

Waimāero
Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board
Submissions Committee
EXTRAORDINARY MINUTES

Date: Monday 24 March 2025
Time: 5.39pm
Venue: Boardroom, Fendalton Service Centre,
Corner Jeffreys and Clyde Roads, Fendalton

Present

Chairperson Nicola McCormick
Members Jason Middlemiss
Shirish Paranjape

Principal Advisor

Maryanne Lomax
Manager Community Governance
Tel: 941 6730
maryanne.lomax@ccc.govt.nz

Meeting Advisor

Aidan Kimberley
Community Board Advisor
Tel: 941 6566
aidan.kimberley@ccc.govt.nz

Website: www.ccc.govt.nz

To watch meetings, live, or previous recordings, go to:

<https://www.youtube.com/@fendaltonwaimairiharewoodc6878/streams>

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, go to:

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



-
- Part A Matters Requiring a Council Decision**
Part B Reports for Information
Part C Decisions Under Delegation
-

1. Apologies Ngā Whakapāha

Committee Resolved FBSC/2025/00001

That the apologies from Linda Chen, David Cartwright and Bridget Williams for absence be accepted.

Nicola McCormick/Jason Middlemiss

Carried

2. Declarations of Interest Ngā Whakapuaki Aronga

There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. Board Submissions

Officer Recommendations

That the Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board Submissions Committee:

1. Receives the information in the Board Submissions Report.
2. Considers making a submission to the Council on the Draft Annual Plan 2025-26.
3. Considers making a submission to the Council on Local Water Done Well.
4. Considers making a submission to the Council on the Development Contributions Policy Review 2025.

Committee Resolved FBSC/2025/00002

That the Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board Submissions Committee:

1. Provisionally adopts the following submission to the Council on the Draft Annual Plan 2025-26 and authorises Nicola McCormick to approve any minor amendments prior to the submission being lodged:

Question	Feedback
What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average	The Board’s view is that a proposed rate increase which is close to 5% higher than the rate of inflation is very concerning. Our city’s residents have been facing significant financial strain for several years now and have had to make difficult choices about what they can afford. There is a perception in the Community that the Council has not reviewed its expenditure with the same discipline.

residential rates increase of 7.40%?	
Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?	<p>The Board supports the staged approach to delivering the Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route. The connection between the Nor’West Arc and Northern Line routes is comparatively uncontroversial and makes sense. However, the ongoing controversy about the middle section along Harewood Road shows that the Council needs to do more work to get the Community on board.</p> <p>The Board believes that a piecemeal approach to transport planning in the Harewood/Bishopdale area has contributed to concerns about the cycleway project. For example, the Board received advice that both the cycleway and Greers/Langdons intersection project outcomes were contingent on upgrades to Sawyers Arms Road (particularly the Sawyers Arms/Greers/Northcote intersection) which would ease demand on Harewood Road and Greers Road. The fact that the Council subsequently removed the Sawyers Arms Road project from the Long Term Plan without reviewing the implications on the other relevant projects is deeply concerning to the Board and has reinforced a perception that the Council does not have a strategic plan for the transport network in the area.</p> <p>The Board’s view is that the Council needs to work with the community on a strategic transport plan for the Harewood/Sawyers Arms/Greers/Northcote area. This will give the community the opportunity to give feedback on how they want the network to function and understand how all the constituent projects relate to each other, instead of considering all the separate projects in isolation.</p>
Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?	Water infrastructure is a core Council function and the Board agrees with this investment, particularly where it should result in a reduction in maintenance expenditure.
Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?	The Board’s view is that any enhancements need to be backed by a robust business case demonstrating significant demand for the service, or evidence that the investment will offset ongoing maintenance costs. Otherwise the Council should focus on maintaining what it has got instead of enhancements.
Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?	
Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the	The Board agrees with the suggestion to pause the targeted rate and invest the current balance to accrue the remaining funds required to meet the Council’s funding commitment. Continuing to collect this

<p>Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?</p>	<p>rate while the project is mothballed would be confusing for the community.</p>
<p>Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years</p>	<p>The Board agrees that this is a sensible proposal. Even though it will have a small rates impact in the short term, it will quickly pay itself back. The Board remains concerned that there is an underlying issue which is not being addressed, that having a capital programme which is fully debt funded is not sustainable in the long term.</p>
<p>Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?</p>	<p>The Board recommends that the Council reviews its fees and charges for meeting room hire. For example, some of our public meeting rooms with full AV equipment are hired to commercial users for as little as \$10/hour. The Board has no problem with community/not-for-profit groups receiving free or discounted booking rates, but for commercial users this appears to be well below market rates.</p>
<p>What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option) • Option 2: Two-tiered volume rate • Option 3: Fixed volume rate 	<p><i>The Board chose not to respond to this question.</i></p>
<p>Tell us about the services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You value the most and 	<p>The Board urges the Council to ensure that its levels of service are aligned with community expectations. Cost cutting does not need to be the main motivation, but is likely to be an outcome of ensuring our services are targeted at what the Community expects. For example,</p>

<p>would not want reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You could manage without. Where there could be an opportunity for savings. 	<p>we hear anecdotal evidence that our local Fendalton Library experiences very low demand after 6pm. This suggests that the opening hours at this facility are not aligned with community expectations. This is an example of Council expenditure that could be redirected to another library or a different service where there is unmet demand.</p>
<p>Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?</p>	<p>The Board is deeply concerned at the Council’s proposal to establish a fund before knowing the fund’s purpose or governance arrangements. Regardless of how commendable the intended outcomes are, we believe the Community expects the Council to have these details ironed out before agreeing to establish a fund.</p>
<p>Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?</p>	<p>The Board cautiously supports this proposal, and acknowledge the significance of the aircraft to be displayed in the new hanger. However the Board would expect the grant to be backed by a high quality business case.</p>
<p>Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?</p>	<p>The Board does not support this proposal. The Board has no problem with the concept of a central city shuttle service, but we receive a lot of feedback from the community imploring the Council to focus on its core business. Public transport routes are a core function of Environment Canterbury and not the City Council.</p> <p>Furthermore, Environment Canterbury’s Long Term Plan included provisions for investigating local connector routes and network enhancements. We believe that this is the appropriate avenue for investigating the central city shuttle.</p>
<p>The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?</p>	<p>The Board agrees with disposing of under-utilised property, as it is a poor use of capital. However, the Board’s preference would be for this capital to be recycled into new capital expenditure with an expected rates-reduction benefit, not a one-off rates reduction.</p>
<p>Any further comments?</p>	<p><i>The Board chose not to respond to this question.</i></p>

Committee Resolved FBSC/2025/00003

2. Provisionally adopts the following submission to the Council on Local Water Done Well and authorises Nicola McCormick to approve any minor amendments prior to the submission being lodged:

Question	Feedback
Which water services delivery model do you support?	<p>Select:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In house delivery model <p>Why did you choose this option?</p> <p>The Board agrees with the Council’s preferred option of an in-house delivery model. The Board’s view is that the establishment costs of setting up a Council-Controlled-Organisation would be significant and unlikely to deliver any real benefit to the City over and above the service we already receive through the in-house model.</p> <p>The Board would support having a separate discussion about moving to volumetric charging for water usage.</p>
Is there anything else you want to tell us?	

Jason Middlemiss/Shirish Paranjape

Carried

3. Declines to submit on the Draft Development Contributions Policy Review.

Meeting concluded at 6:15pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 26TH DAY OF March 2025

NICOLA MCCORMICK
CHAIRPERSON