst Council departments to deliver better outcomes in this area. It supports greater involvement from community groups. The board seeks \$150,000 for a 10-year weed control strategy of Sycamore trees.
Grants and funding	The board requests Community Grants (especially Strengthening Communities) to be retained and increased in line with inflation and the living wage. It would also like the Sustainability Fund continued.
Urban Forest Plan	The board strongly supports the Urban Forest Plan and requests increased operational spending in this area e.g. mapping. The board would like to see it extend beyond parks to streets and waterways, with considerations around water management and the flow of water.
Parks and green space	Parks and facilities are a top priority for the board. At a high level, the board would like general investment and getting toilet facilities improved (e.g. Somerfield Park, Addington Park, Barrington Park, Rapaki Track, and Francis Reserve). Additional projects were mentioned for inclusion in the next LTP process (Hunter Terrace pump track/basketball court, Hoon Hay Park pavillion project, Addington Park refresh support, accessible access to Sumner Beach). The board requests that playground renewal programmes take into account the diverse needs of the community.
Land drainage	The board has concerns about the levels of service for land drainage in Hillsborough and along the Ōpāwaho Heathcote River catchment due to reduced spending on water programmes.
Cycleways	The board encourages the Council to prioritise projects that encourage residents to use active transport means safely (a key priority in the board plan). In particular, the board advocates bringing back the three MCRs: Southern Lights, Simeon St (build) and Ōpāwaho River Routes. The board would especially like to see the planning and engagement components of these projects undertaken so these projects are shovel ready when the immediate budget constraints have passed. The board also advocates that minor and local connector routes to be funded (e.g. Sparks Road/Westmorland - Princess Margaret Hospital)
Safer Speed Plan	The Board supports the continuation of the Support Safer Speed Plan – especially around schools and on the hills, as well as other minor safety improvement projects as they arise; supports the continued funding of the Safety and Ancillary Projects programme; advocates for the Te Aratai Cycle connection (noting it impacts students living in this board); requests the Innovating Streets projects and transitional projects have a planned pathway to permanence; and reinstatement of Disraeli/Harman/Selwyn Streets Intersection.
Selwyn Street Master Plan	The board supports the completion of the Selwyn Street Master Plan once the Brougham Street upgrade has been undertaken.



Red zone property disposal	The board proposes the removal of 32 Hillier Place from the list of red zone properties for disposal, as it was purchased using funds bequeathed only for social housing purposes, and additionally may be required for property access purposes. It also advocates that Raekura Place remains in Council ownership.
Waste operations	The Board would like to see the bin-lid clips in use city-wide (particularly in the Port Hills) and requests a programme is put in place to support this.

LTP24-34 Guidance from workshops to inform Mayor's Recommendations
As at 14 June 2024

Topic	Guidance
MR1: Accelerating Climate Adaptation	<p>MR1a: Agrees to increase by \$1.8 million OPEX funding for climate adaptation work from FY25/26 (Year 2 of the Long Term Plan).</p> <p>MR1b: Requests staff to report back on how the additional funding provided for climate adaptation work will be applied, in time for the 2025/26 Annual Plan process.</p>
MR2: Climate Resilience Fund	<p>MR2a: Agrees to establish a Climate Resilience Fund in FY25/26 (Year 2 of the Long Term Plan) noting that: MR2a(i): FY25/26 will have a rates increase of 0.25%, and this will increase by 0.25% for each year of the Long Term Plan until FY33/34 by which time the accumulated annual rates increase will equal 2.25%. MR2a(ii): The fund could be as high as \$127 million by FY33/34.</p> <p>MR2b: Requests staff to report back on the Climate Resilience Fund Terms of Reference regarding how the additional funding will be applied, in time for the 2025/26 Annual Plan process.</p>
MR3: Anglican Cathedral	<p>MR3: Requests staff to engage with Christ Church Cathedral Rebuild Limited (CCRL) and report back to the Council at regular intervals on the options being explored.</p>
MR4: Air Force Museum	<p>MR4: Agrees to consult during the 2025/26 Annual Plan on an option to provide up to \$5 million capital grant in FY27/28 (Year 4 of the Long Term Plan) for extension to the Air Force Museum.</p>

LTP24-34 Guidance from workshops to inform Mayor's Recommendations
As at 14 June 2024

Topic	Guidance
MR5: Yaldhurst Memorial Hall	<p>MR5a: As set out in the draft Long Term Plan, and in accordance with the previous Council decision on 24 January 2024 in relation to the Yaldhurst Memorial Hall at 524 Pound Road:</p> <p>MR5a(i): Agrees to proceed with the gifting the of the Yaldhurst Memorial Hall to the Yaldhurst Rural Residents' Association; and</p> <p>MR5a(ii): Agrees to give effect to the transfer of the building, agrees to lease the land at 524 Pound Road to the Yaldhurst Rural Residents' Association at a peppercorn rent (for a term of years to terminate if and when the Yaldhurst Rural Residents' Association return the building to Council ownership, or the building no longer exists).</p>
MR6: Shirley Community Centre	<p>MR6a: Agrees to bring forward the funding for the Shirley Community Centre as follows: MR6a(i): \$75,000 in FY24/25 (Year 1 of the Long Term Plan); MR6a(ii): \$800,000 in FY25/26 (Year 2 of the Long Term Plan); and MR6a(iii): \$2.83 million in FY26/27 (Year 3 of the Long Term Plan).</p> <p>MR6b: Agrees to provide \$40,000 of OPEX per annum from FY27/28 (Year 4 of the Long Term Plan) for the Shirley Community Centre.</p>
MR7: Sports Network Plan	<p>MR7: As set out in the draft Long Term Plan, confirms that \$85.6 million of CAPEX is budgeted over the term of the Long Term Plan for the Sports Network Plan.</p>
MR8: Temporary South Library	<p>MR8: As set out in the draft Long Term Plan, confirms that no further funding is required for the temporary South Library, and agrees to reprioritise South Library OPEX to increase services at Spreydon Library and enhanced mobile and outreach services for the duration of the rebuild programme.</p>

LTP24-34 Guidance from workshops to inform Mayor's Recommendations
As at 14 June 2024

Topic	Guidance
MR9: Akaroa Wastewater	MR9: As set out in the draft Long Term Plan, confirms that \$93.5 million is budgeted over the term of the Long Term Plan for the Akaroa Wastewater Scheme.
MR10: Disposal of Council Properties	MR10: As set out in the draft Long Term Plan, agrees to proceed with the proposal to dispose of Council properties (as listed in the draft Long Term Plan), noting that some variations may occur due to market conditions and timing of sales.
MR11: Rating for Renewals	MR11: Agrees to the partial deferral of increases of rating for renewals in FY24/25 and FY25/26 (Years 1 and 2 of the Long Term Plan), noting that the Council will meet the full cost for renewal or replacement of existing assets by 2032.
MR12: City Vacant Land Differential	MR12a: As set out in the draft Long Term plan, agrees to extend the Vacant Land Differential Rate to areas zoned Commercial Core in Linwood Village, New Brighton, and Sydenham. MR12b: As set out in the draft Long Term plan, agrees to extend the Vacant Land Differential Rate to areas zoned Commercial Banks Peninsula in Lyttelton.
MR13: Rating Visitor Accommodation in Residential as Business	MR13: As set out in the draft Long Term Plan, agrees that residential units used for un-hosted short-term accommodation for more than 60 nights per year will be charged the business differential rate.
MR14: Rate Remission for Charities	MR14: As set out in the draft Long Term Plan, agrees to simplify the wording of Remission Policy 1 and Remission Policy 2 to give more flexibility for granting remissions to charities.
MR15: Heritage targeted rate	MR15: As set out in the draft Long Term Plan, agrees to merge the heritage targeted rate into general rate.

LTP24-34 Guidance from workshops to inform Mayor's Recommendations
As at 14 June 2024

Topic	Guidance
MR16: Active Travel targeted rate	MR16: As set out in the draft Long Term Plan, agrees to merge the active travel targeted rate into uniform annual general charge.
MR17: Orana Park	MR17a: Agrees to provide the following funding to Orana Park: MR17a(i): \$240,000 from the Strengthening Communities Fund in FY24/25, FY25/26 and FY26/27. MR17a(ii): An additional \$260,000 from the Capital Endowment Fund in FY24/25, FY25/26 and FY26/27. MR17b: Notes that \$50,000 was funded from the Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board from Better Off funding in FY24/25 to conduct a business review for Orana Park.
MR18: Arts Centre	MR18a: Agrees to provide the following funding to the Arts Centre: MR18a(i): \$500,000 per annum for the life of the Long Term Plan (10 Years). MR18a(ii): \$250,000 from the Capital Endowment Fund in FY24/25 for restoration works. MR18a(iii): Notes the continuation of \$110,000 in FY24/25 and FY25/26 from the Strengthening Communities Fund. MR18b: Requests Council staff to work with the Arts Centre to develop a sustainable funding model and asset management plan, and report back in time for the 2027/37 Long Term Plan process.
MR19: Santa Parade	MR19a: Agrees to provide funding of \$125,000 per annum for 3 years (FY24/25, FY25/26 and FY26/27), from the Capital Endowment Fund to the Santa Parade, for organisational expenditure to support the Christmas parade. MR19b: Requests staff to review the funding provided to the Santa Parade after three years.
MR20: Hagley Parks parking	MR20: Agrees to the following parking charges for Hagley Park: MR20a(i): \$4.60 (incl GST) per three hours on weekdays, Monday to Friday, 8am-5pm. MR20a(ii): Free parking on weekends and public holidays.

LTP24-34 Guidance from workshops to inform Mayor's Recommendations
As at 14 June 2024

Topic	Guidance
MR21: Natural Environment staff resource	MR21: Agrees to provide an additional \$35,000 to support a new position to co-ordinate the natural environment actions across the organisation.
MR22: Biodiversity	MR22: Agrees to provide an additional \$100,000 per annum for 3 years for the Biodiversity Fund.
MR23: Environmental Partnership Fund	MR23a: Agrees to provide funding for the Environmental Partnership Fund as follows: MR23a(i): FY24/25 - A total of \$700,000, which includes \$250,000 from Better Off Funding, \$300,000 from the CEF and the remaining funded from rates. MR23a(ii): FY25/26 - A total of \$700,000, which includes \$250,000 from Better Off Funding, and the remaining funded from rates. MR23a(iii): From FY26/27 onwards – \$1 million per annum funded from rates.
MR24: Events funding	MR24a: Agrees to provide the following additional funding for events: MR24a(i): FY24/25 - \$1.2 million; MR24a(ii): FY25/26 - \$2.1 million; MR24a(iii): FY26/27 - \$2.7 million; and MR24a(iv): FY27/28 - \$0.4 million. MR24b: Requests staff to provide a report with advice on how the additional funding for events should be split.
MR25: GPS/Transport	MR25a: Agrees to proceed with the Transport Capital Programme as proposed in the draft Long Term Plan, subject to final New Zealand Transport Agency advice regarding funding. MR25b: Notes that staff will report back to the Council for a final decision on the Transport Programme and projects within the programme after New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) has advised the Council of its final funding outcomes in September or October 2024.

Christchurch City Council Long Term Plan 2024-34 - Management Sign-off

SIGN-OFF BY MANAGEMENT FOR THE 2024-34 LONG TERM PLAN PROCESS

Initial	Accountable person	Signed Off	Initial	Accountable person	Signed Off
CE	Chief Executive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCE	Head of Communications and Engagement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CFO	Chief Financial Officer / GM Finance, Risk & Performance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	H3W	Head of Three Waters	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HF	Head of Finance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HTW	Head of Transport and Waste	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GMCC	GM Citizens & Community	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HPC	Head of Planning and Consents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GMSPR	GM Strategy, Planning & Regulatory	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HRC	Head of Regulatory Compliance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GMCI	GM City Infrastructure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HBC	Acting Head of Building Consenting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GMCS	GM Corporate Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HPA	Acting Head of Parks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GFC	Group Financial Controller	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HRSE	Head of Recreation, Sports, and Events	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HLDS	General Counsel / Head of Legal & Democracy Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HLI	Head of Libraries and Information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HCPP	Head of Corporate Planning & Performance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DAG	Director Art Gallery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HSPR	Head of Strategic Policy & Resilience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOCE	Head of Office of Mayor and Chief Executive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HPMO	Acting Head of Programme Management Office	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FBP-CI	Finance Business Partner, City Infrastructure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FBP-CS/SPR	Finance Business Partner, Corporate Services/Strategy, Planning & Regulatory	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FBP-CC	Finance Business Partner, Citizens & Community	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
1. Financial Strategy and Infrastructure Strategy			
1.1. Does the financial strategy meet the purpose as defined in LGA 2002, section 101A(2)?		CE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1.2. Does the Long-Term Plan (LTP) comply with the financial strategy?		CE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1.3. Does the LTP comply with the Infrastructure Strategy?		CE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMSPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HSPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
1.4. Are the “stories” that the financial and infrastructure strategies tell consistent? Robust financial and infrastructure strategies cannot be developed in isolation from intended levels of service and the operational expenditure and capital expenditure programmes associated with these.		CE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMSPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HSPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Revenue and Financing Policy (RFP)			
2.1 Does the LTP include the revenue and financing policy as required by clause 10 of Schedule 10 of the LGA?		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.2 If not, have you planned a review of the RFP so that it is adopted before the LTP?	N/A -refer 2.1	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.			
	Refer all of Council FIS, p 20	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
3.1. Does your LTP contain a funding impact statement (FIS) for the whole of council? (LGA 2002, sch 10 cl 15 (2)/Financial Reporting Regulations 2014)		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.2. Does your FIS contain two components: 3.2.1. a financial statement as per 3.1 above 3.2.2. information about funding sources ("funding disclosure"). (LGA 2002, sch 10 cl 15(3))	Refer rating information – pages 20 – 21, 23 – 24	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.3. Does the whole-of-council FIS have a "nil" balance (Financial Reporting Regulations 2014)?		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.4. Does the funding disclosure contain details of each of the rates your local authority proposes to set and how these will be calculated (including specifying the relevant matters from Schedule Two and factors from Schedule Three of the Rating Act)?		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.5. Is the funding disclosure specified with enough particularity that ratepayers can, for example, determine whether they are liable for any particular rate and what differential categories they are in?		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.6. Does the funding disclosure include sample models of the impact of the rating proposals for the LTP?		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
3.7. Have sample models been included in the consultation document? (LGA 2002, s93C(2)(g))	Refer CD p 40	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HLDS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HCE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.8. Has the entire Funding Impact Statement, but especially the funding disclosure, been reviewed for legal compliance by someone conversant with the LGA 2002 and the Rating Act?		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HLDS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.9. Has the funding disclosure been checked for consistency with the RFP?		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.10. Is the funding disclosure complete (i.e., is every rate that your local authority proposes to set included)?		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
4. Financial Statements			
4.1. Does the LTP include forecast financial statements for each of the financial years covered by the plan? (LGA 2002, sch 10 cl 12)		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.2. Has the LTP included the financial statements for the year preceding the LTP? If yes, are these in the same format as the financial statements for the LTP? (LGA 2002, sch 10 cl 13).		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.3. Do all of the forecast financial statements comply with Generally Accepted Accounting Practice? (LGA 2002, s 111) + (Section 18 of part 2 of Schedule 10, of the LGA 2002) GAAP = applicable accounting standard = PBE FRS 42)		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GFC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.4. Has the LTP included the rating base disclosures? (LGA 2002, sch 10 cl 15A)	Refer FS – vol 2, page 15 Draft LTP	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.5. Has the LTP included a statement showing the objectives for reserves, the starting and end balance for reserves and any movements in reserves? (LGA 2002, sch 10 cl 16)		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.6. Have disclosures been made with respect to the Council's intended level of performance against the so-called fiscal benchmarks and indicators? (Financial Reporting Regulations 2014)?		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
4.7. Are the prospective financial statements in the LTP prepared in accordance with the appropriate financial reporting standards? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LGA 2002, Schedule 10, Section 12 – Forecast financial statements PBE FRS 42 		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GFC (Accounting Policies Only)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.8. Has review of required disclosures in the prospective financial statements been performed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LGA 2002, Schedule 10 	<p>Consider adding the following wording under the sub-heading 'Description of the nature of the entity's principal current operation and its principal activities: to restate what is at the top of the statement of significant accounting policies</p> <p>'The primary objective of the Council is to provide infrastructure and public services for the community for social benefit rather than making a financial return. Accordingly, the Council has designated itself and the Group as public benefit entities for financial reporting purposes.'</p> <p>Under purpose consider the wording: and the reference to Long Term Plan rather than annual report.</p> <p>It is a requirement of the Local Government Act 2002 to present prospective financial statements that span 10 years and include them within the Long Term Plan. This provides an opportunity for ratepayers and residents to review the projected</p>	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF (Consistent format)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GFC (Accounting Policies Only)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
	financial results and position of the Council. Prospective financial statements are revised annually to reflect updated assumptions and costs.		
5. Balanced Budget Statements			
5.1. Is the Council running a balanced budget in the LTP year? (LGA 2002, s 100)	The position has improved for financial years 24/25 and 25/26.	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.2. If there is an unbalanced budget does the LTP explain the reasons for the unbalanced budget, and the implications of the decision? (LGA 2002, s 10 cl 14)	Yes	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.3. Is running an unbalanced budget prudent? (NB: Assessing prudence will necessitate consideration of the impacts beyond the life of the plan)	Yes. Council agreed to extend the timeframe to reach a 100% funding for renewals position out to 2032.	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.4. Has the Council resolved to operate an unbalanced budget? (That resolution should ideally be made before adoption of the LTP.)		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.5. Has the necessary analysis been performed with respect to the levels of service and the financial impacts in order to provide the Council and the auditors with assurance that the unbalanced budget is prudent?		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
5.6. Are appropriate disclosures considered and / made in the LTP regarding the unbalanced budget?	AS detailed in the Financial Strategy.	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.7. Is an unbalanced budget an issue that warrants inclusion in the financial strategy?	Yes - it has been	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Forecasting Assumptions – See also Sign-off for Forecasting Assumptions where individual assumptions are signed off			
6.1. Has the LTP identified all of the significant forecasting assumptions and risks? (LGA 2002, sch 10 cl 17(a))	Should we have an assumption that the services and activities delivered by a council will remain largely unchanged along the lines of: The nature of Council’s activities and operations for the period of the Long Term Plan 2024-34 will be consistent with the activities and operations outline in the LTP Assumption 2.2 - Do we consider and document any change or not as required if we update the reference to the Reserve Bank’s August 2023 MPS? Assumption 3.4 - think we remove reference to local government review – this is not being progressed Assumption 4 – are we comfortable this risk is low given the discussion with S&Ps, [yes – change down	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
	<p>in credit rating = circa 5 basis points on interest cost = 0.05%]</p> <p>Assumption 5.3 - should it be CCO/CCFO - adding in 'CCO' [check reason]</p> <p>Assumption 7 – are we comfortable that we will be able to afford prudentially appropriate cover for the duration of the LTP, even if it is available to or we can self-insure, underwrite or mitigate the risk in some other way [yes – relates to material damage and not natural hazard/disaster damage, eg earthquake flooding etc, see assumption 7.2]</p>		
6.2. Has the LTP disclosed the useful life of significant assets and funding sources for the replacement of significant assets? (LGA 2002, sch 10 cl 17(b))		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GFC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.3. Are there any disconnects between the assumptions disclosed in this section and those disclosed in the infrastructure strategy and the financial strategy?	Aligned currently. ACFO	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
		GMSPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HSPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.4. Did management review the assumptions and their significance afresh, or did it “roll over” the assumptions from the draft LTP?		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.5. Has management checked economic assumptions with those others are making (e.g., what interest rates is management assuming compared to those of others)?	Yes, uses independent financial data used widely across the sector	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.6. Should Council undertake scenario modelling of the impact if significant assumptions fail to materialise or are significantly different from those you expected? For example, a local authority reliant on central government funding for a particular large project might consider whether it needs a “plan B”; a growth council might want to forecast different scenarios for the receipt of development contributions revenue.	Transport option re the delay in the Transport/NZTA GPS advice, have been considered by Council, and models in the LTP are based on best evidence/most likely outcomes	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.7. Does the LTP include the following (if not, should it)? 6.7.1. service level assumptions	Yes	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
		GMSPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.7.2. demand assumptions (note that this includes demand driven by population growth and change, economic growth, and transformation, and changing preferences)	Yes	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMSPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HCPP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.7.3. economic assumptions (interest rates both for council investments and council borrowing, investment/dividend flows from council assets, forecast changes in key costs.)	Yes	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Capital Expenditure			
7.1. Does the capital expenditure show the following detail for each group of activity? (LGA 2002, sch 10 cl 3) <ul style="list-style-type: none">amount to meet additional demandamount to improve levels of performanceamount to replace existing assets	Yes	CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HPMO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		FBP-CC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
		FBP-CI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		FBP-CS/SPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. Proposed changes to levels of service			
8.1. Do proposed changes to levels of service include significant or material differences from the content of the draft 2024-34 Long Term Plan (LGA 2002 Section 95 2A)	No	CE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HCPP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Statement of service provision			
9.1. Does the LTP include statement of levels of service provision (LGA 2002, sch 10 cl 4) that specifies: - (a) any performance measures specified in a rule made under section 261B for a group of activities described in clause 2(2); and (b) the performance measures that the local authority considers will enable the public to assess the level of service for major aspects of groups of activities for which performance measures have not been specified under paragraph (a); and (c) the performance target or targets set by the local authority for each performance measure; and (d) any intended changes to the level of service that was provided in the year before the first year covered by the plan and the reasons for the changes; and (e) the reason for any material changes to the cost of a service.		CE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HCPP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		CE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
9.2. Will the Council comply with PBE FRS 48 <i>Service Performance Reporting</i> if it reports against the prospective performance information in the LTP?		HCPP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Proposed Fees and Charges			
<p>10.1. Fees and charges schedules - have these been prepared in line with LGA 2002 Section 12 and LGA 2002 Section 150 or other relevant legislation (e.g., Dog Control Act 1996, Building Act 2004, Food Act 2014, etc.)</p> <p>NOTE: <i>Dog Registration fees section was included for adoption with Annual Plan 2023/24 on the basis proposed amendments were adopted initially with the draft Annual Plan. Usual business process is for Dog Registration fees (including changes) to be notified independently of the LTP/AP process, therefore not included:</i></p> <p><i>Dog Registration fees section is to be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>excluded from adoption and publication as part of any draft plan (AP or LTP)</i> <i>excluded from adoption of any final plan, but</i> <i>included in the publication of any final plan (based on changes adopted directly with Council under s37)</i> <p>First section as well as</p>		CE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		CFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMCI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		GMSPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		H3W	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HTW	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HPC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HRC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HBC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT	
		Person Responsible	Sign-Off
		HPA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HRSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HLI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		DAG	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HOCE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		FBP-CC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		FBP-CI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		FBP-CS/SPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Significance and Engagement Policy			
11.1. Does the special consultative procedure proposed used in adopting the 2024-34 LTP complied with the requirements of the LGA02 and the Council’s significance and engagement policy?		CE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HLDS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HCE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		HSPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Christchurch City Council Long Term Plan 2024-34 - Management Sign-off

SIGN-OFF BY MANAGEMENT FOR SIGNIFICANT FORECASTING ASSUMPTIONS IN THE 2024-34 LONG TERM PLAN

Initial	Accountable person	Signed Off	Initial	Accountable person	Signed Off
CFO	Chief Financial Officer / GM Finance, Risk & Performance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCPP	Head of Corporate Planning & Performance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GMSP R	GM Strategy, Planning & Regulatory	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HSPR	Head of Strategic Policy & Resilience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GMCC	GM Citizens & Community	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HPMO	Head of Programme Management Office	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GMCI	Acting GM City Infrastructure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	H3W	Acting Head of Three Waters	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GMCS	GM Corporate Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HTW	Head of Transport and Waste	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HF	Head of Finance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HPA	Acting Head of Parks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GT	Group Treasurer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCGP	Head of City Growth & Property	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GFC	Group Financial Controller	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MAMF	Acting Manager Asset Management & Facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HLDS	General Counsel / Head of Legal & Democracy Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FBP-CI	Finance Business Partner for City Infrastructure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

In preparing this Long-term Plan (LTP) it was necessary for Council to make a number of assumptions about the future. The following tables identify those forecasting assumptions which are significant in that if actual future events differ from the assumptions, it will result in material variances to this Plan. The table also identifies the risks that underlie those assumptions, the reason for that risk, and an estimate of the potential impact on the Plan if the assumption is not realised.

A number of assumptions have such a high level of uncertainty the financial impact of a change in the assumption is not able to be quantified. In these situations, a description of the impact has been provided.

AREA	COMMENT	Person accountable Signed-Off
Forecasting Assumptions		
	Yes	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AREA	COMMENT	Person accountable Signed-Off
Has management considered the level of uncertainty in each of the significant forecasting assumptions and risks?		HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Where levels of uncertainty are high then the LTP must disclose:		CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the fact of the uncertainty an estimate of the uncertainty on the financial estimate (Cl. 17, Sch. 10, LGA). 	<p>Assumption 3.2 - we should add the wording to the last financial impact '...with Waka Kotahi [update to New Zealand Transport Agency] funding availability and if funding for some work is less than budgeted this may mean some projects are deferred and do not progress within the forecast period'</p> <p>Assumption 3.7 - this can be removed as F4LG is unlikely to proceed in its proposed form under the current government.</p> <p>Assumption 6.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not sure i understand what is meant by 'or alternatively adjust the budget between services to free up additional funding', are meaning that we are transfer pricing between services or that we would seek a reduced scope to accommodate the funding - can we review the labour market assumption, the evidence, job market data, suggests this is easing and the market is not as constrained as previously, - in respect of the last sentence – is it budgetary adjustments or does it also include LoS being adjusted, what happens if it is part way through a year, how do we manage the community expectation and obligation to consult etc? 	HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
1. Capital Programme and infrastructure assets				
1.1 Capital Works. Programmes and projects are assumed to be delivered within budget and on time and to required quality specifications. The capital programme is generally managed within overall budget allocations requiring changes to programme or project budget to be found within available budgets. At a corporate level provision is made for delayed delivery by forecasting an annual capital budget carry forward based on historic delivery trends. There may also be some projects delivered ahead of forecast and these will be managed within borrowing allowances via bring backs.	If actual costs will vary from estimates, due to higher input prices and/or delivery delays, then this could result in budget shortfalls. However, Council has tendered significant work and estimates are based on the best available information. Delays could also be due to consenting and consultation requirements. See also 3.8 for Covid impact.	Moderate/ Low	To the extent possible Council staff seek to proactively manage the delivery of capital works, substituting projects within a programme where necessary. Those that are unable to be completed as planned in any year of the Long Term Plan may be carried forward. The implications of this are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> possible additional reactive opex; not all delays lead to additional costs. possible reduction in opex if the delay relates to a new facility projects may cost more than planned due to inflation. less funds will need to be borrowed in the short term. Delaying new borrowing will impact on the timing of financing costs. possible reduction to levels of service Any inflationary increase in Council's costs that is not offset by efficiency gains or revenue is likely to impact the timing of future works or increase borrowing, or lead to a reduced scope of work to be completed within the allocated budget. 	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1.2 Sources of funds for replacing assets. The sources of funds will occur as projected.	If funding does not occur as projected, then borrowing is required.	Low	If required, Council is well placed to borrow funds as required and remain within its LGFA benchmarks. The impact to ratepayers of every \$10 million of additional borrowing for capital works is	HPMO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
			approximately 0.1% increase to rates spread over two years. This increase accounts for the interest cost and repayment of the borrowing over 30 years.	GMCI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GMCS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1.3 Asset life. Useful life of assets is as recorded in asset management systems and plans or based upon professional advice (the Accounting Policies detail the useful lives by asset class)	If the useful life of an asset/s is significantly shorter than expected, then the asset will need to be replaced sooner than planned and budgeted for. If the useful life of an asset is longer than expected, then the asset may be replaced sooner than required resulting in a loss of economic life and a consequential higher cost of service.	Moderate	Council maintains its databases with the latest known condition information. However, piped networks are below ground making asset condition more difficult to assess reliably. Ideally assets are replaced just in time. Earlier replacement would put more pressure on the Council's capital programme, financing costs and rates requirement. Late replacement can lead to more expensive replacement costs plus generally greater impacts on the operational costs, community, and the environment.	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HTW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				H3W <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HPA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HCGP (Housing) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				MAMF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
1.4 Carrying value of assets. The opening statement of financial position reflects the correct asset values. The carrying value of assets are revalued on a regular basis	If asset revaluations differ to that planned and change projected carrying values of assets, depreciation expense and certain ratios may be impacted.	Low	Land and buildings were independently revalued as of 30 June 2022, using market value where appropriate. Wastewater, water supply and stormwater assets, were independently revalued as of 30 June 2023. Roading assets were independently revalued as of 30 June 2022. The valuation of the Council’s facilities and infrastructure assets at optimum depreciated replacement cost involves a significant amount of judgement in estimating the replacement unit cost, asset condition (for underground assets) and the remaining useful life of the assets. Note: That the asset values of three waters, roads and footpaths assets include additions (at cost less depreciation) and disposals since the last valuation.	CFO ☑
				HF ☑
				GFC ☑
2. Inflation. Growth and Population				
2.1 Inflation. The price level changes projected will occur. Council has considered both information provided by Business Economic Research Limited (BERL) to all local authorities and a weighted mix of its own cost inputs in determining appropriate	If inflation is materially higher or lower than anticipated, then the Council will have a revenue shortfall or surplus relative to its planned work programme.	Moderate	Short-term impacts will be managed by managing costs to budget without impacting levels of service where possible. If increased costs and/ or reduced revenue negatively impacts on the	CFO ☑
				HF ☑

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off					
<p>inflators. It also receives external advice on forecast future salary movements.</p> <p>Where specific contractual or determined increases are not identified Council has used an inflation assumption of 4.2% for operational costs for the 2024/25 plan.</p>	<p>If inflation on costs is not offset by inflation on revenues, then the Council will have a revenue shortfall relative to affected planned work programmes.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Council's balance sheet it could lead the Council to decide to borrow more, increase rates and or fees and charges, or reduce service/ project delivery or a combination of all the above.</p> <p>However, these risks are considered to be unlikely to eventuate to a significant degree within a single rating year. Any decision to significantly cut services or increase debt would be more likely to be addressed in a future Annual Plan or Long Term Plan.</p>						
<p>Different forecast inflation figures for capital and operational items are used in developing the plan due to the differing mix of cost inputs in each.</p>									
	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34
Capital	3.4%	2.3%	2.4%	2.4%	2.2%	2.2%	2.1%	2.0%	2.0%
Opex	2.9%	2.2%	2.3%	2.3%	2.2%	2.1%	2.0%	2.0%	1.9%

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
<p>2.2 Economic Environment. This Plan assumes that the economic environment develops broadly in line with the Reserve Bank of New Zealand's Monetary Policy Statement of May 2024, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic growth to remain slow in 2024 as tighter monetary policy dampens demand to more sustainable levels, with recovery in calendar 2025. Annual consumer price index inflation to continue its decline from a peak of 7.3% (Jun-22) and current level of 4.0% (Mar-24), to be within the 1%-3% target band by Dec-24. Interest rates to remain around current high levels over the 24 calendar year, with a slow reduction in the Official Cash Rate not expected until 2025. Employment to slow to more sustainable levels as the economy slows, with unemployment rising from its trough of 3.2% (Mar-22) and current level of 4.3% (Mar-24), to be 5.1% by Jun-25. <p>Council has prepared this Plan on the assumption that inflation and interest rates will progress broadly in line with these projections – see assumptions for both.</p>	<p>If unexpected local, national, or international economic shocks occur and have a significant negative impact the economic environment affecting Council costs and or revenue, then a range of risk factors may materialise including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Persistent inflation, leading to higher interest rates and cost pressures for longer An increased incidence of supply chain interruptions and delays An increase in late and non-payment of rates 	Moderate	<p>A significant deterioration in the economic environment could negatively impact on Council's finance and operating costs, its revenue from sources driven by external demand such as consents and development contributions and on ratepayers' ability to pay rates.</p> <p>If increased costs and/ or reduced revenue negatively impacts on the Council's balance sheet it could lead the Council to decide to borrow more, increase rates and or fees and charges, or reduce service/ project delivery or a combination of all the above.</p> <p>However, these risks are considered to be unlikely to eventuate to a significant degree within a single rating year. Any decision to significantly cut services or increase debt would be more likely to be addressed in a future Annual Plan or Long Term Plan.</p>	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HCPP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2.3 Development contributions revenue. The Council has assumed development will reflect the population and business growth model growth forecasts and has budgeted</p>	<p>If the number of new properties paying development contributions is significantly less than forecast over the funding</p>	Low	<p>The timing of growth, and its impact on Council's development contributions revenue, will have a low impact on the</p>	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
its development contributions revenue accordingly.	<p>life of assets, then revenue from development contributions will not be sufficient to fund the growth component of the Council's capital programme.</p> <p>If the timing of growth differs significantly from forecast this will impact on Council's cash flows and may necessitate changes to planned borrowing.</p> <p>The location and timing of development is determined by several factors such as market forces which are outside the control of the council.</p>		<p>borrowing and interest expense assumptions in this Plan.</p> <p>Any shortfall in development contributions revenue must be funded initially by borrowing which is funded from rates over the relevant debt financing term.</p>	HCPP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.4 Population. That population and business growth will occur as forecast by the Council's growth modelling.	<p>If population and/ or business growth is higher than projected, then the Council will need to provide additional unplanned services and infrastructure.</p> <p>If growth is lower than projected, then the Council will be required to support excess levels of infrastructure and service delivery.</p>	Low	Population projections are based upon a standard set of demographic assumptions. The Council revises its growth modelling annually based on the best information available at the time.	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HCPP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.5 Rating Base. Growth in the number and value of rating units to 30 June 2024 is expected to increase the rating base for 2024/25 by \$12.6 million (1.85%) compared to 2023/24. This is taken into account when determining the annual rates increase to existing ratepayers.	If the rating base grows at a materially different rate from that projected, then rates income may be materially different to that planned.	Low	Actual growth in the rating base is never known until 30 June because of the process by which it is measured. Council staff work closely with QV in the period leading up to 30 June to have as accurate an assessment as possible. Variances between the forecast and actual growth in the rating base to 30	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GFC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Assumption	Risk		Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off					
				June of each prior year will cause changes to the total rates revenue collected in the new year.						
The assumed annual growth in the capital value of the city is 1% over the LTP period. This will increase the rating base as outlined in the table below,										
Year	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34
\$ Impact on Rates Base	\$6.8 m	\$7.6m	\$8.3 m	\$8.9 m	\$9.5 m	\$10.1 m	\$10.7 m	\$11.2 m	\$11.6 m	\$11.9 m
2.6 Aging population. The number of Christchurch residents over the age of 65 is expected to increase by 150% between 2023 and 2053 to 94,200 (20% of the total population). By 2053 the number of residents over the age of 80 is expected to be around 7% of the population, compared to around 4% in 2023. The total number is expected to increase by 209% from 16,300 to 34,000.			If the mix of ages within the population is significantly different from that forecast the range and types of services that have factored in the needs of older persons may need to change.		Low	Age projections are produced by Statistics New Zealand on a nation-wide basis. The projections use the most recent census as a starting point. Demographic projections are based on assumptions about future fertility, mortality, migration, inter-ethnic mobility, living arrangement type and labour force participation patterns of the population. Historically the StatsNZ projections have provided an accurate representation of the growth in Christchurch.			CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
									HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
									HCPP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3. Impact of policies and external factors										
3.1 Council policy. Given the significant extent of government reform, there will be regular updates to Council policy in response to legislative changes and emerging strategic issues. Known changes are appropriately budgeted for.			New legislation is enacted that requires a significant policy response or business change from Council or, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC) uses its statutory powers such that a change is required to Council policy that was unplanned.		Low	Dealing with changes in legislation is part of normal Council operations. Any financial impact is managed, which may include deferring some work.			CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
									HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
									GMCS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
									HLDS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
									HSPR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
3.2 Waka Kotahi subsidies. The Current Funding Assistance Rate (FAR) of 51% on qualifying expenditure will not change. We will receive the total amount of subsidy that we have assumed we will receive.	If there are changes in the FAR, and/ or the overall amount in the National Land Transport Fund, then there could be changes to government transport priorities, and to funding eligibility criteria for projects which could impact on the amount of subsidy funding we receive from Waka Kotahi and/ or could change the projects for which we receive funding.	Moderate	Changes to government funding priorities and Waka Kotahi funding decisions are outside Council control and the risk varies from project to project. The maximum financial impact would be the elimination of the subsidy, which is extremely unlikely. Decisions on what improvement projects will be funded through the National Land Transport Fund will not likely be confirmed until after approval of the Detailed Business Case, and this means there is some inherent uncertainty around funding for some improvement projects. The Council is regularly in discussions with Waka Kotahi to gain more clarity on which projects will receive funding. The Council adjusts its work programme and budget assumptions if necessary to align with Waka Kotahi funding availability.	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HTW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.3 Resource Consents. Conditions of resource consents held by Council will not be significantly altered.	Conditions required to obtain/maintain the consents will change, resulting in higher costs than projected, and these costs will not be covered by planned funding. Council is currently working through the Akaroa wastewater consent issues.	Moderate/ Low	Advance warning of likely changes is anticipated. The financial impact of failing to obtain/renew resource consents cannot be quantified.	FBP-CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				H3W <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
<p>3.4 Legislative and Regulatory change. The Government has initiated significant reform that will in time impact on the legislative and regulatory frameworks within which local government currently operates.</p> <p>Three key reform programmes are; three waters reform and resource management reform. and the future for local government review.</p> <p>Given the expected timelines of the review processes the Council has assumed that no significant legislative or regulatory change will impact on the Council in the coming year, although this might change if the government follows through on its intention to enact the water service entities bill this year.</p> <p>The reform programmes are each covered in more detail below.</p>	<p>Should the local government legislative environment change, the activities, and services the Council plans to provide over the period of this Plan could change which could impact on Council's costs and revenue requirements.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The Government has several review programmes in progress which will significantly change the roles and responsibilities of local government as changes are implemented over time.</p> <p>At the time of preparing this Plan the Council is unable to determine how any potential legislative change might impact its operations or quantify the potential financial impact.</p> <p>Expected costs relating to enactment of the RMA (Housing Bill) and to the Council's involvement in Government reform processes have been incorporated in this Plan.</p>	CFO ☑
				HF ☑
				GMSPR ☑
				HLDS ☑
				HSPR ☑
<p>3.5 Three Waters Reform. The Council will continue to deliver water services over the life of the LTP and has budgeted accordingly.</p> <p>The government has recently introduced legislation which will determine the requirements for the future of three waters asset ownership and service delivery.</p>	<p>If Council resolves to transfer the three waters assets and responsibility for service delivery to a new water services entity, then large parts of this Long Term Plan will be inaccurate. If this occurs out of cycle with the 3 yearly LTP programme, this will then require significant budgeting and operating changes for the Council through an amended LTP process.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The Council is in close contact with the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) which is responsible for overseeing the new legislation regarding transfer of three waters assets and service delivery to water services entities.</p> <p>The work programmes and budgets for three waters activities have been prepared as if the Council will deliver these services indefinitely though with close liaison with the DIA to facilitate a smooth transition.</p>	CFO ☑
				GMCC ☑
				GMCI ☑
				HF ☑
				H3W ☑

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
3.6 Potential climate change impacts. The Ministry for the Environment and Stats NZ “Environment Aotearoa 2019” report states all aspects of life in New Zealand will be impacted by climate change. The projected local changes to climate that we must prepare for are: a. 0.48 metre rise in sea-level by 2070 and 1 metre sea-level rise by 2100; b. average temperatures will rise 0.5°C – 1.5°C by 2040 and by 3.5°C by 2090 c. changes in rainfall and extreme weather events.	The timing or severity of any climate change impacts could be worse than expected, meaning the Council is not sufficiently prepared.	Low	The Council has developed a Climate Resilience Strategy, which identifies action programmes to respond to the impacts of climate change and the legislative requirements to consider the impacts of climate change. Variability in changes to the climate and its impacts and how we respond could result in different financial impacts. We have significant work to do to have a better understanding of our exposure and vulnerability to the impacts of climate change on our assets and how we adapt, to determine the financial impacts. A Climate Resilience Fund is also proposed to build a fund over the longer term to respond to the impacts of climate change, along with continuing to invest in climate adaptation efforts and partnerships with communities and rūnanga.	CFO ☑
				HF ☑
				GMSPR ☑
				HSPR ☑
3.7 Future for Local Government Review. The Council has assumed any changes to local government service delivery and responsibilities arising from recommendations in the Future for Local Government report will not materially impact on its costs or financial position over the life of the LTP 2024-34.	If significant changes to local government functions and/ or structure materialise then this could have a significant impact on work programmes and budgets detailed in this LTP.	High	If significant changes to local government functions and/ or structure materialise then work programmes and budgets will need to be amended. This can be done through the LTP 2027-37 or through Annual Plans prepared in the intervening years. It is possible the Council may need to undertake a formal LTP amendment if changes are significant.	CFO ☑
				HF ☑
				HLDS ☑
				GMSPR ☑

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
				HSPR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HCPP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.8 Impact of Covid-19. Operational and Capital Programme delivery will be able to occur without significant financial, staffing or deliverability issues due to Covid-19 or future similar situations (to be reviewed as required).	If Covid-19 or another health pandemic re-emerges as a significant health risk resulting in lockdowns and other responses that interrupt normal work life, then the Council is unlikely to be able to deliver its work programme as planned and budgeted.	Low	The Council better understands the implications of a Covid-19 or similar pandemic on its operations and the need to reprioritise work and functions than previously and has plans in place to minimise disruption. The Council is now significantly better prepared to have staff work from home if required.	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HTW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				H3W <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HPA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HCGP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				MAMF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Borrowing Related				
4.1 Credit Rating. The Council’s current rating of AA is maintained.	If the Council’s credit rating with Standard and Poor’s is downgraded, then the Council’s cost of borrowing is likely to increase. This would increase the budget required to service debt which would reduce funding available for other things.	Low	A one-notch downgrade at some point in the future (i.e., from AA to AA-) would not affect any debt existing at the time but would increase the cost of new borrowing and refinancing by an estimated 5 basis points (0.05 percentage points) for the life of the borrowing. Such an event occurring at the start of 2024/25 would increase interest costs by an estimated \$0.1 million in 2024/25.	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off						
			rising to \$1.6 million annually by 2033/34.							
4.2 Borrowing Costs. Net cost of ratepayer funded borrowing (i.e. including current and projected debt) is projected to be 5.1% in 2024/25.	If interest rates increase to above the assumed level, then the Council's debt servicing costs will increase. This would increase the budget required to service debt which would reduce funding available for other things.	Moderate	Council manages its interest rate exposure in accordance with its Liability Management Policy, and in line with advice from an independent external advisor. Projected debt is mostly hedged to reduce exposure to market rate fluctuations, but a moderate amount of risk remains. Market interest rates 0.5% higher than projected would increase interest costs by around \$3.1m in 2024/25.	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
				GT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
The net cost of new borrowing includes assumed long-term market interest rates (based on a fixed/floating mix of 75/25% and including Council's borrowing margin) of:										
Year	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34
Total rate	5.5%	5.25%	5.0%	4.85%	4.7%	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%
4.3 Securing External Funding. New, or renewal of existing borrowings on acceptable terms can be achieved.	If new borrowing cannot be accessed to refinance existing debt or fund future capital requirements, then the Council could need to borrow from unconventional sources or default on its debts.	Low	The Council minimises its liquidity risk by maintaining a mix of current and non-current borrowings in accordance with its Liability Management Policy, plus some undrawn committed lending facilities from banks.	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
				GT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
4.4 LGFA Guarantee. Each shareholder of the LGFA is a party to a deed of Guarantee, whereby they guarantee the obligations of the LGFA and the obligations of other participating local authorities in the event of default.	If the LGFA couldn't meet its obligations, then each guarantor would be liable to pay a proportion of the amount owing. The proportion to be paid by each guarantor is set in relation to each guarantor's relative rates income.	Low	The Council believes the risk of the guarantee being called on and any financial loss arising from the guarantee is remote. The likelihood of a local authority borrower defaulting is extremely low and LGFA has recovery mechanisms that would be applied prior to any call on the Guarantee. All the	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
			borrowings by a local authority from the LGFA are secured by a charge over each local authority's Rates.	
4.5 Opening Debt: The Council's opening debt of \$2.593 million is made up of; <ul style="list-style-type: none">\$221 million of equity investments, mainly in CCTOs (Venues Ōtautahi Ltd \$185 million),\$790 million of money borrowed for on-lending, (in accordance with the Council's Liability Management Policy),\$1,501 million of capital works and earthquake related borrowing. There is an additional \$91.5 million borrowed internally from the Capital Endowment Fund.\$81 million finance lease (Civic Building).	If the Council's actual opening debt differs from forecast, then the debt servicing costs may be higher than budgeted.	Low	Council's debt requirements are well understood and closely managed. It is unlikely that opening debt will be significantly different to forecast.	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Investment related				
5.1 Return on investments. Interest received on cash and general funds invested is projected to be 5.15% for 2024/25 decreasing to 3.0% by 2027/28. The return on the Capital Endowment Fund (most of which is currently invested internally) is forecast to be 4.45% for 2024/25, increasing to 4.6% by 2033/34.	If interest rates are lower than projected, then Council's revenue from interest will be less than budgeted. Conversely, if interest rates are higher than projected, then Council's revenue from interest will be more than budgeted.	Low	Any financial impact is unlikely to be significant.	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.2 Value of investment in subsidiaries That the opening statement of financial position reflects the correct investment values.	If CCO revaluations differ significantly from the assumed values, then Council's assets will be overstated.	Low	The valuation of the Council's investments in subsidiary and associated companies at fair value has a material impact on the amounts	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
			recognised in these prospective financial statements and involves a significant amount of judgement. Independent valuers are commissioned to perform these valuations on a periodic (currently annually) basis, at intervals sufficient to ensure that the fair value of these investments does not differ materially from their carrying value.	HF ☑
5.3 CCO/CCTO income. CCHL will deliver dividend income at the levels forecast in this Plan.	If CCHL delivers a lower than projected dividend, then the Council will need to source alternate funding or reduce work programmes funded from dividends. If additional dividend income is received, then the level of borrowing forecast in this Plan will be reduced.	Low	CCO/CCTOs are monitored by their Statements of Intent and quarterly reporting to the Council.	CFO ☑
				HF ☑
5.4 Tax planning. The Council (parent) will operate a tax loss for the period covered by this Plan due to the availability of tax deductions on some Council expenditure. This allows the Council's profit-making subsidiaries to make deductible payments (known as subvention payments) to entities with a tax loss which reduces the Council Group tax payments.	If subvention payments are lower than planned, then the Council's revenue will be less than budgeted.	Low	CCTOs are monitored by the Statement of Intent and a quarterly performance reporting process. Returns are expected to continue as forecast in this Plan. Council also works closely with those subsidiaries in Councils Tax group, to achieve positive outcomes.	CFO ☑
				HF ☑
				GFC ☑
6. Services and Operations				
6.1 Community housing. The Council's community housing assets are leased to Otautahi Community Trust, who are	If lease revenue is not sufficient to enable the social housing portfolio to be financially viable	High	With a focus on repairing earthquake damage, lifting quality standards, and addressing deferred maintenance, there	CFO ☑
				HF ☑
				MAMF ☑

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
<p>responsible for operations, maintenance and renewals.</p> <p>It is assumed that community housing remains ring-fenced from rates, through a separate Housing Fund. The ongoing revenue source for this fund is the lease payments from the Ōtautahi Community Housing Trust.</p>	<p>then alternative sources of funding may need to be found which may include from rates and property sales.</p> <p>If expenditure is higher than expected expenditure (e.g., due to asset failure or external events) then additional sources of funding may need to be found which may include from rates and property sales.</p>		<p>has been significant expenditure from the fund over the last 5 years. The fund is now in a depleted state and is not anticipated to accumulate in the foreseeable future. During this period, it is at a heightened risk.</p> <p>The proposed Long Term Plan contains revenue budget from future sales of complexes to ensure a balanced budget. Council has already made the decision to sell some complexes but has not yet decided to sell all required for a balanced budget.</p> <p>Changes to Government policy may also impact on the funding available for new social housing. Should policy change and future Council decisions reduce funding availability the approach reflected in the LTP will be revisited. To remain within Council's policy parameters the most likely recommendation will be to reduce renewal and maintenance expenditure.</p>	FBP-CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HCGP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		High	Where possible Council would review the scope of work under an affected	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
6.2 Contract Rates. Re-tendering of major contracts will not result in cost increases in excess of the rate of inflation.	<p>There is currently some post Covid increase in cost around the supply chain.</p> <p>Additionally, some contracts are impacted by the Councils 2021 living wage decision.</p> <p>If there is a significant variation in price from re-tendering contracts, then the costs of providing services will increase beyond what is budgeted.</p>		<p>contract, or alternatively adjust the budget between services to free up additional funding.</p> <p>Inflation is currently running at 6.7%. On its own, this presents a real risk. However, there also remains volatility in supply chains and shortages of construction materials, placing further upward pressure on costs. The 'post Covid increase' appears greater now than a few months ago, with no sign of its influence diminishing anytime soon. Similarly, the labour market is also under considerable pressure, with organisations routinely increasing wages to retain and secure staff. Inevitably this will impact contract rates.</p> <p>Some potential cost increases may be mitigated or offset through the negotiation period by revising the scope of services or accepting a lower level of services, such as inspections and cleaning frequencies. We will also be challenging/tasking contractors to identify and suggest cost savings and improved efficiencies and consolidating services within existing contracts where possible. However, it is unlikely that any potential savings will outweigh increased contractor and supply costs, so some budgetary adjustments may be necessary.</p>	GMCC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMCI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				GMSPR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HTW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				H3W <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HPA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				MAMF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Assumption	Risk	Level of Uncertainty	Reasons and Financial Impact of Uncertainty	Person accountable Signed-Off
7. Insurance cover and natural disaster financing				
7.1 Insurance cover. The Council has adequate Material Damage cover for all above ground buildings which are undamaged and fire cover for significant unrepaired buildings.	Risk of major loss through fire	Low	The results of external and independent modelling suggests that Council's insurance cover is sufficient to meet two times the maximum loss. Any financial impact is not expected to be significant. Recent advice on the mix of coverage now able to be provided on Councils housing stock, will impact premiums.	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7.2 Natural disaster financial implications. The Christchurch region will at some time experience earthquake, flooding and tsunami events that will result in damage to Council infrastructure. It is assumed the Council's insurance along with central government assistance will cover the cost of repairs.	If the Council's insurance cover and expected Government assistance isn't sufficient to cover the costs of repairing Council infrastructure following a natural disaster, then additional funding will need to be found.	Moderate	Council has limited insurance cover in place for damage to infrastructure networks from flooding, tsunami and earthquake events and relies on the strength of its Financial Position plus access to central government emergency funding in the event of another major event. Financial implications of another significant natural disaster event are large, particularly when our ability to borrow may be limited due to the high debt to revenue ratios forecast. This risk is considered in preparing forecasts and particular attention is paid to the financial headroom for each year. Financial headroom is a measure of Council's ability to borrow in the event of an emergency. Council is maintaining significant debt headroom to meet such events.	CFO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				HF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

14 March 2024

Chantelle Gernetzky
Director
Audit New Zealand
PO Box 2
Christchurch

Dear Chantelle

Letter of representation for the audit of Christchurch City Council's long-term plan consultation document

This representation letter is given in connection with your audit, conducted on behalf of the Auditor-General, of Christchurch City Council's (the Council's) long-term plan (LTP) consultation document for the 10 years commencing 1 July 2024.

This representation letter is provided to you in connection with your responsibility under the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act) to report on:

- whether the consultation document gives effect to the purpose set out in section 93B of the Act; and
- the quality of information and assumptions underlying the forecast information provided in the consultation document.

We understand that your audit was carried out in accordance with the International Standard on Assurance Engagements (New Zealand) 3000 (Revised) *Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information*. In meeting the requirements of this standard, we understand you took into account particular elements of the Auditor-General's Auditing Standards and International Standard on Assurance Engagements 3400 *The Examination of Prospective Financial Information* that were consistent with those requirements.

We also understand that your audit was (to the extent that you deemed appropriate) for the purposes of expressing an opinion about whether the consultation document provides an effective basis for public participation in the Council's decision-making processes about the proposed content of the 2024--34 long-term plan and on the quality of the information and assumptions underlying the information provided in the consultation document, and that the audit would not necessarily disclose any or all irregularities should any exist.

We acknowledge that actual results are likely to be different from the forecast information on which the consultation document is based because anticipated events frequently do not occur as expected and the variation may be material, and that you express no opinion about whether the forecasts will be achieved. We also acknowledge that you do not express an opinion on the merits of any policy content of the consultation document.

We confirm, to the best of our knowledge and belief, the following representations:

General

- 1 The Council accepts that it is responsible for the preparation of a consultation document that meets the requirements of the Act.

- 2 In complying with the requirements of the Act in relation to the preparation of the consultation document, we have acted in such a manner and included in the consultation document such detail as we consider on reasonable grounds to be appropriate.
- 3 The consultation document has been prepared using the best information currently available to the Council and, accordingly, the forecast information underlying the consultation document is our best forecast of anticipated events for the 10 years commencing 1 July 2024.
- 4 The consultation document has been prepared and is consistent with the Council's own policies and strategies and of other organisations where appropriate.
- 5 We believe the effects of uncorrected misstatements in the underlying information are immaterial, both individually and in the aggregate, to the consultation document as a whole.

Underlying information and assumptions

- 6 The forecast information has been properly prepared on the basis of the underlying information and the assumptions adopted. The assumptions and information underlying the forecast information have a reasonable and supportable basis in the context of the Council's position and have been based on the best information currently available to the Council. The assumptions are consistent among themselves, consistent with the current strategies and plans of the Council, and have been consistently applied.
- 7 All significant forecasting assumptions have been included in the preparation of the forecast information and have been clearly identified in the underlying information on which the consultation document is based. Where significant forecasting assumptions have a high level of uncertainty, that uncertainty has been stated and the potential effects of the uncertainty on the forecast financial information have been disclosed in the adopted underlying information and will be included in the long-term plan when it is adopted.
- 8 The consultation document is based on the adopted underlying information that will form the basis of the long-term plan. The underlying information includes all the items of operating expenditure and capital projects the Council reasonably expects will be done in the 10 years covered by the plan, based on the best information currently available to the Council.
- 9 The forecast of capital expenditure and operating expenditure contained in the adopted underlying information that supports the consultation document are supported by, and consistent with, underlying information such as asset management plans and the infrastructure strategy.
- 10 The records maintained by the Council were adequate for the preparation of the underlying information on which the consultation document is based.
- 11 We have made available to you all supporting documentation on the underlying information and assumptions used to prepare the consultation document.
- 12 All minutes of meetings of the Council and its sub-committees held to date have been made available to you for inspection, including summaries of recent meetings for which minutes have not yet been prepared or approved.

Performance framework

- 13 Forecast information and proposed performance measures provide an appropriate framework for the meaningful assessment of the actual levels of service. Proposed performance measures reflect the intended levels of service for those activities the Council has chosen to carry out. Proposed performance targets are based on the equivalent basis of reasonable and supportable assumptions and underlying information.

Systems and processes

- 14 The Council accepts that it is responsible for establishing and maintaining systems and processes designed to provide reasonable assurance about the integrity and reliability of the forecast information on which the consultation document is based. The Council has maintained effective systems and processes, and they operated to generate accurate and reliable forecast information.

Legislative compliance

- 15 The Council accepts that it is responsible for ensuring that all applicable aspects of the Act that affect the consultation document have been complied with. To the best of its knowledge, the Council has complied with all legislative requirements in the preparation of the consultation document.
- 16 The Council has followed the decision-making provisions of Part 6 of the Act in making decisions about the content and options considered for inclusion and exclusion from the consultation document.
- 17 The Council intends to follow the special consultative procedures outlined in section 93A of the Act in relation to the consultation document. We acknowledge our responsibility to provide a consultation document that enables the consultation to be done. In considering this, we are satisfied the information provided can be readily understood by interested or affected people.
- 18 We have a significance and engagement policy that outlines the Council's approach to determining the significance of proposals and decisions in relation to issues, assets, and other matters in accordance with section 76AA of the Act.
- 19 The Council has considered the balanced budget requirements outlined in section 100 of the Act, and is managing its revenue, expenses, assets, liabilities, and general financial dealings prudently as required by sections 101 and 101A of the Act. We have made adequate provision to meet the expenditure needs of the Council identified in the underlying information that has formed the basis of the consultation document.
- 20 The Council has adopted the following policies that underlie the consultation document:
- a revenue and financing policy that complies with section 103 of the Act and has been prepared following consideration of the matters outlined in section 101(3) of the Act;
 - a liability management policy that complies with section 104 of the Act;
 - an investment policy that complies with section 105 of the Act;
 - a policy on development contributions that complies with section 106 of the Act;

- a policy on remission and postponement of rates on Māori freehold land that complies with section 108 of the Act;
- a rates postponement policy adopted under section 110 and a rates remission policy adopted under section 109 of the Act.

These policies have formed the basis for the financial parameters used in the preparation of the consultation document.

- 21 We consider that the underlying information and recommended direction inherent in the consultation document supports financial prudence.

Generally accepted accounting practice

- 22 The accounting policies applied to the forecast financial statements underlying the consultation document comply with generally accepted accounting practice and are those that the Council intends to use in the future for reporting historical financial statements. Any change in accounting policy from policies previously applied and reported in historical financial statements will be disclosed in the accounting policies included in the underlying information.
- 23 The estimated effect of the revaluation of service delivery assets has been incorporated into the underlying information on which the consultation document is based.
- 24 The underlying forecast financial information on which the consultation document has been based has been prepared in accordance with PBE FRS 42, Prospective Financial Statements.
- 25 The forecast financial information on which the consultation document has been prepared is in accordance with the accounting policies.
- 26 The Council's assumption about future price changes on the forecast financial information on which the consultation document has been based is also based on best information currently available to the Council and is reasonable and supportable.

Publication of the consultation document and related audit report on the Council's website

- 27 The Council accepts that it is responsible for the electronic presentation of the audited consultation document.
- 28 The electronic version of the audited consultation document and related audit report presented on the website are the same as the final signed version of the audited consultation document and audit report.
- 29 We have clearly differentiated between audited and unaudited information in the presentation of the consultation document on the Council's website and understand the risk of potential misrepresentation in the absence of appropriate controls.
- 30 We have assessed the security controls over the audited forecast information and the related audit report and are satisfied that procedures in place are adequate to ensure the integrity of the information provided.

These representations are made at your request, and to supplement information obtained by you from the records of the Council and to confirm information given to you orally.

Yours faithfully



Phil Mauger
Mayor
Christchurch City Council

Item 11

Attachment F

Released From Public Excluded