
Council Workshop

NOTES

Date: **Wednesday 15 April 2026**
Time: **9.36 am**
Venue: **Camellia Chambers, Civic Offices,
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch**

Present

Chairperson	Mayor Phil Mauger
Deputy Chairperson	Deputy Mayor Victoria Henstock
Members	Councillor Kelly Barber
	Councillor David Cartwright
	Councillor Melanie Coker
	Councillor Pauline Cotter
	Councillor Celeste Donovan – attended by audiovisual link
	Councillor Tyrone Fields
	Councillor Tyla Harrison-Hunt – attended by audiovisual link
	Councillor Nathaniel Herz Jardine
	Councillor Yani Johanson
	Councillor Aaron Keown – attended by audiovisual link
	Councillor Sam MacDonald
	Councillor Jake McLellan
	Councillor Tim Scandrett

Principal Advisor

Mary Richardson
Chief Executive
Tel: 941 8999
mary.richardson@ccc.govt.nz

Meeting Advisor

Ruth Close
Democratic Services Advisor
Tel: 941 5561
ruth.close@ccc.govt.nz

Website: www.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.

Councillor MacDonald was in the Chair for Items 1, 2, 8 and 9. Mayor Mauger took the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

1. Apologies Ngā Whakapāha

An apology from Councillor Peters was received.

An apology for lateness from Mayor Mauger was received.

An apology for early departure from Councillor Fields was received.

An apology for early departure from Councillor Harrison-Hunt was received.

Councillor Moore was absent from the workshop and no apology was received.

7. Items Closed to the Public Ngā Take mō te wāhanga o te hui e rāhui ana ki te hunga tūmatanui

The session went into public excluded to consider the confidential items advertised at the end of the public agenda.

The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 10.45 am.

Councillor Harrison-Hunt left the workshop at 10.45 am at the conclusion of public excluded Item 9 and did not return.

Mayor Mauger joined the workshop at 11.15 am during consideration of Item 2.

2. Akaroa Wastewater

Gavin Hutchison, Head of Three Waters; Brent Pizzey, Senior Legal Counsel; and Kylie Hills, Senior Engineer, Three Waters joined the workshop to present Item 2 (refer to agenda report and the attached, updated presentation), and to answer questions from elected members.

Key presentation points:

- The purpose of the workshop is to discuss how to reduce costs for the scheme.
- Staff provided a timeline on the history of wastewater disposal in Akaroa and planning and decisions since 2011.
- Since the 2020 decision to go ahead with the scheme, the following law changes have occurred:
 - Introduction of the Wastewater Environment Performance Standards Regulations 2025 (WEPS)
 - Change to the Resource Management Act Ease of consenting would make a harbour or ocean outfall more comparable to other options than in 2020.
 - Local Government (Water Services) Act 2025A new decision on options would require the Council to choose the decision considered most cost-effective over the life of the infrastructure, though this could include considering social, environmental and cultural outcomes.

- Obligations under the Local Government Act (to consider impact on mana whenua) remain unchanged.
- The current budget available for the Akaroa and Duvauchelle Treated Waste Irrigation Scheme project is \$98m but it is now forecast to cost approximately \$175m. This is due to 40% construction inflation, geotechnical works for the Waste Water Treatment Plant, adding Duvauchelle into the scheme, increased irrigation storage, and the NZTA requirement for the road to be rebuilt and resurfaced following the trenching for pipes.
- If the Council wants to significantly reduce costs, it must reconsider its options.
- Staff have considered a wide range of options to reduce costs and outlined the 'long list' of cost reduction options considered and discounted, and the 'short list' of options recommended for consideration. The shortlisted options were reduced cost versions of the current proposal and a harbour outfall.
- An additional variation is to have a marine pipe through the harbour rather than along the SH72 road corridor.
- Next steps: staff will present a report to the Finance and Performance Committee meeting on 22 April with options for cost savings. Following the decision at that meeting, staff will report back with refined costs for consideration in the Long Term Plan.

Key discussion points:

- Confirmation that planning work will be done in time for consideration in the Long Term Plan to avoid further delays.
- Infrastructure for the scheme including capacity of the pipe for discharge to harbour, cost of ocean outfall option, storage tank size, trenching for pipes and location of the Akaroa Waste Water Treatment Plant.
- Ability of the land to absorb water, landslide risk at irrigation sites and associated liability.
- That a fresh water supply pipe to Duvauchelle will be considered alongside either the marine or road wastewater pipe options.
- Costs of options including the effect of current fuel issues, a marine versus land-based pipe, and operational costs for the land-based scheme.
- Availability of expertise in marine work and lessons learned from the Lyttelton Harbour wastewater scheme.
- The need for a peer review before the project goes to tender.
- In response to questions, staff undertook to provide additional information for the decision-making meeting next week.

Attachments

- A Updated Akaroa Wastewater Presentation [⇌](#) 

Councillor MacDonald left the workshop at 11.53 am at the conclusion of Item 2 and did not return.

Deputy Mayor Henstock left the workshop 11.53 am at the conclusion of Item 2 and returned at 12.03 pm during consideration of Item 3.

Councillor Fields left the workshop 11.53 am at the conclusion of Item 2 and returned at 12.03 pm during consideration of Item 3.

Councillor Cotter left the workshop at 12.16 pm and returned at 12.19 pm during consideration of Item 3.

3. Short-term visitor accommodation in residential units

Mark Stevenson, Head of Planning & Consents; Aimee Martin, Senior Research Analyst; Craig Jorgensen, Team Leader RM Compliance; Steve Tunley, Principal Advisor Compliance; Steve Ballard, Group Treasurer, Andre Winkelman, Principal Advisor Building Consenting and Hermione Blair, Principal Advisor Resource Consents joined the workshop to present Item 3 (refer to agenda report and presentation), and to answer questions from elected members.

Key presentation points:

- This workshop is in response to a request at the Policy and Planning Committee on 11 March 2026. It provides an overview of the current regulatory framework and functions performed across different units in managing the effects of short-term visitor accommodation in residential units and the challenges in monitoring such activities.
- The District Plan sets the rules for the use of residential homes and units for short-term visitor accommodation within Christchurch and Banks Peninsula, introduced by Plan Change 4 to the District Plan. The focus of the plan change was managing effects on amenity and neighbours, not housing affordability.
- Short-term visitor accommodation includes hotels, motels, B&Bs, campgrounds, and hosted and unhosted accommodation (often described as Airbnb-type, but covering multiple platforms). Rules differ depending on whether the accommodation is hosted or unhosted, and the zoning of the property in the District Plan.
- Census and building consent data show that overall housing supply has broadly kept pace with household demand citywide, but unoccupied dwellings have increased in the central city, where they now make up a higher share of housing.
- Any person who commences the use of a residential unit for short-term visitor accommodation in a residential or rural zone must notify Council.
- The Council's Compliance Unit has resources dedicated to monitoring compliance with rules of the District Plan on short-term visitor accommodation. There are ongoing challenges with identifying residential units used for short-term visitor accommodation unless the host has notified Council or resource consent has been applied for/granted. Officers have no power of inspection.
- The Council is working to understand how many units are used for short-term accommodation, noting data limitations and the absence of a single reliable dataset.
- Hosted accommodation is generally permitted in residential zones, subject to standards and an eight-person limit. Unhosted accommodation is permitted for up to 60 nights per year with notification to Council; beyond that, resource consent is required.
- Council has previously sought a national registration system for short-term visitor accommodation via a remit to LGNZ.
- Using a residential unit for unhosted visitor accommodation for more than 60 nights per year, or predominantly for hosted visitor accommodation, or having a resource consent to do so, are currently rated using the business differential on the general rate.

- There are requirements under the Building Act relating to changing the use of an existing building that may affect short-term visitor accommodation. The Council is seeking a related determination from the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment.
- The Council continues to support advocacy for enabling legislation to allow a mandatory guest accommodation registration system.

Key discussion points:

- Hosted accommodation was confirmed as generally permitted, with no night limit, provided standards are met and the Council is notified, and that hosted accommodation can be self-contained, provided the permanent resident is in residence.
- Whether owners avoid notifying Council due to concerns about business rates or other costs.
- Reclassifying properties for rating purposes does not increase total revenue, but improves fairness between accommodation providers.
- Whether the level of effort and resourcing is proportionate to the scale of the problem, given uncertainty about total numbers.
- Concerns were raised about multi-unit complexes with a high proportion of short-term accommodation and how affected neighbours are identified.
- Whether complaints relate to genuine breaches or general neighbour inconvenience, and whether better complaint categorisation would be useful.
- Support was expressed for a national registration system to enable councils to identify properties directly from platform providers.
- Staff confirmed continued work on policy wording to support compliance and investigation, subject to legal advice and resourcing.

Councillor Coker left the workshop at 12.45 pm at the conclusion of Item 3 and did not return.

Deputy Mayor Henstock left the workshop at 12.45 pm at the conclusion of Item 3 and returned at 2.05 pm during consideration of Item 5.

Councillor Keown joined the workshop at 1.34 pm during consideration of Item 4.

Councillor Cotter left the workshop at 1.37 pm and returned at 1.45 pm during consideration of Item 4.

4. Life in Christchurch Housing Survey Results

Aimee Martin, Senior Research Analyst joined the workshop to present Item 4 (refer to agenda report and presentation), and to answer questions from elected members.

Key presentation points:

- The Life in Christchurch Housing and Neighbourhoods survey was undertaken in mid-2025 and sought Christchurch residents' views on housing availability, affordability, design and liveability, and the impacts of short-term visitor accommodation on neighbourhoods.
- 3,542 people provided feedback, with the majority being long-term residents and homeowners living in older housing, with experiences and satisfaction varying strongly by age, tenure, and location.
- Housing affordability is a major concern—especially for renters and younger adults—and is delaying or discouraging home ownership.

- While standalone homes remain the most preferred option, openness to other housing types depends more on design quality (warmth, accessibility, outdoor space, storage, and proximity to services) than on density itself.
- Overall, residents feel that current housing does not consistently meet diverse present and future needs, particularly for working-age households, with mixed views on housing quality, energy efficiency, and the impacts of short-term visitor accommodation.

Key discussion points:

- The large number of respondents and how the data captured can flow on to different parts of the organisation and inform their work.

Councillor Herz Jardine left the workshop at 1.54 pm and returned at 1.55 pm during consideration of Item 5.

5. Gambling and TAB Venues Policy Review

Sharna O’Neil, Policy Analyst Strategic Policy and Thomas Lee, Principal Advisor Policy joined the workshop to present Item 5 (refer to agenda report and presentation), and to answer questions from elected members.

Key presentation points:

- The Gambling Act 2003 (s102) and Racing Industry Act 2020 (s97) require territorial authorities to have a policy on class 4 gambling venues (pokie machines) and standalone TAB venues. The policy must be reviewed at least every three years and cannot be amended without undertaking a special consultative process (SCP).
- The policy was last reviewed and retained without amendment by the Council in October 2024. The Council resolved for the policy to be reviewed within two years and for a SCP to be undertaken.
- The policy must specify whether new class 4 gambling (pokies) and TAB venues can establish in the district, and if so, where they may be located. In addition, a class 4 venues policy may also include limits on the maximum number of gaming machines at a new venue and may include a relocation policy. The policy cannot force venues to close or relocate.
- The Council’s Gambling and TAB Venues Policy is a combined policy document. It does not allow an increase in class 4 gaming venues or machine numbers. If a venue closes, another venue cannot be established. The policy allows new standalone TAB venues to establish, subject to statutory requirements. The current policy provisions have been in place since 2004.
- The primary intent of the policy is to reduce gambling accessibility to prevent and minimise harm.
- Aspects out of scope of the policy include online gambling, distribution of grant funding, licencing, compliance, TAB kiosks, Pub TAB and Casinos.
- A report will be presented to the Policy and Planning Committee on 13 May.
- As the Council resolved to undertake a SCP, a new decision would be required if it decides that is not required.

Key discussion points:

- The amount of grant funding that goes to community groups that rely on gambling funding.

- Confirmation that the Council needs to go through a review process even if it decides to make no changes.

6. Delegations Register

Ron Lemm, Manager Legal Service Delivery joined the workshop to present Item 6 (refer to agenda report and presentation), and to answer questions from elected members.

Key presentation points:

- The Council delegates many decisions to staff and to community boards, though there are some powers that cannot be delegated.
- The Delegations Register is split into five parts. Staff are reviewing officer delegations (Parts A, B and C), that they are fit for purpose and effective and efficient.
- Staff are seeking direction about whether this should include:
 - Consideration of delegations from Council directly to Officers (Part B of the register) that could lawfully be delegated from Council to the Chief Executive, who can then subdelegate to staff; and
 - A review of the governance delegations from the Council to Community Boards.

Key discussion points:

- The reasons why it would be useful for the Chief Executive to be able to subdelegate, including when there is a change in a role title or a staff member is on extended leave. Sub-delegation would mean no requirement for a report to the Council seeking approval of a change in delegation.
- General support for the suggested scope of the review.

Meeting concluded at 2.20 pm.