

Long-Term Plan Workshop
ATTACHMENTS - UNDER SEPARATE COVER

Date: Thursday 28 May 2026
Time: 9.30 am
Venue: Camellia Chambers, Civic Offices,
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

TABLE OF CONTENTS NGĀ IHIRANGI	PAGE
2. Long Term Plan 2027 - 2037 Workshop - Infrastructure Strategy	
A. Presentation Pack.....	3

Long Term Plan 2027 - 2037

Infrastructure Strategy
Responding to Significant Issues

What we're doing today

DETERMINING COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC DIRECTION IN RESPONSE TO THE SIGNIFICANT ISSUES.

WHAT WE'RE DOING TODAY

- Working through Council's strategic direction for each of the six significant issues, plus the enabling dependencies underneath them
- Testing whether each direction captures the right Council position
- Confirming the direction staff will build the Infrastructure Strategy against

WHAT WE'RE NOT DOING TODAY

- Resolving specific projects, timing, or funding allocations
- Working through operational detail that sits with staff
- Finalising the Infrastructure Strategy itself

HOW THE WORKSHOP FLOWS

- Issue by issue, with the Council direction for each presented as positions for Council to give direction on
- Discussion focused on whether each Council direction is right, missing something, or pitched at the wrong level
- Enabling dependencies (data, digital, workforce, partnerships) covered as a set at the end

Workshop Structure and Context

The six significant issues

Structural pressures that will shape decisions across the next thirty years.

ISSUE 1

Affordability and Funding Constraints

We are facing rising costs and infrastructure demand, alongside constrained revenue streams and increasing scrutiny of Council spending.

ISSUE 2

Managing Renewals Across Generations

Large parts of our infrastructure were built together and will come up for renewal at the same time, placing pressure on funding and delivery capacity.

ISSUE 3

Climate Change and Hazard Exposure

Infrastructure exposure to hazards is increasing and we are facing compounding costs to reinstate and improve resilience, placing pressure on funding.

ISSUE 4

Growth and Demographic Change

Growth creates opportunity but increases pressure on infrastructure and services, requiring a coordinated, financially sustainable response.

ISSUE 5

Regulatory Reform and Service Standards

We are facing growing regulatory obligations and standards, alongside rising community expectations that are influencing how we deliver infrastructure and services.

ISSUE 6

External Shocks and Uncertainty

External shocks and risks have the ability to undermine our operational resilience and increase and cost and complexity of delivering infrastructure and services.

Responding to the Significant Issues

These significant issues will shape Council's operating environment for the next thirty years. These issues won't all be resolved this cycle... and some can't be resolved at all. They can only be managed.

What the Strategy does

The Strategy doesn't attempt to fix these issues. It sets the position on how Council will manage them. Deliberately, with trade-offs visible and consequences understood.

- The Strategy will outline a set of Council directions: positions Council is being asked to consider today.
- These directions will inform how we approach activity planning and infrastructure management.
- Where we find gaps in our ability to respond, the Strategy will call out specific actions to close them.

How the directions work

The direction Council provides becomes the guidance that we plan against. The gap to meeting it becomes a named action in the Strategy.

-
- The direction is guidance: it becomes one of the key positions staff plan against (along with the FS and capital prioritisation framework) when reviewing Activity Plans, Asset Management Plans, and the capital programme.
 - It describes the ideal end state: what success looks like, in observable terms.
 - The gap becomes action: where we can't yet meet the direction, that gap becomes a named action in the Strategy. Some will be owned in the IS; others will sit in the FS, other strategies, plans, or workstreams. The key is that the issue is recognised, the response is identified, and it's clear where it's being picked up.

Some actions are discrete; some are staged programmes of work running across multiple LTP cycles. Both sit in the Strategy as commitments, not asks for later.

Why directions, not actions or projects

Directions are durable. They hold across LTP cycles even as the actions underneath them evolve

-
- Each direction is a strategic position. Not a project, not an action, not a list of things to do.
 - Directions are durable. They hold across multiple LTP cycles, even as the work underneath evolves.
 - Actions are time-bound. They describe what the Strategy commits to in the current cycle and the cycles immediately following.

Keeps Council's involvement at the level where governance decisions belong and gives the organisation something durable to plan against.

From direction to guidance

Council considers the directions today. The Strategy translates them into the LTP programme and the actions to close the gaps.

1 TODAY	2 JUNE 2026	3 JUNE TO 1 OCT 2026	4 TO JUNE 2027
Refine Council Directions Test each issue's direction. Adjust where needed.	Translate to guidance The Directions become Council guidance, recorded in the IS. Gaps identified through this work become named actions. Some of these will be discrete, some will be picked up in other workstreams.	Draft LTP Build We come back to Council with the draft IS (as well as activity plans, asset plans and capital programme developed against the confirmed guidance.)	Draft LTP finalisation Draft LTP aligned and finalised prior to consultation (February 2027) and adoption (June 2027.)

Proposed Council Direction

Te Tiriti Context

Council's infrastructure planning operates within a Treaty context, shaped by obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Ngāi Tahu Settlement Act.

- Mana whenua hold enduring, intergenerational relationships with land, freshwater, and coastal environments. Infrastructure decisions can enable or constrain these relationships.
- Wāhi tapu, culturally significant landscapes, waterways, and coastal environments are directly affected by where and how infrastructure is planned, built, and managed.
- Mātauranga Māori provides distinct and complementary insight into environmental systems, risk, resilience, and long-term change, alongside scientific and technical evidence.
- Cultural values and impacts are not separate from infrastructure trade-offs. They should sit within decisions about cost, growth, service levels, and adaptation.

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

All infrastructure planning, investment, and management should consider mana whenua values and priorities for land, freshwater, and coastal environments, and be developed through ongoing partnership with mana whenua in line with Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations.

This expectation applies across all significant issues and downstream planning.

ISSUE 1

Affordability and Funding Constraints

We are facing rising costs and infrastructure demand, alongside constrained revenue streams and increasing scrutiny of Council spending.

SUMMARY

- Christchurch is managing a complex, capital-intensive infrastructure portfolio against rising costs, declining community capacity, and a tightening rates envelope.
- Construction, operating, and insurance costs are up structurally and not reversing. Household income growth is relatively slow and cost of living is rising.
- With an increasing proportion of older residents who may hold significant assets but have more limited disposable income and rely on fixed incomes (e.g. superannuation), the Council may face mounting pressure to limit rate increases, heightening the challenge of balancing affordability with ongoing infrastructure investment.
- The 2025/26 Annual Plan highlighted \$6.5m in inflationary pressures beyond LTP forecasts, and at least an additional \$4.1m in operating costs from new capital projects.
- We have a constrained rates trajectory, and we're conscious of the pressure rates put on the community.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR COUNCIL

- The Financial Strategy principles set a Council expectation to look after what we've got, look to the future, and balance affordability with deliverability. How can the Council find the right balance?
- How can we better convey what is non-discretionary versus discretionary investment, and the implications on funding and finance decisions?
- Trade-offs are coming whether we choose them or not. The question is whether they are made deliberately or by default.
- Where is deferred renewal creating risk that Council should formally acknowledge and account for?
- Are there areas of the portfolio where the answer is that current service expectations cannot be sustained within affordable funding constraints?
- Given the above, what is genuinely affordable and sustainable over 30-50 years, and where do expectations need to be realigned to the funding envelope?

ISSUE 1

Affordability and Funding Constraints

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Affordability is the binding constraint.

Develop Activity Plans and AMPs within the financial envelope, not toward an aspirational one. Where need exceeds envelope, name the gap rather than absorb it.

- The Financial Strategy envelope, and capital delivery constraints, are the boundaries within which infrastructure decisions are made.
- The IS, FS and capital prioritisation process will not expand beyond the approved FS envelope
- Where the combined cost of activities exceeds what's affordable, the gap is made visible, not absorbed silently.

How costs are shared between today's and future ratepayers is made visible

For major investment decisions, the FS will show how the proposed funding split divides cost between the ratepayers of today and those of the future and make that case explicitly, connected to the Financial Strategy.

- How costs are split between current and future ratepayers is a Council position, made deliberately in the FS.
- The case for major infrastructure investment and the FS show this split explicitly: who pays what, when, and why that's the right balance.
- Future ratepayers carry real cost and benefit from decisions made now; that is acknowledged, sized, and visible at the point of decision.

Infrastructure management requires deliberate, transparent, and well reasoned trade offs.

FS and capital prioritisation decisions about scope, timing, service levels, and investment priorities must be made consciously and recorded. They are not left to emerge by default through omission or silent drift.

- Where expectations cannot be met within the available funding or resource envelope, this must be explicitly acknowledged in the FS and capital prioritisation process.
- Any reductions, deferrals, or scope changes must be visible, taking into consideration risk implications and change in service level expectations.

ISSUE 1

Affordability and Funding Constraints

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

The programme is prioritised within the financial envelope; non-discretionary investment is provided for first.

Investment is sequenced deliberately. Where the full programme cannot be delivered, we clearly set out what proceeds now, what is deferred, and on what basis.

Service expectations will need to be aligned to the funding trajectory.

Where discretionary levels of service can't be sustained affordably, the Level of Service Review is the mechanism to consider options.

- Staging is a deliberate decision, not a residual outcome. Programme sequencing reflects explicit choices, not what happens to fit.
- The basis for sequencing is transparent. The rationale for prioritising some work now, and deferring other work, is clear and defensible via the approved capital prioritisation process.
- Deferrals are visible and understood. Where work is moved beyond the current envelope or into later LTP cycles, the implications (risk, cost, and service impact) are recorded and made visible.
- Level of Service Review (part of Activity Planning) is the formal channel for resolving where standards may need to shift.
- Council expects to see, across the portfolio, where this realignment is being raised and how it is being carried into the Review.

ISSUE 2

Managing Renewals Across Generations

Large parts of our infrastructure were built together and will come up for renewal at the same time, placing pressure on funding and delivery capacity.

SUMMARY

- The post-quake rebuild has created a future renewal dynamic that will concentrate in the 2050s to 2070s, alongside ageing pre-earthquake infrastructure.
- Renewal is the largest and least discretionary part of the capital programme,
- Each renewal locks in 30 to 50 years of operating conditions. Replacing like-for-like is a choice, even when it looks like the default.
- Without a consistent renewal framework, decisions default to project-level judgement and specification creep is a real risk.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR COUNCIL

- What standard should govern major renewals: like-for-like, current conditions, modern equivalent, or a risk-based tier?
- How should the renewal peaks be managed: smooth through debt, bring forward, or accept as a higher-expenditure period?
- How do we ensure design standard changes come to Council for approval rather than being embedded implicitly through project-level decisions?
- What is the right planning horizon for renewals in hazard-exposed locations?

ISSUE 2

Managing Renewals Across Generations

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Renewal peaks are anticipated and managed across the 30-year view.

Where renewal peaks emerge, make them visible and indicate how they're managed.

- Renewal investment is presented across the full 30 years, not just the LTP decade.
- Where peaks are foreseeable, the plan for them explicitly rather than absorbing them when they arrive.
- How a peak is managed (smoothed, brought forward, accepted) is a Council position taken in advance, not deferred to the cycle it lands in.
- Risk based approach utilising asset criticality and condition data is used in managing peaks (i.e. prioritising renewals of high-risk assets, and/or strategic review of renewals that are based on high-risk asset data)

Renewal planning is transparent, risk based, and data driven ensuring the right assets are renewed at the right time.

Renewal programmes are developed and managed using a risk-based approach drawing on criticality, condition, and repair and maintenance history.

- Prioritisation and deferrals are strategic decisions; considering risk, service expectations and whole of life cost optimisation.
- The basis for deferring or re-prioritising a renewal traces back to the asset records, with any deviations recorded in the asset information systems
- The cost of deferring (risk, consequence, and future cost) is sized and visible alongside the near-term saving
- A review process is in place for renewal programmes based on high-risk asset data

ISSUE 2

Managing Renewals Across Generations

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Renewal design standards are explicit, and any upgrade is justified.

Renewals are designed to a clear default standard for each asset class. Anything above that default requires the rationale and cost to be set out, so we're not quietly scope creeping.

- Infrastructure Design Standards (IDS) and Construction Standard Specifications (CSS) set the default renewal standard for each major asset class.
- Renewals are designed to that default unless there's a clear case to do otherwise.
- Where an upgrade above the default is proposed, the rationale, cost, and whole-of-life implications are documented and visible.

ISSUE 3

Climate Change and Hazard Exposure

Infrastructure exposure to hazards is shifting from infrequent shocks to also include chronic, recurring impacts. We are facing compounding costs to reinstate and improve resilience, placing pressure on funding.

SUMMARY

- Over a third of the district is already exposed to at least one climate-related hazard, with damage and disruption growing for public and private assets.
- Water-related hazards dominate the city's risk profile: river flooding, coastal inundation, and groundwater rise.
- However, these are not the only risks, with localised but severe hazards such as wildfire, landslides and coastal erosion also present, alongside growing impacts from heat and wind.
- The financial picture is shifting from infrequent shocks to chronic, recurring impacts that compound over decades.
- Climate risk is asymmetric: the cost of adapting early is consistently lower than adapting late, but adaptation requires Council positions on risk appetite and the long-term viability of some infrastructure in some locations.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR COUNCIL

- How long do we continue repairing and protecting assets, when do we adapt assets, and when do we accept changes to levels of service to maintain long-term affordability?
- How should climate-related costs be managed proactively over time?
- How can greenhouse gas emissions be managed throughout the lifecycle of infrastructure: embodied, operational, and avoided?

ISSUE 3

Climate Change and Hazard Exposure

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Use the latest-available risk information as a key planning input.

Use the available climate and projection data to inform risk assessment in your activity. Apply it consistently across your programme.

- Identify the challenges, trade-offs and costs of different design options, to inform decisions; don't defer the conversation to the next cycle.
- Renewals in hazard-exposed locations are designed with future conditions deliberately considered, over the lifetime of the infrastructure.
- Climate and projection data informs risk assessment as it becomes available.
- Higher near-term cost from future-condition design is surfaced and weighed, not a reason to defer.
- Climate risk sits inside renewal and capital decisions, not alongside them.

Assets in hazard-exposed locations are designed with future conditions deliberately considered.

In hazard-exposed locations, weigh the conditions the asset will face over its life against the cost of designing for them.

- Present the options (design to future conditions, renew to current standards with a shorter horizon, change the level of service, or transition out) with the trade-offs visible, including how the options can be met within the financial envelope set by the FS.
- The planning horizon for the decision reflects the conditions the asset will face, not the era it replaces.
- The options are considered openly, with cost, risk, service implications and asset data quality shown for each.

ISSUE 3

Climate Change and Hazard Exposure

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Emissions are weighed in the investment case for major capital and renewals, especially where decarbonisation saves money over the long term.

Consider lifecycle emissions when you're building the case for major capital and renewals: what the work emits to build, what it emits to run, and what emissions it avoids.

- Where a lower-emissions option saves money over the asset's life, that's a real choice for Council to see, not a co-benefit in an appendix.
- Emissions are considered alongside cost and performance in the business case, not after it.
- Where emissions are material to the decision, Council expects to see them in the trade-off, not in a separate report.

Where assets cannot be sustained, Council engages before events force the conversation.

Flag locations and assets where managed transition is becoming the right answer. Build the cost of leading that conversation into the plan, alongside protection costs.

- Managed transition conversations happen proactively, not in the aftermath of damage.
- Council does not expect to be presented with these decisions under crisis conditions.
- The cost of leading these conversations is part of the cost of adaptation.

ISSUE 4

Growth and Demographic Change

Growth creates opportunity but increases pressure on infrastructure and services, requiring a coordinated, financially sustainable response.

SUMMARY

- Christchurch is projected to grow to around 520,000 by 2057, with a shift towards more multi-unit dwellings across the city, balanced with a steady demand for standalone family homes close to services and employment.
- Investing in city infrastructure gives businesses the confidence to grow, while attracting new firms and jobs to the city. Our diverse regional economy, especially its strong, expanding manufacturing sector, brings unique infrastructure demands and challenges.
- Growth-enabling infrastructure is planned for in line with projected demand, but out of sequence growth remains a challenge.
- Around 40% of Selwyn and Waimakariri's workforce relies on Christchurch infrastructure daily without contributing to the city's rates, with sustained ongoing growth further increasing demand.
- The proportion of residents aged over 65 is projected to rise from 16% to 26% by 2073, which will increase demand for age friendly infrastructure.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR COUNCIL

1. Intensification often requires significant upgrades to water, wastewater, stormwater, transport, and community infrastructure in existing urban areas. It can be more cost-effective to support intensification, but only if infrastructure is upgraded in a coordinated way, and with enough capacity to meet long-term growth, rather than requiring repeated or reactive upgrades.
2. Planning for the provision of growth infrastructure requires strong integration with strategic land use planning to ensure infrastructure is delivered where growth is enabled. Developer driven out of sequence development can lead to unplanned, more expensive upgrades and can disrupt planned infrastructure investment.
3. Transport, water, and public amenities are used at a metro scale, not just within city boundaries. Christchurch ratepayers bear disproportionate costs for infrastructure used by non residents.
4. Businesses require reliable freight routes and infrastructure. Infrastructure investment and capacity will influence the city's ability to attract and retain business relative to other regions.

ISSUE 4

Growth and Demographic Change

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

We take a coordinated, long-term, approach to providing for growth

Infrastructure is planned for and delivered in line with projected growth, with enough flexibility to respond to out of sequence growth where there is a clear, strategic benefit for the city.

- Growth infrastructure is delivered in a coordinated, integrated way across asset types and services, in line with projected demand and to incentivise development in priority development areas.
- Infrastructure is sequenced to maximise development potential within a prudent financial framework.
- Council maintains enough flexibility to respond to out of sequence development opportunities where there is a clear strategic benefit, while ensuring decisions remain financially sustainable and ensuring ratepayers are no worse off.

We invest in infrastructure capacity that supports economic growth

We provide resilient, well serviced infrastructure in business areas to support a diverse economy and enable business and job growth.

- Business zoned land is supported by fit for purpose infrastructure to meet the needs of a diverse business sector.
- Infrastructure networks are planned, delivered, and managed in a way that supports resilience, minimises disruption, and supports the retention and attraction of business and jobs.

Supporting today while building for tomorrow

Right infrastructure, right place, right time.

- We plan for adaptable, accessible infrastructure and community facilities that supports an ageing and more diverse population, while staying resilient and scalable to support future growth rather than requiring repeated or reactive upgrades.
- Future community needs guide infrastructure decisions today, ensuring assets remain fit for purpose over time.

ISSUE 4

Growth and Demographic Change

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Growth pays for growth

We ensure that growth pays for growth by using available funding tools that allocate infrastructure costs to those who benefit, rather than existing ratepayers.

- We make use of the right funding tools, so the cost of growth infrastructure is funded by the beneficiaries of the infrastructure, not existing ratepayers, ensuring existing ratepayers are no worse off.
- Our approach must provide for efficient urban development and growth, while maintaining affordability for current communities.

ISSUE 5

Regulatory Reform and Service Standards

We are facing growing regulatory obligations and standards, alongside rising community expectations that are influencing how we deliver infrastructure and services.

SUMMARY

- More than six concurrent central government reform programmes are reshaping what councils must do and how. Compliance is non-discretionary; the question is how and when Council responds.
- Local government structural reform is now an active programme: Head Start opened May 2026, with implementation targeted by the 2028 elections. The Strategy must hold value through reform.
- Tightening standards are already reshaping the capital programme: Taumata Arowai, NPS for Freshwater, Water Services Act, climate obligations, facility standards.
- How Council responds to regulation has a material impact on total cost. Integrated responses cost less than standalone compliance under deadline pressure.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR COUNCIL

- Should Council respond to regulation reactively, integrate compliance with renewal cycles, or get ahead where the certainty test is met?
- Is the full regulatory pipeline understood and reflected in the capital programme?
- How should non-discretionary and discretionary investment be distinguished in programme reporting, consistent with the capital prioritisation framework, and should this become a permanent feature?
- Are there areas where we have certainty that standards will change, and is it cheaper to build to new standards now rather than retrofit later?
- Does the current programme presentation enable genuine prioritisation decisions, or does it obscure them?

ISSUE 5

Regulatory Reform and Service Standards

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Integration with renewal cycles is the default position.

Meet regulatory obligations through the renewal programme wherever the timing allows. Where you've had to address compliance standalone, explain why integration wasn't possible.

- Regulatory, and non-discretionary level of service, obligations are met through the renewal programme wherever the timing allows.
- Standalone compliance under deadline pressure is more expensive and displaces other work.
- Where integration isn't possible, that is explicit, not a fait accompli.

Non-discretionary investment is permanently visible.

Tag each capital line as non-discretionary or discretionary, consistent with the capital prioritisation framework.

- Ratepayers and elected members can read the programme and see what is non-discretionary versus discretionary (as defined by the approved Capital Prioritisation framework)
- Without it, prioritisation discussions are constrained.

Build compliance into the programme only where future tightening is demonstrably certain.

Don't propose getting ahead of regulation unless the case is firm. Where future tightening is certain, consider that as part of the investment case.

- Proactive investment ahead of regulation requires a clear certainty test to be met.
- Speculative pre-compliance is not expected; the case for getting ahead is to be made.
- Where certainty is sufficient, getting ahead is the cheaper whole-of-life option and Council expects it.

ISSUE 6

External Shocks and Uncertainty

External shocks and risks have the ability to undermine our operational resilience and increase and cost and complexity of delivering infrastructure and services.

SUMMARY

- In the last 15 years, the Canterbury Earthquakes, a global pandemic and geopolitical disruption, has led to acute cost escalations, disrupting our capital programme and delivery.
- When these disruptions occur, does Council have the financial headroom, critical asset knowledge, and standing arrangements to respond without improvising under pressure.
- Lower-level uncertainty (cost estimates, demand, regulatory timelines) is a persistent source of variance through the programme.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR COUNCIL

- Does Council have a current and tested view of which infrastructure assets are critical, meaning their failure would cascade across networks or essential services?
- For those critical assets, are there documented contingency plans (a credible Plan B) that have been reviewed and are capable of being activated?
- How much financial headroom should be maintained as standing policy, sized for both shock events and sustained chronic losses over decades?

ISSUE 6

External Shocks and Uncertainty

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Being ready for shocks is built into how we plan, invest, and deliver.

Plan, invest, and design so the organisation can absorb and adapt to shocks rather than just react to them. Where possible, build resilience in proactively at programme, investment, and project level, not after an event exposes the gap.

- Resilience to shocks is a forward-looking position, designed in deliberately.
- At programme level, we understand what flexibility we have to redirect, reprioritise, or accelerate when conditions change.
- At investment level, major decisions weigh their contribution to resilience alongside cost and performance.

Council holds a current, shared view of critical infrastructure.

Keep the picture of your critical assets current, particularly where failure would cascade or trigger health and safety consequence.

- Criticality is a live, maintained picture, ready to draw on when an event occurs.
- Owners are named, condition is known, contingency arrangements are documented (or their absence is).
- The view is validated regularly between events, not only when one is unfolding or when a plan is being written.
- Critical assets should be governed differently from the rest of the portfolio.

Financial headroom for shocks is set through the Financial Strategy and kept fit for purpose.

The position on debt headroom for shocks is resolved in the Financial Strategy, not in individual activity plans.

- The level of headroom Council holds for shocks is a Financial Strategy position.
- The setting is fit for purpose for current conditions and reviewed as scenario planning, stress tests, or external conditions shift it.
- Where activity-level scenario work suggests the headroom assumption no longer fits, that finding is brought forward to the FS for consideration, not absorbed in the AP.
- Where current headroom settings bind what activity plans can fund, that trade-off is explicit, not silent.

Enabling Dependencies

Data, digital systems, workforce, and partnerships are not background to infrastructure delivery. They are what makes infrastructure delivery possible.

S U M M A R Y

- Asset data and condition information essential across networks. Where it is poor, governance is operating partly blind: decisions about renewal, criticality, and risk rest on assumptions rather than evidence.
- Digital systems underpin every infrastructure group. Underinvestment here degrades all of them at once, but the cost tends to sit in corporate overhead rather than the capital programme where it can be seen.
- Workforce and contractor capacity is constrained sector-wide. Pipeline pressure on engineers, planners, and specialist trades is a real limit on what the programme can deliver, separate from what it can fund.
- Nationally, job losses in the construction sector have been notable, with the number of filled jobs down by 5.1% in the past year.

C O N S I D E R A T I O N S F O R C O U N C I L

- Is the state of asset data and condition information good enough to support the governance decisions Council is being asked to make, and where it isn't, what is the plan?
- Should digital and technology investment be made visible in the capital programme, rather than absorbed into corporate overhead where its scale and trade-offs aren't seen?
- Structural issues like skills shortages, long procurement lead times, and limited tender responses could further constrain project initiation and execution.
- How should workforce and contractor capacity constraints be surfaced in the programme? As a named risk to delivery, distinct from funding constraints?

Enabling Dependencies

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Mana whenua partnership is distinct and embedded.

The relationship with mana whenua is a partnership, not a stakeholder engagement exercise. It is ongoing and embedded in how we plan, not triggered project by project.

- Infrastructure decisions should reflect partnership input before they're locked in, not after.
- Planning processes distinguish between:
 - Treaty partnership obligations
 - General stakeholder or community engagement
 - Capability, systems, and resourcing support effective partnership with mana whenua

Workforce constraint is named, not absorbed.

Where workforce or contractor capacity limits what you can deliver, name it as a programme risk. Don't let deferred delivery look like deliberate phasing.

- Where workforce capacity limits delivery, that constraint is surfaced as a programme risk, not absorbed as silent deferral.
- The sector-wide pipeline pressure on contractors, consultants, and specialist skills is part of the planning environment.

Digital and technology investment is part of the infrastructure picture.

Where your activity depends on digital systems, surface that investment

- Digital systems underpin every named infrastructure group; underinvestment degrades them all.
- Council expects digital and technology investment to be visible
- Where digital systems are not keeping pace with network complexity or regulatory reporting, Council expects to know.

Enabling Dependencies

PROPOSED STRATEGIC DIRECTION

**Data and information
are governance
infrastructure.**

Make asset data, condition, and risk information visible in the AMP. Where the data isn't good enough to support a decision, say so in the plan rather than working around it.

- Council expects to be able to see, in the programme, what assets are critical, what their condition is, and what risk they carry.
- Accurate asset data, condition assessment, and decision-support are not back-office work; they are a precondition for governance.
- Where data gaps prevent good decisions, those gaps must be surfaced during planning, not absorbed.

Next Steps

From direction to guidance

Council considers the directions today. The Strategy translates them into the LTP programme and the actions to close the gaps.

1 TODAY	2 JUNE 2026	3 JUNE TO 1 OCT 2026	4 TO JUNE 2027
Refine Council Directions Test each issue's direction. Adjust where needed.	Translate to guidance The Directions become Council guidance, recorded in the IS. Gaps identified through this work become named actions. Some of these will be discrete, some will be picked up in other workstreams.	Draft LTP Build We come back to Council with the draft IS (as well as activity plans, asset plans and capital programme developed against the confirmed guidance.)	Draft LTP finalisation Draft LTP aligned and finalised prior to consultation (February 2027) and adoption (June 2027.)