

We support the small residential unit adjustment with a view towards increasing affordable, spatially-efficient housing within the central city. Encouraging more one-bedroom homes will help grow the central city population, support local businesses, and strengthen the availability of rentals without contributing to urban sprawl. Higher residential density in the city core better utilises existing already paid for infrastructure and public transport, reducing the need to build out new and expensive infrastructure where it will not be as well used.

1.2.3

What don't you like about our recommended policy position on the small residential unit adjustment?

While individual one-bedroom units generate lower infrastructure demand, a high concentration of them could still require significant investment in transport, water, and other community services.

City fringe areas often lack robust public transport, meaning residents may be forced to rely exclusively on cars, increasing congestion and emissions. Further, if the area's demographics shift, an oversupply of one-bedroom homes may not meet future needs, leading to inefficient land use.

Accordingly, we only support this adjustment within the central city. Applying it to fringe areas could encourage car-dependent development and strain suburban infrastructure, undermining efforts to create a well-connected, compact city.

Catchments for Neighbourhood Parks Road Network activities

[You can read more about this on our Let's Talk page.](#)

1.2.8

What do you like about our recommended policy position on the Catchments for Neighbourhood Parks Road Network activities?

It is essential that funding remains ring-fenced to these catchments so that contributions collected in a particular area are reinvested there, rather than being redistributed elsewhere. This approach ensures that new developments pay for the infrastructure they rely on, reducing the burden on existing ratepayers.

1.2.9

What don't you like about our recommended policy position on the Catchments for Neighbourhood Parks Road Network activities?

Catchments should be carefully defined to ensure fairness, with a strong focus on making sure people are contributing to—and benefiting from—the services they use as much as possible.

Many areas across Christchurch still lack essential infrastructure like footpaths, despite development contributions (DCs) being collected. We urge Council to prioritise completing basic infrastructure—especially footpaths and safe transport links—in areas where development contributions have already been collected. Residents should see tangible benefits from these contributions, rather than funds being tied up for years or spent elsewhere.

2.1

Overall, do you support the Development Contributions Policy Review?

Required

Somewhat

2.2

Do you have any other feedback that should be considered by the Council when making a decision on the Development Contributions Policy Review?

We believe that, in aggregate, the total increase in development contributions (DCs) should be higher than the proposed ~3%, rather than further increasing general rates. Development should pay its fair share for the infrastructure it necessitates, ensuring that existing ratepayers are not unfairly burdened.

PT Futures: It is regrettable that the majority of this project is no longer being funded by central government. Given the importance of PT to Christchurch's future, it makes sense for DCs to contribute to its development.

Mass Rapid Transit (MRT): The proposed \$53~ is not enough to deliver meaningful progress. MRT is no longer a luxury but a must-have for the city's future transport network. New housing developments will increase network loads, and it is only fair that new residents contribute more than existing ratepayers. DCs should be increased significantly to ensure funding for multiple business cases over a short timeframe. If Council is unable or unwilling to drive MRT forward effectively, it must identify another body capable of delivering real progress and ensure the project is completed.

Parks in the North & West: We support increasing DCs for parks in these areas as post-quake land availability has diminished, and new land will need to be purchased to provide adequate green spaces as the population grows. It is fair that those who benefit contribute to these costs. Neighbourhood parks can also provide stormwater solutions (i.e. wetlands).

Major Cycle Routes (MCRs): We support collecting committed funds in advance to avoid a large debt or rates shock when major investments are required. A gradual funding approach through DCs will make future cycleway projects more financially sustainable. However, we strongly oppose Lyttelton paying an active travel rate when it has no MCRs, while Templeton is excluded despite clearly benefiting from the South Express MCR in the future.

Roads: It is unclear why Central's roads would be more expensive than those in the East, where roads are in significantly worse condition. More transparency is needed to justify this funding allocation.

Renewals: The \$50 million allocation for Street Asset Renewals to Support Capital Projects lacks clarity regarding its intended use. Given that this represents a significant portion of the cost increase for the active travel development contribution (DC), there needs to be full transparency on how these funds will be spent. While we strongly support investment in active travel, we cannot support unexplained cost increases without a clear breakdown of what projects or upgrades this programme includes. If this funding is meant to subsidise general street renewals rather than specifically improving active transport infrastructure, it is misleading to place this burden in the active travel category.