

Christchurch City Council ATTACHMENTS UNDER SEPARATE COVER

Date: Tuesday 10 May 2022

Time: 9am

Venue: Council Chambers, Civic Offices,

53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE

 Hearing of Verbal Submissions for the Draft Annual Plan 2022-23 (and other concurrent consultations) - Tuesday 10 May 2022

C. Tuesday 10 May 2022 Volume of submissions for concurrent consultations......3





Submission ID	What do you think about the proposal to introduce a City Vacant differential of 4 for central city land with no active or consented use?	What do you think about the proposal to introduce a new rates remission for land kept in an improved and maintained state?	Where else do you think this could be applied and why?	Do you think that the Council should investigate options for increasing rates on derelict central city buildings, to ensure they contribute fairly to overall rates and to encourage them to commence repair work?	Name	Name of organisation	Your role
45982	HPC requests that for the proposed Vacate Land Rate Differential a provision allowing for discretion for Heritage and Character buildings be added. HPC is concerned the proposed new Rate in its application should not become a contributing factor in a buildings demise. HPC considers that an increased funding of the Tangible Fund (HIG grants etc) empowers the CCC Heritage Team to be more proactive and achieve more positive outcomes.			commence repair work?	Mark Gerrard	Historic Places Canterbury	

Submission	Do you have any comments on the proposed new policy on Māori Freehold Land? Please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views		
ID			
45979	We note with approval the following policies, programmes and projects:		
	The changes in Maori land rating.		



	Do you support the proposal to extend the three-bin kerbside collection to all serviceable roads in Wairewa?	Do you have any comments about the proposal?	Yes, I would like to speak to the Hearings Panel about my submission	Name
45509	Yes	The extension up Okuti does not go far enough. 1) from a land use perspective, the 3 bin collection should go another 500m up the road so that it would then get the additional smaller lifestyle blocks that all occur between the Reynolds Valley turnoff where it is proposed to terminate, and the Okuti reserve turnaround. 2) changing from reynolds to the sealed turnaround at the reserve up the road if far safer from a traffic safety perspective, and for this reason the school bus has changed from reynold (with its blind corners) to the reserve (which has far more space and is safer to turn around. 3) a save in CO2 ommisions. As CCC has its own sustainibility policy and has signed on to intenational climate accords, reducing carbon footpprint should be a priority-which it is for residents in this valley. As per the attached, there are 6 lifestyle size properties that front okuti between the proposed stopping point at reynolds and the new suggested reserve turnaround point. This one rubbish truck and its omissions over what I expect would be a 5minute addition to the journey, would save5 vehicles and their emmisions from being produced, having to drive all the way to the birdlings flat depot- a 20min round trip (5 x 20min= 1hr 40mins of driving and emissions instead of 5mins). This is a no brainer- we understand that there are some rurally zone larger blocks of land further up the valley that may not be efficient for CCC to pick up and there are few spots to turn around safety further up the valley. but the currently proposed stopping point at reynolds is unsafe, and makes limited sense given a better turning point and smaller lifestyle blocks occur in the 500m gap between reynolds and the reserve turn around. My neighbours agree- I have asked them. Do they need to submit or is my submission enough? its fairly clear from my plans, even from canterbury maps, the additional lad holdings/ dwellings I m talking about thanks We ask that you consider this minor change- it will be very much appreciated.	Yes	Jade McFarlane



