

---

## **Council Information Session/Workshop**

### **NOTES**

---

**Date:** Tuesday 26 November 2024  
**Time:** 8.30 am - 3.00 pm  
**Venue:** Council Chambers, Civic Offices,  
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch  
**Zoom Link:** <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/8305479561>  
**Meeting ID: 830 547 9561**

---

#### **Present**

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

---

#### **Principal Advisor**

Mary Richardson  
Chief Executive  
Tel: 941 8999

[mary.richardson@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:mary.richardson@ccc.govt.nz)

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

**To find upcoming meetings, watch a recording after the meeting date, or view copies of meeting Agendas and Notes, go to:**

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



The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

## **1. Apologies Ngā Whakapāha**

Apologies from Councillor Gough and Councillor MacDonald.  
Councillor Donovan, Councillor Johanson and Councillor Harrison-Hunt arrived late.

## **4. Annual Plan 25/26 Briefing Update**

- 1.1 Bede Carran (GM Finance, Risk & Performance / CFO), Russell Holden (Head of Finance), Peter Ryan (Head of Corporate Planning & Performance), John Higgins (GM Strategy, Planning & Regulatory) and Lynn McLelland (GM Corporate Services) spoke to the following for the Annual Plan (AP) 2025/26 process:
  - Purpose of final workshop.
  - Context: LTP decisions underpinning Annual Plan.
  - Direction on Annual Plan process.
  - Process milestones to date.
  - Current rates position.
  - Major financial levers and other options - staff advice.
  - Additional non-infrastructure CAPEX changes
  - Next Steps.
- 1.2 A PowerPoint presentation was tabled to support of discussions (refer to **Attachment A** to the Notes).

### **Discussion**

- 1.3 Elected Members discussed the following:
  - 1.3.1 Methods of reducing rates and the risk of triggering an amended Long-Term Plan (LTP).
  - 1.3.2 The feasibility/risk of starting an amended LTP process at this stage.
  - 1.3.3 The consequences of using one-off levers to reduce rates in the coming financial year.
  - 1.3.4 The breakdown of the original rates increases from Year 2 of the LTP.
  - 1.3.5 Options regarding the Cathedral targeted rate.
  - 1.3.6 Feasibility of delaying earthquake renewals at Jellie Park.
  - 1.3.7 Drivers of increased digital costs.
  - 1.3.8 Offsetting the operational costs of new facilities like Te Kaha and Parakiore.
- 1.4 Staff provided the following responses to questions raised during the workshop:
  - 1.4.1 A significant reduction in a Level of Service (LoS) for a limited time is still likely to trigger an amended LTP process. Significance can only be judged on a case-by-case basis but, broadly speaking, a noticeable change from what the public expects to receive as a service from the Council for their rates is likely to be viewed

as significant and could impact the relevant Strategies such as the Financial Strategy.

- 1.4.2 Starting an amended LTP process at this stage is likely to result in the Council being unable to adopt the plan by the statutory deadline delaying the ability to strike a new rate.
- 1.4.3 Planning team additional FTE positions - If the FTE's were not included, this would not jeopardise the industrial plan change work but would impact the ability to deal with additional expected work.
- 1.4.4 Jellie Park earthquake renewals – Works have already been significantly delayed due to lack of network capacity which will be alleviated with the opening of Parakiore.
- 1.4.5 Digital costs - A significant driver of increased digital costs is the move to a Software as a Service (SaS) model, resulting in decreased capital expenditure (CAPEX) and increased operational expenditure (OPEX). However, this shift also provides better cyber security and enables targeted licencing.


### **Guidance**

- 1.5 Elected Members provided no guidance on the main options (1 to 3) on developing the Annual Plan.

### **Actions**

- 1.6 During discussions, the workshop requested the following:
  - 1.6.1 Clarification of the process to propose further cost reductions and receive advice on their impacts (e.g. if they would trigger an amended LTP.)
  - 1.6.2 Illustrative figures of cost to ratepayers of the forecast rates increase for FY25/26.
  - 1.6.3 Quantum spent on Fendalton library maintenance works.
  - 1.6.4 Briefing on fees and charges modelling from Recreation, Sports & Events to inform decisions around charging for use of new facilities like Parakiore.
  - 1.6.5 Advice on feasibility and any legal implications of using monies collected under the Cathedral targetted rate for other purposes (e.g. to offset rates increases).
  - 1.6.6 An update on possibility of sale of the Lichfield Street carpark.
  - 1.6.7 Advice on feasibility of sale of He Puna Temoana Hot Pools to suitable purchaser.
  - 1.6.8 Options to raise revenue to offset the costs of Te Kaha (e.g. seat sales, ticket levies).
  - 1.6.9 To confirm if there are further briefing dates available for the rest of the year, with topics to be confirmed depending on Councillors level of interest.
- 1.7 The workshop also requested:
  - 1.7.1 For consultation regarding the Cathedral targetted rate should be comprehensive enough to cover feasible future options to avoid further consultation.
  - 1.7.2 For the options presented on 10 December to include using all operating surplus and subvention credits to repay debt.

## Attachments

A Presentation 

### 3. Draft Development Contributions Policy - Draft Charges

Presented by Ellen Cavanagh, Senior Policy Analyst, Aimee Martin, Research Analyst, and Elizabeth Wilson

- Presenters talked through the presentation slides about Development Contributions Policy
- When 2021 Policy was prepared, Council was using post-earthquake population changes (2018)
- In the first 10 years for 2021 and 2024 policies the projections are the same, biggest difference 3 percent. Biggest change is in long term projections, it will be slower than previously predicted. Difference in long term projections ranges between 2 percent and 11 percent. 2024 projections flatter, returned to lower growth.
- Statistics will revise these projections continuously, CCC continues to talk to StatsNZ about growth projections and what this means.
- 2024 policy based on slower growth, is subject to change.
- Cost of growth being spread across fewer new households means an increase in development contributions charges.
- Staff responded to Councillor Questions.
- Example of Bexley Dog Park. This is impacted by growth projections and service debt. Impact is cost of charge moved by 32 cents to 57 cents. This trend is seen with entire DC policy.
- Compared to other councils, (these are not direct comparisons), we are not out of step with other councils.
- Draft policy to Finance & Performance Committee on 18 December 2024, consultation will commence in new year, hearings panel in March 2025, and final policy to Council to adopt at the end of May 2025.

Lunch 12.30pm-1.30pm

### 4. Plan Change 14 briefing

Presented by Mark Stevenson - Acting Head of Planning and Consents, Brent Pizzey - Senior Legal Counsel, and Ike Kleynbos - Principal Advisor

- Going to go through decisions, structure of the report, recommendation, and will cover off next steps.
- The legislation is specific, that is that only information what is presented to IHP can be considered.
- In terms of making a decision on policy three, this is about intensification within and around commercial centres.
- Policy three includes high density residential zones, includes alternatives regarding city centre catchment, increasing catchments. Part of medium density zoning, are part of the policy three response. About 30 centres overall. Alternatives include standards for 8 centres. Any other zone in catchment is also intensified. Also captures visitor accommodation zones, within or adjacent to catchments.
- Previously discounted 4 catchment (Lyttelton, Sumner, Redcliffs, New Brighton). The likes of New Brighton, Sumner, Redcliffs, have coastal hazards, in most instances there is not medium density. Lyttelton centre not included previously, as interpreted this as a character

area where operative zone would apply. However, the IHP clarified this, as medium density zone with the rules of character area on top. This will change to medium density zone, but there will be the character area overlay on top of this as well.

- Only qualifying matters within Policy 3 areas are required to be decided. Caveat to that, where there is a recommendation to remove a qualifying area, would not be deciding on underlying zoning accordingly.
- The Act requires Council to either accept or reject, cannot be a split vote, therefore important to state an alternative if an IHP recommendation is rejected. If we state what we would like to do, the decision from the Minister would become binary.
- All alternative recommendations have been linked to their corresponding submission points. Making a decision without that does heighten the risk that the Minister would not accept the alternative, and a risk for judicial review.
- Structure of report (7 areas): Scope of decision making (the LGA decision); Zone decisions (with any alternative treated separately); Qualifying matters (with any alternative treated separately); Financial contributions and other Council recommendations; Officer alternative recommendation on residential pathways; Councillor alternatives (with Panel's recommendations included); Other administrative delegations | decisions.
- References to 4(a) through (k) is referencing capturing a Policy 3 area.
- There are about 20 councillor alternative recommendations that will need to be voted on. There are 5 new or amended, others remain unchanged. Specific details about these will be in the report.
- Officer alternative recommendation: residential pathways recommendation from the hearings panel was in response to High Court precedent. Effectively, could be alternative pathway where applicants can choose to apply. That was precedent to ensure there is no restriction more than the status quo.
- Implications of Panel's recommendations, residential chapter is split in two. Preamble of this details how each of these pathways is enabled, ensures that they are only ever assessed individually. The Panel through minute 58, recommended rules that state both pathways can be considered at the same time.
- Staff put forward alternative, to accept independence of pathways, reject provision that removes this independence or makes it clear, simplify duplicate character approach.
- There are risks with this, any alternative has judicial review risk. No option to go back to the panel due to the timeframe we have to have this complete by end of the year. Only viable option to us is to put forward alternative recommendation to the Minister.
- Plan change 13 has been taking a back seat relative to PC14. We notified Heritage on the same date as PC14, went parallel through the submissions process. Through the process of developing PC14 and identifying where intensification should be required, some parts of the city should be kept as residential heritage areas.
- Hearings Panel came back with recommendations, rejected idea of residential heritage areas. They gave comments on evidence, questioned methodology of residential heritage areas. They were unconvinced that residential heritage areas were stood up to the test of section 6 of RMA. Therefore, residential heritage areas should not be a qualifying matter.
- Even with that decision, residential heritage areas will still be in effect for PC14. Consequence, anyone who has a property in residential heritage area, any demolition works to that building would still need resource consent. Any decision of PC14 has a consequential effect on PC13. If Council accepts that residential heritage areas are not part of PC14, a report will be brought to Council regarding this in PC13. Avoids re-litigation of residential heritage areas in PC13. Staff will bring a report to council following decisions.
- Next steps PC14: decision set for 2 December 2024, from there seek to notifying submitters of decision. Staff will then work to collate information to send to Ministry for the Environment. Staff will also begin to integrate accepted parts into the District Plan – this

---

will take some time. Staff will assist resource consent teams in applying the rules, treated as operative from decision.

- Staff responded to Councillor questions.

**Meeting concluded at 2:37pm.**