

# Long Term Plan 2024 – 2034

## Submissions Analysis

May 2024

## **How to use this document**

The purpose of this document is not to provide analysis on everything that submitters commented on, but rather to provide a summary of key topics and issues identified by submitters and responses to the specific questions we asked submitters.

The analysis is based on the opinions of submitters, whether they are factually correct or not.

The first part of this report provides an overview of the key themes and messages that have come through in submissions, and the latter provides detailed submissions analysis for some of the topics and issues that were most popular with submitters.

## **A note of Schools Strike for Climate submissions**

Many of the questions asked in our online form were transferred across to the school strike for climate submission form, however in almost all instances they were tweaked at least slightly. This ranged from removing response options (particularly 'don't know' options) to changing the wording which fundamentally changed the question.

For this reason, where appropriate two tables have been provided in this report, one sets out the responses from the CCC forms and one combines the data from the two sources.

## Summary of what we heard

The feedback received on the Long Term Plan (LTP) reflects the perspectives and priorities within our community, revealing a nuanced landscape of values and aspirations. Over recent years we have seen many examples of 'one person's nice to have is another person's must have', and the feedback we received on the draft LTP once again reinforces this. Submitters commonly told us that we haven't got the balance right, but their reasons for this were varied.

On one hand there were submitters voicing the opinion that we hadn't gone far enough to reduce costs, rates increases were too high, and we hadn't exercised the fiscal restraint or responsibility that they expect of us. In their view, we should be looking at either reducing services or finding efficiencies within our services and cutting 'wasteful' spending. However, when presented with the opportunity to provide feedback on areas where we should be looking at finding further savings or efficiencies, many of these submitters did not provide any specific examples of spending that they thought was wasteful or areas where we could reduce services or make savings.

On the other hand, there were submitters who voiced their strong desire to see us do more to prioritise the future of the city. They called for us to accelerate work and funding for preparing for and responding to the impacts of climate change, urging us to take this seriously. Many wanted us to accelerate work on public and active transport, invest in growing the tree canopy, implement a range of measures to help drive behaviour change (including further increases to car parking charges) and enable intensification across the city. Others highlighted the importance of the services that we provide, noting that they were pleased to see that we hadn't proposed cuts to services to find savings. They talked about the importance of community facilities, spaces and places; libraries were mentioned by many not only because of the services they provide but also because of the sense of connection that they build and foster.

Submitters were united in their calls for us to focus investment into core infrastructure. However, they were at odds about what constitutes 'core infrastructure'. For some it means investing more into the quality of our roads and footpaths, while for others it means accelerating progress on infrastructure that supports active and public transport. They were however united in their support for investing in our water infrastructure. For many the focus was on doing whatever it takes to get the chlorine out of our water, while others wanted us to focus on delivering a stormwater network to manage increased flooding risk. The importance of our green spaces was recognised by many, with many submitters calling for us to bring forward planned investment in our sports parks and facilities to allow more people in the city to be more active, more often.

Submissions revealed strong support for community grants and funding, with many submitters reminding us that this funding is crucial to the work that many organisations do for and with our communities. Submitters who wrote in support of the Arts Centre highlighted the value that the centre brings, citing its cultural significance, heritage value, and community-building role. Orana Park also garnered significant backing, with submitters urging additional funding due to its tourism, conservation, and educational contributions. Feedback on contestable funds called for maintaining and even increasing support for sustainability, biodiversity, and heritage preservation initiatives. Regarding the Anglican Cathedral, most submitters opposed further council funding, preferring support for the Arts Centre or expecting the church to secure additional funds for the restoration project.

Generally, feedback on this LTP highlighted the competing priorities, opinions and values that our residents and communities have. Finding the right balance in the final LTP will require careful consideration of these varied viewpoints. Our residents and communities care deeply about their future and the future of the city and have told us that they want to see us deliver an LTP that is affordable but doesn't ignore or forget about the things they really care about.

## Table of Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Who did we hear from?</b> .....  | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Why do we collect demographic information?</b> .....   | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>At a Glance   What we've heard from the community</b> .....  | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Have we got the balance right?</b> .....   | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Rates, Fees &amp; Charges, &amp; Other Revenue</b> .....   | <b>17</b> |
| Rates.....  | 17        |
| Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms.....   | 17        |
| City Vacant Differential .....  | 18        |
| Charging Visitor Accommodation as a Business .....  | 18        |
| Fees & Charges.....   | 19        |
| Charging for Parking at Key Parks.....  | 19        |
| Car Parking Charges .....   | 20        |
| Disposal of Council Owned Properties and Red Zone Land.....   | 20        |
| Disposal of five Council owned properties .....   | 20        |
| Disposal of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties ..... | 20        |
| <b>Our Proposed Operational Spending</b> .....  | <b>22</b> |
| Libraries .....   | 23        |
| Transport .....   | 23        |
| Community Grants and Funding.....   | 24        |
| The Arts Centre .....   | 24        |
| Orana Park.....   | 25        |
| Other Contestable Funds.....  | 25        |
| Screen Canterbury Grant.....  | 25        |
| Anglican Cathedral Funding.....   | 26        |
| Resource Recovery .....   | 26        |
| Resourcing.....   | 26        |
| <b>Our Proposed Capital Spending</b> .....  | <b>27</b> |
| Transport .....   | 28        |
| Cycleways.....  | 28        |
| Public Transport Infrastructure.....  | 29        |
| Roads .....   | 29        |
| Three Waters .....  | 30        |
| Taumata Arowai Requirements.....  | 30        |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Parks.....   | 30        |
| Sports Grounds & Facilities and the Sports Field Network Plan .....  | 30        |
| Tree Canopy .....  | 31        |
| Libraries .....  | 31        |
| Te Kaha .....  | 31        |
| <b>Event Bid Funding .....</b>                                       | <b>33</b> |
| <b>Investing More in Adapting to Climate Change .....</b>            | <b>35</b> |
| <b>Additional Savings &amp; Efficiencies .....</b>                   | <b>38</b> |
| <b>Yaldhurst Memorial Hall .....</b>                                 | <b>38</b> |
| <b>Appendix One: Summary of number of comments by category .....</b> | <b>39</b> |
| <b>Appendix Two: Summary of Key Issues by Community Board .....</b>  | <b>41</b> |

## Who did we hear from?

| Community Board*                       | Number of Submitters | % of Submitters |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|
| Not Stated**                           | 4300                 | 61%             |
| Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū Banks Peninsula | 203                  | 3%              |
| Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood         | 448                  | 6%              |
| Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton      | 439                  | 6%              |
| Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood   | 504                  | 7%              |
| Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central          | 510                  | 7%              |
| Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote    | 636                  | 9%              |
| Total                                  | 7040                 | 100%            |

| Ward*           | Number of Submitters | % of Submitters |
|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Not Stated**    | 4300                 | 61%             |
| Banks Peninsula | 203                  | 3%              |
| Burwood         | 93                   | 1%              |
| Cashmere        | 319                  | 5%              |
| Central         | 213                  | 3%              |
| Coastal         | 227                  | 3%              |
| Fendalton       | 173                  | 2%              |
| Halswell        | 200                  | 3%              |
| Harewood        | 193                  | 3%              |
| Heathcote       | 202                  | 3%              |
| Hornby          | 64                   | 1%              |
| Innes           | 202                  | 3%              |
| Linwood         | 128                  | 2%              |
| Papanui         | 95                   | 1%              |
| Riccarton       | 175                  | 2%              |
| Spreydon        | 115                  | 2%              |
| Waimairi        | 138                  | 2%              |

\*Indicative only. These numbers have been prepared using the suburb information provided by submitters.

\*\*Not stated includes submitters who did not provide a postal address, those who provided only a street name or suburb, and any submitters who used a PO Box address.

## Who did we hear from?

| Location                        | Number of Submitters | %* of Submitters |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| <b>Christchurch City</b>        | 2740                 | 39%              |
| <b>Elsewhere in Canterbury</b>  |                      |                  |
| Selwyn                          | 118                  | 1.7%             |
| Waimakariri                     | 89                   | 1.3%             |
| Hurunui                         | 10                   | 0.1%             |
| Ashburton                       | 10                   | 0.1%             |
| Timaru                          | 8                    | 0.1%             |
| Waimate                         | 1                    | 0.01%            |
| <b>Elsewhere in New Zealand</b> |                      |                  |
| Northland                       | 6                    | 0.1%             |
| Auckland                        | 37                   | 0.5%             |
| Waikato                         | 5                    | 0.1%             |
| Bay of Plenty                   | 9                    | 0.1%             |
| Gisborne                        | 1                    | 0.01%            |
| Hawkes Bay                      | 3                    | 0.04%            |
| Taranaki                        | 3                    | 0.04%            |
| Manawatū-Whanganui              | 10                   | 0.1%             |
| Wellington                      | 21                   | 0.3%             |
| Nelson-Tasman                   | 9                    | 0.1%             |
| Marlborough                     | 1                    | 0.01%            |
| Dunedin                         | 16                   | 0.2%             |
| Queenstown Lakes                | 3                    | 0.04%            |
| Southland                       | 5                    | 0.1%             |
| <b>Outside of New Zealand</b>   |                      |                  |
| Australia                       | 11                   | 0.2%             |
| United Kingdom                  | 6                    | 0.1%             |
| Canada                          | 1                    | 0.01%            |
| USA                             | 1                    | 0.01%            |
| Hungary                         | 1                    | 0.01%            |

## Who did we hear from?

### Number of Submitters by Age

| Age               | Number of Submitters | % of Submitters |
|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Not Stated        | 3476                 | 50%             |
| Under 18 years    | 44                   | 1%              |
| 18 – 24 years     | 217                  | 3%              |
| 25 – 34 years     | 570                  | 8%              |
| 35 – 49 years     | 991                  | 14%             |
| 50 – 64 years     | 973                  | 14%             |
| 65 years and over | 759                  | 11%             |

### Number of Submitters by Gender

| Gender                      | Number of Submitters | % of Submitters |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Not Stated                  | 3543                 | 50%             |
| Male                        | 1299                 | 18%             |
| Female                      | 2141                 | 30%             |
| Non-binary / another gender | 58                   | 1%              |

### Number of Submitters by Ethnicity

| Ethnicity                                | Number of Submitters | % of Submitters |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|
| NZ European                              | 2897                 | 41%             |
| Māori                                    | 218                  | 3%              |
| Pacific Peoples                          | 47                   | 1%              |
| Asian                                    | 135                  | 2%              |
| Middle Eastern, Latin American & African | 31                   | 0.4%            |
| Other European                           | 311                  | 4%              |
| Other                                    | 211                  | 3%              |



## Who did we hear from?

### Number of Submitters by Submission Method

| Ethnicity    | Number of Submitters | % of Submitters |
|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Online       | 6683                 | 95%             |
| Email        | 196                  | 3%              |
| Over Counter | 110                  | 2%              |
| Post         | 48                   | 1%              |
| Other        | 4                    | 0.1%            |

## Why do we collect demographic information?

It is important that we understand both who we have and have not heard from when we consult on issues that affect everyone in the city. We include a standard set of demographic questions across our consultations that help us better understand this. These questions are optional; submitters do not have to answer them to make a submission.

Where possible, we align the questions we ask with the information that StatsNZ collects via the census. This ensures that we are capturing the information that is consistent with the national approach to reporting on demographics, but also enables us to benchmark and understand whether we have heard from a representative group of submitters.

## At a Glance | What we've heard from the community

| What we asked the community  |  | What the community told us  |   |   |                                       |
|--|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Have we got the balance right?</b></p> <p>What do you think of our proposed plan? Have we got the balance right? Have we prioritised the right things? If not, what changes would you like to see?</p> | <p>The majority of submitters told us that we haven't got the balance right, wanting us to focus on either finding further savings and efficiencies to bring the projected rates increase down or accelerating work on some projects or programmes. Responses to this question highlighted the differing views, opinions and priorities of our residents and diverse communities, and reiterates the need for the Council to land an LTP that acknowledges and responds to these diverse opinions.</p> <p>For many, changes to community grants and funding, or the omission of grants and funding, equates to not getting the balance right. For others, this looks like delaying projects or not placing enough urgency on climate adaptation and resilience. In other instances, submitters told us that they didn't think we had gone far enough to reduce costs, and that the proposed rates increase is too high and will put an unreasonable level of pressure on households.</p> <p>Some submitters told us that to get the balance right, there are some aspects of the plan that they would like us to make changes to, including focusing more on specific areas or services including heritage preservation, climate adaptation and resilience, 'core' infrastructure, more investment in the eastern suburbs, reducing borrowing, and community grants and funding. Others thought that we needed to focus on looking after what we already have before pursuing new capital projects, facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>There was a strong relationship between wanting to see funding for the Arts Centre included in the LTP and a perception that we haven't got the balance right. Many of these submitters told us that omitting funding for the Arts Centre, in their opinion, equates to not having the balance right. This was echoed by submitters addressing other community grants and funding, including Orana Park, contestable funds such as the sustainability and biodiversity fund, and the Screen Canterbury grant.</p> <p>Similarly, those who want to see us invest more in climate adaptation and resilience are more likely to feel that we haven't got the balance right, reinforcing their desire to see us do more in the climate adaptation and mitigation areas, and to see us do it sooner than we have planned.</p> |   |   |   |                                       |
|  | <p><b>What should we be focusing on?</b></p> <p>Which of the following do you think should be our focus for the 2024–2034 Long Term Plan?</p>  | <p><b>Deliver what we have proposed in the Draft Long Term Plan</b> (e.g. maintain existing levels of service and invest in our core infrastructure and facilities that keep Christchurch and Banks Peninsula running).</p> <p>19.96%</p> | <p><b>Explore other ways to bring down our proposed rates increases across the Draft LTP</b> (e.g. reduce or change some of the services we provide, review our grants funding, increasing fees and charges for some services).</p> <p>35.14%</p> | <p><b>Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations</b> (e.g. spending more on climate change adaptation, boost the funding for major events).</p> <p>37.37%</p> | <p><b>Don't know</b></p> <p>7.53%</p> |

| What we asked the community    |   | What the community told us   |        |   |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--------|---|
| Our proposed rates increase    | 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? | Yes  | 51.25% | The feedback on whether we should be increasing rates at a time when both the Council and households are under increased financial pressure indicates a split opinion on rates increases: one group supports rates increases to maintain services and invest in the city's future, emphasising the need to prioritise climate resilience, while another group opposes them due to financial challenges, expressing concerns about affordability and fairness, particularly for those on fixed incomes.  |
|                                |   | No   | 32.04% |   |
|                                |   | Don't know   | 16.71% |   |
| Changes to how we rate         | Do you have any changes on our proposed changes to how we rate?   | <p>Generally, submitters were supportive of the proposed changes to how we rate. The two proposals that we received the most feedback on were changes to the city vacant differential and charging visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business.</p> <p><b>City Vacant Differential</b><br/>294 submitters provided written feedback on the proposed changes to the City Vacant Differential. 53% of those who provided feedback supported the proposed changes, 3% opposed the proposed changes and 39% provided other suggestions.</p> <p>Mostly submitters were supportive of our proposal to extend the City Vacant differential to additional areas of the city. In some instances, submitters wanted to see if extended to cover the whole city and the multiplier increased from 4.523 to 6. Those who opposed the change tended to feel that it is overly punitive or punishing, and we should be supporting landowners instead of penalising them for not developing their land.</p> <p><b>Charging Visitor Accommodation as a Business</b><br/>363 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to rate visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business. 77% of these submitters were supportive of our proposal, 7% of these submitters opposed the move to rate them as businesses, indicating that they feel the approach is heavy handed and unfair, and citing concerns about the impact it would have on visitor accommodation and tourists visiting the city. 10% provided other suggestions or ideas.</p> <p>In general submitters were supportive of our proposal to rate visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business. They thought this was a fair and equitable approach, with many noting the impacts of residential units being used for visitor accommodation on housing supply. The impacts on 'Mum and Dad' investors was a concern for many, who reiterated that this should only be applied to homes where the home is only used for short term accommodation, ensuring that people renting out a single room in their home are not charged business rates.</p> |        |   |
| Our proposed operational spend | Are we prioritising the right things?   | Yes  | 35.34% | <p>Much of the feedback on our proposed operational spend was submitters reinforcing that they want to see us maintaining our current levels of service. In some instances, submitters simply highlighted the importance of maintaining services, while feedback from others told us that they would like us to look for other ways to cut costs that won't have an impact on the level of service we provide to our residents and communities.</p> <p>There was a smaller cohort of submitters who suggested that we should be looking at cutting services to reduce costs, with many indicating that there are aspects of our proposed spend are wasteful. Others mentioned the process that Central Government agencies are currently going through to reduce costs and thought that the Council should be doing the same.</p> |
|                                |   | No   | 39.48% |   |
|                                |   | Don't know   | 25.19% |   |

| What we asked the community |   | What the community told us  |        |  |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--------|--|
| Our proposed capital spend  | Are we prioritising the right things?   | Yes   | 38.14% | <p>Of the 443 general comments on our capital programme, 56% of them were submitters suggesting changes that they would like to see us make to the programme. Submitters talked about a range of changes they would like to see us make to the programme, which included more focus on specific services (transport and three waters were commonly mentioned), focusing on looking after what we've got before we add anything new or start other major capital projects, pausing capital projects until there is less pressure on the city's finances, or removing projects and programmes that they don't consider to be worthwhile.</p> <p>In some instances, submitters highlighted the importance of maintaining what you have, indicating that generally they supported our proposed capital investment.</p> <p>Key areas that received a number of comments from submitters included active and public transport, roads, Taumata Arowai requirements, sports grounds &amp; facilities and the Sports Field Network Plan, our tree canopy, libraries and Te Kaha.</p>  |
|                             |   | No  | 43.48% |  |
|                             |   | Don't know  | 18.38% |  |
| 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? | <p>Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed.</p> | 68.94% | <p>69% of submitters who indicated a preference want us to leave the bid funding for major and business events at the current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed. 31% thought that we should increase the bid funding.</p> <p>Feedback from submitters indicated that they consider this a nice to have at a time when households are under increased financial pressure. Submitters noted that many of them wouldn't be able to afford to attend the events, so they don't want to see more ratepayer money spent on bidding for them.</p> <p>In other instances, submitters suggested that they would rather see event bid funding reduced or removed all together. There are concerns about the amount being spent on attracting these events, which benefits a small proportion of the population. Some submitters indicated that if attracting more major events is important to certain business sectors, they should be contributing to bidding for them. Others felt that our neighbouring districts should be contributing.</p> <p>Those who supported the additional bid funding tended to discuss the economic benefits of attracting more major events or point out that we've invested so much in building these new facilities that we need to be able to attract the events to make them a success.</p> |
|                             |   | <p>Increase the bid funding.</p>  | 31.6%  |  |

| What we asked the community                   |  | What the community told us  |        |  |
|---|--|---|--------|--|
| 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   | 51.63% | <p>Much of the feedback we received on these two proposals urged the Council to take climate change and climate risk seriously, and do more to support mitigation, adaptation and prepare us for what the future may bring. 778 submitters provided written feedback on our climate proposals; 45% were comments in support of accelerating adaptation or creating a climate fund, 11% were comments opposing the proposal, 30% were submitters suggesting alternative ideas or proposals and 15% were general comments.</p> <p>Many submitters raised the urgent need for climate action - they want to see us take it seriously and commit to investing in climate resilience and adaptation. In some instances, they raised the potential opportunities that could come with investing in climate resilience, including an opportunity to attract residents, businesses, and new sectors to Christchurch.</p> <p>Overall, there was a strong push from these submitters for the Council to prioritise climate change mitigation in our long-term planning, including investments in biodiversity, climate adaptation, and sustainable infrastructure. They feel that the focus should be on spending to prepare now rather than dealing with costly damage to our infrastructure and communities in the future.</p> |
|   |  | No  | 33.72% |  |
|   |  | Don't know  | 14.65% |  |
|   | 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   | 57.78% |  |
|   |  | No  | 27.93% |  |
|   |  | Don't know  | 14.29% |  |
| Additional savings and efficiencies           | Are there any areas where you feel we should be reviewing the level of service we provide in order to manage our costs?  | <p>We asked submitters whether there were any areas where they thought that we could find additional savings or efficiencies. 332 submitters provided us with feedback on this question. In many instances submitters told us that our spending was wasteful, that we need to cut our costs, focus on the basics and find ways to reduce costs. However, when presented with the opportunity to provide feedback on areas where they think we could find savings and efficiencies, few were able to pinpoint specific examples.</p> <p>Where submitters did provide feedback on specific areas, they often overlapped with projects, programmes, funding or services that other submitters had told us are very important, again reinforcing that one person's 'must have' is another person's 'nice to have'. Specific examples commonly mentioned by these submitters included climate change, cycleways, staff costs, Te Kaha, events, cuts to community funding and service cuts.</p>   |        |  |
| Disposal of Council owned land & properties   | What do you think of our proposal to start formal processes to dispose of five Council-owned properties?   | <p>The message from most submitters who commented on our proposal to begin the process of disposing of five Council-owned properties was simple – just get on with it. 1156 submitters provided feedback on beginning the process of disposing of five council owned properties, 57% of these submitters supported moving forward, 12% opposed, 21% provided alternative suggestions and 9% made general comments.</p> <p>Those who were in support agreed that if they were surplus to requirement, then we should sell them and use the profits to ease the financial pressure that the Council is facing in the coming years. Those who opposed beginning the process to dispose of these properties tended to generally oppose the sale of Council land and assets. In some instances, submitters indicated that they would prefer we used this land for growing the city's tree canopy, providing more social or affordable housing, or creating community focused spaces such as food forests and shared gardens. The property at 26 Waipara Street was an issue for some, due to its potential future link between Cracroft and a shared path along Cashmere Stream.</p> |        |  |
|   | What do you think of our proposal to dispose of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties?   | <p>1128 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to dispose of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties. 58% of submitters who provided feedback supported us to move forward with this process. Those who did not support us beginning the process of disposing of these properties either outright opposed the sale of Council land and assets, believing that we should retain it for a future use, or expressed concerns about the sale of red zoned land.</p>   |        |  |
|   | What do you think of our proposal to gift Yaldhurst Memorial Hall to the Yaldhurst Rural Residents' Association?   | <p>1231 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to gift the Yaldhurst Memorial Hall to the Yaldhurst Rural Residents Association. The vast majority (79%) of submitters supported gifting the hall to the resident's association. Submitters generally thought that it was a good solution, particularly if it removed any onus on the council to or expectation that the Council will repair and restore the hall.</p>  |        |  |

## Have we got the balance right?

We asked submitters whether we have struck the right balance with our draft LTP, and what they think our focus for the 2024 – 2034 LTP should be. Submitters were divided on whether we have the balance right and had differing opinions around what we should be focusing on. 35% thought that we should be exploring other ways to bring down our proposed rates increase, 37% thought we should be accelerating work on some projects and programmes with a focus on balancing the needs of today’s residents with the needs of future generations, and 20% told us that they want us to focus on getting on with delivering what we have proposed in the draft LTP.

This result highlights how divided our residents and community are, and the differing values and priorities that the Council must grapple with.

### Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

| <b>Which of the following do you think should be our focus for the 2024 - 2034 Long Term Plan?</b>  |              |          |
|---|--------------|----------|
| Total number of responses: 2,245  |              |          |
| <b>Response</b>   | <b>Count</b> | <b>%</b> |
| Deliver what we have proposed in the Draft Long Term Plan.  | 448          | 19.96%   |
| Explore other ways to bring down our proposed rates increases across the Draft LTP.   | 789          | 35.14%   |
| Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today’s residents with the needs of future generations. | 839          | 37.37%   |
| Don’t know  | 169          | 7.53%    |

## School Strike for Climate

| <b>Which of the following do you think should be our focus for the 2024 - 2034 Long Term Plan?</b>  |                 |                       |          |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Total number of responses: 2,293  |                 |                       |          |
| <b>Response</b>   | <b>Count</b>    |                       | <b>%</b> |
|   | <b>CCC Form</b> | <b>School Strike*</b> |          |
| Deliver what we have proposed in the Draft Long Term Plan.  | 448             | 1                     | 19.58%   |
| Explore other ways to bring down our proposed rates increases across the Draft LTP.   | 789             | 2                     | 34.49%   |
| Accelerate work on some projects and programmes, with a focus on balancing the needs of today's residents with the needs of future generations. | 839             | 45                    | 38.5%    |
| Don't know  | 169             | NA                    | 7.37%    |

\*School Strike for Climate Question: What should be our focus for the 2024 – 2034 Long Term Plan? (Don't know response option was removed).

Of the 1236 comments on whether we have struck the right balance with the draft LTP, around 25% signalled that we've got the balance about right, 43% told us we haven't struck the right balance, and 20% indicated that they'd like us to do something different.

Feedback from the 43% who told us we haven't got the balance right tended to reflect the results from the question about what our focus should be – they either wanted us to focus on ways to reduce costs and thought we hadn't gone far enough in the draft LTP, or they were disappointed about some of the decisions made in the draft LTP, many of which were related to decisions about community grants and funding.

We received a large number of submissions on funding for the Arts Centre, both through our online form and the short form created by the Arts Centre. There is a strong relationship between wanting to see funding for the Arts Centre included in the LTP and a perception that we haven't got the balance right. Many of these submitters told us that omitting funding for the Arts Centre, in their opinion, equates to not having the balance right. This was echoed by submitters addressing other community grants and funding, including Orana Park, contestable funds such as the sustainability and biodiversity fund, and the Screen Canterbury grant.

Similarly, those who want to see us invest more in climate adaptation and resilience were more likely to feel that we haven't got the balance right, reinforcing their desire to see us do more in the climate adaptation and mitigation areas, and to see us do it sooner than we have planned. They provided many examples of things they would like to see throughout their submissions, including accelerated work on completing the major cycleways and providing local cycleways connections, more investment in public transport infrastructure and more funding towards enhancing biodiversity and ecological restoration.

On the other hand, there is a cohort of submitters who would like to see us do more to bring down the proposed rates increase which, in their view, is going to put an unacceptable level of pressure on households and ratepayers. Many of these submitters feel that the proposed rates increases are unsustainable, and we need to go further in terms of looking for ways to reduce costs. Feedback from some indicated that they didn't feel we had gone far enough when looking at savings, or that the Council should have taken more of the savings options put forward by staff.

Those who tended to think we have the balance about right often noted that they were happy to see that we had not reduced services that they value to bring costs down, and that we had struck the right balance at a time when everyone is facing increased financial pressure, including the Council which was acknowledged by some submitters. Others thought that we had struck the right balance in terms of the priorities that we identified for this LTP. Others acknowledged that if we want to see improvement in big ticket infrastructure, then we need to be willing to prioritise it and pay for it.

Submitters who told us that they'd like to see us do something different tended to want us to do more or less of something. They had a wide range of suggestions on how they'd like to see us adjust the balance, such as focusing more on specific areas or services including heritage preservation, climate adaptation and resilience, 'core' infrastructure, more investment in the eastern suburbs, reducing borrowing, and increasing? maintaining? community grants and funding.

Other submitters indicated that they would like us to focus on maintaining what we have before we add anything new, typically focusing on the capital spend and whether aspects of the capital programme could be adjusted, removed or the focus changed in specific areas of the capital programme. Transport was the aspect of the capital programme where submitters suggested the most change. Some wanted to see us focus less on cycleways and more road and footpaths, others wanted to see us shift our focus away from the safer streets work programme, while others urged us to get on and complete the major cycleways earlier than planned and invest more in public transport.

Overall, the feedback on whether we have struck the right balance highlighted the differing values, opinions and priorities of our residents and communities, and reinforces the need for Council to land an LTP that acknowledges the needs, wants and varying opinions of our diverse communities.



## Rates, Fees & Charges, & Other Revenue

### Rates

We asked submitters whether they think we should be maintaining our existing level of service and level of investment in our core infrastructure and facilities when both the Council and residents are facing significant financial challenges. Of the submitters who provided a response to this question, 51% agreed that we should be maintaining our levels of service and level of investment in core infrastructure, 32% disagreed and 17% didn't know.

#### Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

| <b>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%?</b> |       |        |
|---|-------|--------|
| Total number of responses: 2,597  |       |        |
| Response  | Count | %      |
| Yes   | 1,331 | 51.25% |
| No  | 832   | 32.04% |
| Don't know  | 434   | 16.71% |

#### School Strike for Climate

| <b>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%?</b> |          |                |        |
|---|----------|----------------|--------|
| Total number of responses: 2,643  |          |                |        |
| Response  | Count    |                | %      |
|   | CCC Form | School Strike* |        |
| Yes   | 1,331    | 40             | 51.87% |
| No  | 832      | 6              | 31.70% |
| Don't know  | 434      | NA             | 16.42% |

\*School Strike for Climate Question: Should the Council increase rates to maintain existing services? (Don't know response option was removed).

Written feedback provided in response to this question highlighted that many would rather see rates go up, maintaining services and proposed levels of investment, than see us reduce the overall rates increase through cutting services and reducing investment in the future of the city.

Submitters who supported maintaining our services and current levels of investment often noted that it was a significant increase, but felt that it is an investment in the future of the city and the

kind of city that they want to live in. Continuing work to build climate resilience and reduce our environmental impact was a priority for many, and they acknowledged that this comes with a cost. There was a sense of urgency from these submitters, with many suggesting that there are projects we just need to get on with that cannot wait.

In many respects, this feedback echoes what submitters told us when thinking about whether we have the balance right. There are services and support that we provide that our residents and communities value, and maintaining these is important to them.

On the other hand, a third of submitters indicated that they don't think we should be maintaining our existing levels of service and investment when both the Council and residents are facing significant financial challenges. For many, they are worried about the impacts that further rates increases will have on their ability to pay their rates when the costs of other household expenses are also increasing. In some instances, these submitters noted that they are concerned that they will no longer be able to afford to live in their homes as they are on fixed incomes that are not increasing at the same pace or level as rates and other living expenses. These submitters regularly commented that they feel an increase so far above CPI/inflation is unjustified and unfair. Others noted that the compounding level of increase across the period of the LTP is significant and were worried about what it will mean for their household and finances long term.

In some instances, submitters suggested that we split the proposed rates increase over the period of the LTP to flatten it out more, or look at changes to our rating system to make it more equitable.

## **City Vacant Differential**

294 submitters provided written feedback on the proposed changes to the City Vacant Differential. 53% of those who provided feedback supported the proposed changes, 3% opposed the proposed changes and 39% provided other suggestions.

Those who supported the proposed changes tended to feel that it is a good way to encourage productive use of land in the city, and to discourage 'land banking'. Others simply supported the move as a mechanism to reduce rates for the average household. Those who opposed the changes tended to feel that it is overly punitive, or see it as a revenue-gathering exercise as opposed to a genuine mechanism for behaviour change.

Many submitters provided other suggestions as to how they would like to see the City Vacant Differential applied. Generally, these submitters tended to support extending the City Vacant Differential so that it covers more of the city, or the whole city. Many of these submitters also suggested that we should increase the multiplier from 4.523 to 6 if we really want to see behaviour change. Some submitters suggested that where vacant sites are being used for activities such as car parking, they shouldn't be eligible for a remission as they do not consider car parking to be a productive use of land.

## **Charging Visitor Accommodation as a Business**

363 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to rate visitor accommodation in a residential unit as a business. 77% of these submitters were supportive of our proposal, with many noting that

they are operating as a business so should be rated appropriately. 7% of these submitters opposed the move to rate them as businesses, indicating that they feel the approach is heavy handed and unfair, and citing concerns about the impact it would have on visitor accommodation and tourists visiting the city. 10% provided other suggestions or ideas.

Many submitters reiterated that this should only be applied to homes where the home is only used for short term accommodation, ensuring that people renting out a single room in their home are not charged business rates.

## **Fees & Charges**

We received a range of feedback our proposed fees and charges. In many instances, submitters supported a move to user pays, which they feel will help reduce pressure on rates and ratepayers and ensure those who benefit from the services are the ones who pay for them. Changes to the balance between rates and user funded fees and charges were raised by many when asked about our rates proposal or other areas where we could look for additional savings or efficiencies.

## **Charging for Parking at Key Parks**

Submitters were divided on our proposal to introduce parking charges at key parks. 1088 submitters provided feedback on this proposal; 30% support introducing parking charges at key parks, 43% oppose introducing parking charges, 19% proposed alternatives, and 8% made general comments.

Those who supported the proposed charges generally advocated for a user pays approach and acknowledged that it would help to manage demand and deter people from using them as all day parks, which impacts genuine park visitors and users. Some noted they supported the move as long as it was affordable and didn't prohibit access, while others supported introducing parking charges alongside promoting and supporting access via public and active travel.

Those who opposed the proposed charges felt that access would be unfairly impacted, and that our parks and greenspaces should be available for anyone to use, regardless of whether they can afford to pay for parking. They thought that introducing parking charges at these parks would put an unfair barrier to access in place, particularly for young families. Others simply expressed that they thought it was the Council being greedy for relatively little economic gain and chasing further revenue to fund unnecessary spending.

In some instances submitters put forward alternatives, signalling that they understood the need to manage demand on the parking spaces but would like to see us implement a solution that would manage demand but not restrict access to those who may not be able to afford the parking charges. Alternatives suggested included introducing time limits as opposed to charges, keeping charges low, providing an up-front period that is free with charges that kick in after that, or charging during the week but keeping the weekends free.

## **Car Parking Charges**

225 submitters provided feedback on our car parking fees and charges. 44% of these were submitters suggesting alternatives.

In some cases submitters thought that we should be increasing car parking charges to encourage people to consider using other modes of transport. This commonly went hand in hand with a desire to increase and accelerate spending on cycling and public transport.

Others called for more proactive enforcement of bad parking behaviour and easier ways for residents to report bad behaviour.

## **Disposal of Council Owned Properties and Red Zone Land**

### **Disposal of five Council owned properties**

The message from most submitters who commented on our proposal to begin the process of disposing of five Council-owned properties was simple – just get on with it. 1156 submitters provided feedback on beginning the process of disposing of five council owned properties, 57% of these submitters supported moving forward, 12% opposed, 21% provided alternative suggestions and 9% made general comments.

Those who were in support agreed that if they were surplus to requirement, then it made sense to get rid of them, particularly if it will help to ease the financial pressure that the Council is facing in the coming years. Those who opposed beginning the process to dispose of these properties generally tended to oppose the sale of Council land and assets. They felt that we should be retaining these properties for future use.

In some instances, submitters indicated that they would prefer we used this land for growing the city's tree canopy, providing more social or affordable housing, or creating community focused spaces such as food forests and shared gardens. The sale of the land at 26 Waipara Street was a concern for some, who view it as an important potential future link between Cracroft and a shared path along Cashmere Stream.

### **Disposal of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties**

1128 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to dispose of other Council-owned properties which includes former Residential Red Zone Port Hills properties, 58% of submitters who provided feedback supported us moving forward with this process. They were supportive of the Council finding ways to reduce the pressure on our finances in coming years.

Those who did not support us beginning the process of disposing of these properties either outright opposed the sale of Council land and assets, believing that we should retain it for a future use, or expressed concerns about the sale of red zoned land. For some, the rights of former red zone property owners were of concern, with submitters wanting to see the land first offered to its previous owners, and if the land was sold the history of the earthquakes and their displacement

acknowledged. Others wanted to see any sale of the land include conditions around responsible development, environmental protection, and community consultation. Some submitters advocated for ecological reserves or green spaces rather than commercial development. There were suggestions by some submitters that Port Hills red-zoned properties should be replanted with native and/or fire-resistant plantings. In some cases, submitters were concerned about the liability associated with the sale of red zone land.

## Our Proposed Operational Spending

We asked submitters whether they think that we were prioritising the right things within our proposed operational spending. 35% agreed that we've got it about right, while 39% thought that we needed to make some changes.

### Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

| Are we prioritising the right things? |       |        |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--------|
| Total number of responses: 2,295      |       |        |
| Response                              | Count | %      |
| Yes                                   | 811   | 35.34% |
| No                                    | 906   | 39.48% |
| Don't know                            | 578   | 25.19% |

### School Strike for Climate

| Are we prioritising the right things? |          |               |        |
|---------------------------------------|----------|---------------|--------|
| Total number of responses: 2,337      |          |               |        |
| Response                              | Count    |               | %      |
|                                       | CCC Form | School Strike |        |
| Yes                                   | 811      | 8             | 35.04% |
| No                                    | 906      | 34            | 40.22% |
| Don't know                            | 578      | NA            | 24.73% |

\*School Strike for Climate Question: Are we prioritising the right things? (Don't know response option was removed).

Much of the feedback on our proposed operational spend was submitters reinforcing that they want to see us maintaining our current levels of service. In some instances, submitters simply highlighted the importance of maintaining services, while feedback from others told us that they would like us to look for other ways to cut costs that won't have an impact on the level of service we provide to our residents and communities. Finding efficiencies within the services and staff costs were commonly raised by these submitters.

There was a smaller cohort of submitters who suggested that we should be looking at cutting services to reduce costs, with many indicating that there are aspects of our proposed spend are wasteful. Others mentioned the process that Central Government agencies are currently going through to reduce costs and thought that the Council should be doing the same.

This sentiment was echoed by those who generally opposed our proposed opex spending, expressing opinions that the Council is wasting ratepayers' money, is inefficient, doesn't have a commercial mindset, and that staff salaries are too high. Others focused their feedback on specific services or programmes that they feel are wasteful.

On the other hand, those who supported our proposed opex spending were generally supportive of retaining our existing levels of service, others were pleased with our planned spend on specific purposes. In some instances, submitters pointed out that cutting services would have a disproportionate impact on those in our community who do not have the means to access these services elsewhere. The importance of maintenance was also highlighted by some submitters, particularly with respect to our physical assets such as libraries, parks, and rec and sport facilities.

## **Libraries**

The important role of libraries and the level of appreciation that residents have for our library system was a common theme in feedback from submitters on our proposed operational spend. Many submitters highlighted the services and value that our libraries provide, and how important these are to them. Others noted the important social benefits libraries provide alongside the typical day to day library services. The common theme throughout feedback from these submitters was how much they value the libraries and how disappointed they would be if we were to reduce the level of service they provide.

Other submitters provided feedback that they thought we could take another look at opening hours for our libraries, with some suggesting that they probably don't need to be open seven days a week. In some instances, they pointed out the changing online environment, and whether libraries would be as important as the presence of the internet and 'online' world continues to grow. Annual membership fees or the addition of other new fees, including reintroducing fines for overdue items, were suggested by some submitters as a way to maintain our current libraries service while reducing the operating costs to ratepayers.

## **Transport**

Many submitters provided feedback on aspects of our transport operational spending, the most prominent of these was feedback on our safe streets and neighbourhoods work programme.

Submitters were divided on the safer streets and neighbourhoods work. In some instances, submitters expressed that they feel it is wasteful spending and this is an area we could look at in terms of reducing spending, while other submitters highlighted the importance of the programme in making our streets safer for all users, requesting that we continue to invest in this work or invest even more in projects that support this.

Those who opposed work on the programme tended to feel that it was unnecessary and is making it harder for vehicle users to travel. In their view, we could save a significant amount of money by simply cutting the programme while making travel in the city easier. In many instances, these submitters were frustrated about the changes that have already been made to some of our streets, and do not want to see any more of these changes in other areas of the city. In some cases

submitters mentioned that slowing vehicles would equate to more transport emissions, which is the very opposite of what the Council is trying to achieve by providing transport choice.

Those who supported retaining the programme or asked us to accelerate or expand the programme highlighted their concern about speed associated safety hazards, and noted the difference it has made to the communities where speed lowering measures have already been implemented. Often this feedback went hand in hand with feedback about improving access to active and public transport, with many noting that making our streets safer is an important step in enabling more travel choice.

## **Community Grants and Funding**

Many of the submissions that we received on the LTP were driven by proposed changes to, reductions in, or requests for additional community grants and funding. While the submissions often focused on different aspects of community grants and funding, these submitters were united in their desire to clearly communicate the importance of the community grants and funding that the Council provides.

### **The Arts Centre**

We received 4158 submissions that addressed funding for the Arts Centre, through both our online form and the short form created by the Arts Centre. 99% of these submitters wanted council to provide support for the Arts Centre in the LTP. For the majority of these submitters, the omission of funding for the Arts Centre in the draft LTP was unacceptable. However, their submissions focused on the need to keep the Arts Centre open and thriving, as opposed to the mechanism for providing that support.

For many who live both in the city, and elsewhere in New Zealand, there are fond memories associated with the Arts Centre, whether it is an important milestone in their life such as a wedding, attending a concert or show, or attending university at the centre. Many submitters spoke of their memories of the Arts Centre and the value that the Arts Centre brings as a cultural asset, and the importance of the programmes that the Arts Centre runs.

Other submitters discussed the heritage value of the Arts Centre buildings, noting how unique they are, with some submitters saying they feel the Arts Centre is more iconic than the Cathedral. There was a feeling from many of these submitters that we have invested so much in restoring these buildings, that not providing the operational funding to keep the Arts Centre running would undermine all the investment in the restoration of the buildings.

The community aspect of the arts centre was raised by many submitters, who spoke of the Centre's ability to bring people together, foster community and connection, and the importance of it as a space for the arts community.

In some cases, submitters pointed out the financial risk to the Council if the Arts Centre Trust was to dissolve. They pointed out that the Council would be the most likely candidate for taking over the Centre, which would come with a large legal bill as well as ongoing operating costs more than what the trust are requesting.



A few submitters supported the move to remove funding for the Arts Centre from the LTP. These submitters tended to feel that the Arts Centre should be doing more to try and reduce their costs and overheads, and that there are revenue opportunities available to the Arts Centre that are not currently being taken up.

## **Orana Park**

1013 submitters provided feedback on funding for Orana Park, 98% of these were in support of the Council providing the funding requested to help Orana Park. Submitters voiced a view that Orana Park is a crucial asset for tourism, conservation and education in Christchurch, urging the Council to protect this work and the animals in their care. Many spoke of their fond memories of visiting Orana Park when they were children and with their children and grandchildren. Several emphasised the economic and educational value Orana Park brings to the city, with specific mentions of its contributions to tourism, conservation breeding programs, and wildlife advocacy. Submitters who raised the importance of the conservation work undertaken by the park want to see this continued, while others feel that we have an obligation to protect and look after the animals who live at Orana.

Regardless of why they want us to provide additional funding to the park, submitters were united in their call for the Council to provide additional funding to Orana Park, to ensure its ongoing sustainability and continued positive impact on the community. Some pointed out the support that other zoos across New Zealand receive from their local councils, noting that they would like to see Orana Park provided with a similar level of support.

## **Other Contestable Funds**

Submitters provided a range of feedback on other contestable funds, most notably the sustainability and biodiversity fund. 50 submitters provided feedback on other contestable funds (many of which were organisations), 63% of these submitters provided other ideas or requested alternatives.

Several submitters told us throughout their submissions that they don't think we are doing enough to support biodiversity, ecological restoration and sustainability, and called for us to maintain the biodiversity and sustainability funds and the environmental partnership fund. In some instances, they thought that we should increase the level of funding provided through these funds. Groups and organisations who currently receive funding from these funds spoke of the work it enables them to do, and the difference this work is making. Many feel that if these funds are removed, it will jeopardise the progress being made, and we will go backwards.

## **Screen Canterbury Grant**

A number of submitters provided feedback on the Screen Canterbury grant, pointing out the value this has brought to the city and the screen industry, and asking the Council to reinstate the \$1.5 million grant. Submitters highlighted that the \$1.5 million grant had returned \$12.5 million for the city. These submitters pointed out that our community outcomes point towards us wanting to

become a cultural powerhouse but feel that not including the Screen Canterbury grant in the LTP is actively working against achieving this outcome.

## **Anglican Cathedral Funding**

Feedback from the vast majority of submitters who commented on further funding for the Anglican Cathedral was clear - they do not want to see the Council or ratepayers provide any further funding to the Cathedral restoration project. Many of these submitters indicated that they would rather see the money invested in supporting the Arts Centre, which they feel is more iconic. In a number of instances these submitters noted that they didn't support the initial \$10 million of funding that the Council provided for the Cathedral project and expressed their opposition to any further funding being provided. Many thought that it was appropriate that the church find the additional funding required to complete the project.

A small number of submitters indicated support for additional funding for the project, with many saying we've invested so much in it already that the project must be completed.

## **Resource Recovery**

365 submitters provided feedback on our operational spend on resource recovery. A number of these submitters requested that we extend the service we currently provide, many of which were focused on ways that we can build more sustainable practises into the service.

Submitters called for more focus on waste reduction, including education programmes to support this, promoting reuse and repair, incentivising responsible demolition, and adopting more environmentally friendly disposal methods. Many submitters wanted us to introduce additional services that would enable more materials to be recycled or reused, instead of going to landfill.

Others highlighted their disappointment about the recent national standards implemented by the Government, pointing out that they feel it has made the service worse not better. They are disappointed that material that would have previously been recycled or composted is now going to landfill, which feels like a step backwards instead of a step forwards.

## **Resourcing**

In a number of cases, submitters felt that optimising spending on staff and reducing the number of staff would be a quick and easy way to reduce Council spending. There was strong sentiment from some submitters that salaries need to be reduced, and we need to focus resourcing on 'the basics'. Other submitters indicated that they feel that there is excessive bureaucracy and inefficiencies within the Council. Generally, the issues raised by these submitters reflected a desire for responsible financial management and to see the Council deliver services efficiently, reducing unnecessary costs.

Other submitters expressed their support, gratitude and appreciation for the work that Council staff do.

## Our Proposed Capital Spending

We asked submitters whether they think we are prioritising the right things in our capital programme and spending. 38% told us they think we've got it about right, 43% told us that we aren't prioritising the right things and 18% didn't know.

### Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

| Are we prioritising the right things? |       |        |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--------|
| Total number of responses: 2,323      |       |        |
| Response                              | Count | %      |
| Yes                                   | 886   | 38.14% |
| No                                    | 1010  | 43.48% |
| Don't know                            | 427   | 18.38% |

### School Strike for Climate

| Are we prioritising the right things? |          |               |        |
|---------------------------------------|----------|---------------|--------|
| Total number of responses: 2,366      |          |               |        |
| Response                              | Count    |               | %      |
|                                       | CCC Form | School Strike |        |
| Yes                                   | 811      | 9             | 34.65% |
| No                                    | 906      | 34            | 39.72% |
| Don't know                            | 578      | NA            | 24.42% |

\*School Strike for Climate Question: Are we prioritising the right things? (Don't know response option was removed).

Of the 443 general comments on our capital programme, 56% of them were submitters suggesting changes that they would like to see us make to the programme. Submitters talked about a range of changes they would like to see us make to the programme, which included more focus on specific services (transport and three waters were commonly mentioned), focusing on looking after what we've got before we add anything new or start other major capital projects, pausing capital projects until there is less pressure on the city's finances, or removing projects and programmes that they don't consider to be worthwhile.

14% of general comments were from submitters who supported the draft capital programme and think we've got it about right. These submitters highlighted the importance of maintaining what we've got and preparing for the future of the city.

13% were comments from those who opposed our proposed spending, which tended to either focus on a specific aspect of the programme or our general level of spending. Others didn't think we'd got the priorities right within the programme.

The remaining 17% of comments were general/other comments made by submitters.

## Transport

Feedback on our proposed capital spend on transport reinforced that one person's 'must have' is another person's 'nice to have, and highlights the challenge that the Council must grapple with in terms of balancing these different views and needs within our capital programme.

## Cycleways

Submitters were extremely divided on our proposed spending on cycleways. Of the 906 submitters who provided feedback on cycleways, 22% generally supported our proposed spend on cycleways, 33% opposed our proposed spending and 39% provided other suggestions or want us to do something different to what we have proposed.

Most submitters who provided other suggestions or wanted us to do something different were requesting that we invest more in or accelerate work on cycling infrastructure, both the major cycleways and local cycle connections. Many of these submitters were disappointed to see that this work had been delayed in the draft LTP, and wanted the previous timelines reinstated and funding brought forward. Submitters noted that this infrastructure is extremely important in providing transport choice, however many thought that we should explore alternative ways of delivering it that may be more cost effective. The Park Terrace cycleway was used as an example of a pragmatic, relatively low-cost solution, with submitters suggesting we explore whether this approach is a viable alternative in any other area of the city. Other submitters noted the need to provide safe infrastructure in all areas of the city to ensure equitable access to safe transport options.

On the other hand there were some submitters who thought that we should scale back and further delay cycling infrastructure to try and reduce costs and rates increases. In this instance they weren't suggesting that we should never make the investment, but they did think that it wasn't an essential right now so the investment could wait. A few mentioned that they feel the cycleways are 'over engineered' and did not provide benefits that are commensurate with the amount that we spend on them.

Submitters who opposed our proposed spend on cycleways tended to oppose outright the development of cycleways at all, considering them to be a waste of money and unnecessary. Some accused the Council of proceeding with cycleways despite feedback from local communities that they don't want them in their area. Wheels to Wings was the most common example of this. They tended to feel that the level of use they receive didn't warrant the level of investment proposed, and that they are generally a nuisance to other road users.

In contrast to this, the submitters who supported our proposed spend tended to view it as essential, and supported the investment to provide residents with more travel choice and to make

cycling safer. Many highlighted the environmental benefits, talking about the green, environmentally friendly city that they wanted to live in, and the contribution that an improved cycle network would make towards our goals of reducing transport emissions and meeting our emissions targets. In some instances these submitters noted that they were concerned that the Central Government Policy statement would put this investment in jeopardy.

Some submitters highlighted that we also need to invest more in end of journey infrastructure, particularly cycle parking.

## **Public Transport Infrastructure**

Making public transport more accessible and easier to use was front of mind for many submitters. 371 submitters provided feedback on our proposed investment in public transport infrastructure. 33% supported our proposed spend, 8% opposed and 48% made other suggestions.

Those who supported our proposed investment and the majority of submitters who made other suggestions acknowledged the need to make public transport more accessible, quicker and easier to use, and highlighted its importance in the transport choice picture. In some instances, submitters wanted to see us bring planned work forward or ensure that work still happens in light of changing Central Government priorities, while others were focused on providing services to areas where there is currently poor access (areas in the Southwest of the city were raised most commonly). Many of the comments about transport choice went hand in hand with submitters commenting on the provision of cycling infrastructure.

Those who opposed our proposed spending on public transport tended to fall into two camps: submitters who thought that we were spending too much on roads and not enough on public and/or active transport; and those who thought any investment in public transport infrastructure would be a waste of money as it is underutilised.

## **Roads**

458 submitters provided written feedback on our proposed spending on roads. Around 14% of these submitters supported our proposed investment in our roads, 30% opposed and 45% made other suggestions.

Those who made other suggestions tended to have opinions at very opposite ends of the spectrum. In some cases, submitters thought that the balance was out as it was placing too much priority on investing in roads and not enough on investing in active or public transport. On the other hand there were submitters who thought the balance was tipped too far towards active and public transport, and we should be investing more in our roads.

Those who think that the balance needs to be tipped towards less investment in our roads noted that along with the environmental benefits of shifting some of this investment towards active and public transport, there would also be benefits of reducing the number of cars on the road, which would in turn reduce the wear and tear on our roads and reduce maintenance costs in the long term.

Those who think that the balance needs to be tipped towards more investment in our roads urged us to get on with improving the quality of the road surfaces and making it easier for road users to travel in the city. In many instances these submitters were highlighting issues in specific parts of the city, many of which are in the east. Prioritising the work required on the Pages Road Bridge was raised by many of these submitters, who reinforced its importance as a lifeline connection for many who live in New Brighton.

Those who opposed the proposed investment in roads provided a range of opinions and reasons for opposing our proposed spend. In some instances, they raised their opposition to specific projects that they deem to be wasteful; speed cushions, roundabouts and the 'beautification' of our roads are some examples. Others objected to the amount we are proposing to invest in our roads, indicating that they thought it was too car centric.

Those who supported our proposed spend were pleased to see us investing our roads.

## **Three Waters**

Many submitters noted the importance of investing in our three waters network, while others questioned why we are investing in three waters now that Central Government has indicated that they will be taking a different approach to water reform. The term 'three waters' is in some respects facing an identity/reputation challenge, with many strongly associating it with the previous Government's water reform programme.

## **Taumata Arowai Requirements**

133 submitters provided feedback on Taumata Arowai/Central Government requirements. The majority of the feedback that we got on our water infrastructure related to removing the chlorine from our water and, on a smaller scale, not introducing fluoride. Feedback from these submitters was clear – undertake the work required to get the chlorine out of our water. Many reflected on the quality of our water prior to chlorination and want us to get back to that level of quality, while others reminded us of the previous promises and commitments made by Council in terms of getting Chlorine out of the water.

## **Parks**

### **Sports Grounds & Facilities and the Sports Field Network Plan**

We received many submissions urging us to bring forward our proposed investment in the city's sports parks and fields. 313 submitters provided feedback on the funding for the Sports Field Network Plan, particularly the staging of the funding. A further 88 comments were provided on other sports grounds and facilities.

Many of the submissions on the Sports Field Network Plan originated from the football community. They requested that the \$85.6 million set aside towards the end of the 10-year period of the LTP be brought forward, enabling investment in establishing floodlit artificial playing turfs, and improving grass facilities. Many pointed out that the state of the current grass turfs was having an impact on

accessibility and playing time, and in some instances caused health and safety issues. Others noted that the facilities currently available was limiting development opportunities for players. Regardless of why they wanted the investment brought forward, they were united in their requests for better facilities to be provided sooner.

Of the further 89 submission points on sports grounds and facilities, 63% were submitters asking us to invest more in a range of sporting facilities, including a range of land-based turf and court facilities, as well as requests for additional canoe polo courts. As with the submissions on the Sports Field Network Plan, these submitters highlighted the importance of these facilities in supporting a range of sporting codes, enabling people to be more active, attracting events to the city and developing local athletes.

## **Tree Canopy**

134 submitters commented on spending on the tree canopy. More than half (53%) of these comments supported investing more in growing the tree canopy across the city, highlighting how important it will be from an environmental perspective but also the impacts that it has on the look, feel, and liveability of our neighbourhoods. A further 34% of the comments were submitters putting forward alternative ideas, including accelerating the work, focusing on native, regenerative forests, and increasing the tree canopy in certain areas of the city.

## **Libraries**

389 submitters commented on our proposed capital spend on libraries. 45% of these submitters supported our proposed capital spend on libraries, 19% opposed and 26% provided other ideas or suggestions.

Much of this feedback was focused on the number of facilities and the rebuild of the South Library. Submitters who opposed our investment in rebuilding this library questioned why so much needs to be spent on a rebuild when the current facility was still functioning. Those who supported the proposed investment in the rebuild highlighted the importance of this facility to the local community, and reinforced the need to replace the current facility with a new one that is fit for purpose and future proofed to continue providing the service that the community values so much for many years to come.

More generally, submitters were divided on whether we should be spending on any new or additional libraries. On one hand, submitters told us how much they value libraries, and supported investing more in our libraries network. On the other hand, submitters told us that they think we have too many libraries, and we don't need to invest any more in the network.

## **Te Kaha**

542 submitters provided feedback on the investment we are making in Te Kaha. Around 52% of these submitters noted their opposition for the investment going into Te Kaha. Many acknowledged that it was too late to do anything about the spending but were disappointed that the level of spend required on Te Kaha meant that we were unable to make the level of investment

in areas that they saw as a higher priority. Many were disappointed that ratepayers were having to foot such a large bill for a facility that many wouldn't be able to access events at or weren't likely to attend events at, or in other instances were disappointed that so much was being spent on a facility to enable sports events, but cultural facilities were having to fight so hard for their survival.

Several submitters requested alternatives to our proposed spending on Te Kaha, many of which were submitters suggesting that funding should be sought from other parties to reduce the impact on Christchurch ratepayers. The most common suggestion was contributions from our neighbouring territorial authorities, however entities such as the Canterbury Rugby Union and the New Zealand Rugby Union were also mentioned by submitters.



## Event Bid Funding

We asked submitters whether they thought we should increase the level of bid funding, or leave it at the levels proposed in the draft LTP. 69% of submitters who indicated a preference said that they would prefer we left it at the levels proposed in the draft LTP, while 31% wanted us to increase the level of funding allocated to bidding for events.

| <b>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?</b> |               |          |
|--|---------------|----------|
| Total number of responses: 1,934   |               |          |
| <b>Response</b>  | <b>Number</b> | <b>%</b> |
| Leave the bid funding for major and business events at current levels in the draft LTP, as proposed.   | 1332          | 68.94%   |
| Increase the bid funding.  | 600           | 31.6%    |

Comments from submitters who support leaving it at the levels proposed in the draft highlighted that many feel that now is not the time to be considering increasing the fund, which would further increase rates, putting more financial pressure on households. In some instances, these submitters suggested we revisit the proposal in a few years, when households are facing less financial pressure. There were concerns from others that the ratepayers fronting the cost for the additional bid funding won't be able to afford to attend the events, and the major benefactors would be the hospitality and retail sectors. Others questioned whether attracting more events really would be good for the city, citing environmental concerns (many using SailGP as an example), whether the economic benefits really are as good as stated, and whether the city has the infrastructure to support further large-scale events.

Of the 738 comments made by submitters on the additional bid funding, around 40% were submitters suggesting alternatives to our proposal. These tended to fit into two categories:

- Reducing the amount allocated to event bid funding in the LTP or removing it completely.
- Shifting the onus of funding any additional funding away from the ratepayer, instead suggesting that those who will benefit most from additional funding should contribute more.

Feedback from submitters who would like to see the event bid funding reduced or removed echoed the concerns discussed by those who support keeping the bid funding at the levels proposed in the draft LTP. Some submitters highlighted that they don't think that this should be a priority for Local Government or that it is a luxury, and that ratepayers shouldn't be subsidising attracting events to the city. Others felt that attracting events to the city should be the responsibility of those set to benefit the most from hosting them, with some submitters noting that they don't feel that they personally, or their household, get any benefit from the money invested in bringing these events to the city. Others felt that we have made our contribution in investing in the

facilities to attract these events, and now it should be over to the events industry to attract and host the events.

In some instances, submitters indicated that if we were to increase the level of event bid funding, they would like to see this done within the proposed rates envelope, making substitutions as opposed to adding it onto the proposed rates increase as an additional cost.

25% of submitters who provided a preference on increasing event bid funding supported increasing the level of funding proposed in the draft LTP. Many highlighted the economic benefits of attracting additional and bigger events to the city, while others focused on the need to make the most of the facilities that we are investing so much in providing. Many highlighted the vibrancy that events bring to the city, and discussed their desire to live in a vibrant, interesting city.

## Investing More in Adapting to Climate Change

We asked submitters whether they think we should bring forward an additional \$1.8 million currently proposed to commence in 2027/28, to accelerate our grasp of climate risks. 52% of the submitters who provided an answer to this question support bringing forward the \$1.8 million, 34% wanted us to maintain the status quo of the funding commencing in 2027/2028 and 15% didn't know.

### Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

| <b>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?</b> |              |          |
|--|--------------|----------|
| Total number of responses: 2,301   |              |          |
| <b>Response</b>  | <b>Count</b> | <b>%</b> |
| Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.   | 1188         | 51.63%   |
| No - don't bring \$1.8 million forward.  | 776          | 33.72%   |
| Don't know - not sure if we should bring \$1.8 million forward.  | 337          | 14.65%   |

### School Strike for Climate

| <b>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?</b> |                 |                      |          |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|----------|
| Total number of responses: 2,353   |                 |                      |          |
| <b>Response</b>  | <b>Count</b>    |                      | <b>%</b> |
|  | <b>CCC Form</b> | <b>School Strike</b> |          |
| Yes - bring \$1.8 million forward.   | 1188            | 52                   | 52.69%   |
| No - don't bring \$1.8 million forward.  | 776             | 0                    | 32.97%   |
| Don't know - not sure if we should bring \$1.8 million forward.  | 337             | NA                   | 14.32%   |

\*School Strike for Climate Question: Should the Council bring forward the \$1.8 million proposed for 2027/28 to accelerate how we address climate risks? (Don't know response option was removed).

We also asked submitters whether we should create a climate adaptation fund. 58% of submitters who provided an answer to this question supported establishing a climate adaptation fund, 28% opposed establishing a fund and 14% didn't know.

### Christchurch City Council Online & Paper Forms

| <b>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?</b> |              |          |
|---|--------------|----------|
| Total number of responses: 2,288  |              |          |
| <b>Response</b>   | <b>Count</b> | <b>%</b> |
| Yes - create a climate adaption fund.   | 1322         | 57.78%   |
| No - don't create a climate adaption fund.  | 639          | 27.93%   |
| Don't know - not sure if we should create a climate adaption fund.  | 327          | 14.29%   |

### School Strike for Climate

| <b>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?</b> |                 |                      |          |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|----------|
| Total number of responses: 2,339  |                 |                      |          |
| <b>Response</b>   | <b>Count</b>    |                      | <b>%</b> |
|   | <b>CCC Form</b> | <b>School Strike</b> |          |
| Yes - create a climate adaption fund.   | 1322            | 51                   | 58.70%   |
| No - don't create a climate adaption fund.  | 639             | 0                    | 27.31%   |
| Don't know - not sure if we should create a climate adaption fund.  | 327             | NA                   | 13.98%   |

\*School Strike for Climate Question: Should we create a Climate Resilience Fund? (Don't know response option was removed).

Much of the feedback we received on these two proposals urged the Council to take climate change and climate risk seriously, and do more to support mitigation, adaptation and prepare us for what the future may bring. 778 submitters commented on our climate proposals - 45% were comments in support of accelerating adaptation or creating a climate fund, 11% were comments opposing the proposal, 30% were submitters suggesting alternative ideas or proposals and 15% were general comments.

Submitters who expressed their support and many of those who suggested alternative proposals raised several issues.

Many raised the urgent need for climate action They want to see us take it seriously and commit to investing in climate resilience and adaptation. They raised the urgent need for this in areas like

New Brighton that are vulnerable to coastal hazards and sea-level rise. They called for accelerated action and funding for proactive action. They also stated that inaction now will most likely lead to bigger costs in the future, advocating for early investment in climate adaptation and mitigation to avoid future financial pressure.

In some instances they raised the potential opportunities that could come with investing in climate resilience, including an opportunity to attract residents, businesses, and new sectors to Christchurch. Action and investment is viewed as a chance for the city to lead the way in addressing climate change and creating a sustainable and attractive city. For many, investment in public and active transport and more intensive development went hand in hand with responding to climate change, taking climate action and developing Christchurch into a more resilient city.

Many young submitters emphasised the importance of community engagement and taking our residents and communities on the journey with us. They felt that we could do more to ensure that young people are included in the decision-making processes that will have a profound impact on their future.

Overall, there was a strong push from these submitters for the Council to prioritise climate change mitigation in our long-term planning, including investments in biodiversity, climate adaptation, and sustainable infrastructure. They felt that the focus should be on spending to prepare now rather than dealing with costly damage to our infrastructure and communities in the future.

On the other hand, there were also submitters who felt that we shouldn't be spending on climate change at all, or that it should wait until the city is under less financial pressure. In many instances they expressed strong opposition to additional spending on climate change initiatives, viewing any spending as a waste of money.

Others advocated for a focus on investing in essential infrastructure, suggesting that we should be focusing on a broader goal of resilience rather than attempting to change the climate.

There were also submitters who expressed scepticism about the effectiveness of climate change spending, instead emphasising the need for financial prudence and accountability from the Council.

## Additional Savings & Efficiencies

We asked submitters whether there were any areas where they thought that we could find additional savings or efficiencies. 332 submitters provided us with feedback on this question.

In many instances submitters told us that our spending was wasteful, that we need to cut our costs, focus on the basics and find ways to reduce costs. However, when presented with the opportunity to provide feedback on areas where they think we could find savings and efficiencies, few were able to pinpoint specific examples.

Where submitters did provide feedback on specific areas, they often overlapped with projects, programmes, funding or services that other submitters had told us are very important, again reinforcing that one person's 'must have' is another person's 'nice to have'. Specific examples commonly mentioned by these submitters included climate change, cycleways, staff costs, Te Kaha, events, cuts to community funding and service cuts.

## Yaldhurst Memorial Hall

1231 submitters provided feedback on our proposal to gift the Yaldhurst Memorial Hall to the Yaldhurst Rural Residents Association. The vast majority (79%) of submitters supported gifting the hall to the resident's association. Submitters generally thought that it was a good solution, particularly if it removed any onus on the council to or expectation that the Council will repair and restore the hall.

Around 11% of submitters provided alternative thoughts. Many of these submitters thought that we should look at selling the hall to the Resident's Association instead of gifting it. Others thought we should gift the hall but ensure there were protections in place to stop the Association selling the hall and land for a profit further down the track.

## Appendix One: Summary of number of comments by category

| Category                    | Sub Category                                      | No. Of Submitters | Support | Oppose | Other | General Comments |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------|---------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Strategic Direction         | Have we got the balance right?                    | 1215              | 25%     | 44%    | 20%   | 11%              |
|                             | Financial Strategy                                | 24                | 8%      | 4%     | 63%   | 25%              |
|                             | Infrastructure Strategy                           | 43                | 24%     | 4%     | 58%   | 13%              |
|                             | Community Outcomes & Strategic Priorities         | 537               | 25%     | 6%     | 47%   | 22%              |
|                             | Performance Framework                             | 50                | 25%     | 10%    | 37%   | 27%              |
|                             | Our Treaty Relationships                          | 49                | 22%     | 4%     | 59%   | 16%              |
|                             | Climate Change                                    | 374               | 29%     | 13%    | 46%   | 11%              |
|                             | Additional Savings & Efficiencies                 | 332               | 0%      | 0%     | 0%    | 100%             |
| Other Policy Matters        | 49  | 10%               | 2%      | 57%    | 31%   |                  |
| Rates                       | Residential Rates                                 | 985               | 21%     | 30%    | 30%   | 20%              |
|                             | Business Rates                                    | 56                | 9%      | 17%    | 62%   | 12%              |
|                             | Remote Rural Rates                                | 22                | 14%     | 27%    | 50%   | 9%               |
|                             | Uniform Annual General Charge                     | 9                 | 0%      | 33%    | 67%   | 0%               |
|                             | Rates Remissions                                  | 180               | 50%     | 12%    | 29%   | 9%               |
|                             | City Vacant Differential                          | 294               | 53%     | 3%     | 39%   | 5%               |
|                             | Visitor Accommodation                             | 363               | 77%     | 7%     | 10%   | 6%               |
|                             | ECAN Rates  | 10                | 0%      | 0%     | 0%    | 100%             |
|                             | Other   | 365               | 10%     | 4%     | 65%   | 21%              |
| Revenue                     | Dividends   | 5                 | 0%      | 0%     | 60%   | 40%              |
|                             | Development Contributions                         | 18                | 6%      | 0%     | 78%   | 17%              |
|                             | Central Govt Grants & Funding                     | 37                | 3%      | 0%     | 89%   | 8%               |
|                             | Excess Water Charge                               | 56                | 14%     | 5%     | 77%   | 4%               |
|                             | Disposal of Council Owned Land                    | 1156              | 57%     | 12%    | 21%   | 9%               |
|                             | Disposal of Red Zoned Land                        | 1128              | 58%     | 8%     | 25%   | 8%               |
|                             | Other   | 52                | 4%      | 2%     | 83%   | 11%              |
| Borrowing & Debt Management | Borrowing & Debt Management                       | 75                | 9%      | 47%    | 31%   | 13%              |
|                             | Rating for Renewals                               | 4                 | 25%     | 25%    | 50%   | 0%               |
| Fees & Charges              | Car Parking (Parks)                               | 1088              | 30%     | 43%    | 19%   | 8%               |
|                             | Venue Charges (Parks)                             | 16                | 75%     | 13%    | 6%    | 6%               |
|                             | Venue Charges (Libraries)                         | 8                 | 100%    | 0%     | 0%    | 0%               |
|                             | Resource Consent Fees                             | 15                | 73%     | 7%     | 13%   | 7%               |
|                             | Building Consent Fees                             | 17                | 47%     | 6%     | 18%   | 29%              |
|                             | Libraries Charges                                 | 31                | 42%     | 6%     | 45%   | 6%               |
|                             | Car Parking Fees (on-street & off-street parking) | 225               | 22%     | 22%    | 44%   | 11%              |
|                             | Community Halls & Spaces                          | 11                | 64%     | 0%     | 36%   | 0%               |
| Other                       | 161   | 16%               | 10%     | 60%    | 14%   |                  |
| Spending                    | Our Proposed Spending                             | 625               | 12%     | 20%    | 46%   | 21%              |
|                             | Te Kaha   | 542               | 5%      | 52%    | 25%   | 17%              |
|                             | Capital Programme (General)                       | 416               | 14%     | 12%    | 54%   | 19%              |
| Grants & Funding            | Strengthening Communities Fund                    | 46                | 43%     | 9%     | 43%   | 4%               |
|                             | Capital Endowment Fund                            | 1                 | 0%      | 100%   | 0%    | 0%               |
|                             | Other Contestable Funds                           | 50                | 16%     | 19%    | 63%   | 2%               |
|                             | Events Ecosystem Funding                          | 738               | 25%     | 26%    | 43%   | 6%               |
|                             | ChristchurchNZ Funding (General)                  | 96                | 13%     | 19%    | 54%   | 14%              |
|                             | Funding for other CCOs                            | 5                 | 20%     | 40%    | 40%   | 0%               |
|                             | Arts Centre Funding                               | 4158              | 99%     | 0%     | 1%    | 0%               |
|                             | Orana Park Funding                                | 997               | 98%     | 1%     | 0%    | 1%               |
|                             | Other Community Grants & Funding                  | 99                | 33%     | 14%    | 46%   | 8%               |
|                             | Requests for Additional Grants & Funding          | 115               | 1%      | 1%     | 97%   | 1%               |
| Other                       | 87  | 7%                | 13%     | 65%    | 15%   |                  |
| Three Waters                | Three Waters (Operations)                         | 138               | 35%     | 16%    | 34%   | 15%              |
|                             | Waste Water (Capital)                             | 92                | 32%     | 23%    | 28%   | 17%              |
|                             | Water Supply (Capital)                            | 125               | 27%     | 7%     | 38%   | 28%              |
|                             | Stormwater & Land Drainage (Capital)              | 152               | 30%     | 5%     | 52%   | 13%              |
|                             | Waterways Quality & Compliance (Operations)       | 53                | 24%     | 4%     | 51%   | 22%              |
|                             | Waste Water Treatment Plant (Insurance & Repairs) | 44                | 16%     | 2%     | 41%   | 41%              |
|                             | Taumata Arowai Requirements                       | 133               | 7%      | 13%    | 65%   | 14%              |
|                             | Other   | 130               | 17%     | 5%     | 39%   | 39%              |
| Transport                   | Transport (Operations)                            | 409               | 7%      | 27%    | 48%   | 18%              |
|                             | Roads (Capital)                                   | 458               | 14%     | 30%    | 45%   | 11%              |
|                             | Cycleways (Capital)                               | 906               | 22%     | 33%    | 39%   | 6%               |

|   |   |      |     |     |      |      |
|---|---|------|-----|-----|------|------|
|   | Footpaths & Streetscapes (Capital)                          | 190  | 27% | 9%  | 55%  | 9%   |
|   | Public Transport Infrastructure (Capital)                   | 371  | 33% | 8%  | 48%  | 11%  |
|   | Carparking (Capital)  | 57   | 3%  | 12% | 69%  | 16%  |
|   | Other   | 232  | 11% | 10% | 49%  | 30%  |
| Resource Recovery   | Resource Recovery (Operations)                              | 348  | 23% | 1%  | 55%  | 21%  |
|   | Resource Recovery (Capital)                                 | 150  | 53% | 5%  | 28%  | 14%  |
|   | Ōtautahi Christchurch Regional Organics Processing Facility | 32   | 44% | 0%  | 53%  | 3%   |
| Parks   | Parks Maintenance   | 184  | 28% | 7%  | 45%  | 20%  |
|   | Playgrounds & Play Equipment                                | 42   | 20% | 2%  | 73%  | 5%   |
|   | Sports Grounds & Facilities                                 | 88   | 23% | 7%  | 63%  | 7%   |
|   | Parks Paths & Walkways                                      | 24   | 46% | 4%  | 50%  | 0%   |
|   | Foreshore   | 84   | 32% | 12% | 44%  | 13%  |
|   | Biodiversity & Ecological Restoration                       | 156  | 29% | 6%  | 56%  | 9%   |
|   | Public Convenience  | 32   | 22% | 0%  | 59%  | 19%  |
|   | Wharves & Jetties   | 20   | 20% | 10% | 45%  | 25%  |
|   | Heritage (Capital)  | 155  | 28% | 20% | 35%  | 17%  |
|   | Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Regeneration                    | 68   | 35% | 18% | 40%  | 7%   |
|   | Other Red Zone Areas  | 23   | 17% | 9%  | 65%  | 9%   |
|   | South New Brighton & Southshore Estuary Edge                | 28   | 36% | 4%  | 46%  | 14%  |
|   | Tree Canopy   | 134  | 53% | 2%  | 34%  | 11%  |
|   | Sports Field Network Plan                                   | 313  | 11% | 20% | 17%  | 53%  |
|   | Parks Spending (General)                                    | 256  | 42% | 11% | 39%  | 7%   |
| Other   | 245   | 12%  | 4%  | 54% | 30%  |      |
| Recreation, Sports & Events                                       | Libraries (Operations)                                      | 636  | 32% | 4%  | 32%  | 33%  |
|   | Libraries (Capital)   | 389  | 45% | 19% | 26%  | 10%  |
|   | Temporary Facility for South Library                        | 22   | 45% | 14% | 27%  | 14%  |
|   | Community Facilities (Operations)                           | 31   | 19% | 0%  | 69%  | 13%  |
|   | Halls & Community Centres (Capital)                         | 30   | 7%  | 0%  | 83%  | 10%  |
|   | Service Centres (Operational)                               | 5    | 60% | 0%  | 40%  | 0%   |
|   | Rec & Sport (Operations)                                    | 62   | 24% | 5%  | 44%  | 27%  |
|   | Events  | 69   | 29% | 14% | 43%  | 13%  |
|   | Pools (Capital)   | 71   | 21% | 15% | 44%  | 20%  |
|   | Recreation Centres (Capital)                                | 50   | 16% | 16% | 49%  | 20%  |
|   | Stadiums (Capital)  | 11   | 9%  | 18% | 64%  | 9%   |
| Community Arts  | 97  | 38%  | 7%  | 45% | 9%   |      |
| Art Gallery & Museums   | Art Gallery (Operations)                                    | 31   | 39% | 0%  | 42%  | 18%  |
|   | Art Gallery (Capital)                                       | 26   | 50% | 8%  | 38%  | 4%   |
|   | Museums (Operational)                                       | 18   | 50% | 6%  | 28%  | 17%  |
|   | Museums (Capital)   | 16   | 44% | 6%  | 38%  | 13%  |
| Planning & Strategic Transport, Urban Design & Urban Regeneration | City Planning   | 208  | 5%  | 4%  | 57%  | 34%  |
|   | Population, Household & Business Growth                     | 2    | 0%  | 50% | 50%  | 0%   |
|   | Strategic Transport   | 301  | 12% | 3%  | 43%  | 43%  |
|   | Coastal Hazards Adaptation & Adaptation Planning            | 76   | 30% | 8%  | 46%  | 16%  |
|   | Urban Design  | 19   | 11% | 0%  | 58%  | 32%  |
|   | Urban Regeneration  | 40   | 16% | 2%  | 56%  | 26%  |
|   | Heritage (Strategic)  | 21   | 24% | 5%  | 29%  | 43%  |
|   | Greater Christchurch Issues                                 | 8    | 13% | 0%  | 38%  | 50%  |
| Other/Special Interest Topics                                     | Creating a Climate Fund                                     | 778  | 45% | 11% | 30%  | 15%  |
|   | Vertical Capital  | 25   | 20% | 20% | 32%  | 28%  |
|   | Social Housing  | 59   | 14% | 12% | 63%  | 12%  |
|   | Yaldhurst Memorial Hall                                     | 1231 | 79% | 4%  | 11%  | 6%   |
|   | Asset Sales   | 69   | 33% | 25% | 35%  | 7%   |
|   | Tarras Airport  | 43   | 0%  | 57% | 23%  | 20%  |
|   | Commonwealth Games  | 50   | 6%  | 79% | 4%   | 12%  |
|   | New Brighton Suburban Master Plans / Oram Avenue            | 29   | 45% | 3%  | 31%  | 21%  |
|   | Civil Defence and Emergency Management                      | 23   | 12% | 0%  | 76%  | 12%  |
|   | Public Transport  | 241  | 7%  | 3%  | 70%  | 20%  |
|   | Cathedral   | 217  | 12% | 53% | 11%  | 24%  |
|   | LTP Consultation  | 152  | 12% | 6%  | 34%  | 48%  |
|   | Engagement & Communications (General)                       | 59   | 0%  | 5%  | 55%  | 40%  |
|   | CCHL Matters  | 34   | 3%  | 0%  | 56%  | 42%  |
|   | Governance  | 153  | 0%  | 0%  | 0%   | 100% |
| Staff Matters   | 288   | 0%   | 0%  | 0%  | 100% |      |



## Appendix Two: Summary of Key Issues by Community Board

### Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū Banks Peninsula Community Board

| Key topics and projects                                    | What the community told us  |
|--|---|
| <b>More investment in adapting to climate change</b>       | There was a sense by many submitters that Banks Peninsula communities are particularly vulnerable to climate change and there was strong support for Council accelerating and investing in climate change adaptation measures e.g. coastal hazard adaptation plans, strengthening sea walls.  |
| <b>Biodiversity and ecological restoration</b>             | <p>There was strong support for restoration of plantings and a general appreciation of funding allocated in LTP, but there were some concerns that funding was insufficient or discontinued (e.g. Environmental Partnerships Fund) and a desire for sufficient Council resourcing.</p> <p>A wide range of benefits resulting from environmental restoration were mentioned, including reducing the impacts on Council infrastructure during adverse weather events.</p> <p>Other submitters felt there was insufficient mention of or funding towards pest control and other threats to native biodiversity, including on CCC-owned land.</p> |
| <b>Capital spend on roading and Council infrastructure</b> | <p>There was a sense that there is a lack of maintenance and capital spend on Banks Peninsula roads and other vulnerable infrastructure, as they're not considered a priority due to the low numbers travelling on them or using them.</p> <p>Some submitters feel that the LTP is too city-centric and many anticipated projects have been omitted from the draft plan e.g. Wainui slipway.</p>  |
| <b>Wharves and jetties</b>                                 | <p>There were mixed views about the Akaroa wharf project, with some submitters believing the cost is too high and asking whether it is feasible and even resilient to future events. Other submitters were supportive of the investment.</p> <p>It was noted that there were other wharves and jetties in need of urgent maintenance. The Governors Bay community was seeking funds towards reducing the balance of its community loan in regards to the jetty repair.</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Sail GP and Naval Point</b>                      | <p>Sail GP event was contentious. Some submitters were supportive of hosting the event, citing wider economic and social benefit benefits. Other submitters were against the event mainly due to the cost of bidding/hosting, the environmental risks and impact on marine life, and thought the economic benefits were overstated and/or confined to certain business interests.</p> <p>There were mixed views about the Naval Point development and its cost, with some submitters discussing its need in relation to the future hosting of SailGP.</p> |
| <b>Stormwater management</b>                        | There is ongoing concern about sediment and contaminant flow into streams and the harbours, with general support for spending on erosion and sediment projects, although some submitters want more done to address concerns.  |
| <b>Wastewater projects</b>                          | Submitters were concerned about wastewater issues, particularly the Akaroa Harbour wastewater project in regards to the cost, design, feasibility and potential overflows into the harbour. Alternative proposals were suggested, along with calls to pause the project while more work is done exploring options.  |
| <b>Civil defence and emergency management</b>       | Some submitters noted the self reliance of peninsula communities during adverse weather events, and requested funds supporting communication options and community preparedness and resilience. Other submitters recognised the isolated nature of the peninsula and its vulnerable infrastructure, such as the Fire service requesting resources allocated to constructing water ponds for emergency use.  |
| <b>District planning matters</b>                    | A small number of submitters objected to the current Lyttelton Port noise overlays, telling us it was restricting development and requesting changes to district plan rules.  |
| <b>What the community board told us</b>             |   |
| <b>Investing More in Adapting to Climate Change</b> | The board believes a climate resilience fund is imperative and that adaptation proposals (including the Coastal Hazards programme) should be extended throughout the peninsula and brought forward – and potentially affected communities (and infrastructure) identified and prioritised.  |
| <b>Biodiversity funding</b>                         | The board requests the retention of all funds relevant to pest management, and continue to be accessible to the community. It supports the Biodiversity fund and proposed increase.   |
| <b>Additional savings and efficiencies</b>          | The board believes savings can be made on repairs & maintenance and capital programme works within the board area by using peninsula-based contractors. This would result in savings as well as increased responsiveness times for immediate issues.  |
| <b>Roading</b>                                      | The board advocates that peninsula rural roads are given a higher priority within the Council’s minor safety works programme.   |
| <b>Parks and green spaces</b>                       | The board supports 15 Reserve Committees within the board area. There is concern there appears to be nil funding for these committees (Regional Parks) past FY25/26 and seeks reassurance that there is funding beyond this period.   |
| <b>Three waters</b>                                 | The board is supportive of water supply infrastructure projects, but would like the Duvauchelle membrane filtration project brought forward.  |
| <b>Heritage</b>                                     | The board supports maintaining and continuing support of the historical aspects of the board e.g. Takapūneke Reserve, museums.  |

### **Additional funding**

Specific projects mentioned include: funding for the Pigeon Bay seawall; addressing flooding in Port Levy and Little River; a plan for the reduction of heavy metals into Council infrastructure; incorporating energy efficiency into all Council facilities; and a destination management plan for the area and promotion of regenerative tourism.

## Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Board

| Key topics and projects                              | What the community told us   |
|--|--|
| <b>Organics processing plant</b>                     | The ongoing impact of the organics processing plant on the Bromley community was noted by several submitters, and there was widespread support for its relocation to Hornby.   |
| <b>Wastewater treatment plant</b>                    | Similarly, the impact of the wastewater treatment plant on Bromley residents was noted, with support for repairs/replacement being carried out without delay.  |
| <b>Ōtākaro-Avon cycle routes</b>                     | <p>There was general support for the Ōtākaro-Avon cycle routes being implemented without delay, and in some instances brought forward. A small number of submitters were opposed. There were suggestions that the cycle network could be incorporated into the red zone.</p> <p>Some submitters noted the east was poorly served by the cycle network.</p>   |
| <b>Future use of red zone land</b>                   | Many comments were made regarding the future use of red zone land in general, especially in regards to planting with natives and/or use as a food producing area. Other suggested uses centred around recreational, nature and community purposes.   |
| <b>Pages Road bridge renewal</b>                     | <p>There was widespread support for the planned improvements and without delay, regardless of government funding. The bridge was recognised as an essential access route for the community, particularly for evacuation purposes.</p> <p>A few submitters did not see the need for this bridge or felt it was too expensive.</p>   |
| <b>New Brighton mall upgrade</b>                     | There was strong support by submitters for the New Brighton mall upgrade and the associated Oram Ave extension (which is seen as an important part of the area's regeneration). Submitters felt it was long overdue.   |
| <b>More investment in adapting to climate change</b> | There was general support for adapting to and accelerating climate change resilience measures, which was widely viewed as building resilience for some of the city's most vulnerable communities (due to the proximity to the coast).  |
| <b>Road safety improvements</b>                      | There was strong support for safety improvements at the intersections of Aldwins/Ensors/Ferry Roads and Aldwins/Buckleys/Linwood Roads, commonly mentioned in relation to Te Aratai College. This included a mini-proforma from around a dozen submitters relating to the installation of safe speed platforms to slow people down. Other safety and pedestrian improvements near schools were supported or suggested. |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Neglect of the east</b>  | There continues to be submitters who tell us that there is ongoing neglect of the east by the Council in terms of investment in infrastructure, maintenance and services e.g. condition of roads, earthquake repairs.  |
| <b>Southshore estuary edge</b>                                    | Submitters were generally supportive of proposed spending here, although many viewed it as urgently required due to ongoing erosion, with some suggesting that timelines should be brought forward.  |
| <b>Biodiversity and ecological restoration</b>                    | There was sense from some submitters that biodiversity work needs to be appropriately resourced. Some submitters had concerns about the lack of plantings on and erosion of dunes, and thought further pest eradication was required along the dunes and coastline, including the estuary.   |
| <b>What the community board told us</b>                           |  |
| <b>Capital programme deferral</b>                                 | The board accepts that the Council is in a difficult position due to Te Kaha and debt servicing. It proposes deferring some non-urgent capital projects to fund more renewals from rates (or to increase rates).   |
| <b>Top five board priorities</b>                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages Road bridge (mentioned above)</li> <li>• New Brighton Mall upgrade (mentioned above)</li> <li>• Southshore Estuary Edge (mentioned above)</li> <li>• Wastewater Treatment Plant renewal (mentioned above)</li> <li>• Marshland Hall Trust (mentioned below)</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Marshland Hall</b>   | The board supports the funding required for the Marshland Hall Trust community facility business case and these should be included within LTP allocations.   |
| <b>Vacant land differential</b>                                   | The board supports the extension of the vacant land differential to include New Brighton, along with additional measures to encourage development.   |
| <b>Coastal hazards adaptation and emergency response planning</b> | <p>The board notes the urgent need for integrated coastal hazards adaptation and emergency response planning, with additional funding sought. The board notes that along with Banks Peninsula communities, residents of this board will be most affected by sea level rise and tsunami events.</p> <p>While the board supports the upgrade of the Tsunami Warning System, it seeks funding to complete an evacuation plan, a response plan, and supporting community preparedness.</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Level of service increase in village areas</b></p> | <p>The board would like to see level of service increase in the Woolston, Queenspark and New Brighton village areas e.g. increased rubbish removal, weeding, infrastructure maintenance, back-flow valve maintenance, and improved beach access and tracks. It also notes there should be adequate funding to maintain the sand dunes at a low enough level in front of He Puna Taimoana: New Brighton hot pools.</p>  |
| <p><b>Social housing</b></p>                             | <p>The board would like the amount of social housing in the east to increase to pre-quake levels (adjusted for population change).</p>   |
| <p><b>Transport safety improvement</b></p>               | <p>Specific transport safety improvement projects mentioned include: Ōtākaro-Avon cycle route tying into Aranui Streets for People; Burwood/Mairehau Roads intersection and corridor improvements; funding for Bromley roads and North Linwood streets; and street renewals and improvements (Hay Street, Ruru Road, Bower Ave, Maces Road, Wyon Street and Hulbert Street).</p>   |
| <p><b>Recreation enhancement</b></p>                     | <p>The board wishes to ensure that funding for playground renewals is adequate for true like-for-like replacements. Specific recreation enhancement projects mentioned include: QEII Master Plan and accessible toilet/changing facilities; Burwood Park cricket facilities renewal; athletic track upgrade at Rawhiti domain; car park renewals at South Brighton Community Centre and Cockayne Reserve; and North Ramp retaining walls.</p>  |
| <p><b>Three waters</b></p>                               | <p>Stormwater and flood management projects and funding remain of importance to the board, with a request for no reductions within the board area. Spencer Park was mentioned as an area that needs remediation.</p> <p>Other three waters projects mentioned include: Waitaki Storm Basin; Pūharakekenui - Styx Waterway Detention &amp; Treatment Facilities; investigation of stop-banks for Spencerville through to Brooklands; funding for the Bexley Landfill remediation being brought forward; and Cygnet Street Pipeline as a separate line item.</p> |

## Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board

| Key topics and projects  | What the community told us   |
|--|--|
| Wheels to Wings cycleway   | <p>Wheels to Wings cycleway remains very divisive due to the cost and its potential impact on other road users, as well as the impact on local residents and businesses. Harewood Road is seen by many submitters as an already busy road requiring two lanes in each direction, and no loss of on-street parking.</p> <p>Other submitters told us that there was an urgency for this cycleway to proceed and that alternative routes are not suitable. Some submitters suggested alternative routes for the cycleways (e.g. Wairakei Road, Sawyers Arms Road), or changes to the proposed timeframes.</p> |
| Memorial Avenue cycle lanes project                              | The Memorial Avenue cycle lanes project was requested by several submitters to be brought forward and completed by 2025 as the current state is not considered safe, especially for school students.   |
| Sawyers Arms/Greers Road/Northcote Road intersection improvement | There was concern from some submitters that the Sawyers Arms/Greers Road/Northcote Road intersection improvement project has been removed from the draft LTP. This intersection is viewed as dangerous and dysfunctional, and improvements have been promised to the community for a number of years.  |
| Lights at Harewood/Breens/Gardiniers Roads                       | The continues to be requests from the community for traffic lights to be installed at Harewood/Breens/Gardiniers Roads, including right turn arrows. Submitters told us this is a dangerous intersection and that lights would improve road safety.  |
| Nunweek Park facility upgrades                                   | <p>Many users of Nunweek sports park (including pro-forma from a range of sports) requested further investment from the council, including an upgrade to the toilet and changing room facilities, and improved drainage to sports surfaces.</p> <p>It was noted by many submitters that the northwest of Christchurch is lacking in sufficient sports fields and pitches/surfaces, and require facility upgrades.</p>  |
| Orana Park funding   | There was overwhelming support for Council to provide ongoing funding to support Orana Park's operations as it is considered a key asset and attraction for the city, and it was noted that other large Councils around the country financially support their zoos.  |
|  | <b>What the community board told us</b>  |
| Borrowing & Debt Management                                      | The board expresses concern about the Council's plan to fund its capital programme through debt, which is thought to be unsustainable. A staged phase approach to delivering the capital programme was suggested.  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Additional savings</b>                            | The board requests that the Council prioritise conducting a thorough levels of service review to ensure that operational spending is optimised. This includes reviewing the opening hours of some Council facilities. The board is uncomfortable with the consultation process around proposed car parking charges, when other cost-saving options were not presented to the public.  |
| <b>Disposal of Council-owned properties</b>          | The board supports the disposal of these surplus properties, and suggests there are further opportunities for such sales to free up capital and reduce operating costs.   |
| <b>Intersection improvement project</b>              | The board is particularly concerned that the Sawyers Arms/Greers/Northcote Road intersection improvement project has been removed from the draft LTP (impacting aspects of the wider network), along with 13 other transport projects within the board. This is viewed as an essential project, with any delay resulting in inflated costs in the future.   |
| <b>Maintenance budgets</b>                           | The board has concerns there are assets owned by Council with no associated maintenance budget. These are often features of subdivisions, e.g. sculptures throughout the Northwood area. The result is that residents are left with broken or deteriorating assets next to their homes which impacts public perceptions of Council.   |
| <b>More investment in adapting to climate change</b> | <p>While supportive of climate change investment, the board has concerns on the lack of clarity on how a dedicated climate fund would be established, managed, governed, and the criteria for its utilisation. It suggests a separate consultation and deliberation process for this.</p> <p>Similarly, although acknowledging that the Coastal Adaptation Planning Programme work is vital, the board submits that this needs to be balanced against the immediate needs of our residents. If brought forward, the board seeks confidence the outcome would be a greater return on investment than if we waited until 2027/28.</p> |
| <b>Bid funding</b>                                   | Before making any decision about increasing the bid funding, the board encourages the Council to seek advice on any cost-neutral options for making the city more attractive to event organisers, and seek cost efficiencies from existing events to free up more event bid budget for Te Kaha.   |



## Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board

| Key topics and projects            | What the community told us   |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed Organics Processing Plant | There was general support for this new facility in Hornby, but some concerns were expressed about whether offensive odours can be effectively contained without impacting local residents.   |
| Yaldhurst Memorial Hall            | The gifting of this hall was widely supported by the community but there were some concerns about the ability of the residents' association to be able to finance its repair and operating costs without requiring future Council support.   |
| Cycleways                          | There was general support for cycleways projects (South Express, Northern Line, Quarryman's Trail, Little River) – some submitters state they are needed to provide greater safety to cyclists and to provide missing cycle links to other areas and need to be completed earlier than planned for. Others note that cycleway projects included in previous LTPs have been omitted from the draft LTP.<br><br>Cycleways in this board do not appear to be as contentious as cycleways in other boards. |
| Dog Park                           | There was strong support for a new dog park in Halswell (or elsewhere in the southwest). Submitters told us there was a need for this, with various locations suggested (including Carrs Reserve, Ridder Reserve and the domain). Some thought funding and completion timeframes should be brought forward.  |
| Transport safety projects          | There was general support for the proposed Clyde, Riccarton and Wharenui Intersection Safety Improvements, while some submitters requested transport projects be reinstated to the LTP (e.g. Sockburn Roundabout Intersection Safety Improvement).   |
|                                    | <b>What the community board told us</b>  |
| Intersection improvement projects  | The board requests Awatea/Springs/Amyes Road Intersection Improvements be brought forward due to its long overdue status and population growth in the area. The board considers Waterloo/Gilberthorpes/Parker Street Intersection Improvement needs to be investigated as a priority.  |
| Foothpaths                         | The board seeks additional funding for footpaths e.g. in Halswell, which is a community board plan priority.   |
| Sockburn Park                      | The board requests provision for the revitalisation of Sockburn Park (an area lacking in greenspace), which is community board plan priority.  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Dog Park</b>                                   | The board suggests that the investigation into a new dog park in southwest Christchurch is brought forward to 2025/26, aligning with the community board plan priority.  |
| <b>Wharenui Pool</b>                              | The board requests investigation of Wharenui Pool refurbishment, due to population increase in Riccarton and the delays in Parakiore opening.  |
| <b>Rates increases and additional savings</b>     | The board suggests rates increases should be less than 10%. It is proposed that savings could be made at libraries by reviewing opening hours and revisiting fines for overdue items. The board suggests Council explores other options for revenue, such as reviewing options to increase the financial return to ratepayers of CCHL without selling the asset. |
| <b>Three waters – Taumata Arowai requirements</b> | The board is supportive of measures to remove chlorine from the city’s water supply.   |

## Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board

| Key topics and projects                         | What the community told us   |
|---|--|
| Transport operations in Central City            | Transport issues in the central city were an issue raised by some submitters (e.g. light phasing, speed restrictions, cycleways) – with some feeling the Council makes it deliberately difficult to drive within the central city. Some submitters avoid travelling into the central city for this reason. Others were supportive of these changes and measures.   |
| Te Aratai cycle connection                      | There was strong opposition to the pausing of the proposed cycleway project connecting Te Aratai College to other cycleways. Submitters told us that this should be prioritised as it would provide a more affordable and safer travel option for families, and result in less traffic congestion down Aldwins Road.   |
| Cranford Street                                 | Some submitters commented on the congestion, design and safety aspects of Cranford St, particularly relating to buses, cyclists and children using the road. There were requests for improvements to Flockton Street to counter the Downstream Effects of the Christchurch Northern Motorway   |
| Te Kaha operations                              | Many submitters had concerns about operating costs, noise and transport issues once the multi-use arena is operational. Some suggested pausing any changes to surrounding roads until after the arena is completed and needs can be assessed.  |
| Park Terrace cycleway                           | Some submitters told us they were dissatisfied with the effect that this cycleway has had on traffic flows along Park Terrace/Rolleston Ave and Kilmore Street, due to the removal of one lane and would like traffic lanes reinstated.<br><br>Other submitters applauded this project for having positive outcomes for cyclists, and some used this project as an example of how segregated cycleways could be implemented across the city at a lower cost than others. |
| Arts Centre                                     | There was overwhelming support for Council to contribute adequate funding towards the Arts Centre’s operations, with many referring to its importance as a central city treasure, as well as the cultural and cultural benefits this centre brings to the city.  |
|   | <b>What the community board told us</b>  |
| Community facilities and associated greenspaces | The board supports funding to be included and retained for the following community spaces and projects: Phillipstown Community Hub, Papanui Youth Facility and Shirley Community Reserve (with support for funding to be brought forward for the latter). The board would like clarity about the additional budget for the parks-funded component of these projects - with a suggestion that this is visible as a separate line item.                                    |
| Grants and funding                              | The board supports the funding of community grants and community development initiatives that support the board’s community priorities e.g. CPTED, Petrie Park revitalisation, community partnerships etc.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Three waters</b></p>                         | <p>The board is particularly supportive of the considerable proposed investment in the Three Waters, emphasising that failing to continue to upgrade our infrastructure would have unacceptable consequences.</p>   |
| <p><b>Urban forest plan</b></p>                    | <p>The board highlights its support for the Ōtautahi-Christchurch Urban Forest Plan, noting the importance of replacing and improving tree cover.</p>   |
| <p><b>Christchurch Northern Corridor DEMP</b></p>  | <p>The board acknowledges issues affecting the transport network in Papanui and supports the budget retained in the Christchurch Northern Corridor downstream effects management plan (DEMP). Some submitters also commented on the congestion, design and safety aspects of Cranford St, particularly in regards to buses, cyclists and children using the road.</p>   |
| <p><b>Intersection improvement project</b></p>     | <p>The Board is concerned to see the Greers/Northcote/Sawyers Arms Intersection Safety Improvement project does not appear in the draft LTP, and advocates for its inclusion, understanding there to be relevant interconnectivity with the projects for the Greers/Langdons Traffic Lights and Northcote Road Corridor Improvement.</p>  |
| <p><b>Northcote Road corridor</b></p>              | <p>The board believes there is an urgent need relating to the Northcote Road corridor being investigated for improvement following increased traffic flows, and opposes any reduction or removal in funding for this project.</p>   |
| <p><b>Other transport improvement projects</b></p> | <p>Other transport improvement projects mentioned include: advocating for pedestrian safety on the Springfield Road corridor; improving efficiency along Langdons Road corridor; and advocating for street renewal along Flockton Street.</p>   |
| <p><b>Cycleways</b></p>                            | <p>The board perceives the draft LTP appears to be retreating from what is proposed in the current LTP, with negative impacts on local network connections. The board supports active transport measures and would like aspects of the Northern Line cycleway brought forward (e.g. signalised crossings for Harewood and Langdons Roads).</p> <p>The board supports the Council’s previous commitment to delivering the Wheels to Wings cycleway and submits that previous processes and decisions should be honoured.</p> <p>The board supports the greenway cycleway to link Richmond to the central city.</p> |
| <p><b>Storm water management</b></p>               | <p>Surface flooding remains an issue and board priority, and the board supports the proposed surface flooding reduction programme and supporting affected communities, including through investing in flood preparedness and response. The board requests prioritisation of MacFarlane Park, St Albans Park and Edgeware Village. Other streets mentioned for mitigation include Francis Avenue, Emmett Street and Harris Crescent.</p>   |

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Central city shuttle trial</b>  | The board supports a trial of the Central City shuttle in order to make it easier for people to travel around the central city – it was also noted by other submitters that previously Council had supported this and that demand is there. |
| <b>Fees and charges</b>            | The board reluctantly supports proposed changes to fees and charges, including applying charges at the Armagh Street carpark so long as it remains accessible for all.  |
| <b>Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor</b> | The board supports the ecological restoration of the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor.   |
| <b>Climate change</b>              | Climate change remains a top priority for the board and it supports advance investment in adapting to climate change, which is relevant to the Climate Resilience Strategy.   |

## Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board

| Key topics and projects   | What the community told us   |
|---|--|
| <b>Lincoln Road and Cashmere/Dyers/Colombo Roundabout safety improvements</b> | There were mixed views about traffic calming measures, including raised platforms/ road cushions and roundabout work. Some submitters told us these traffic calming measures were unnecessary or excessive, and too expensive (e.g. the proposed roundabout at Dyers/Colombo/Cashmere and the completed Lincoln Road raised platforms. Other submitters supported the Council's work in this area. |
| <b>South Library rebuild</b>  | There were mixed views from the community about this. Many submitters were supportive of the planned rebuild and were looking forward to having a new facility. Some submitters opposed this due to the cost and some questioned why a rebuild was required if it was still able to be used in its current state. Others told us the rebuild could be delayed by a number of years.                |
| <b>Port Hills plantings and red zone</b>                                      | Some submitters mentioned that pine trees were not suitable on the Port Hills or throughout the peninsula for ecological reasons as well as the potential fire risk. There were suggestions by some submitters that in particular, Port Hills red-zoned properties should be replanted with native and/or fire resistant plantings.  |
| <b>Ōpāwaho Heathcote River Corridor</b>                                       | Several submitters were supportive of capital spend management plans in terms of biodiversity and flood management, although concerns remain about the impact of residential development on the hill and associated silt entering waterways.<br><br>Some submitters request maintained or increased funding towards ranger/ecological staff.   |
| <b>Ōpāwaho River Route cycleway</b>   | Many submitters requested that the timeframe for the completion of sections of this cycleway network is brought forward.   |
|   | <b>What the community board told us</b>  |
| <b>South Library rebuild</b>  | While the board supports the funding allocated to the rebuild, the board seeks additional funding to provide ongoing library services during the rebuild (\$400,000 for a temporary facility, and a minimum of \$150,000 for a mobile service and public programming).   |
| <b>Port Hills Plan</b>  | The board supports funding is retained for the Port Hills Plan and encourages board input into developing this plan – ecological restoration of the hills, and reducing fire risk (emergency preparedness is a board priority). It requests future funding for active land management to reduce fire risk, including strategic use of paper roads as fire breaks.                                  |

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Pest management</b>           | The board requests sufficient operational spending for Pest Plant Management along the river, and requests improved coordination amongst Council departments to deliver better outcomes in this area. It supports greater involvement from community groups. The board seeks \$150,000 for a 10-year weed control strategy of Sycamore trees.  |
| <b>Grants and funding</b>        | The board requests Community Grants (especially Strengthening Communities) to be retained and increased in line with inflation and the living wage. It would also like the Sustainability Fund continued.  |
| <b>Urban Forest Plan</b>         | The board strongly supports the Urban Forest Plan and requests increased operational spending in this area e.g. mapping. The board would like to see it extend beyond parks to streets and waterways, with considerations around water management and the flow of water.   |
| <b>Parks and green space</b>     | Parks and facilities are a top priority for the board. At a high level, the board would like general investment and getting toilet facilities improved (e.g. Somerfield Park, Addington Park, Barrington Park, Rapaki Track, and Francis Reserve). Additional projects were mentioned for inclusion in the next LTP process (Hunter Terrace pump track/basketball court, Hoon Hay Park pavillion project, Addington Park refresh support, accessible access to Sumner Beach). The board requests that playground renewal programmes take into account the diverse needs of the community.  |
| <b>Land drainage</b>             | The board has concerns about the levels of service for land drainage in Hillsborough and along the Ōpāwaho Heathcote River catchment due to reduced spending on water programmes.  |
| <b>Cycleways</b>                 | <p>The board encourages the Council to prioritise projects that encourage residents to use active transport means safely (a key priority in the board plan). In particular, the board advocates bringing back the three MCRs: Southern Lights, Simeon St (build) and Ōpāwaho River Routes. The board would especially like to see the planning and engagement components of these projects undertaken so these projects are shovel ready when the immediate budget constraints have passed.</p> <p>The board also advocates that minor and local connector routes to be funded (e.g. Sparks Road/Westmorland - Princess Margaret Hospital)</p> |
| <b>Safer Speed Plan</b>          | The Board supports the continuation of the Support Safer Speed Plan – especially around schools and on the hills, as well as other minor safety improvement projects as they arise; supports the continued funding of the Safety and Ancillary Projects programme; advocates for the Te Aratai Cycle connection (noting it impacts students living in this board); requests the Innovating Streets projects and transitional projects have a planned pathway to permanence; and reinstatement of Disraeli/Harman/Selwyn Streets Intersection.  |
| <b>Selwyn Street Master Plan</b> | The board supports the completion of the Selwyn Street Master Plan once the Brougham Street upgrade has been undertaken.   |

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Red zone property disposal</b> | The board proposes the removal of 32 Hillier Place from the list of red zone properties for disposal, as it was purchased using funds bequeathed only for social housing purposes, and additionally may be required for property access purposes. It also advocates that Raekura Place remains in Council ownership. |
| <b>Waste operations</b>           | The Board would like to see the bin-lid clips in use city-wide (particularly in the Port Hills) and requests a programme is put in place to support this.  |