

Greater Ōtautahi Submission to the Christchurch City Council's Draft Long-Term Plan 2024/2034

Greater Ōtautahi is a non-partisan group of Ōtautahi Christchurch residents who want to help create a better city. We have rapidly gained 50 members and are growing fast. We advocate primarily for housing choice, transport choice, access to amenities, safe streets and a vibrant city. Through this vision, we see a future Ōtautahi that is liveable and equitable for generations to come.

If you would like to join us, flick us a message on [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), or e-mail us at greaterotautahi@gmail.com.

How to:

The link to the submission form is [here](#). More info can be found on CCC's webpage [here](#).

Please use our submission below to help you create your own submission **in your own words**. Please don't copy and paste word-for-word, as the council will include this as one submission. However, please include the lists of projects, which must be explicitly stated.

- If you are short on time, you can use the [quick version](#).
- If you'd like to include more detail, check out our [detailed answers below](#) for ideas.

Quick Version:

- **Q1 - Overall, have we got the balance right? No**
 - Too much capital allocated to **road maintenance**
 - Need to invest in **cycle infrastructure** which requires little maintenance and has numerous active health and environmental benefits
 - Increasing use of **active transport** and **public transport** reduces wear on our roads
 - Insufficient investment in **climate mitigation** and **adaptation**.
- **Q2 - Given that both the Council and residents are facing significant financial challenges, should we be maintaining our existing levels of**

service and level of investment in our core infrastructure and facilities, which will mean a proposed average rates increase of 13.24% across all ratepayers and an average residential rate increase of 12.4%?: Yes

- Any change in rates must account for continued investment in public and active transport, climate mitigation projects, and climate adaptation projects. These are simply non-negotiable for future generations. If projects are being deferred or discontinued to make these rate cuts occur, we strongly recommend that this practice be reversed.
- Rates have been kept artificially low through underinvestment in or deferment of infrastructure, and commitments by Councillor and Mayoral candidates running on keeping rates low as a form of electoral promise.
- If we lower rates, our city will lose the ability to provide its current levels of service, and those who use council services will be disproportionately worse off. More affluent residents and neighbourhoods may think they are insulated from this trend as they are less likely to use these facilities, but they are still part of this city, and will feel the effects of austerity.
-

- **Q3 - We're proposing some changes to how we rate, including changes to the city vacant differential, rating visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business, and changes to our rates postponement and remissions for charities policies. Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to how we rate?**
 - Because rates are based on the number of "rating units" in the city, it can spread costs more equitably by zoning for more building. Therefore, CCC should commit to implementing MDRS in full by 2025, in order to maintain a growing ratings base.
 - Recommend investigating the implementation of **Land Value Rating** ready for a potential referendum alongside local body elections in 2025. This ensures that we get more productive use of our valuable city centre land, enabling a city for people, not car yards and car storage.
 - Recommend expanding the **City Vacant Differential (CVD)** programme to:
 - Cover the entire city, as a disincentive to land banking,
 - Ban car parks from being considered from remission,

- Increase the multiplier of the CVD from 4.523 to 6.
- Agree with the proposed changes to the **rating of visitor accommodation** in a residential unit. Too often, new housing is built, only to be purchased by investors and let out as short-stay accommodation (AirBnB), limiting the supply of housing for first-home buyers, renters, and homeowners looking to downsize.
- **Q4 - Fees & Charges (e.g. proposal to introduce parking charges at key parks)?**
 - Support proposed **parking charges** at the **Botanic Gardens and Hagley Park**, as these areas are well-connected by public transport, and active transport. The \$2m a year this would raise (based on Council's calculations) would be useful in offsetting other costs.
 - **Parking charges should be increased** around the city. This would incentivise public and active transport use, and by disincentivizing car usage, we could also improve air quality, reduce emissions, and improve accessibility of our city.
 - **Increase the fees for excess water usage.** These fees are targeted towards ratepayers who consume a significantly above average amount of water, and any increases would not have an impact on the average ratepayer.
- **Q5 - Operational Spending. Are we prioritising the right things? Yes**

There is no mandate for Council to cut back on services people rely upon (libraries, swimming pools, etc) to force a lower rates increase. Council's services exist for its constituents, and removing these services will disproportionately impact lower socioeconomic, disabled, and elderly residents.
- **Q6 - Capital Spending. Are we prioritising the right things? No**

The delays to the Major Cycle Routes (MCRs) programme are unacceptable and irresponsible. This programme needs to be accelerated rather than defunded and delayed. The “cheap and cheerful” approach to the cycleway rolled out on Park Terrace and Rolleston Avenue could be used to speed up the cycleway rollout with much reduced capital costs initially. This would allow people to have access to more safe cycling infrastructure more quickly.

- **Q7. Is there anything that you would like to tell us about specific aspects of our proposed capital spend or capital programme? Yes**
- **Q7.1 - Transport?**
 - Provide better public transport options, including installing more bus lanes and better enforcement of bus lanes
 - Continue the rollout of the Major Cycle Routes without additional delay by returning the funding models for the following programmes to what they are in the Current Amended LTP 2024-2034 funding allocations:
 - 26611 – Major Cycleway – Wheels to Wings Route (Section 1) Harewood to Greers
 - 23101 – Major Cycleway – Nor'West Arc Route (Section 3) University to Harewood
 - 26604 – Major Cycleway – Ōpāwaho River Route (Section 1) Princess Margaret Hospital to Corson Avenue
 - 26606 – Major Cycleway – Ōpāwaho River Route (Section 2) Corson to Waltham
 - 26605 – Major Cycleway – Ōpāwaho River Route (Section 3) Waltham to Ferrymead Bridge
 - 23100 – Major Cycleway – Heathcote Expressway Route (Section 2) Tannery to Martindales
 - 26607 – Major Cycleway – Southern Lights Route (Section 1) Strickland to Tennyson
 - 26601 – Major Cycleway – Ōtākaro Avon Route (Section 1) Fitzgerald to Swanns Road Bridge (OARC)
 - 26602 – Major Cycleway – Ōtākaro Avon Route (Section 2) Swanns Road Bridge to Anzac Drive Bridge (OARC)
 - 26603 – Major Cycleway – Ōtākaro Avon Route (Section 3) Anzac Drive Bridge to New Brighton (OARC)
 - 1986 – Programme – Major Cycleway – Northern Line Cycleway
 - 47031 – Major Cycleway – South Express Route (Section 2) Craven to Buchanans
 - 1341 – Major Cycleway – Nor'West Arc Route – Annex, Birmingham & Wrights Corridor Improvement
 - 1993 – Programme – Major Cycleway – Nor'West Arc
 - Bring back the following Local Cycle Network (LCN) and Cycle Connections programmes:
 - Burwood Ward: 41852 - Cycle Connections - Ōtākaro-Avon Route
 - Fendalton Ward: 44709 – Local Cycle Network – Greers Rd
 - Harewood Ward: 41853 – Cycle Connections – Wheels to Wings, 12692 – Belfast Park Cycle & Pedestrian Rail Crossing
 - Waimairi Ward: 44696 – Local Cycle Network – North West Outer Orbital, 44707 – Local Cycle Network – Bishopdale & Casebrook
 - Halswell Ward: 44710 – Local Cycle Network – Halswell to Hornby, 17059 – Cycle Connections – Little River Link

- Hornby Ward: 41849 – Cycle Connections – South Express, 44697 – Local Cycle Network – South West Outer Orbital, 44712 – Local Cycle Network – Springs Road
- Riccarton Ward: 41847 – Cycle Connections – Nor’West Arc, 44695 – Local Cycle Network – Inner Western Arc, 44698 – Local Cycle Network – Burnside to Villa
- Central Ward: 44693 – Central City Projects – Cycle Connections, 44699 – Local Cycle Network – The Palms to Heathcote Express, 44706 – Local Cycle Network – Avonside & Wainoni, 44713 – Local Cycle Network – Ōtākaro-Avon
- Innes Ward: 44701 – Local Cycle Network – Northern Mid Orbital, 44702 – Local Cycle Network – Northern Outer Orbital, 44703 – Local Cycle Network – Northwood
- Cashmere Ward: 41850 – Cycle Connections – Southern Lights, 44711 – Local Cycle Network – Opawa, Waltham & Sydenham
- Heathcote Ward: 41844 – Cycle Connections – Heathcote Expressway, 41851 – Cycle Connections – Ōpāwaho River Route
- Reinstate the following separate projects for their benefit of improved travel choice and amenities/safety for busy areas:
 - 53733 – Heathcote Street Pocket Park & Pedestrian Development
 - 53734 – Ferrymead Towpath Connection (FM5)
 - 914 – Core Public Transport Corridor & Facilities – South (Colombo St)
 - 60276 – Public Transport Improvement Programme (Brougham & Moorhouse Area)
 - 60250 – Programme – Electric Vehicle Charging At City Council Off Street Parking Buildings & Facilities
 - 26623 – Edgeware Village Masterplan (A1)
 - 63365 – Central City Projects – Active Travel Area

- **Q7.2 - Parks, heritage or the coastal environment?**

Council must allocate more funding to implement the biodiversity strategy.. Evidence shows there are tangible benefits to increasing tree cover in urban streets and creating green urban pathways, including reducing urban surface temperatures, and increasing appearance and value. They are also an attractive asset to local communities and can provide significant social and visual benefits to the overall appearance of any given street.

- **Q7.3 - Libraries?**

The provision of a temporary facility is essential for the community while the South Library is under reconstruction. It is a vital community space, and the volumes of displaced users are too high to assume they'll all be covered by Te Hapua and Spreydon Library. This should be considered regardless of the Operational Expenses required.

- **Q7.4 - Solid waste and resource recovery?**

Outside of our scope, but comment provided by Morgane from Richmond Community Garden

- **Minimising Landfill Waste:** Avoid sending organic waste to landfill whenever possible. Organic waste can be composted or converted into valuable resources.(i.e Christchurch Red Zone could do with compost and mulch to help the fruit trees).
- **Improved Waste Management Practices:** Better monitoring and regulation of waste companies, especially Wasteco.
- **Construction Waste Sorting:** Sort and divert construction waste for recycling or repurposing.
- **Microplastic Monitoring:** Better monitoring and management strategies to prevent microplastics from entering waterways.
- **Encouraging Responsible Waste Disposal:** Making waste disposal more expensive to incentivise individuals and businesses to reduce waste generation and prioritise recycling and composting. Additionally, providing financial support to local groups and communities to manage organic waste.
- **Investing in Education and Infrastructure:** Funding should be allocated towards educating the public on recycling practices and promoting waste reduction initiatives.

- **Q7.5 - Other aspects of our capital spend or capital programme?**

The following Climate Emergency Response Fund (CERF) projects need to be added back in as part of the council capital programme:

- The Cycle Link along Aldwins Road and Ensors Road, making it safer for students to bike to Te Aratai College, a move which will reduce congestion at peak times.
- The Cycle Connection on Cashmere Road, between Hoon Hay Road and Oderings Garden Centre.
- The Cycleway along Simeon Street, which will connect cyclists to the Little River Link, Quarryman's Trail, and Barrington Shopping Centre; and improve cycling connections for neighbourhoods such as Aidanfield and the sports facilities at Ngā Puna Wai.

- The scheduled pedestrian improvements in 10 locations in Linwood to help tamariki travel to Whītau School.
- The upgrading of six Bromley intersections with reduced road widths in certain sections, raised zebra crossings, traffic islands, pedestrian refuge islands, safe speed platforms, speed cushions, transitional roundabouts, and refreshing painted markings.
- A cycle-friendly environment along Smith Street so people can cycle safely to Te Pou Toetoe: Linwood Pool and Te Waka Unua School on Ferry Road.
- The new cycle route in Richmond that will connect cyclists from the north to the south of Richmond.

● **Q8 - Additional opportunity and options to our main proposal. Which of the following do you think should be our focus for the 2024 - 2034 Long Term Plan?**

Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

● **Q9 - Are there any areas where you feel we should be reviewing the services we provide to reduce our costs throughout the Draft LTP 2024-2034? Yes**

Cost reductions cannot come from service cuts, outright sale of assets, or cuts to Climate Change or Biodiversity programmes (including all cycleways). We believe that more can be done to extract value from existing assets that are not currently generating sufficient returns:

- Sell the land purchased to build Tarras Airport (Otago Central Airport).
- Introduce small levies on Domestic and International Flights to and from Christchurch International Airport.
- Increased charging for parking in Council facilities.
- A Congestion Charging area within the Central City during hours of high traffic (Mon-Thu 9am-5pm, Fri-Sat 9pm-2am)

● **Q10 - Major event bid funding. Should we leave bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed? Or should we increase the bid funding?**

There should be a moderate increase in bid funding. Bidding on these events can provide a significant return on investment for businesses and create an excellent environment for residents.

- **Q11 - More investment in adapting to climate change. Do you think we should bring forward to 2024/25 the additional \$1.8 million spend currently proposed to commence in 2027/28, to accelerate our grasp of the climate risks?**

Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.

Christchurch is majorly exposed to climate change with billions of dollars worth of infrastructure and residential property threatened by coastal flooding alone. These impacts, and the array of other climate-exacerbated natural hazards (groundwater rise, river flooding, heat, wildfires etc.), threaten the physical, mental, and economic wellbeing of our communities. Early investment into adaptation has been shown to have significant return on investment and has wide co-benefits. It is critical that this work is a cornerstone of all infrastructure investment going forward.

- **Q12 - Should we create a climate adaptation fund to set aside funds now to manage future necessary changes to Council assets, including roads, water systems, and buildings, in alignment with our adaptation plans?**

Yes - create a climate adaption fund.

This must be a high priority for the council. Even if there is success in limiting global warming to 1.5 - 2 degrees, there will be negative externalities (e.g. more extreme weather, higher sea levels) that need to be addressed. Council must have plans and funding in place to both mitigate our emissions and work on adaptation.

- **Q13 - Our Community Outcomes and Priorities. Do you have any thoughts on our vision, community outcomes and strategic priorities?**

- **Q14 - What do you think of our proposal to start formal processes to dispose of five Council-owned properties?**

Oppose any potential sale of 26 Waipara St, as it is the only possible future link from Cracroft through to a future shared path along the Cashmere Stream

- **Q15 - What do you think of our proposal to dispose of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties?**

Properties should be retained and a proper Port Hills Red Zone plan developed for their future use - e.g., fire mitigation, native plantings, etc.

- **Q16 - What do you think of our proposal to gift the Yaldhurst Memorial Hall to the Yaldhurst Rural Residents' Association?**

(We have no opinion on this!)

Detailed Version:

Q1 - Overall, have we got the balance right? **No**

- We believe there has been too much priority in allocating capital to road maintenance (\$591 million on carriageway renewals). Due to changes made to the revised Long Term Plan (LTP), there is now a desperate need to invest in cycle infrastructure, which by comparison requires very little maintenance and has numerous active health and environmental benefits, rather than sinking more money into carriageway maintenance. Increasing the rate at which active transport and public transport is used within the city will have the knock-on effect of reducing wear on our roads, which will result in less repairs being needed and less capital being required.
- We believe the LTP fails to meet the bare minimum levels of investment in climate mitigation. There is little to no scope for future requirements, and it has been consistently noted that the current investment will not even meet our existing goals. There must be a concerted effort to properly allocate capital to these ends. The GNS report released to Council in December 2023, indicated that:

"Christchurch could see 14 to 23 centimetres of sea-level rise over the next 30 years. However, in places where land is subsiding at about 8 millimetres per year, such as parts of Brighton Spit and parts of Lyttelton Harbour and Koukourarata Port Levy, sea levels could rise by 38 to 47 centimetres – twice as much over the same 30-year timeframe." (GNS Science Consultancy Report 2023/81)

- Without adequate funding to mitigate or invest in retreat, this leaves little room for the Council to appropriately respond to the estimated \$17.2B worth of property that Council estimated would be impacted by sea-level rises in their October 2023 Submission to the Environment Select Committee's *Inquiry into Climate Adaptation*. While we are not advocating for Council to foot the entire bill, it must be noted that at least \$3.2B of that \$17B in property is the Council's Infrastructure. This is an unacceptable risk for Council to shoulder without sufficient capital and is a burden that should be shouldered from now on rather than being deferred.

Q2 - Given that both the Council and residents are facing significant financial challenges, should we be maintaining our existing levels of service and level of investment in our core infrastructure and facilities, which will mean a proposed average rates increase of 13.24% across all ratepayers and an average residential rate increase of 12.4%?: Yes

- Local Governments across New Zealand have traditionally kept rates low through deliberate underinvestment in or deferment of infrastructure, and commitments by Councillor and Mayoral candidates running on keeping rates low as a form of electoral promise. The proverbial chicken has now come home to roost.
- If we lower rates, our city will lose the ability to provide its current levels of service, and those who use council services will be disproportionately worse off. There is an assumption that more affluent residents and neighbourhoods may think they are insulated from this trend as they are less likely to use these facilities, but they are still part of this city, and will feel the effects of austerity.
- Any change in rates must account for continued investment in public and active transport, climate mitigation projects, and climate adaptation projects. These are simply non-negotiable for future generations. If projects are being deferred or discontinued to make these rate cuts occur, we strongly recommend that this practice be reversed.

Q3 - We're proposing some changes to how we rate, including changes to the city vacant differential, rating visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business, and changes to our rates postponement and remissions for charities policies. Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to how we rate? Yes

- We recommend that Council continues to investigate the implementation of Land Value Rating ready for a potential referendum alongside local body elections in 2025. This ensures that we get more productive use of our valuable city centre land, enabling a city for people, not car yards and car storage.
- We recommend an expansion of the City Vacant Differential (CVD) programme to:
 - Cover the entire city, as a disincentive to land banking,

- Ban car parks from being considered from remission,
- Increase the multiplier of the CVD from 4.523 to 6.
- We agree with the proposed changes to the rating of visitor accommodation in a residential unit
 - Too often, new housing is built in the centre of the city, only to be snapped up by investors and let out as short-stay accommodation, limiting the supply of housing for first-home buyers, renters, and homeowners looking to downsize.

Q4 - Fees & Charges. Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges (e.g. our proposal to introduce parking charges at key parks)? Yes

- We support the proposed parking charges at the Botanic Gardens and Hagley Park, as these areas are well-connected by public transport, and active transport. The \$2m a year this would raise (based on Council's calculations) would be useful in offsetting other costs.
- We believe that parking charges should be increased around the city. This would incentivise public and active transport use. In disincentivizing increased car usage, we could also improve the air quality and accessibility of our city.
- We recommend that Council increase the fees for excess water usage. These fees are targeted towards ratepayers who consume a significantly above average amount of water, and any increases would not have an impact on the average ratepayer.

Q5 - Operational Spending. Are we prioritising the right things? Yes

- There is no mandate for Council to cut back on services people rely upon (libraries, swimming pools, etc) to force a lower rates increase. Council's services exist for its constituents, and removing these services will disproportionately impact lower socioeconomic, disabled, and elderly residents, for whom there is no alternative.
- We request increased and/or continued funding for the Rapid Response Footpath Crews program which was set up to target smaller footpath repairs to increase customer satisfaction and safety. We believe this program has been very successful and would like it to continue.

- We request the expansion and proper funding of the parking enforcement team. Currently it operates only short working hours so enforcement of parking can not be carried out at times when it is really needed. The enforcement team should also allow the public to report using alternative methods such as sending photos to a monitored email address. The current system of needing to call a phone number is slow, inefficient and not cost effective. The rationale for this is equity and accessibility for all. For some people it is not easy to “just go around” a car parked on the footpath such as those using a wheelchair or pushing a pram. We also request a review of fines as they have not been increased in many years and may not be sufficiently high to act as a deterrent or to cover the cost of enforcement.

Q6 - Capital Spending. Are we prioritising the right things? No

- The delays to the Major Cycle Routes (MCRs) programme are unacceptable and irresponsible. Ōtautahi Christchurch is home to the two highest electorates where people cycle to work (Ilam and Christchurch Central). It is also home to the highest electorate for people who cycle to study (Ilam). The success of the existing network is proof that this investment is absolutely good value for money. This programme needs to be accelerated rather than defunded and delayed.
- If Councillors see the cost of active transport infrastructure as prohibitive at this current moment, then it would be worth looking at the work done in Wellington (and other cities around the world, including Seville) around rolling out networks faster and cheaper. These are excellent examples, and the basic ideas can include rolling out cycleways fast by reallocating road space, putting up plastic hit sticks or bollards and barrier arms, and being flexible. This is a similar approach to the cycleway rolled out on Park Terrace and Rolleston Avenue and would have the benefit of allowing people to have access to more safe cycling infrastructure more quickly and for less initial capital spending. It would allow staff to consider longer-term plans before committing significant capital to any project.

Q7. Is there anything that you would like to tell us about specific aspects of our proposed capital spend or capital programme? Yes

Q7.1 - Transport?

- Transport makes up 54% of Christchurch's gross emissions (cars constitute 22%, whilst utes and vans make up 10%). There is not enough of a focus on reducing these figures. We suggest that the Council consider:

- The continuation, without additional delays, of the rollout of the Major Cycle Routes programmes, with a focus on completing the partially complete projects of the Nor'West Arc and Wheels to Wings cycleways.
- Place a higher priority on progressing the Ōtakaro-Avon River and North-East Cycle Routes, which would travel through areas currently underserved by existing infrastructure.
- Place a higher priority on the Southern Lights cycleway which will serve a community that has already shown high willingness to change mode from car to bike.
- Ensuring that priority is given to planning and building a denser city, and restricting urban sprawl across the remaining green spaces and productive land available in the city,
- Provide better public transport options (which will encourage mode shift from private vehicles) including fully rolling out PT Futures programme and the construction and permanent enforcement of more bus lanes which have worked well on major thoroughfares such as Lincoln Road.
- Reduce funding for road renewals/resurfacing to more manageable levels and investigate ways to reduce their cost in the long term including roadway narrowing (footpath widening) instead of just like-for-like renewals and use of new products to extend the life of existing surfacing such as the one shared by the Mayor recently that waterproofs the surface of old asphalt.

- There were 462 premature deaths attributed to human-made air pollution in Christchurch in 2016. The majority of this air pollution is caused by exhaust fumes by fossil fuel vehicles. The aforementioned solutions could help in mitigating this issue.
- We agree with the aim of increasing access by walking within 15 minutes to key destinations. This is key to livability and reducing emissions and will have a positive impact on local communities in terms of amenities and service availability.
- We agree that the delivery of School Cycle Skills and Training is good, but without tangible changes to the roads around schools then it is wasted capital. Children need safe networks to get to school. We support the funding of programmes that lower speeds, create safe crossings, and priorities separated cycle facilities.

- We support the goals within the level of service section “Our networks and services are environmentally sustainable and increasingly resilient” but want to see more ambitious targets.
- The removal of the majority of the Local Cycle Network (LCN) and Cycle Connections programmes from the Draft LTP Capital Programme presents an unacceptable delay and risk to our city. This programme is designed to aid in both feeding users onto the Major Cycle Routes (MCR), and as significant improvements to local cycle infrastructure. Some of these improvements would provide missing links from MCRs to popular destinations which are nearby but not served by the MCR itself, such as Westfield Riccarton from the South Express. Without these improvements, the usefulness of the cycleways is greatly reduced for some people who are not willing to bike unless they can get all the way to their destination safely on a cycleway. There is also a higher likelihood of serious injury or death to cyclists in our city than there should be. The removal or deferral of these projects is not inline with Strategic View 3 “Ensuring Resilience to the Impacts of Climate Change and Natural Hazards”, or Strategic View 4 “Planning and Investing for Sustainable Growth” or their respective Strategic Responses and Action Areas given in the council’s Infrastructure Strategy (pp.14-16) document attached to this Long Term Plan.
- To this end, we request that the following removed Local Cycle Network and Cycle Connections projects be reinstated to the LTP 2024/2034:
 - Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Board:
 - Burwood Ward:
 - 41852 - Cycle Connections - Ōtākaro-Avon Route
 - Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board:
 - Fendalton Ward:
 - 44709 – Local Cycle Network – Greers Rd
 - Harewood Ward:
 - 41853 – Cycle Connections – Wheels to Wings
 - 12692 – Belfast Park Cycle & Pedestrian Rail Crossing
 - Waimairi Ward:
 - 44696 – Local Cycle Network – North West Outer Orbital
 - 44707 – Local Cycle Network – Bishopdale & Casebrook
 - Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board
 - Halswell Ward:

- 44710 – Local Cycle Network – Halswell to Hornby
 - 17059 – Cycle Connections – Little River Link
- Hornby Ward:
 - 41849 – Cycle Connections – South Express
 - 44697 – Local Cycle Network – South West Outer Orbital
 - 44712 – Local Cycle Network – Springs Road
- Riccarton Ward:
 - 41847 – Cycle Connections – Nor’West Arc
 - 44695 – Local Cycle Network – Inner Western Arc
 - 44698 – Local Cycle Network – Burnside to Villa
- Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board
 - Central Ward:
 - 44693 – Central City Projects – Cycle Connections
 - 44699 – Local Cycle Network – Palms to Heathcote Express
 - 44706 – Local Cycle Network – Avonside & Wainoni
 - 44713 – Local Cycle Network – Ōtākaro-Avon
 - Innes Ward:
 - 44701 – Local Cycle Network – Northern Mid Orbital
 - 44702 – Local Cycle Network – Northern Outer Orbital
 - 44703 – Local Cycle Network – Northwood
- Waihoro Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board
 - Cashmere Ward:
 - 41850 – Cycle Connections – Southern Lights
 - 44711 – Local Cycle Network – Opawa, Waltham & Sydenham
 - Heathcote Ward:
 - 41844 – Cycle Connections – Heathcote Expressway
 - 41851 – Cycle Connections – Ōpāwaho River Route
- Within the Draft LTP Capital Programme, we also recognise and call for the following separate projects to be reinstated:
 - 53733 – Heathcote Street Pocket Park & Pedestrian Development
 - 53734 – Ferrymead Towpath Connection (FM5)
 - 914 – Core Public Transport Corridor & Facilities – South (Colombo St)
 - 60276 – Public Transport Improvement Programme (Brougham & Moorhouse Area)

- 60250 – Programme – Electric Vehicle Charging At City Council Off Street Parking Buildings & Facilities
 - 26623 – Edgeware Village Masterplan (A1)
 - 63365 – Central City Projects – Active Travel Area
 - 17862 – Clyde, Riccarton & Wharenui Intersection Safety Improvements
- Each of the aforementioned programmes represents an investment either in transport mode diversification or an opportunity to improve safety in a highly trafficked area.
- Within the Draft LTP Capital Programme, we ask that the funding models for the following programmes revert to the Current Amended LTP 2024-2034 funding allocations:
 - 26611 – Major Cycleway – Wheels to Wings Route (Section 1) Harewood to Greers
 - 26612 – Major Cycleway – Wheels to Wings Route (Section 2) Greers to Wooldridge
 - 26613 – Major Cycleway – Wheels to Wings Route (Section 3) Wooldridge to Johns Road Underpass
 - 23101 – Major Cycleway – Nor’West Arc Route (Section 3) University to Harewood (Note: only move the funding back to earlier years 2024/25 and 2025/26 but keep the increase of total funding to \$21,704,400)
 - 18396 – Te Kaha Surrounding Streets
 - 26604 – Major Cycleway – Ōpāwaho River Route (Section 1) Princess Margaret Hospital to Corson Avenue
 - 26606 – Major Cycleway – Ōpāwaho River Route (Section 2) Corson to Waltham
 - 26605 – Major Cycleway – Ōpāwaho River Route (Section 3) Waltham to Ferrymead Bridge
 - 23100 – Major Cycleway – Heathcote Expressway Route (Section 2) Tannery to Martindales
 - 26607 – Major Cycleway – Southern Lights Route (Section 1) Strickland to Tennyson
 - 26601 – Major Cycleway – Ōtākaro Avon Route (Section 1) Fitzgerald to Swanns Road Bridge (OARC)
 - 26602 – Major Cycleway – Ōtākaro Avon Route (Section 2) Swanns Road Bridge to Anzac Drive Bridge (OARC)
 - 26603 – Major Cycleway – Ōtākaro Avon Route (Section 3) Anzac Drive Bridge to New Brighton (OARC)

- 1986 – Programme – Major Cycleway – Northern Line Cycleway
- 47031 – Major Cycleway – South Express Route (Section 2) Craven to Buchanans
- 1341 – Major Cycleway – Nor’West Arc Route – Annex, Birmingham & Wrights Corridor Improvement
- 1993 – Programme – Major Cycleway – Nor’West Arc
- 17060 – Cycle Connections – Uni-Cycle
- 930 – Sockburn Roundabout Intersection Safety Improvement

- We ask that the funding models for the following programmes move to earlier years of the LTP as they are currently funding very late in the 10 year plan:
 - 75070 - Memorial Ave Cycle Lanes
- We note are strong support for keeping the following programmes as they are currently funded in the draft LTP:
 - 73854 - Programme - PT Futures (Externally Funded)
 - 75363 - Programme - Mass Rapid Transit
 - 59181 – Central City Projects – Antigua Street Cycle Network (Tuam-Moorhouse)
 - 65923 - School Safety
 - 68430 – Ferry Road Active Transport Improvements
- We request the council to work further with ECan to align investment in public transport services and infrastructure. The following public transport related investments should be prioritised:
 - Construction of more bus lanes to reduce delays caused by traffic jams
 - More bus signal priority at intersections to reduce delays for buses
 - Construction of many more new and better bus shelters
 - Better technology for upcoming bus signs including installing LCD screens for upcoming buses at well used bus stops
- We request further funding to be given to 75051 Programme - New Footpaths. There are many locations around the city where footpaths have never been built and there has been no investment in filling in the gaps for many years. This severely hinders accessibility for those outside of a car. We are very supportive of this new programme and would like funding for it to be increased much more to a level required to make a significant dent in the number of footpaths required.
- We request more funding to be made available for small pedestrian safety and accessibility improvements such as pedestrian refuges and kerb build outs in

underserved areas. We support existing projects which include these types of improvements.

- Wayfinding for cycleways should be improved. The current signs are lacking in detail and missing some important landmarks/destinations. For example many signs on South Express do not include Riccarton mall or central Riccarton shops.
- We support the continuation of the Speed Management plan “Safer Speed Plan”.
- We also request that in line with advice from He Pou a Rangi - Climate Change Commission given to the Government in April 2023 ([2023 Draft advice to inform the strategic direction of the Government’s second emissions reduction plan](#)) that none of the above projects related to aspects of the Major Cycle Routes, Local Cycle Network, or Cycle Connections programmes be scheduled for completion any later than 2030. This advice also recommends the completion of Rapid Transit Networks no later than 2035, which we also advocate for.
- Continue the investigation of the central city shuttle trial.
- Adding more bike parking around the city. There is a lack of bike parking in the south west and most other areas outside the central city. There are also areas within the central city which need more bike parking.
- Protection of potential MRT corridors should be investigated.
- Protection of future MCR corridors should be investigated. This will prevent parts of future MCRs from being constructed to poor quality. For example, the Northern Line at the north end of Saint James Park has recently become a dangerous blind corner because the corridor was not protected and a new housing development built a fence right up to the corner of the property adjacent to the cycleway which blocks visibility.

Q7.2 - Parks, heritage or the coastal environment?

- Council must allocate more funding to implement the biodiversity strategy (less than 50% of actions are currently being implemented).
- Evidence shows there are tangible benefits to increasing tree cover in urban streets and creating green urban pathways. Lining our streets with trees and other plants and increasing the number of green corridors, as part of the Urban

Forest plan will have the effect of reducing urban surface temperatures and increasing appearance and value. They are also an attractive asset to local communities and can provide significant social and visual benefits to the overall appearance of any given street.

- This is all notwithstanding the environmental impact of increasing tree cover and green spaces. An investment in more trees and biodiversity should go hand in hand with an increased priority in the planting of native plant types in appropriate circumstances.
- There must also be consideration given during this LTP period to the creation of a fund or allocation for preparation to undertake Climate Mitigation works or Managed Retreat in future. The current LTP Capital Programme falls significantly short in this area, and does not plan for future Capital Expenditure that will be required. This is essentially passing the burden of this expenditure onto future generations.

Q7.3 - Libraries?

- The Rebuild of South Library must give priority to both sustainability and internal ventilation during planning, construction, and operation. The current facility does not meet best practice standards for air filtration, which has been shown by COVID to be essential for public health, reducing the transmission of respiratory illness and associated long-term disabilities. The provision of a temporary facility is essential for the community while the South Library is under reconstruction. It is a vital community space, and the volumes of displaced users are too high to assume they'll all be covered by Te Hapua and Spreydon Library. This should be considered regardless of the Operational Expenses required. South Library is a key functional space for the Council when it comes to services for constituents, and the impact their removal will have must be taken into account when deciding to temporarily relocate.
- More support should be given to Community Libraries and Centres in suburbs, to help them meet the needs of their communities. There are several areas in the city that are not serviced by official Council Service Centres or Libraries. Community-led initiatives in this space deserve more support from Council. These are often constituent's primary spaces to meet and represent an opportunity for Council to do proactive consultation, however, are often ill-staffed or financially supported to take on a more intensive role.

Q7.4 - Solid waste and resource recovery?

Outside our scope, but comment provided by Morgane:

- **Minimising Landfill Waste:** With a significant amount of waste being sent to landfill each year, it's crucial to focus on minimising this impact. Approving the sending of organic waste to landfill should be avoided whenever possible, as organic waste can be composted or converted into valuable resources.(i.e Christchurch Red Zone could do with compost and mulch to help the fruit trees).
- **Improved Waste Management Practices:** There is a need for better monitoring and regulation of waste companies, especially concerning unacceptable practices such as those exhibited by Wasteco. Strengthening oversight and enforcement mechanisms can ensure that waste management practices align with environmental and community standards.
- **Construction Waste Sorting:** Construction waste represents a substantial portion of landfill waste. Implementing measures to sort and divert construction waste for recycling or repurposing can significantly reduce the volume of waste sent to landfill.
- **Microplastic Monitoring:** Microplastic pollution poses a significant threat to waterways and ecosystems. Better monitoring and management strategies are needed to prevent microplastics from entering waterways and mitigate their environmental impact.
- **Encouraging Responsible Waste Disposal:** Making general waste disposal more expensive can incentivize individuals and businesses to reduce waste generation and prioritise recycling and composting. Additionally, providing financial support to local groups and communities to manage organic waste and educate the population on proper waste management practices can help foster a culture of sustainability.
- **Investing in Education and Infrastructure:** Funding should be allocated towards educating the public on recycling practices and promoting waste reduction initiatives.

Q7.5 - Other aspects of our capital spend or capital programme?

- The following Climate Emergency Response Fund projects have been cut, and these need to be added back in:
 - The Cycle Link along Aldwins Road and Ensors Road, making it safer for students to bike to Te Aratai College, a move which will reduce congestion at peak times.
 - The Cycle Connection on Cashmere Road, between Hoon Hay Road and Oderings Garden Centre.
 - The Cycleway along Simeon Street, which will connect cyclists to the Little River Link, Quarryman's Trail, and Barrington Shopping Centre; and improve cycling connections for neighbourhoods such as Aidanfield and the sports facilities at Ngā Puna Wai.
 - The scheduled pedestrian improvements in 10 locations in Linwood to help tamariki travel to Whitau School.
 - The upgrading of six Bromley intersections with reduced road widths in certain sections, raised zebra crossings, traffic islands, pedestrian refuge islands, safe speed platforms, speed cushions, transitional roundabouts, and refreshing painted markings.
 - A cycle-friendly environment along Smith Street so people can cycle safely to Te Pou Toetoe: Linwood Pool and Te Waka Unua School on Ferry Road.
 - The new cycle route in Richmond that will connect cyclists from the north to the south of Richmond.
 - ID 71496 – Richmond CRAF – Neighbourhood Greenway Cycleway
 - ID 72758 – Transport Choices 2022 – Richmond Neighbourhood Greenway
- Provisions must be made for the funding of these programmes to be brought into the Council's own Capital expenditure. The Council should not rely on the Government to provide funds for these projects, as said funding is unlikely to be forthcoming, and these projects are too important to be left to chance.
- The Salisbury Street project that includes converting the street to be two way and adding a cycleway must be brought forward. For too long, the north of the central city has not had a supermarket in walking distance as Foodstuffs has held their Salisbury Street site at ransom until the CCC completes this project. Significantly, this holds back the potential growth and intensification of the northern city as well as the viability of the South-East Central Neighbourhood Plan.

- Development contributions should be ring fenced such that they are spent on projects within the local area of the new development. This will prevent them being used for projects in other areas and unrelated to the required infrastructure for those new developments.
- We support 77201 Programme - Surface Flooding Reduction. We also suggest that a rapid response crew, similar to the footpath one, could be created in order to quickly respond to storm water issues during and after rain events.
- We support the proposed spending of \$964 million on wastewater infrastructure. Investment in wastewater will be vital to supporting the increased housing density that we advocate for. We request that the increased housing density planned in PC14 informs how much investment is made in this critical infrastructure. If possible, the investment in the first year should be increased.
- We request funding for stormwater and water supply be increased in the first three years of the LTP. These two areas both have reduced funding in the first three years which we consider is not sufficient investment in this incredibly important infrastructure.

Q8 - Additional opportunity and options to our main proposal. Which of the following do you think should be our focus for the 2024 - 2034 Long Term Plan?

- Deliver what we have proposed in the Draft Long Term Plan (e.g. maintain existing levels of service and invest in our core infrastructure and facilities that keep Christchurch and Banks Peninsula running).
- Explore other ways to bring down our proposed rates increases across the Draft LTP (e.g. reduce or change some of the services we provide, review our grants funding, increasing fees and charges for some services)
- Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).

Q9 - Are there any areas where you feel we should be reviewing the services we provide to reduce our costs throughout the Draft LTP 2024-2034? Yes

- We must stress that cost reductions can not come from service cuts; nor should it come from the outright sale of assets. Likewise there should not be room for cuts to Climate Change or Biodiversity programmes (including all cycleways) to meet these margins.
- We believe that more can be done to extract value from existing assets that are not currently generating sufficient returns. Examples might include:
 - Restructuring the use of the Tarras Airport (Otago Central Airport) site in lieu of the Airport to generate tenant rents as dividends for the Council.
 - Introducing manageable small levies on Domestic and International Flights to and from Christchurch International Airport.
 - Increased charging for parking in Council facilities.
 - A Congestion Charging area within the Central City during hours of high traffic (Mon-Thu 9am-5pm, Fri-Sat 9pm-2am)
- We would also like to see the Council legitimately consider structural changes to the ways rates are collected in this city (e.g. land value taxes), and to investigate proactive forms of consultation to see this happen outside of the LTP scope.

Q10 - Major event bid funding. Should we leave bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed? Or should we increase the bid funding?

- We believe there should be a moderate increase in bid funding. Bidding on these events can provide a significant return on investment for businesses and create an excellent environment for residents.

Q11 - More investment in adapting to climate change. Do you think we should bring forward to 2024/25 the additional \$1.8 million spend currently proposed to commence in 2027/28, to accelerate our grasp of the climate risks?

- Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.
- No - don't bring \$1.8 million forward.
- Don't know - not sure if we should bring \$1.8 million forward.

Q12 - Should we create a climate adaptation fund to set aside funds now to manage future necessary changes to Council assets, including roads, water systems, and buildings, in alignment with our adaptation plans?

- Yes - create a climate adaption fund.
- No - don't create a climate adaption fund.
- Don't know - not sure if we should create a climate adaption fund.

- This must be a high priority for the council. Even if there is success in limiting global warming to 1.5 - 2 degrees, there will be negative externalities (e.g. more extreme weather, higher sea levels) that need to be addressed. Council must have plans and funding in place to both mitigate our emissions and work on adaptation.

Q13 - Our Community Outcomes and Priorities. Do you have any thoughts on our vision, community outcomes and strategic priorities? Yes

Biodiversity

- Biodiversity is only \$2million in the LTP
 - Sports fields have \$100 million over the LTP. Can we take some from this?
- Gaps in biodiversity funding.
 - Jobs for Nature – who will pick up that work? Ends in 2025. This focuses on public land. We need funding to continue that work
 - Community Partnership Fund – disappearing in July 2024. Currently 200k. Supports Styx Mill Trust and Summit Road Society. Need to reinstate
 - Biodiversity Fund (used to support biodiversity work on private land) – ask to increase from what is supposed to be 400k. Need councillor support for this.
 - Environmental/climate change partnership fund. Where is the integration with biodiversity
 - Sustainability fund – ends of FY 2025. Need to get this reinstated and funded in future years
 - Waterways restoration budget. We need funding to reach those targets. Need to advocate for funding.
 - Healthy Water Bodies Action plan which details holistic goals and targeted for waterway health outside of stormwater quality. To implement that plan and reach those targets, more funding is required
 - CCC has a very small waterways restoration budget, which is shown to be cut going forward. The amount of money we are

asking for over a 10 yr period is the equivalent to 1 or 2 stormwater basins.

- Climate change levy – could we use some of that levy for biodiversity.
- Stormwater
 - Considerable amount of money is being put towards the stormwater basins with the thought of improving water quality. Based on the current information, those basins are not providing adequate treatment.
 - Stormwater quality is only one part of improving waterbody health, if we put a small % of that funding towards other aspects of waterway health (i.e. planting, naturalising stream banks, instream habitat additions) we could see some changes in ecosystem health.
 -
- Resources / staff
 - Biodiversity management currently sits under the 'parks team'. Which limits our ability to work across council and focus primarily on biodiversity outcomes. Instead there is a lack of strategic focus and expertise to deliver this work (as not all park rangers have same expertise in this area)
 - We have also gone from a team of 2 waterways ecologists to 1 which means there is even less capacity to ensure council projects are resulting in good outcomes for waterway health. This also means there is lack of oversight on private projects around waterways which require resource consent. This is due to capacity internally.
 - Need to reinstate the Natural Environment Team. This team was dis-established when the 'climate working group was set up' - so the focus shifted to 'climate change' but then limited the focus and resource on biodiversity - i.e biodiversity now lacks an 'all of council' approach.
 - Need to set up a well resourced biodiversity team that operates across teams and is integrated within the climate strategy. Need an all of council approach. How do we set up an all-of-council ecology team? We also need better integration of the climate change strategy and biodiversity strategy. There are currently no ecologists on the climate change working group. So consider whether to add 'biodiversity' to the climate change working group/ and support for funding of biodiversity out of the climate change levy? (so not just focused on adaptation - which may just be infrastructure)
- General
 - Significant Natural Areas? What approach will the council take? We need to continue to progress this - regardless of government direction.

- Natural regenerating forest – better bang for buck. We should be focused on buying land and letting this regenerate naturally. Cheaper and more effective than mass planting.

Q14 - What do you think of our proposal to start formal processes to dispose of five Council-owned properties?

- We oppose any potential sale of 26 Waipara St, as it is the only possible future link from Cracrost through to a future shared path along the Cashmere Stream

Q15 - What do you think of our proposal to dispose of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties?

- We believe these properties should be retained and a proper Port Hills Red Zone plan developed for their future use - e.g., fire mitigation, native plantings, etc. However, if they are sold, they must first be offered back to the previous owners

Q16 - What do you think of our proposal to gift the Yaldhurst Memorial Hall to the Yaldhurst Rural Residents' Association?

- [No Comment](#)