

# Greater Ōtautahi Submission to the Christchurch City Council's 2025/26 Annual Plan Consultation





## Greater Ōtautahi Submission to the Christchurch City Council's 2025/26 Annual Plan Consultation

### About Us

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

Greater Ōtautahi was founded in 2024 by a group of Ōtautahi Christchurch residents and ratepayers seeking more investment in their communities. It has empowered its members to action their concerns, and provided a united progressive front on Local Government issues.

Greater Ōtautahi is proudly non-partisan and thrives on the basis that our members come from diverse social and political backgrounds.

### Contact

Primary Contact Person - Harrison McEvoy - Greater Ōtautahi Committee Member

Secondary Contact Person - M Grace-Stent - Greater Ōtautahi Chairperson

Email contact - [greaterotautahi@gmail.com](mailto:greaterotautahi@gmail.com)

Website - [greaterotautahi.nz](http://greaterotautahi.nz)

<b>About Us</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Contact</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Overview and Comments</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questions</b>	<b>5</b>
Proposed Average Rates Increase	5
Q1) What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?	5
Proposed Spending	6
Q2) Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?	6
Q3) Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?	10
Q4) Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?	10
Q5) Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?	11
Christ Church Cathedral Targeted Rate	11
Q6) Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?	11
Rating for Renewals	12
Q7) Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.	12
Fees and Charges	13
Q8) Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?	13
Trade Waste	13
Q9) What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer? Why do you prefer this option?	13
Reducing Rates	13
Q's10 and 11) Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced, and Tell us about the services you could manage without.	13
Q12) Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.	13
Climate Resilience Fund Policy	15
Q13) Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?	15
Air Force Museum Grant	16
Q14) Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?	16
Central City Shuttle Service	16
Q15) Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?	16
Potential Disposal of Properties	17
Q16) The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?	17

# Overview and Comments

***“It’s every elected official and public servant’s responsibility to ensure we have systems in place to help cities meet the needs of their most vulnerable citizens.”***

- Michele C. Martinez, former City Councillor,  
City of Santa Ana, California

Greater Ōtautahi’s kaupapa focuses on Housing, Transport, Urban Environment, and Local Government. Because of this, we have focused our attention to these topics within the Christchurch City Council 2025/26 Annual Plan. Where questions fall outside those scopes, we have asked our members for comments.

We believe in a city that is healthy, vibrant, and flourishing. We believe in communities that are well-resourced, enabled, and uplifting. We believe in being responsible with finances, and using common-sense approaches to enable success.

It is the responsibility of the Council to fund these things through its Annual Plan. We believe that the Annual Plan has aspects that do this. We also believe there are significant gaps in parts of the Annual Plan.

We do not believe that rates increases should be blunted at the expense of services and investment, nor that our future should be traded for the concerns of the present. It is the responsibility of officials to both enable the present and support the future.

We also have concerns around processes and transparency. There are items in this Annual Plan that are either unclear on their scope, have had to have data requested, or are defunded for purely political reasons. These are not the kinds of actions we expect from a transparent and healthy democratic body. We believe that best practice and evidence should be followed.

The Christchurch City Council should be this city’s biggest enabler of community cohesion. It should be creative in how it uses funds, rather than reverting back to the simplest answer.

Our city is crying out for investment, not for more cuts. If we are truly to take the stage as New Zealand’s greatest place to live and second largest economy, we must enable ourselves to grow and stand tall.

- Harrison McEvoy - Greater Ōtautahi Committee Member

***“Nā tō rourou, nā taku rourou,ka ora ai te iwi.”***  
*[With your food basket, and my food basket, our people will thrive.]*

- Māori Whakataukī

# Questions

---

## Proposed Average Rates Increase

Q1) What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

**The amount rates go up by isn't as important as what they are being spent on. If a rates increase cut means programmes are being cut, that is not a good way to keep rates low.**

Greater Ōtautahi wishes to see a city where programs are funded sustainably and equitably, and where existing infrastructure continues to meet the community's expectations. This means that CCC should be operating in a way that it can function and meet its obligations around programme delivery and service levels. We want to see this hand in hand with more transparency about what these programmes are delivering, and how well resourced they are.

We also believe that CCC is not and has not done enough in other areas to mitigate rates increases.

CCC's delay and resistance to adopt the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) and effective housing intensification has effectively suppressed the number of rating units inside the city, and grown the number of people commuting in. This means we are disproportionately feeling the pressure of having a sprawling network of infrastructure, while simultaneously not trying to share the burden across more people.

Delivering on the MDRS, and investigating systems such as Land Value Rating, should be key strategic priorities for CCC in the coming year. A return to land value rating, or a hybrid zoned model, would improve equity by shifting the heaviest rates burden onto those that can best afford it. The end result would likely be a significant reduction in rates for the average Christchurch household. Council should at a minimum do some high-level modelling of the potential effects of adopting Land Value Rating. We expect that it would encourage development of higher density housing, particularly in the central city, while simultaneously encouraging developers to build on the many empty gravel lots that remain.

Elected Members over successive councils have continued to act in ways that prioritise artificially low rates (such as the transfer of funds from one budget to another) rather than actually resolving the core issues driving rates increases.

**Council should ensure it rates at a level that it can deliver on its programmes and service levels. It should also prioritise new incomes/systems instead of cutting budgets.**

---



## Proposed Spending

Q2) Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

**We support Council keeping funding in the 2025/26 Annual Plan to deliver the Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings Major Cycle Route in a staged delivery programme.**

The current programme has a short piece of Section 1 being delivered to link the Puari ki Pū-Harakeke-nui Northern Line and Te Ara O-Rakipaoa Nor'West Arc Major Cycle Routes on Harewood Road. We support this section being built as the first step of an incremental programme over the coming years.

Capital is currently available in later years of the CCC 2024/34 Long Term Plan, and we are pleased to see some of this being moved forward to facilitate this construction.

In our view, the North-West of Christchurch is being left behind due to repeated and unnecessary political delays on this project. We think these delays are letting the community down, and preventing them from making their own transport choices. Delays in this project have caused the deterioration of the road surface on Harewood Road, and seen safety improvements put off. The delays in this project have seen Council move ahead with lighting the Breens/Gardiners Road intersection without co-funding from NZTA. This is an unnecessary additional cost to the ratepayer.

It is more crucial now than ever that this project goes ahead. Schools and businesses that will see improved connectivity due to this project have expressed a desire to see infrastructure built.

Our biggest concern is around the political viability of this project, and we are worried that a change in the make-up of the Council will see it cancelled altogether. This is not an acceptable result, and would represent a failure of this city to properly cater for and enable transport choices for its residents. To avoid this, we think Council should adopt a slower construction timeline, and build the sections separately. This will split the upfront cost over more years, but also enable it to be built.

**Council should provide assurances that this will not be defunded or delayed further.**

**We do not support deferring the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30.**

We see the completion of the bus lanes on Lincoln Road as a transport priority for the South-West of Christchurch. Lincoln Road is the primary public transport corridor for these communities, and while it is seeing some of the highest growth within Council's borders, public transport investment has not kept pace with growth in this area.

We do recognise there could be value in deferring if the Council chooses to apply for NZTA funding; however, this is a large risk as there are no guarantees that Council will receive this funding. If Council is

to take this route, it must prepare its business cases appropriately to give them the best chance to succeed.

This section represents a choke point for public transport in the South-West. ECan is indicating a desire to improve performance and capacity on routes in this area with the implementation of turn-up-and-go timetabling on the Route 7 Halswell - Queenspark service. In order to ensure that this is both possible and used to its fullest extent, we believe it is better to begin this project now.

ECan and Council should be working together to ensure that where one party makes an investment, the other matches. If ECan puts on a bus every 5 minutes, but delays are causing bunching on Lincoln Road, that investment was all for nothing.

**We also believe Council should be increasing spending on new footpaths.**

Many new housing projects have inadequate pedestrian access. Communities that are accessible on foot are safer, more inclusive, and have a better impact on local economies. Communities that require residents to drive are less desirable for those with mobility issues and children. This presents an issue for those who want to stay in their community as they age. This is key for retaining people within our borders and helps keep rates lower.

These issues are most prominent in new areas of growth on the periphery of the city, and have contributed to worse infrastructure outcomes for those areas. Council should assess and close any gaps in its footpath network to enable equitable community growth.

We want to know how Council is prioritising this work. Is it being funded by Development Contributions? If it was, why was it not already done? If it was not, why not?

**We have serious concerns with the delays of, and financial reporting processes for cycleways at Council.**

Past enquiries have indicated that Council struggles to release financial data around cycleways. However, recent OIAs have shown that Council has on average received 51% co-funding from NZTA for cycleway related projects.

Under this kind of funding model, we believe Council should have prioritised major programmes, rather than delaying. With the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) no longer able to fund cycle infrastructure and Climate Emergency Relief Fund (CERF) disestablished, we believe Council has missed a critical opportunity to do more of this work.

The loss of this co-funding places Council in the position that either they have to defund projects or make up funding through rates. This is unideal and represents a major loss for the city.

Projects undertaken at Council often do not clearly define what is being spent within each programme. Examples of this are the Antigua Street improvements around Parakiore, where the entire expense was chalked up as cycleways, and the Puari ki Pū-Harakeke-nui Northern Line Major Cycle Route, where \$7.94 million was spent on Section 1 Railway Crossings and rolled into the total cost.

Reporting on these programmes needs to be clear about what is being spent and where. Failing to report on this creates an atmosphere of distrust between ratepayers and the Council, especially when costs blowout on these projects for unrelated reasons (such as service clashes).

**We would like more clarity around the Public Transport Futures (PT Futures) Programme.**

Transport staff at CCC need to be properly resourced to complete this programme. It is unacceptable that business cases are missing funding opportunities because there is not capacity to follow through.

With PT Futures being the second largest line item for Transport, it is critical that there is visibility on what it is paying for. There must be more clarity and separation of items, rather than lump funding for a poorly defined programme.

This programme is amongst the largest expenses in the Council's Transport programme. It should be the Council's premier transport investment, yet its progress and benefits are unclear to most residents.

Senior staff have been unable to identify what projects are part of PT Futures, or if programmes known to be part of PT Futures are being prioritised for delivery. Technologies that should be covered by this project are either not adapted for the best use, or are being used elsewhere.

The lack of clarity represents a concern around what this is being spent on.

Council should investigate the use of low-cost, low-impact technologies such as Traffic Signal Preemption. This could help avoid the short-to-medium term need to build out capital intensive and disruptive physical works, while better enabling public transport service reliability and emergency services priority.

**We would like to see an effort to incorporate best practice road design and modal separation when renewals are done.**

Far too often, Council undertakes renewals on a street without using that opportunity to incorporate safer design aspects. This means streets that are objectively lacking in safety features continue to present risk, even after Council has invested significant capital into renewals.

Design practices such as kerb build-outs, speed platforms, mid-block crossings, and road dieting are empirically shown to reduce risk, improve fatality rates, and reduce average speeds. These measures are internationally tried, tested, and approved.

We would also like to see more effort to separate modes of transport. Park Terrace showed us that this can be done cheaply and quickly to great effect. There are major corridors in this city where mode separation is weak or non-existent. This represents significant risk to both motorists and active transport users. More effort must be made to make small safety improvements when renewals come due.

Council should be making more effort to include these designs in renewal projects. While we acknowledge that there is some vocal controversy, the evidence is and always has been clear on this. Safety features and modal separation saves lives.

We would also encourage Council to take a more nuanced view on renewal timelines. A street that is due for renewal but doesn't need it should be deprioritised so a street that might not be due but does need



renewal can be done instead. Council falls into the trap of renewing for the sake of renewing, when some areas require significant attention and a full redesign.

**We would like to see the Council do more to prepare the MRT business case and investigate regional connections.**

While the current government has not committed to MRT in Christchurch, having a complete and up-to-date business case will be crucial to ensuring that funding is properly secured should circumstances change. Christchurch possesses one of the most outdated and inflexible public transport networks for a city of its size in the world. The need for more modes and better coordination will only become more pressing as populations grow and age. It is therefore critical that funding for the business case is made available sooner rather than later. This is important to ensure that the business case can progress in lock step with the other agencies that will need to be involved.

The burden of Selwyn and Waimakariri commuters is becoming obvious on the residents and ratepayers of affected suburbs in St Albans, Northcote, Addington, and Sydenham. Not only do these commuters have a massive impact on these neighbourhoods, the increased traffic demand is taking a significant toll on our road network.

CCC must ensure that the MRT Business Case is completed in time for NZTA funding opportunities. We simply do not have the luxury of missing this opportunity to acquire funding. CCC has taken on the responsibility of this business case from ECan, it must do it justice and complete it promptly so that we don't end up being left out of funding discussions.

Both of this and PT Futures deserve more clarity and focus. As key programmes that underpin the future of public transport in this city, their delay will have impacts for decades potentially.

With 76053 - *Programme - Carriageways Renewals* being allocated \$401.3 million in the FY27/28-34 period, we should investigate every possible avenue to reduce the amount of damage being done. This will require Council to investigate supporting alternative methods of transport from neighbouring districts, such as rail or improved bus services. Every cent saved here is another that can be invested into our communities.

**We think the following programmes either need more clarity or should be considered for priority within the Council's Transport Capital Expenditure.**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| - 26611 - Major Cycleway - Wheels to Wings Route (Section 1)                                     | - 66637 - Radcliffe Road Railway Crossing                  |
| - 66289 - Public Transport CRAF - Advanced Bus Detection   | - 71536 - Brougham Street Complementary Projects           |
| - 66294 - Public Transport CRAF - Bus Priority, Lincoln Road (Whiteleigh Avenue to Wrights Road) | - 27273 - Pages Road Bridge Renewal                        |
| - 78851 - PT Futures - Bus Priority - Intersection Upgrades - SCATS Bus Priority                 | - 72242 - New Brighton CRAF - Marine Parade Street Renewal |
| - 78854 - PT Futures - Bus Priority - Enforcement  | - 76054 - Programme - Footpaths and Cycle Renewals         |
| - 75051 - Programme - New Footpaths  | - 80178 - Amyes Road Street Renewal                        |
| - 41650 - Minor Road Safety Improvements   | - 18396 - Te Kaha Surrounding Streets                      |
| - 212 - Coloured Surfacing Renewals  | - 42047 - Wigram and Hayton Intersection Improvement       |
| - 924 - Halswell Junction Road Extension   | - 6099 Amyes Awatea Springs Intersection Improvements      |
| - 17052 - Sparks Road Improvements   | - 26608 - South Express (Section 1) Hei Hei - Jones        |
|  | - 26607 - Southern Lights - Strickland to Tennyson         |

- 72755 - Te Aratai Cycle Connection
- 72760 - Simeon Street Little River Link Connection
- 44700 - Local Cycle Network - Eastern Outer Orbital
- 17058 - Cycle Connections - Northern Line
- 17088 - Christchurch Northern Corridor Downstream Effects Delivery Package
- 2735 - The Cathedral Square & Surrounds
- 60297 - Bus Interchange Upgrades

Q3) Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

**Spending on three waters is somewhat outside Greater Ōtautahi's scope of advocacy.**

Generally though, cities need clean drinking water, functional sewage, and resilient stormwater networks. We recognise that there is community concern around the capacity of three waters amenities to handle increased intensification, and concern around the continued impact of flooding in serious weather events.

We support the proposed additional funding for the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor stopbank project, as these stopbanks can be considered critical safety infrastructure for residents living in communities near the Ōtākaro-Avon River. The continuation of wetland restoration in the ŌARC also presents significant investment in stormwater mitigation for the Ōtākaro Avon River catchment, with the added bonus of being a highly effective carbon sink.

We would like to see projects going forward investigate swales and rain gardens where possible to mitigate the impact of severe weather events on stormwater systems.

As our city continues to grow, it is important that we find a sustainable way to grow our city water infrastructure, so that future generations are not left with a poor quality water network, or shocking repair bills. We should also be encouraging efficient usage of our existing network through intensification.

Q4) Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

**We believe Council should be ensuring that third spaces (parks, reserves, walkways in this instance) are equitable, accessible, well-maintained, and friendly.**

Communities benefit when shared spaces bring them closer. Christchurch is peppered with small urban parks and reserves, each with its own character and history. These represent significant investments in, and social glue for local communities.

To this end, ensuring that our parks are well maintained and accessible should not only be a matter of civic pride for Council, it is also a tangible investment in community growth.

Residents take pride in their local amenities, and they provide spaces for people to gather as whanau, groups, and organisations. This is of invaluable benefit to the social wellbeing of our city.

Q5) Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

**Council facilities often represent a critical piece of infrastructure for the ratepayer. Without them, many ratepayers would see significant losses of service.**

Libraries, Service and Community Centres, and Recreational Facilities are one of the largest benefits the Council provides to its residents. These facilities are absolutely necessary in building the fabric of communities and represent one of the most valuable investments Council could make. The replacement of the remaining earthquake damaged or demolished facilities should be a priority for Council, so it is reassuring to see both the Ōmōkihi South Library and Customer Service Hub and the Shirley Community Centre projects get underway.

Facilities like these are the beating hearts of our city. Without them, residents would be deprived of affordable and well-maintained spaces to meet, associate, and socialise. Community events would not be as successful, and our city would suffer. Prioritising filling gaps here is a must if we want a healthy, vibrant city.

---

## Christ Church Cathedral Targeted Rate

Q6) Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

**Although the question about what should be done with the Cathedral is outside the scope of Greater Ōtautahi's advocacy, our members have suggested the following thoughts.**

One member suggests that the funding from the targeted rate be used to improve public amenities within Cathedral Square, including landscaping, facilities, lighting, and more pedestrianisation to help the Square perform better as the large civic space it is intended to be.

- "Keeping the funding ring-fenced to the overall project is important support for the cause, but it should be used to improve Council facilities and spaces if it is not to be used for the Cathedral's restoration.

Cathedral Square is in dire need of a major facelift if the new facilities to the North (Te Pae, Court Theatre, Tūrangā, Arts Precinct, etc.) are to be properly integrated into the overall fabric of the city. This funding could bring forward projects 60272 and 60273 from FY27/28-34."

Another member believes the Council should pause all funding for the reinstatement of the Cathedral.

- "I don't think ratepayers should be funding any restoration of the Cathedral. I believe that the Cathedral should be made safe enough to exist as a ruin, as a memorial to the earthquake."

Other members think that the funds should be returned.

- "With the cathedral restoration project restored indefinitely, it makes sense that the targeted rate be paused. I like the idea of improvements to Cathedral Square, but I also think that returning that money to ratepayers is sensible while the project is in limbo."
- "In principle, I support spending money for the purposes in which it was first collected. Using that same principle - If the project is not proceeding, it should be refunded."

---

## Rating for Renewals

Q7) Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

### **We support increasing funding for rating for renewals by at least \$2 million a year.**

Council's current scheme of borrowing capital to pay for major renewal work is unsustainable. While it presents no upfront cost to the ratepayer, it compounds debt and interest over the long run, costing us more, and exposing Council to the volatility of international markets and pressures.

CCC needs a more robust method of renewing infrastructure. With urban sprawl exacerbating CCC's infrastructure maintenance costs, it is more crucial now than ever that CCC gets ahead of the curve, and does so in a way that won't saddle the city with long-term debt.

Councils across the country are experiencing eye-watering rates increases in the face of Official Cash Rate fluctuations, increased insurance premiums, and reduced central government funding. We argue it is better to speed this process up as much as possible, to reduce the amount we have to repay and the risk we are exposed to. This will help keep rates increases lower in the medium- and long-term periods.

It is prudent to reduce the risk Council's finances are exposed to by reducing debt rather than keeping rates lower in the short-term. From what we understand, the more we invest in this, the more benefit we will see.

While borrowing for renewals means there is no up-front cost to the ratepayer, it will create more pressure in the future, as we need to both service a larger infrastructure network and more debt. Council should "bite the bullet" and fund this renewal work itself. The expected savings alone are enough to justify this change.

## Fees and Charges

Q8) Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

**This question is outside of Greater Ōtautahi's scope of advocacy.**

---

## Trade Waste

Q9) What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer? Why do you prefer this option?

**This question is outside of Greater Ōtautahi's scope of advocacy.**

---

## Reducing Rates

Q's 10 and 11) Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced, and Tell us about the services you could manage without.

**We do not believe any service reductions are an equitable solution to managing rates increases.**

Community members most affected by rates increases are also the most affected by service reductions. Reductions in things like operating hours for libraries, which has been proposed, should absolutely be seen as service cuts that will harm the most at need in our communities. This is unacceptable.

As we stated in our answer to Questions 4 and 5, these "third spaces" are critical to a thriving city as they promote community connectivity. Libraries create spaces that are available for people of all ages and dispositions. From young parents attending group classes, to people without internet access, and community groups, our libraries are core service facilities. Recreation centres provide affordable opportunities for senior citizens to stay active, rangatahi to take swimming courses, and help support the overall hauora and wellbeing of our citizens. Community Activators and Centres are key to enabling groups to flourish in safe spaces, providing facilities, advice, and direction to growing community organisations and organisers.

When considering these enormous benefits, it's clear that any service cuts are untenable. To do so, in favour of rates cuts, would directly harm the health of our communities.

Q12) Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

**We believe that instead of looking for ways to cut services, Council should be looking at ways to increase revenue.**



One opportunity is that there is currently an enormous amount of free car parking available in the Central City. Capturing value from this is as simple as charging a fair market rate based on demand. Free car parking isn't equitable or prudent, as the use of public land for private goods represents an enormous subsidy to car-users. Adequate pricing for on-street parking enables supply to be better managed and can increase revenue. Council should review the availability of free parking in-line with its own Central City Parking Policy; we should be charging money for parking anywhere that 85% occupancy is exceeded during the day.

Investment into new technologies, such as subsurface or "stick on" car presence detectors would allow Council to more accurately measure and charge users for car park use, and overstaying. This would free up parking inspectors to manage illegal or antisocial parking in the Central City; for example, the increasing use of The Commons site as a carpark by a local educational centre.

Similarly, it would free up inspectors to more closely monitor misuse of mobility car parks. Charging for parking in the Central City helps to make car parks available for those that truly need them, but we think it would also be appropriate to adopt a policy that mobility permit holders should be exempt from paying parking fees at council facilities to ensure they always have access to the city when they need it.

An additional avenue the council could use to increase revenue is to enable greater licensing of food trucks. Food trucks can generate revenue for council while also significantly improving the amenity of under-used areas. If any harm, lack of interest, or undue controversy is caused, sites can easily be delisted. There are many public plazas, parks and on-street car parks which could be suitable for new or additional sites, which may include:

- The newly approved Court Theatre car park and Gloucester Street
- The Arts Centre
- Mātai Common
- Edmonds Band Rotunda
- Rauora Park
- Margaret Mahy Playground
- Cathedral Square
- Oxford Terrace
- South East Central Neighbourhood and Sydenham

Existing brick-and-mortar restaurants reflexively oppose food trucks on the grounds that it creates unfair competition. However, international evidence suggests that food trucks have a large number of positive traits, and the perceived negative traits largely do not exist. They increase the vibrancy and activity of urban spaces. They reduce the barrier for entry for smaller ethnic and immigrant groups to start their own businesses, improving equity for those members of our community. And in fact, more food trucks is actually correlated with an increase in brick-and-mortar restaurants and customers to those restaurants, likely due to the increased foot traffic.

By enabling more food trucks in the Central City and surrounding communities, council can hugely enhance the vibrancy of our city, while creating an additional revenue stream.

Council should also push back on central government overreach. Within this Long Term Plan period, there will be in excess of \$30 million worth of works or extra costs that CCC will undertake in Kiwirail's name.

There must be more room for work here, including savings, and crown funding rather than the ratepayer absorbing this cost.

---

## Climate Resilience Fund Policy

Q13) Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

**We support the establishment of the Climate Resilience Fund, and believe that this fund should be raised in perpetuity. Our view is that this funding is crucial for the future safety and sustainability of our city.**

For many people, this may be one of the more impenetrable parts of the annual plan, but it is extremely important for the long-term health and safety of our city. GNS reports indicate that \$3.2 billion worth of council property is at risk of sea level rise and persistent flooding over the next 20 to 30 years. According to research from the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA), sea levels have already risen by 21–24 centimetres since the 1980s, and the trend is continuing upwards. This trend poses an existential threat to low-lying communities in our city, for example Southshore and suburbs along the Heathcote River.

The Coastal Hazards Adaptation Management Plan is supposed to address these concerns. Adaptation can mean anything from improving stormwater networks, adding water-holding basins, or even full-scale managed retreat of coastal communities. All of these things come at significant cost to the ratepayer. This Climate Resilience Fund is supposed to mitigate the cost of this necessary work on future ratepayers.

\$127 million dollars over 10 years is not enough to offset this risk, nor enable Council to properly address it. We support the recommendation to put the period of the fund to be in perpetuity.

We support ring-fencing the fund to specific planned adaptation programme work, with an “emergency” clause that can allow it to be used for exceptional circumstances. We are concerned that if the scope of funding is extended to be used for *all* at-risk council assets, the fund will be diverted to projects that don’t directly help us deal with mitigating the impact of climate change. There may be nearer-term adaptation necessary as the climate continues to change, so a balance must be struck between being able to react to nearer-term crises, and taking time to build a large nest-egg.

Given that the purpose of this fund is to share the burden of adaptation across multiple generations of Christchurch ratepayers, the longer we invest in this, the better. If the shorter term is prioritised, it must also be combined with an increase to the contributions by ratepayers, to ensure we have enough when we need it. While raising capital is never the most popular action, failing to have sufficient resources to address significant events or issues would be a failing on Council’s part.

The fund could be leveraged through investment to raise further capital in a self-sufficient manner. Again, realistic projections of the impacts of climate change show that the earlier and better we prepare, the better the outcomes will be.

---

## Air Force Museum Grant

Q14) Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

**Although the question about the Air Force Museum Grant is outside the scope of Greater Ōtautahi's advocacy, our members have suggested the following thoughts.**

One member suggests that it is important for Council to support local organisations and amenities, as these contribute to a better social fabric.

- "The Air Force Museum is a prominent attraction for the South-West of Christchurch, and an important national amenity. Supporting them as they expand the ability to display their collection, including aircraft of historical national significance, is overall a benefit to the local economy and the community it serves."

Another is of the opinion this funding could be better utilised elsewhere.

- "While the Air Force Museum is certainly a fantastic facility, the \$5 million proposed is a very hefty sum to place on ratepayers. This same money could, for example, be used to deliver additional stages of Wheels to Wings cycleway in the near term. I feel council should be prioritising getting the basics like our transport network right, rather than spending ratepayer money on nice-to-haves like aeroplane hangars for a museum the council does not own."

---

## Central City Shuttle Service

Q15) Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

**We strongly support allocating capital for a scoping study. We have concerns that the \$200k cost of the scoping - which is purely an analysis exercise - seems quite high.**

The Central City suffers from poorly interconnected public transport. Improving these facilities would provide a more efficient and effective transport network in the Central City. The hop-on/hop-off orbital

shuttle proposal would improve mobility and accessibility within the urban core. It would be a massive amenity improvement for both residents and visitors.

The new bus network implemented by ECan in 2014 has left areas of the Central City without service. While this wasn't such a pressing issue while the Central City contracted and rebuilt after the Earthquakes, growth in population and new developments mean this should be revisited.

Alongside this there is the added complexities of servicing One New Zealand Stadium at Te Kaha, a venue that will require a wide range of transport connections. This service could be used to assist mobility needs visitors between the venue and car parking buildings as part of its route. This service also has the potential to enable service improvements in the South-East, Central, and Sydenham neighbourhoods.

Provision of public transport in Christchurch is the responsibility of ECan, and not the City Council. We think it wise therefore for Council to engage closely with ECan in this work. Shared workload offers both authorities an opportunity to reduce costs. While the appetite to introduce this service is being driven by the City Council, the service itself should be provided by ECan. The Council is unlikely to be able to complete this task without their support.

Any local Central City shuttle service should be integrated with Motu Move, to make it more accessible to tourists and residents alike. Similarly, we would like to see such a service integrated well with the proposal to create demarcated micro-mobility hubs, where it is acceptable to park for-hire e-scooters. We think the concept of a "Central City Zone", within which applies a single low transferable fare for all modes (bus, shuttle, hire bike or scooter) is highly desirable, and can be enabled through proper integration with Motu Move.

This proposal presents a fantastic opportunity to completely overhaul transport within the Central City, and move Ōtautahi further toward being a dense, inter-connected urban centre.

---

## Potential Disposal of Properties

Q16) The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

**We are opposed to the sale of any strategic assets (held by Christchurch City Holdings Limited (CCHL)), or property where it could be repurposed for community uses. However, there are properties that can be used to provide capital for the Council.**

We believe CCC should be able to sell properties it owns, however:

- 1) CCC should not sell land that is being used by or providing an amenity to the community.
- 2) CCC should be cautious that the land it sells will not trigger further urban sprawl.

- 3) CCC should be cautious around the usability of the land in relation to contamination and identified risk under the District Plan.
- 4) CCC should ensure that the sale will give a return to ratepayers higher than the amenity value it would provide if retained.
- 5) CCC should ensure that Elected Members' Conflicts of Interests are scrutinised in the sale of land.

We believe Council should assess the need for smaller parcels of land within the city's authority and where there is no ability for it to be repurposed for a community facility (park, community centre, onsold to local organisation, etc.), create a plan for disposal. The Council should then use these funds to invest in better amenities.

However, this needs to be done with care. There are potential conflicts of interest involved with elected members involved in property. Some of the unused land proposed for disposal is reserve land. We think that where public reserve land is providing an amenity to residents, it should be preserved. We believe property in the Port Hills Red Zone should be reassessed before being sold. Several vacant properties in the Port Hills Red Zone now provide accessways for the public. If these properties are to be sold, CCC should ensure this access is retained through property resizing, so that the access residents now have is not lost.

Additionally, land disposals need to be done in such a way that we do not encourage further unmanaged greenfield sprawl, or housing development on land that is of poor quality and potentially a flooding, contamination or earthquake risk.

One Council asset that should be considered for sale is the Lichfield Street Car Parking building. The Council directly operates this facility, and it provides a marginal benefit in allowing the Council a stake in the pricing market of parking. However, the Council is under no obligation to operate parking buildings.

We have concerns about the sale of Port Hills Red Zone land. Several vacant properties in the Port Hills Red Zone now provide accessways for the public. If these properties are to be sold, CCC should ensure this access is retained through property resizing, so that the access residents now have is not lost.