

# Land Use Recovery Plan

## Consultation Report

(Round 1 –

targeted stakeholder workshops

November/December 2012)

**DATE: 21 DECEMBER 2012**

PREPARED BY AERU – Lincoln University



Working in partnership with



**AUTHORS**

AERU – Lincoln University

**DISCLAIMER**

While every effort has been made to ensure that the information herein is accurate, the AERU does not accept any liability for error of fact or opinion which may be present, nor for the consequences of any decision based on this information.

**PUBLISHED**

December 2012

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>REPORT INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1	OVERVIEW .....	6
<b>3</b>	<b>OVERALL COMMENT SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>11</b>
3.1	OVERVIEW .....	11
<b>4</b>	<b>RESIDENTIAL LAND - ISSUES AND OPTIONS</b> .....	<b>13</b>
4.1	RESIDENTIAL LAND - OVERALL ISSUES AND OPTIONS .....	13
4.2	SUPPLY AND DEMAND - TEMPORARY HOUSING (ISSUES).....	15
4.3	SUPPLY AND DEMAND - TEMPORARY HOUSING (OPTIONS) .....	17
4.4	SUPPLY AND DEMAND – PERMANENT HOUSING (OPTIONS).....	21
4.5	AFFORDABILITY (ISSUES) .....	23
4.6	AFFORDABILITY (OPTIONS).....	26
4.7	HOUSING DIVERSITY (ISSUES).....	28
4.8	HOUSING DIVERSITY (OPTIONS) .....	30
4.9	HOUSING LOCATION (ISSUES) .....	31
4.10	HOUSING LOCATION (OPTIONS).....	33
4.11	QUALITY OF URBAN DESIGN AND HOUSING (ISSUES) .....	34
4.12	QUALITY OF URBAN DESIGN AND HOUSING (OPTIONS).....	36
4.13	NATURAL HAZARDS AND CONSTRAINTS (ISSUES) .....	38
4.14	NATURAL HAZARDS AND CONSTRAINTS (OPTIONS).....	40
4.15	OTHER (ISSUES) .....	41
4.16	OTHER (OPTIONS).....	43
<b>5</b>	<b>BUSINESS LAND - ISSUES AND OPTIONS</b> .....	<b>45</b>
5.1	BUSINESS LAND - OVERALL ISSUES AND OPTIONS .....	45
5.2	AVAILABILITY, MARKET FUNCTIONING AND LOCATION OF BUSINESS LAND (ISSUES).....	47
5.3	AVAILABILITY, MARKET FUNCTIONING AND LOCATION OF BUSINESS LAND (OPTIONS) .....	49
5.4	CHANGES IN COMMERCIAL CENTRES AND CENTRAL CITY (ISSUES) .....	50
5.5	CHANGES IN COMMERCIAL CENTRES AND CENTRAL CITY (OPTIONS).....	52
5.6	BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL LAND SUPPLY (ISSUES) .....	53
5.7	BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL LAND SUPPLY (OPTIONS).....	56
5.8	IMPLICATIONS FOR THE TRANSPORT NETWORK (ISSUES) .....	56
5.9	IMPLICATIONS FOR THE TRANSPORT NETWORK (OPTIONS).....	58
5.10	BUSINESS LAND SERVICING NEEDS (ISSUES) .....	58
5.11	BUSINESS LAND SERVICING NEEDS (OPTIONS).....	59
5.12	NATURAL HAZARDS AND CONSTRAINTS (ISSUES) .....	60
5.13	NATURAL HAZARDS AND CONSTRAINTS (OPTIONS).....	61
5.14	OTHER (ISSUES) .....	61
5.15	OTHER (OPTIONS).....	63
<b>6</b>	<b>INDIVIDUAL SESSION SUMMARIES</b> .....	<b>64</b>
6.1	PLANNERS WORKSHOP SUMMARY 3-12-12 .....	64
6.2	COMMERCIAL CENTRES/BUSINESS LAND SUPPLY WORKSHOP SUMMARY 4-12-12.....	66
6.3	INFRASTRUCTURE SESSION SUMMARY 5-12-12 .....	68
6.4	PARTNERSHIP FOR ECONOMIC PROSPERITY AND RECOVERY SUMMARY 4-12-12.....	70
6.5	URBAN OVERSIGHT GROUP SUMMARY 6-12-12 .....	72
6.6	HOUSING AND RESIDENTIAL LAND SUPPLY SUMMARY 7-12-12 .....	73
6.7	PROFESSIONAL BODIES SUMMARY 10-12-12 .....	75
6.8	COMMUNITY FACILITIES, SPORT AND RECREATION SUMMARY 11-12-12 .....	77
6.9	THE GREATER CHRISTCHURCH TRANSPORT GROUP SUMMARY 13-12-12 .....	79
6.10	DISABILITY ACTION GROUP 14-12-12.....	81
6.11	GOVERNMENT LEADERS 18-12-12 .....	82

# 1 Executive summary

- 1.1 The Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery has directed the Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) to prepare a Land Use Recovery Plan, through a collaborative multi-agency partnership with Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Te Rununga o Ngai Tahu, the New Zealand Transport Agency, and the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority.
- 1.2 Recovery involves the whole community, not just business owners, developers and other investors. Recovery also involves the rebuilding and provision of infrastructure, social facilities, recreation and other land-use activities that support and create well-functioning, sustainable places and spaces, for residents and visitors to enjoy.
- 1.3 Preparation of the Land Use Recovery Plan began with key stakeholders being invited to a series of topic based workshops to identify the issues, challenges and opportunities of recovery. A series of workshops and information sessions were run, between 13 November and finishing on 18 December (the workshops ran from 3-18 December). Eleven full workshop sessions were run along with around eight other information sessions provided to groups who were invited to provide feedback in a format that suited each group.
- 1.4 In total around 180 individuals attended workshops and 74 completed survey questionnaires. Two documents were provided containing detailed discussion on specific topics and these are included at the end of this document.
- 1.6 The workshops have generally confirmed that both the Issues Paper and supporting Context Paper reflect the current issues facing earthquake recovery in greater Christchurch.
- 1.7 However, potential solutions and options to address the challenges and make the most of the opportunities raised covered a wide cross section of initiatives and interventions. This varied from extremes of imposing further regulation to ensure good quality sustainable development, to leave developers and commercial operators to 'get on with it' and let the market decide. There are varying experiences and expectations of the planning framework, however the desire for better co-ordination between government and across different sectors (including RMA, LGA and LTMA regulation) was universally agreed.
- 1.8 A wide range of useful suggestions are being explored as a result of the workshops, and will inform the preparation of the preliminary draft Land Use Recovery Plan. The preliminary draft Recovery Plan, is expected to be released for further more detailed consultation in March-April 2013.
- 1.9 It is challenging to distil the key messages from the diverse group of participants and some divergent views around how problems should be addressed. However, some of the key Issues raised consistently across a number of different workshops are summarised below:

## Summary of key topics raised at workshops and stakeholder meetings

<b>1. Vision</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a need to work toward a vision for greater Christchurch in 10-15 years, and longer term.</li><li>• Need to integrate all recovery work and programmes, especially economic recovery programme, Greater Christchurch Transport Strategy and others.</li></ul>
<b>2. Leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Being bold and provide strong leadership was encouraged.</li><li>• Co-ordinated decision making is required.</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide certainty about who is in charge and who is making decisions.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Certainty</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development industry and TA staff (along with the community) need certainty about future development, growth, market demand etc.</li> <li>• Need to 'de-risk' investment decision making through providing certainty.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Council processes (opinion differed across the sub-region)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a perception of lack of certainty and consistency in decision making.</li> <li>• Comments that the consenting process doesn't add value to the outcomes.</li> <li>• Extended timeframes cost money and need to be reduced.</li> <li>• Councils should be facilitating recovery, but RMA processes are holding it back.</li> <li>• Planning staff stated that they are keen to better understand developer issues.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Brownfield development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complexity, constraints and profit margins are holding back necessary brownfield redevelopment and revitalisation of suburban centres and towns.</li> <li>• There is a desire for more mixed use, medium density development in commercial centres.</li> <li>• It is easier to deliver Greenfield sections and Greenfield business land to market and the development industry is not geared toward other forms of development.</li> </ul>
<b>6. Urban design/urban form</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a perception of many poorly designed sub-divisions; Councils need stronger guidelines/rules.</li> <li>• Some developers stated that the process and design approval process doesn't add value to the outcome and adds costs and delays.</li> <li>• There was a strong desire to consolidate growth within limits, but others identified that people generally don't want to live in apartments.</li> <li>• More people focussed design is needed to create communities and great places and spaces.</li> </ul>
<b>7. Housing affordability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally land supply is not an issue, but other barriers and constraints add costs (consent process, geotech requirements, etc.)</li> <li>• Covenants requiring large houses decreases affordability.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Infrastructure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure providers (three waters, transport, community services, open space, electricity and others) stated that the UDS growth pattern should be maintained and followed.</li> <li>• Although, some industrial business owners (especially 'wet industry') say lack of supply of unconstrained and serviced land is hampering recovery.</li> <li>• There will be increasing implications on infrastructure from business relocation, and the associated workforce.</li> </ul>
<b>9. Public transport and active travel</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were request for 'transit-oriented development' with better integration between land use and transport.</li> <li>• A need to reduce congestion and costs for road networks.</li> <li>• There should be a promotion of walking, cycling and a 'village' concept of walkable neighbourhoods and communities.</li> </ul>
<b>10. Suburban centres &amp; business land</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater control on malls is needed - car based unsympathetic design, need to integrate better with commercial centre of activity and community.</li> <li>• How to create a thriving central city, without regulating current businesses located in suburbs is a multi-faceted issue.</li> <li>• There is a need to provide diversity of business land choice post 2016.</li> </ul>

# 2 Report introduction

## 2.1 Overview

The Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery directed Canterbury Regional Council (CRC) to prepare a Land Use Recovery Plan. This is to be done through a collaborative multi-agency partnership with Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Te Rununga o Ngai Tahu, New Zealand Transport Agency, and the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority.

The Ministers direction states that CRC must ensure the draft plan reflects to the extent possible the views of greater Christchurch communities generally, and must use targeted stakeholder sessions (among other requirements) and must prepare and publish a report on all consultation undertaken, including a summary of what was heard during consultation and how it influenced the draft Recovery Plan.

As part of the process of identifying the issues and options for the Land Use Recovery Plan workshops were held with a significant number of stakeholder groups. A series of workshops and information sessions were run, starting on 13 November and finishing on 18 December (the workshops ran from 3-18 December). In total 11 full workshop sessions were run along with around eight other information sessions provided to groups who have been invited to provide feedback in a format that suits each group.

In total around 180 individuals attended workshops and 74 completed survey questionnaires. Two documents were provided containing detailed discussion on specific topics and these are included at the end of this document.

The overall aim of this report is to make the information captured from stakeholders as accessible and informative as possible to those preparing the Land Use Recovery Plan and to others who will comment on its development.

### **2.1.1 The Report presents:**

- An explanation of the workshop process and participants
- An overall comment summary
- Detailed discussions of the topics that have emerged under each of the issues and options themes for residential and business land, including a summary of findings
- Summaries and full text transcripts of all of the workshop sessions
- Answers provided to online and paper based survey questionnaires
- An appendix containing a list of participants and organisations they represented plus longer comments.

Each topic/action states the number of *comments*. This is the number of comments on that particular topic. This is to give a general impression of the relative amount of interest shown in particular topics, but is not representative of the level of support for each topic.

The Overall Summary of Comments section at the start of the report presents the *residential* and *business* land *issues* and *options* topics that were commented on most and those considered pertinent across the whole draft Land Use Recovery Plan process.

### **2.1.2 Analysis Method and report writing**

Workshop comments (collected on post-it notes and table sheets) were divided into *residential* and *business* categories. They were also classified under *issues* and *options* and themed according to the topics that make up the main headings of each section. Topics that emerged from the comments were created by the analysis team. The grouping of similar ideas into topics enables the reader and the plan writer/commentator to process the main issues and options that emerge from stakeholders.

Comments that discussed multiple topics were categorised multiple times.

The analysis team sorted, categorised, analysed and summarised the information in preparing this report. Each comment has been read multiple times. The capture of information was designed to separate issues from options. In some cases individual pieces of information captured both issues and options, or were contained initially within the opposite group. Where this has happened issues have been moved to be discussed with similar issues and options have been moved to be discussed with similar options.

The discussion of ideas presented in the report identifies the key issues and opinions of those who have contributed comment on the Land Use Recovery Plan to date. Issues and options for each topic are grouped together within the discussion.

The analysis team has aimed to impartially present the information. Where possible they have stated whether an idea or opinion has been expressed by single or multiple respondents. Where an opinion is expressed in the text, it is not the opinion of the report team, it is the opinion of one or multiple stakeholders.

### **2.1.3 Workshop Format and Process**

Over a five week period, 18 workshops and meetings with various groups and stakeholders have taken place. These have included update meetings and workshops.

The update meetings involved an information briefing to an existing group to inform them of the process and to receive their comment.

The workshops were either two or three-hour sessions. The workshops generally involved a welcome, an information briefing about the Land Use Recovery Plan, and the process, some individual thinking time and then group work or group discussion, depending on whether the sessions were two hours or three hours.

#### **Update meetings**

The following groups had meeting updates in November and December:

- Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Senior Officials Group (CERSOG)
- Advisory Committee briefings
- Canterbury Government Leaders Group
- Greater Christchurch Transport Group
- Natural Environment Recovery Programme (NERP) TAG
- Ngai Tahu representatives
- Community Forum (written information only)

- Disability Action Group

#### 2.1.4 Two-hour workshops

These were held with smaller groups of professionals with similar interests. Most of these workshops addressed either business land or residential land. The workshops ran as follows:

Participants were welcomed to the workshop, given an overview of the Land Use Recovery Plan and the nature of the workshop and told to help themselves to food and drink. An information briefing on the key data and themes related to the Land Use Recovery Plan was then given.

The facilitator then went over how the workshop would run. Participants were asked to think of the top five issues (and any associated options) they thought the Land Use Recovery Plan should address. They were asked to write each of those issues onto a post-it note – one issue per post-it note.

Once this initial process was completed, each person in turn presented their top two priority issues to the rest of the group. Following this, each person then stated their remaining top issues.

Often this would then flow into a general discussion but if it did not, the facilitator would start a discussion based on observations of what had been said around the room and invite discussion from there.


Closing: The participants were thanked and the post-it notes were collected separately for 'top 2 issues' and 'other top issues'. The facilitator told the participants that an online survey was available and would be emailed to them should they want to add anything after the session.

The following groups participated in the two hour workshops (participant numbers in brackets):

- Partners Infrastructure Group (8)
- Partnership for Economic Prosperity and Recovery (7)
- Professional Bodies (21)
- Community Facilities, Sport and Recreation (9)
- Christchurch City Councillors<sup>1</sup> (8)
- Greater Christchurch Transport Group (15)
- Government leaders (16)

#### 2.1.5 Three-hour workshops

These workshops were held with larger groups who generally had a broad range of interests. Most of these workshops addressed both residential and business land. The workshops ran as follows:




---

<sup>1</sup> Full text not included in this report because the session was a publicly excluded session. Ideas captured from the group area included in the report.

As with the two-hour workshops, participants were welcomed to the workshop and given an overview of the Land Use Recovery Plan and the nature of the workshop. An information briefing on the key data and themes related to the Land Use Recovery Plan was then provided.

The facilitator then outlined how the workshop would run. Participants were first asked to think of the top five issues the Land Use Recovery Plan should address and to write these individually on post-it notes. The participants were asked to signify on their post-it notes whether the issue was relevant 'now/in the next 18 months' or 'later/after 18 months'.

Participants were then asked to stick their post-it notes onto the relevant posters around the room. The posters reflected the main themes in the issues document but participants were welcome to place any issues they did not believe were covered onto the 'other' poster.



Once this was complete, participants were asked to go around the posters and read the various post-it notes that had been stuck onto them. This exercise ran for approximately 20 minutes.

The facilitator then initiated a discussion on the patterns and themes of what was on the posters, in particular, considering where there was alignment and divergence in ideas. This discussion ran for approximately 30 minutes.

There was then a break for food and drink.

The participants were then invited back to the tables for a group exercise. The facilitator encouraged people to move seats, and tables often had to be joined up. Here, the groups were given a flipchart and asked to jointly decide on the top five issues and to come up with possible options for addressing these. These were real group discussions and a lot of different ideas, issues and priorities were discussed. The groups were given approximately 30 minutes to do this.



The facilitator would then ask each of the tables to report back to the rest of the group. Following this, the facilitator invited discussion on what they had heard from each of the tables. This took approximately 45 minutes.

A session summary and closure followed and participants were informed they could fill out an optional survey that would be emailed to them should they want to include any other issues or comment further.

The following groups participated in the three hour workshop:

- Planning group (30)
- Urban oversight group (9)
- Commercial Centres/Business Land Supply (21)
- Housing and residential land supply (37)

### **2.1.6 The facilitator's role**

Across all the sessions the facilitator, Graham Spargo from BECA, and Stephen Timms from Environment Canterbury, along with partner body representatives (CERA, CCC and other TA's) were open and welcomed comment and discussion.

The facilitator followed the same process for each of the sessions but appropriately adapted the approach to capturing information to ensure as much information as possible was gained from the particular stakeholder group. This was evidenced in the style of prompt questions and the timing of different parts of the sessions.

# 3 Overall comment summary

## **3.1 Overview**

The broad range of issues and options which emerged in the process to date are fully discussed in this document. This is a brief summary of issues and options that spanned a number of workshops and identifies the following common themes and topics.

### **3.1.1 Time scale (looking beyond 15 years) and Land Use Recovery Plan vision**

Some stated that the Land Use Recovery Plan needs to be based on a clear vision. The mismatch of a timeframe of 10-15 years and buildings that are intended to be used for 100 years was also identified. Some questioned how sustainability and climate change are taken into account. There was concern about the long-term effects of actions implemented in the short-term under the Land Use Recovery Plan, for example former CBD businesses could remain permanently in suburban or residential areas rather than returning.

### **3.1.2 Clarity and certainty**

Lack of clarity and certainty were identified as issues across many topics. Uncertainty in the market, in the development process, demographics, land status and locations of where residential and business development is to occur were issues. Comments stated that increasing certainty will inspire investor confidence and speed recovery, and in particular the development of land.

### **3.1.3 Coordination and collaboration**

Coordination needs were also identified across a variety of issues that included: government (including local) and stakeholders; planning processes; information provision; various plans and strategies. A desire for collaboration to maximise outcomes was discussed at a number of workshops.

Many actions are interlinked and decisions need to be made together to ensure integrated land-use planning. Numerous examples were put forward at the workshops. Locating housing near existing centres, infrastructure and transport (particularly public transport) was strongly desired to ensure utilisation of existing infrastructure.

Ensuring that previous planning, such as the UDS, is built on in this plan was suggested. This was especially true for infrastructure planners who are currently developing their network based on previous UDS directions.

### **3.1.4 Simplifying rules**

There were a number of issues and options that threaded throughout comments made on Residential Land. One constraint consistently identified was the rigidity of rules and time delays

within the planning process resulting in inefficiency, cost and frustration. There was a strong desire to address this. Flexibility, reduced costs, streamlined processes and an enabling council culture was considered desirable.

### **3.1.5 Shifts in location**

The effects of shifts in location of businesses (and residents) from city to suburbs and from east to west came through as a significant issue. Wet industry relocation was a commonly discussed topic. There was concern about the effects of these shifts on existing business and residential areas, especially the CBD and KACs. It was felt that shifts in business and residential locations need to be understood, planned and coordinated.

Accurate information on land supply and demand is needed to guide business relocation and development, as is information on hazard location and mitigation.

### **3.1.6 Brownfield and greenfield development**

There was significant discussion across a number of workshops about the issues and implications of greenfield and brownfield developments. Positive and negative issues associated with the development of each option were identified.

### **3.1.7 Transport planning**

With regard to transport it was identified that there is the opportunity to do what many cities talk about and create a resilient sustainable transport network. Aligning business placement with quality transport planning was commonly discussed as well as ensuring the Greater Christchurch Transport Strategy is included in the Land Use Recovery Plan. Public and active transport options were also promoted.

### **3.1.8 Affordability is not just about providing cheaper land**

Affordability is a complex issue and requires a multi-faceted solution. Suggestions made included: reducing compliance costs and development contributions where possible; reduction in the size of houses; reduction in geo-tech requirements for land that has adequate existing information; and including transport and infrastructure into affordability costs when development of green-fields outside the city is considered.

### **3.1.9 Housing diversity**

This included needing to provide and enable a variety of house types and sizes but also managing expectations of residents in relation to their thinking about different housing types.

# 4 Residential land - issues and options

## 4.1 Residential land - overall issues and options

### 4.1.1 Simplifying rules

There were a number of issues and options that threaded throughout comments made on Residential Land. One particularly consistent area of constraints and issues identified was rigidity of rules and time delays within the planning process, resulting in inefficiencies, increased costs and frustration. There was a strong desire to address this. Flexibility, reduced costs, streamlined processes and an enabling council culture was sought.

### 4.1.2 Coordination and collaboration

Coordination issues were also regularly identified, across a variety of issues. Coordination was desired across: stakeholders, parties, planning processes, information provision, various plans and strategies and policy makers, providers and funders. There was a desire for collaboration.

Integrated land-use planning was important; everything is interlinked and decisions need to be made together to ensure, for example, housing is not developed where services are not currently present.

### 4.1.3 Clarity and certainty

Similarly, lack of clarity and certainty were identified as issues across many of the comments. Uncertainty in the market, in the development process, demographics, land status and locations of where residential development is to occur were issues.

### 4.1.4 Topic based issues and options

**Supply and demand –of temporary housing** was generally desired to be permanent; there was strong support and many suggestions for reuse of temporary housing. The location of temporary housing was discussed and generally centred on utilising existing property or brownfield development. There were a few comments that indicated temporary housing was not as much of a priority.

**Supply and demand - permanent housing** issues centred on policy constraints. There was a desire for zone changes, subdivision, building consents and code of compliance certificates processes for approval to be sped up. Uncertainty in the market and unreasonable constraints on developers were also identified as significant issues and suggestions were made to: address ODP requirements; focus on land with least constraints and with access to infrastructure; free up TC1 land; incentivise brownfield development; and for the government to take the lead.

**Affordability** issues generally related to constraints to the process of development that then causes time lags and additional costs, in particular: covenants; age and size restrictions; and lack of range and flexibility for housing density, sizes and types. Options suggested were to reduce timing and costs and increase flexibility around these. Incentives and subsidies for development were also commonly suggested.

**Housing and diversity** issues were also linked with constraints on development, in particular too much limitation on intensification. Simplification of planning rules was desired. Housing that meets the needs of the community was supported, in particular affordable and social housing. Various types of partnerships were suggested including those between developers, CCDU, the community, public-private and/or public-private-community.

**Housing location** near existing centres, infrastructure and transport (particularly public transport) was strongly desired to ensure utilisation of existing infrastructure, support for existing businesses and communities, avoidance of dormitory towns and transport and infrastructure issues. Options for addressing this were to incentivise or promote land conglomeration and development within existing residential areas. Policy issues and constraints were also identified, particularly around lack of flexibility and rigidity of rules, reduction of compliance costs, removal of restrictive covenants and flexibility with land zoning.

**Quality of urban design and housing** issues centred on restrictive urban design rules and the Urban Design Panel. Options included removing the Panel or making it more transparent. Issues for development included unnecessary planning constraints (such as Outline Development Plans and density controls) and there was a desire to address these. Desirable design outcomes generally oriented around sustainability and integration: energy efficiency, environmental design, solar maximisation, healthy housing, providing space for food growing and integration of public transport, schools, shops.

**Natural hazards and constraints** attracted few comments. The need to identify hazards and then avoid or reduce the effects of hazards were identified as issues. Suggestions for addressing these were reviewing Geo-tech requirements and taking a risk-averse approach to coastal and flooding hazards.

**Other** issues and options varied greatly and mostly repeated general desires already mentioned above including coordination, certainty, timeliness and integrated land-use planning.

## **4.2 Supply and demand - temporary housing (issues)**

**Comments: 22**

### **4.2.1 Reuse of temporary housing**

Reusing temporary housing after it was no longer needed was emphasised as being an important issue by several participants.

*They could linger as poor neighbourhoods*

New uses suggested for former temporary housing included commercial use, affordable housing and other longer-term housing stock, an athlete's village for future sporting events, and visitor industry use.

A number of participants were concerned that temporary housing should be developed with future re-use in mind:

*The delivery of temporary accommodation in a manner that will contribute to longer term housing stock – location, standard price/affordability.*

Similarly, one participant stated that provision of temporary housing needs to occur without crowding out good quality permanent development in key areas, which could be achieved via flexible development where use can change over time, e.g., residential-temporary-commercial.

Another suggested that current temporary housing rules may need to be examined if temporary housing is to translate into affordable housing.

### **4.2.2 Location of Temporary Housing**

**Provision of temporary housing in and near to the central city** was considered to be important by two participants. One suggested that if necessary a review of current L1 and L2 zoning should be considered to ensure increased housing density close to the CBD rather than further greenfield expansion.

One participant observed that temporary housing needs not be built from scratch:

*Need to include measures that make better use of existing housing stock, e.g., homestay/lodging/home sharing to manage peak demand. Analogy with infrastructure: sections and new houses = capital (high cost); use housing stock more efficiently = demand management (low cost).*

One participant commented more generally that:

*Need some temporary housing for construction workers and people with houses being repaired. Need to select appropriate locations, manage impacts on existing communities. Won't stack up financially – no commercial return – therefore needs government funding.*

Another that:

*There is simply not enough done here at Council/Government level to assist with the temp housing models.*

### **4.2.3 Brownfield development**

For temporary housing, brownfield development, was seen as desirable by two participants. One participant saw such development as being necessary to free up more land for houses and small

units. The other suggested temporary housing on brownfield sites could subsequently be used for “quality affordable housing.”

It was suggested by two participants that “temporary” could become permanent. One thought this could be because some displaced residents may be reluctant to move again and that therefore timescales should be well defined in advance. The other participant thought similarly, stating:

*Need flexible options → workers’ needs different to long-term residents’ needs  
– could be recognised in Land Use Recovery Plan. Alternative to the new D.  
Plan rules for temp accommodation is government-led initiatives.*

#### **4.2.4 Innovative solutions**

Some participants called for the ability to use innovative solutions. For example one called for increased use of prefab/portable housing, another suggested social housing solutions (central government, local government, partnerships) and a rental register. One participant provided extensive comments in relation to the ability to employ innovative approaches to the provision of temporary accommodation and this is supplied in full in an appendix (see Brook McKenzie’s comment).

#### **4.2.5 Market-related issues**

One commented that it was important to ensure the market is responsive to rapid change in demand. Another stated that when demand rises for accommodation there may not be sufficient supply. Conversely, another participant thought the market is likely to provide temporary accommodation by way of rental accommodation in the form of permanent houses/units.

#### **4.2.6 Other comments**

There were a number of comments suggesting that temporary housing is not a priority. One participant noted the tension in providing temporary accommodation when there is a shortage of rental properties and another preferred a focus on affordable permanent housing.

Other comments included: there are impediments due to the inability or unwillingness to form appropriate partnerships such as PPPs for the provision of temporary housing; and needs to be commercially viable; there should be a flexible approach to development; it is important to understand the demographic characteristics of construction worker demand, e.g., single male workers; New Zealand should stop being afraid of growth; there is not enough at council/government level to assist with the temp housing models.

#### **4.2.7 After 18 months**

Longer term temporary housing could become affordable housing. It is therefore important to examine current temporary housing laws. This was considered a long term and short term issue.

## **4.3 Supply and demand - temporary housing (options)**

**Comments: 24**

### **4.3.1 Reuse of temporary housing**

Reuse in the future, once temporary housing is no longer needed for its initial purpose, was suggested by a number of participants as being an important consideration. One participant stated that:

*It is accepted that the preferred solution to temporary housing is to develop it with a long term permanent housing use.*

A wide range of other reuse options were suggested including commercial use, affordable housing, an athlete's village for future sporting events, and visitor industry use. One participant suggested:

*Consider a staged approach similar to the Olympic village approach taken in most Olympic cities. E.g. Worker accommodation can become student accommodation in the future – or new communities of more affordable housing provided the levels of amenity can be kept high*

### **4.3.2 Innovative approaches**

The need for innovative approaches was mentioned by a number of participants. One person suggested relocation of habitable houses from the red zone for use as temporary housing and then sale or demolition when no longer needed. Two participants advocated the use of prefab housing. One suggested the use of such housing to assist with the housing shortage and for temporary worker accommodation. Another suggested:

*Potentially some prefabricated / temporary housing may be required – suggest a partnership with industry/competition for innovative design of worker accommodation.*

### **4.3.3 Brownfield developments**

Brownfield developments were suggested as viable options for temporary housing by several participants. One participant advocated the use of publically owned sites and private brownfield areas for housing (at appropriate densities for their location). This participant also commented that urgent attention needs to be given to the future use of school sites that are to be closed – many have existing facilities that could be used for temporary and permanent housing. Another participant felt that brownfield development was needed to free up land to build houses and small units. This participant suggested that in low income areas the minimum section size could be reduced to 350m<sup>2</sup>. This would allow for cheaper sections and also new infrastructure would not necessarily be needed.

Another participant suggested brownfield development:

*Through a 'community clusters' approach of 20-30 units of affordable (yet sustainable) medium-density, brownfield housing developments as proposed by the '500 Houses for Christchurch Project', in collaboration and association with many key stakeholders in the earthquake recovery effort.*

#### **4.3.4 Consultation with and coordination between stakeholders**

Collaboration such as the Christchurch Housing Summit, TPA, 100-day plan group (Glenn Livingston), and other NGOs was considered to be important by two participants. Both participants said that the aim of such consultation would be to gather data, not necessarily quantitative (e.g., concerning inner city east residents) and to develop solutions. One participant suggested:

*Much stronger coordination between the policy-makers, the organisations with the capability of implementing the policies, investors, and design and building solutions.*

Another commented on the importance of:

*Public/Private/Community partnerships to promote healthy housing that addresses the needs of particular population groups but takes into account migration patterns during and after recovery and can later be offered for private sale at an affordable price point to populations of interest like families with children and first-time home-owners.*

The same participant went on to say:

*Of course, any initiative in this regard would need strong support of major policy-making and funding stakeholders to entice and secure private investment and guide organizations through the uncharted waters of the earthquake recovery process.*

Another participant suggested provision of social housing solutions via partnerships involving central government and/or local government.

#### **4.3.5 Market-related issues**

One participant suggested, that if there should be an insufficient supply of temporary housing via the market, perhaps rely on Central City provisions and/or look at permanent buildings with the aim of reuse. Another said it was important to understand supply and demand with respect to existing capacity, e.g., co-locating, using existing housing before investing in new housing. One participant stated that the market is likely to provide sufficient rental accommodation in the form of permanent houses and units.

#### **4.3.6 Other comments**

Other comments were: get rid of the RMA; implement a Council-led programme outside of the Land Use Recovery Plan; use central government investment to kick start; allow the market to provide temporary housing by way of rental accommodation of permanent houses/units; needs to be commercially viable; develop a homelessness survey; establish a rental register; need a flexible approach to encouraging development.

### 4.3.7 Supply and demand – permanent housing (issues)

Comments: 61

#### 4.3.8 Policy issues and constraints

The need for speed, improvement (through flexibility) of local governmental processes and affordability were key themes that came through numerous comments. Various comments specified the need for quick action to improve CCC processes for approving zone changes; easing restrictions and improving the consent process; and speeding up approval of Code of Compliance Certificates.

*Speed up Code of Compliance Certificates (CCC only) to speed up the whole start to finish building process, to enable builders to start next project and to enable people to occupy their homes quicker.*

There were singular comments to create more flexibility in district plans so that they are less prescriptive; avoid consenting delays; the need to ease infrastructure constraints through coordination; there is a need to limit appeal rights on plan changes to matters of law; and that there is a need to look at what sort of people to attract to live in New Zealand and Christchurch.

One commenter suggested: that the traditional building industry is not providing affordable housing.

*To ensure the development of affordable housing any policy will need to go beyond the traditional building industry model and foster an evidence-based social investment approach that, not only fosters collaboration and partners building across the public and private sectors, but offers a seat at the table to whanau, communities, non-governmental organizations, and academia as well.*

There were two comments that no change should be made to Living 1 land. One comment asked for more information on those living in the Red Zone to establish demand and another comment stated that there were too many barriers within Christchurch to supply land. An additional issue was identified as the need to identify why land supply is not equating to housing supply. One comment stated that CIAL is currently a problem and needs to be reconsidered. Another comment queried whether there are sufficient sections and houses available on the market to meet the demand during recovery in the next 10 to 15 years. Another issue was raised about Councils being able to say no to plan changes and that it was very clear that development outside priority areas is not going to be consistent with sound resource management practice.

#### 4.3.9 Development and Developers

Uncertainty in the market and unreasonable constraints on developers were recurrent issues. Two related comments discussed that there is significant areas of zoned land available, fragmented ownership combined with outline development plan (ODP) requirements makes it difficult to develop, and an additional comment expanded this as:

*Unrealistic and unreasonable planning constraints e.g. requirement for Outline Development and Plan for whole of new greenfield residential/business areas. No time frame set for councils to prepare and give cost and multi landowners not practical for area and 2 landowners to prepare-no development approved in meantime.*

There were several comments calling for more understanding around existing housing availability and why there seemed to be a supply of land and why demand has not resulted in this being developed.

Singular comments were that developers are not developing and marketing sufficient property; there is a lack of brownfield developers; there is a lack of developer interest in releasing some land possibly due to the uncertain market; impediments to residential site development options were raised; a need for sustainable residential development that still meets the needs of relocated populations; a need to identify why land supply is not equating to housing supply and the issue of small area Private Plan Changes that may not facilitate expedient land development - creating infrastructure problems. Another comment about housing was:

*[That it is] not priced at the affordable – moderate end of the market – restrictive covenants require minimum house sizes plus often a range of design features which make the ability for homeowners to purchase and site and rebuild with their insurance/government payout impossible.*

One comment suggested that in theory there is ample residential land in the UDS area, but that the problem is that a significant amount of its housing allocation is on land that has development constraints like geo tech and drainage (e.g. Highfields, CN3). Another comment was as follows:

*By ensuring participation and consultation with stakeholders beyond the traditional building industry, which requires concerted and effective strategic planning with stakeholders like the ones mentioned above. If the poor, young families, and first-time home-owner are forced out of the housing market in the Central City and into the suburbs, these sectors are likely to become more socially isolated and deprived of existing and future social infrastructure and services that could otherwise be of support. In reality, these population groups are coincidentally more likely to be in greater need of support and a renewed sense of community and at risk to contend with the worst aspects of earthquake recovery. This is of particular relevance in the context Christchurch where destruction and social dislocation are aggravated by a potent sense of tragedy and loss.*

Another comment about building for projected demand showed concern for creating a giant retirement village. One comment queried whether Councils could address market failure.

#### **4.3.10 Housing Type**

Density issues (proximity to/within commercial centres) and the public's perception of such with earthquake related fears of higher density living are reflected in several comments. There is one comment reflecting:

*[There is an] opportunity to change hearts and mindsets to open up the residential housing market to more dense, better designed, higher quality housing...*

Various comments included the need for thinking outside the square in terms of sections as they exist now; allowing groups of people to build together a "community group" of housing by looking at existing land use rules to make it easier for people to build housing in "communities" e.g. amalgamating backyards etc.; making sure new houses meet "Christchurch lifestyle" requirements; houses needing soul through design; log burners installed in new and existing homes should be possible.

One comment reflected upon the fact that the new supply in Christchurch is Living G which is different to traditional older suburbs.

#### **4.3.11 Other**

One person questioned whether the reduction in the supply of properties to sell was in fact a real problem or if there were causes that could be addressed (e.g. EQC works, etc.) or other risk mitigation (insurance guarantees, etc.). Another comment was that there is adequate supply of land and to look at who is buying the land - housing companies who in turn still have to sell the land on were referred to. There was a call to solve the infrastructure issues that the city has with flooding; gather an accurate picture and furnish a current (accurate) supply and pipeline to key stakeholders; and study the implications of TC3 zoning. One person suggested:

*Be enabling, support priority areas but also provide for responses to future needs/opportunities.*

#### **4.3.12 After 18 months**

These comments were on a range of themes.

There were singular comments regarding the need to understand the implications of capital gains tax on property demand and use (rental or permanent); a call for the improved understanding of Housing Market and not just land supply/housing demand (e.g. Strategic Housing Market Assessment); concern for the staging within subdivisions; a reminder to watch for mechanisms that will encourage development of existing zoned land (e.g. rating penalties, value on vacant land and capital values).

One person said that sprawl need not be costly, simply well designed, with infrastructure hubs. Another said that new land should be researched and monitored so it is developed at the rate which applicants say it will be developed.

### **4.4 Supply and demand – permanent housing (options)**

**Comments: 38**

#### **4.4.1 Policy options**

Removal and speed of processes were common themes in various individual comments as follows: get rid of the RMA; free up consents with the possibility of opening this up to independent organisations that can speed up and simplify processes; speed up CCC processes for approving zone changes, subdivisions, building consents, etc.; remove CCC Design Plan Review Committee; speed up Code of Compliance Certificates; classify SDC and WDC land as TC1, 2 and 3 so detailed geo tech investigation not needed; simplify build type construction of TC2/TC3 land; apply living G regulations; change rating problems; work with trusts, NGO's, etc.; age designation extension; encourage alternative development such as suburban village/communities of large subdivisions; infill - as there is an optimistic estimate of infill development; assess likelihood of areas being developed when running [calculating] numbers of lots available; declare that applicants do not have to prove that house, etc., was lawfully established and remove 6 month limitation; government to pay for infrastructure; outline Development Plan being done by CCC in conjunction with private developers; gain better understanding for what is behind land banking and slow release of stages such as geo tech availability and ask ourselves is a government response needed? One comment outlined:

*Create a coordinated housing strategy to deliver integrated subdivisions/developments that look at providing a mix of housing types and is focused on immediate and long term needs of the people of Christchurch. The*

*strategy should draw on available expertise and market research which highlights needs of the community.*

#### **4.4.2 Developers and developments**

There were various individual comments on this topic, as follows: the City Council and its partners may need to place more emphasis on redevelopment while the peripheral areas are going through their various processes; engage developers fully and lower developer contributions; enable built form development (not bare land) [to] exceed some of the current underlying RMA rules and town planning rules; focus on land with least constraints- TC1, infrastructure access, etc.; free up TC1 land for development (around airport/Johns Road); scope all available TC1 land within the Land Use Recovery Plan area and more importantly make it available for both business and residential development; and another comment:

*Remove the ability of developers to put in place restrictive covenants on sites being subdivided for the rebuild. Allow for smaller lot sizes where developments provide a high standard of solar design and resilient water infrastructure. Develop a more holistic 'master-planning' approach to developments so that they provide a mix of housing types and high levels of amenity – envision a new way of living in Canterbury.*

One person queried how more sections might be released into the market so that houses can be built to meet the housing demand during recovery, and another suggested looking at financial resource cooperative land trusts such as [www.canterburyaffordablesections.org.nz](http://www.canterburyaffordablesections.org.nz).

#### **4.4.3 Brownfield land**

There were four comments specific to brownfield land. One suggested giving incentives to encourage the redevelopment of brownfields and another said that to increase brownfield residential development requires an identification of vacant or underutilised land owned by the public sector and then set up a 'development agency' to provide assistance to guide the process of redeveloping the land. The third comment recommended amending the standards of brownfield developments. The fourth said that governments need to take the lead, change perceptions, increase land holding available for development and create density provisions to unlock brownfield land.

#### **4.4.4 Further Considerations**

One comment suggested that public sector intervention was probably required and that perhaps central government could develop the land it owns in Belfast. Another suggested that to ensure that residential land supply matched with efficient and effective provision of infrastructure and services and that it was best to remember that they are a reciprocal relationship and they should be coordinated - not one being led by the other. Another commented that more work needs to be done to understand the demand better to tailor supply and there needs to be encouragement for a variety of options and in particular affordable medium density options. Another stated:

*Promote and enable use of distributed water (and wastewater schemes) e.g. on site rainwater tanks as supplementary supply for garden/outdoor/non potable uses – as well as greater use of on-site greywater (and wastewater) options. This will enable sites which are not well served by centralised infrastructure (or where centralised infrastructure is substantially damaged) to be developed. Consider a similar approach to energy provision – looking at distributed and neighbourhood level solutions that build resilience as well as robustness in the*

*infrastructure. Use appropriate regulation to require a high standard of solar design at the subdivision, development and house level – this will substantially reduce winter and summer peak loading on electricity demand.*

## **4.5 Affordability (issues)**

**Comments: 54**

### **4.5.1 Policy issues and constraints**

The need for the removal or simplification of building consents, developer and restrictive covenants, and resource consents was expressed in several comments. These included the removal of age and property size restrictions on property development and developer covenants that restrict smaller or cheaper housing.

*Remove barriers; make regulatory rules simple, remove unnecessary rules which don't add to [sic] quality to [sic] the process or the final outcome; remove unnecessary costs by – authorities not requiring detailed details early on in the development process.*

*Barriers –consent barriers within ChCh lies with the regulations-currently regulations allow big players to subdivide (1000 lots+) because they own whole development blocks—development blocks with these are multiple owners are hard and costly to progress—allow land owners to develop with no ODP process as long as they can show integration also activities need to invest earlier to keep up authority engineers should not dictate land availability.*

The costs, lack of guidance within district plans, and delays associated with the consenting process, particularly relating to urban design and 'ODP's, were also identified as a barrier to affordable housing.

*CCC Density A rules focus on urban design at the expense of everything else. This is preventing affordable small units being built. Affordability needs to be taken into account by those processing consents.*

### **4.5.2 Other comments**

Other comments included densities and development, developer control of supply, rental properties, and parking regulations.

A lack of appropriate range and flexibility of housing densities, sizes and typologies, developer awareness and understanding of rationale was identified by one participant. As was a clear, comprehensive process regarding greenfield and high density residential development. Increased housing diversity in subdivisions to avoid developers dictating housing style was suggested in another comment

There were also comments urging greater government interaction and control over rental costs and landlords to facilitate tenant well-being; reducing parking requirements for apartments; restricting the ability of developers to control the supply of residential land which makes it unaffordable to 'red-zoners' and the elderly; and maintaining minimum standards of housing to avoid the exacerbation of diseases associated with overcrowding (such as respiratory and skin disease).

### **Low cost housing**

Several participants noted that simply increasing the supply of land would not solve housing affordability issues.

**Social and Affordable housing.** The need for social and affordable housing, with minimum service levels (open space, infrastructure, services etc.) in close proximity to transport hubs and urban care was identified as a priority for reducing the increasing housing affordability gap. Concern was raised over an inadequate supply of appropriate and affordable housing for people leaving the red zone, which has been forcing residents to leave Christchurch.

*(7.1.2) is glossing the problem. We shouldn't do this. Let's restate as follows  
"The gap between the rateable value of red zone land and market replacement is impossibly wide for the socio economic group most affected. Thousands of households are under financial stress and have NO possibility to purchase or build similar in Christchurch*

**Low cost rental stock.** Sufficient and accessible one bedroom residences that are affordable for renters was identified by several (3) participants as an important consideration. The need to minimize building costs and consents and institutional investment was suggested to develop and retain the rental stock.

*Rebuilding affordable rental stock: sufficient one bedroom builds; Central and close suburbs still accessible to vulnerable beneficiary singles.*

### **Development costs**

A couple of participants addressed the issue that the overall costs of housing include the effects of land price restructuring, development levies, covenants and building costs.

**Lowering development contributions** and other building requirements was discussed. Some participants suggested fee reduction or assistance (possibly through central government), but without negatively impacting the fiscal situation of the TLA. Joint funding between government, TLAs and the private sector was suggested.

*Cost of development incl. development contributions and restrictions, e.g., covenants on titles (mix house size, etc.) – limits ability to provide affordable housing.*

*Costs from CCC for Social Housing Developments – averaging 60-80 K for a 6-8 unit development.*

The need to avoid 'double ups' between CERA and developer's reports (such as engineering or geotech reports) was also raised by one participant. There was also a comment urging the need to distinguish between repairs, upgrades and new developments in the contributions assessments and application of DC charges. One participant indicated that CCC fees are higher than those in Selwyn, for example.

One participant attributed rising building costs to inflated subcontractor rates from Fletchers who charge more for EQC related repair as opposed to new housing. One participant suggested increasing competition in building supplies, and addressing compliance and consent costs as a means to reduce costs. There was also the concern that without policy driven intervention, developers would continue to set minimum housing size requirements which are unaffordable to many residents.

### **Other**

There is a need for certainty and consistency in the housing market to reduce the time and costs of getting a house to the market.

*...consistency and certainty needs to be through for development process. Often we find infrastructure providers don't follow vision as set up in planning environment and decide themselves where to provide infrastructure. Also, are slow to invest in storm water and sewerage and water supply →once planning rules are set don't change them unless there is a reason to.*

**Financial and economic effects of housing affordability** were touched on in a couple of comments. This included the need for housing and/or land packages under \$350,000; inflationary pressures and its relationship to the economic recovery; and financial options for residents (such as lower lending rates for low return housing). One participant mentioned that a compact city centre is likely to increase land value and geographically price the affordable housing sector out of the Central City market and central urban core of the city.

One participant commented on the perceived lack of trust with applicant professionals.

#### **4.5.3 Next 18 months**

A wide range of topics were addressed in this section.

#### **4.5.4 Urban planning and design outcomes**

Diversity and affordability were considered the best urban planning strategies leading to efficient land use in two comments. Access to transport was identified as an important consideration, as was active transport infrastructure (cycle and pedestrian assess). Intensification was also raised as a means of cost reduction.

*Efficient land use/intensification is the only practical way to reduce costs. Building costs and public authority levies and taxes won't yield.*

#### **4.5.5 Consent processes streamlining**

Some participants suggested reducing the complexity and costs of the consent process to avoid it coming across as too confrontational and difficult.

*Streamlining or diminishing or removing the bureaucracies from the detail of land use planning and/or design is the only way to ensure recovery OR quadruple the bureaucracies to ensure the delivery of decisions.*

#### **4.5.6 User affordability**

Both the availability of affordable rental properties for low income earners, and the long term costs associated with property maintenance were highlighted in this section. One participant suggested the use of boarding houses, while another suggested fit for purpose, adequately or universally designed rental properties be developed in order to cater for a wide range of tenants. A couple of participants, however, cautioned that there may be hidden costs in the increased transport, rates and taxes associated with the cheaper land and infrastructure development on the fringes.

#### **4.5.7 Supply and demand**

Comments were divided over the ability to increase supply to reduce price in this section. Many participants supported increasing supply to increase affordability. However, one participant questioned why, if 'TA's' suggest the land is available, sections are so expensive. The effect of the red zone deadline suddenly increases demand, increasing pressure on rentals and an inability to afford new sections with the government payout. Another participant suggested reviewing the foundation requirements on TC3 zoning and the effect on affordable housing supply.

#### 4.5.8 Other

The notion of affordability, and the ability of the Land Use Recovery Plan to achieve meaningful change were also discussed.

*What is “affordable”? Prices will be set by the market unless artificially determined or constrained by subsidies or legislation.*

*I doubt whether the Land Use Recovery Plan can deal with this because it is a structural problem engrained in NZs economy and labour market. It would take some significant interventions that go way beyond those that the current government is prepared to consider.*

### **4.6 Affordability (options)**

**Comments: 45**

#### 4.6.1 Policy options

Reducing the timing and costs associated with building regulation requirements such as development contributions, compliance costs, restrictive covenants, and consents was seen as one of the top options for enabling affordability. The removal of the RMA and infrastructure charges by TAs (at least for the next 10 years) was suggested by a couple of participants. Another participant recommended the use of generic building consents for specific housing designs that can be used on multiple sites. However, one participant urged that the reduction of consent costs and delays should not come at the expense of a well-designed urban environment.

*Care must also be taken to ensure that development does not lead to a resource inefficient Christchurch sprawl. Transit oriented development based on potential future networks should be considered.*

Other comments regarding policy options included: issuing land with titles at an affordable price to red zone evacuees; enabling planning documents to over-ride restrictive covenants; and enabling the amalgamation of brownfield land titles. One comment recommended reducing the level of detail required during early consent stages.

*Authorities require too much detail early on in the development process, i.e. asking for detailed design during resource consent process*

Several comments suggested assigning a percentage of development to affordable housing, either as a resource consent condition, or through building consents and incentives. One comment suggested there is need for major change to policy to make houses more affordable.

*Major policy change required to ensure homes become more affordable.*

Zoning - Several participants suggested using mixed zoning as a means to create more affordable housing. One participant suggested rezoning TC1 land to enable development (this would need to consider amending the airport noise controls).

#### 4.6.2 Housing sizes and styles

Reducing the site and housing sizes was a frequently suggested option for increasing affordability.

There was some discussion over creating greater diversity in housing types to improve affordability. Housing styles such as temporary student housing, and terrace-styled housing were also suggested. One participant suggested factory made houses, assembled on site.

Density was also considered by a few participants. Ideas included contiguous block development and scale with higher density, and cluster density housing in existing brownfield areas around town centres. Medium density was supported by a couple of participants as a means of providing cheaper housing.

*Medium density doesn't mean apartments, Apartments not cheaper than free standing house. Need flexibility in section sizes/comprehensive developments*

#### **4.6.3 Collaboration**

Partnerships such as PPPs between CCC, CERA, HNZ, TLAs or the Central Government and housing providers and developers were suggested. One participant suggested that this would reduce the developer's risk regarding their investment in low cost housing, and recommended the use of brownfield land. Other participant suggested collaborating with socially-invested organisations in order to ensure the needs of the community are met in the development.

*Explore new business models – for example with Christchurch City rebuilding a large number of town centres there is an opportunity for Council to partner with affordable housing providers to integrate affordable housing into Council facilities.*

Another participant suggested making cheap, aggregated, protected land available; and another recommended the creation of more options for co-housing projects.

One participant recommended resourcing cooperative land trusts.

#### **4.6.4 Incentives and subsidies**

Some participants felt that as many costs cannot be reduced, the only way to improve housing affordability was through subsidy. Ideas included: interest free repayments; council insurance for supporting infrastructure; and non-repayable grants. Other areas for subsidy consideration included GST, lending rates and DCNs.

*Incentivise land development and housing through variable costs: GST, DCNs, Lending rates, compliance costs incl. heavy handed and overly prescriptive design controls.*

Some ideas that were considered worth incentivising included: providing a 'density bonus'; incentivising the development of good land quickly; collaboration between developers and social housing providers (by reducing consent costs for social housing providers); and subsidising consents where design standards are met, multi-unit development and minor dwellings (such as in Auckland).

#### **4.6.5 Supply and demand**

There was a mix of responses about the ability to increase the supply of land to reduce cost. Some participants recommended increasing the supply of cheap, safe land to increase affordability. Other participants felt that simply increasing supply (land ownership and rental) would not make housing more affordable, and that a policy-based socially-focused commitment is required.

*[Rezoning land] would make sense as a first step but it is not a magic bullet. That is, to increase the supply of land for residential purposes near the Central*

*City does not entirely ensure that the resulting housing developments will be of affordable stock. There is a need for a social investment approach that views housing as an essential component of the city's infrastructure. Also, an 'Affordable Housing Policy' within the Land Use Recovery Plan that preserves a significant percentage of all planned new housing stock close to the Central City for the most affordable ranges of the real estate market.*

#### **4.6.6 Other Options**

The kiwi dream. A couple of participants mentioned that it may be necessary to sell a different dream to kiwis and adjust people expectations of what residents can afford in terms of housing.

Defining affordability was discussed by a couple of participants. One participant mentioned that a financially feasible target or price range is set before plans can be made.

To avoid doubling up of costs, create open databases for developers (for example geotech reports) was suggested.

Rental properties. Several options regarding rental residences and tenant protection were discussed. These included the creation of rental housing registrations and codes of practice for landlords, and caps on rent based on the value of the property.

One participant recommended following the NSW model of approval for second dwellings for rental purposes.

*NSW has got over rental problems. They have automatic approval where owners of a home on over 400 sq. metres can get automatic approval for a second dwelling either attached or separate. There is a size formula. This has been very effective. Such innovation taps into the existing infrastructure.*

**Financial options.** One participant suggested lower interest rates for first home owners and red zone evacuees. Another participant suggested allowing deferred payments.

**Market led vs government led.** There were recommendations for following both market led and government created development strategies. The UK was recommended as a good example of market led development. Another participant recommended the government guide development more carefully.

*...Government to buy sections and redzone rather than leave to market. When market does it, Govt to take a percentage for social/community use e.g. Queenstown example.*

### **4.7 Housing diversity (issues)**

**Comments: 38**

#### **4.7.1 Policy issues and constraints**

There was a desire for simplification to planning rules, specifically the City Plan was referred to. This was in the light of the city changing in form and so there is a need for a change to the rules to match the changes that have happened on the ground. Altered rules would also allow for more diversity and flexibility in building design.

*...city plan rules around density and bulk location no longer match fit in certain areas. Review density and enable UDP interaction to speed up non-notification*

There are a number of issues limiting intensification, such as the desire for standalone residence, issues with body corporate agreements and associated insurance complexities.

*Have policies & plans – implementation issue. Issue: Achieving diversity in both greenfields & brownfields at the implementation stages both in regard to process and as a result of external issues: i.e., market desire for standalone houses; unwillingness of developers/builders to build it; ownership mechanisms – unit title, body corps & associated insurance related issues.*

There were specific and general references to government and local authorities showing more leadership. The Government housing model was specifically suggested. One comment suggested that PC1 is too restrictive. Another comment listed zoning, coordination and paucity of information, compliance costs, urban design controls and intervention as adding to the cost of development.

Brownfield development ideas included: the need to incentivise, exemplars that prove development is profitable. A “PPP” was suggested as a way to achieve exemplars. One comment suggested that demolition had provided a significant number of brownfield sites, but that they needed to be used in a more innovative mixed use development style.

A further extensive discussion was provided that covered TC1 land zoning and this document has been provided to the project team in its entirety (see Appendix – Brooke McKenzie comment).

#### **4.7.2 Affordable housing**

The overriding theme was that housing stock needs to meet the needs of the community. The central city development plan was commented on for not making a genuine commitment to affordable housing. Others repeated the need to meet the needs of all segments of the community.

*Lack of commitment to social and affordable housing in Central City redevelopment plan – not creating a real city, just a show-case for tourists.  
Solution – need to be catering for young people, students, young couples and older smaller family units in affordable housing.*

The need for housing diversity close to the city centre and adjacent to suburban centres was identified. Waimakariri was also identified as needing housing diversity for all demographic groups.

#### **4.7.3 Mixed Use**

Zoning should be relaxed to allow mixed use development. A comment was made that this could allow land and building costs to match the proposed use.

*Integration of business/residence [needs] more open mindedness with zoning.  
Allow business/residential for smaller “cottage” industries to enable people to work from home, i.e., work below, live above. This would help EQ recovery.*

Other comments were: concentrating on a public/private/community model; flexible land sizes; e.g., 100m<sup>2</sup> minimum and using Government support for exemplar projects. New developments should have a greater range of housing options; smaller houses; mixed with commercial uses, e.g. small neighbourhood shops with an office above might help achieve a better outcome.

#### **4.7.4 Community participation and perceptions**

It was stated that the community (residents and tenants) should be involved with mixed use design. There were several comments that the government should help create models to educate the public’s perceptions toward higher density living models.

*The World Health Organisation Survey showed worldwide that young people fear living in an apartment more than crime, poverty, or climate change.*

One comment was that practical models of higher density living, that the public could see and feel, might help change the cultural choice of one house on ¼ acre section. One comment stated they don't want the 'state house' look or the generic look of UK housing.

#### **4.7.5 Other**

One comment stated concern that the lending criteria of banks is a fundamental issue in achieving brownfield and higher density living. Another voiced that 'housing diversity' was not an issue, as it is market driven. Uncertainty about whether it was possible to know what people want now, or in the future was also expressed.

Other suggestions were: allow for larger section sizes if there is demand, particularly 1000m-4000m; Higher quality rental housing and there is a feeling in the market that there is a lack of good builders.

#### **4.7.6 After 18 months**

A comment was made to incentivise smaller, denser and more diverse housing forms to adjust for the aging population and smaller households.

*Housing type: Christchurch has a fairly one dimensional housing type. There is a need to incentivise a more diverse mix in order to support a sustainable land use pattern and encourage affordable options.*

It was suggested that mixed use zoning would help meet upcoming demand, renew and regenerate ongoing developments and eventually help protect commercial/business property from petty crime activity. However, another comment emphasised that a social marketing programme might be necessary to encourage cultural change of attitudes toward size expectations of living spaces.

### **4.8 Housing diversity (options)**

**Comments: 22**

#### **4.8.1 Policy options**

The following are individual responses in this section:

- Get rid of RMA;
- CCDU partnered with developers to provide a range of demonstrations to reflect housing typologies:

*Business as usual thrives on show homes (mainly 4 bedroom, 2 bathroom, triple garage). To re-house the CBD we need to compete with business as usual and demonstrate a variety of terrace, laneway, courtyard and apartment housing styles.*

- Target vulnerable sectors of the market;
- Reduce level of controls- especially at urban design level;
- Create transport-oriented development;
- Focus on '500 Houses for Christchurch';

- Utilise the expertise of the local community through community planning techniques (e.g. Beacon’s neighbourhood framework and assessment process);
- Rebuild suburban centres, develop Christchurch as a city of urban villages—each with their unique identity and offering something unique;
- Public/private/community partnerships might be a good alternative model to private covenants on new sections;
- Have more flexibility around processing, provision, design, and encourage comprehensive design over multiple sites [for] greater development potential;
- Provide density bonuses;
- Provide 10hh/ha, 12 hh/ha, 15hh/ha + 20 hh/ha for real mixed density;

#### **4.8.2 Affordable Housing**

There was a comment that suggested that being more flexible around design would help affordability. It stated that a smaller house on a smaller section is more affordable than the standard view of mixed density (townhouses). Another comment suggested that council staff do not prefer an urban edge and that the provision of mixed density requirements and location were often not affordable. It states that it is easier to create standalone 450m<sup>2</sup> + sections. Another comment stated that it is important to remember the ‘Seddon era state houses’ that were mixed up all over the place and reducing de-facto zoning by income, as well as, insuring affordable housing all over the city which further reduces any kind of ‘ghetto establishment.’

#### **4.8.3 Other and after 18 months comments**

A comment stated that it is not just density that creates housing diversity. They cited that the age of the population, residence design, size of home and section are what is needed to meet current and future housing needs for life time homes.

### **4.9 Housing location (issues)**

**Comments: 50**

#### **4.9.1 Housing location and development**

Housing located near existing centres, infrastructure and public transport was desired, particularly in brownfields, key activity centres and the CBD. Housing around these sites enables better utilisation of existing infrastructure, especially public transport and also provides support for businesses and residents. It was noted that the spread to the West has issues for transport, can create ‘dormitory’ towns and encourages use of the private car – which should be avoided.

Housing located near (or with access to) jobs, health facilities and secure food sources were also desired.

*Utilisation of existing infrastructure especially public transport*

*Ensuring sufficient development in existing neighbourhoods to keep them desirable and support businesses e.g. central city – land aggregation*

Brownfield and high density housing suggestions were common and included increasing density and development around brownfield suburbs, existing neighbourhoods, the central city, suburban commercial town centres and key activity centres through mechanisms, incentives and land aggregation. Similarly it was requested that recovery is supported in all existing areas including eastern suburbs because there is still desire to live there. It was suggested that community education may also be necessary to support this.

Determining sequencing and location for residential areas with the infrastructure to support it and being careful to ensure reverse sensitivity effects on regionally significant infrastructure was also noted.

*Increase density in and around existing brownfield suburbs to refresh communities, encourage business investment, enable affordable housing solutions, use existing infrastructure.*

*Educate community as to higher costs associated with transport etc. if developing in greenfield*

Housing located on quality land was desired. Suggestions for such land, included greenfields, land in the west and areas within the noise contours of the airport.

Other housing locations suggested were: TC1 land because it is easier and quicker to develop on and TC3 land, which was recognised as having bank lending and insurance issues but if this was sorted, or Government stepped in to enable the land to be bought and sold, then this would help balance housing being developed in the outskirts.

#### **4.9.2 Policy issues and constraints**

Density and development rules were an issue. It was recognised that the Regional Policy Statement has set rules in relation to intensification, number of plots and plot sizes and that this is cemented in the long term unless there is a commitment to promoting intensification.

Low level of provision for rural residential development was identified, particularly in the Selwyn District. Rural land is subsequently experiencing pressure for residential growth.

Lack of flexibility was an issue in relation to rules around housing types, zoning and locations. With no flexibility, issues of expense, time lags and insurance problems result. There was also a desire for council to become more enabling.

Prioritisation needed. Similarly, expediency, logic and efficiency in terms of staging and direction of residential growth was desired.

#### **4.9.3 Other comments**

Other comments questioned the vision for Canterbury and whether it was agreed on by the territorial authorities and what Canterbury will look like in the future. It was also noted that there are unreasonable expectations from landowners in rural areas who are seeking development opportunities.

Another comment was that there needs to be a careful balance between CBD consolidation and meeting housing choices and supply is needed and that overseas models for housing should be looked at – Vancouver for example.

#### **4.9.4 After 18 months**

These comments were varied although there was a general theme to avoid unsustainable land use patterns – that Land Use Recovery Plan should ensure this, that suburban sprawl should be avoided and that greenfield development and use of prime agriculturally productive land for housing will cause irreparable long term damage.

It was also commented that Land Use Recovery Plan may need to consider south west amenities; that confirmation of city rebuild timeframes would encourage housing development around former areas rather than the city periphery; that there is a lack of transport provision to greenfield and existing outer suburbs; that higher density housing needs accessibility to green space and streets and to be conscious of changes in transport patterns.

## **4.10 Housing location (options)**

**Comments: 27**

### **4.10.1 Housing location options**

Housing location options and suggestions generally focused on ensuring integration with transport and key activity centres although some specific land was also identified as good for locating housing. These were specific comments:

- Location to transport routes/public transport/KAC's should identify where and where not development occurs in this 10-15 year timeframe;
- Mechanisms and/or incentives to promote or allow for land assembly and comprehensive development within older, existing residential areas;
- Plans and incentives should focus on supporting centres-based urban form – KACs, and coordinating housing, community activities and transport infrastructure around them (and schools);
- Government to step in and enable TC3 Land to be bought and sold;
- Release TC1 Land;
- Do not locate houses on high quality agriculture soils (Class 1 and 2 soils);
- Locate urban growth areas and priorities by identifying constraints, hazards and the role of market forces;
- Identify 'good' land and prioritising development in these areas
- Use the CCC criteria for identification of suitable areas as assessment criteria for resource consent applications;
- Reduce the control of the airport over development

### **4.10.2 Specific policy suggestions**

A variety of specific and often process oriented suggestions were made to address policy issues and constraints:

- Paying more to speed up consenting;
- Time limited zoning;
- Prioritisation of areas for development and discouragement of development outside of such areas;
- Removing restricted covenants (which inhibit small prefabricated homes);
- Reduce compliance costs;
- Ease restriction on land zoning;
- Include the Cranford Street area within the urban boundary; relax rules of living between the four avenues;
- Flexibility in relation to urban limit restrictions particularly in the east – PC1;
- Getting rid of the RMA;

- Protect Living 1 and possibly Living 2

#### **4.10.3 More general suggestions**

Other suggestions included:

- Trusting the market;
- Being innovative and encouraging innovation;
- Carefully considering the extent and range of tools in relation to greenfield land release;
- Put rules in place to prevent settlements merging to enable maintenance of identities;
- Ensuring coordination with possible investments and that the city centre should be compacted on sound ground to minimise extension of existing city infrastructure;
- More provision of rural residential development was also desired.

### **4.11 Quality of urban design and housing (issues)**

**Comments: 30**

#### **4.11.1 Policy issues and constraints**

Planning-related issues were identified by a number of participants as having an important bearing on the quality of urban design and housing. Planning rules were seen as important, however opinion differed on their utility. One participant considered that existing city plan rules around form may stifle innovation, another that urban design rules rather than guidelines were needed urgently. One participant felt Urban Design Panels are creating delays. Quality of design in L1 and L2 areas was considered by one participant to be as important as in L3/L4 areas and the central city.

Development-related issues were of concern for a number of participants. One participant felt that good design outcomes from commercial and residential greenfield and brownfield development were difficult to achieve without additional tools and incentives. Another stated that good quality urban design was difficult to achieve with site-by-site development and that incentives could be used to encourage amalgamation of sites, for example, by allowing higher densities on big sites. Another participant echoed this view:

*Ad hoc building on smaller sites can potentially create poor built environments.*

One participant felt that developers were unable to achieve density requirements in greenfield developments due to inappropriate planning and layout of subdivisions. However, another stated there was too much micromanagement of subdivisions.

More broadly, one participant stated it was important to:

*Understand and reflect the significance of engineering solutions and design on land development. These assume greater priority than current system affords them.*

In relation to rebuilding, one participant also stated that incentives were needed:

*...to encourage more sustainable building design when rebuilding existing properties i.e enhancement and betterment that is affordable.*

### 4.11.2 Desirable design outcomes

Participants cited a range of desirable design outcomes, many relating to sustainability and “green” themes. For example one participant emphasised the importance of energy efficiency, both in terms of house design and design of the urban environment and another the importance of environmentally aware design and awareness of lifetime design. Another felt it important to carry the garden city design concept. Sustainable urban design was considered by one participant to include the promotion of the development of urban villages rather than urban sprawl. Another participant focused on healthy housing which they suggested could be achieved in co-ordination with the NZ Centre for sustainable cities, which has a considerable body of research in this area.

Design was also seen by a number of participants as important for meeting people’s needs. Housing and communities which facilitate a strong sense of community were seen as important by one participant. Another participant considered quality design was an important consideration when planning housing for temporary workers:

*Challenge of providing quantity and quality of housing, in best places, to meet expected peak of temporary workers. Don’t want to compromise quality and location given urgency.*

One participant thought quality urban design was a way of attracting people to, and keeping them in, Christchurch:

*Quality of urban space essential to attract young people/maintain workforce in increasingly mobile international labour market – key to delivering good future to high wage employees.*

One participant emphasised the importance of high quality open space within developments, as being:

*...what will attract people, vitality and vibrancy into the city? This applies to both residential (higher-density) and commercial activity.*

### 4.11.3 Other

Design-related issues were considered a high priority by several participants. One person stated that design should not be compromised for short term gain. Another, that good quality design is important if we are going to have an attractive city in the future.

One participant was concerned that design issues took precedence over all else and that there was no consideration of affordability and commercial reality in Christchurch City. Another thought design was not a fundamental issue due to the urgency of getting houses built. Another also thought design was a lower priority than other issues and stated:

*Compared to things like affordability and adequacy of housing stock, this is a relatively less important recovery matter. But that doesn’t mean we should ignore it. Minimum quality standards need to be met and good urban design encouraged but the latter is often dependent on the willingness of a developer to incorporate good urban design into residential projects.*

One participant stated urban design should apply to low density as well as higher density development and that there was too much emphasis on high density development.

One participant thought there was a lack of developer interest in architectural design or change (market change). Similarly another participant thought that:

*Developers [were] seeking smaller section sizes without housing design therefore integration and compatibility issues.*

One participant commented that:

*...rising house costs are heading towards the need to create more efficient building methodologies. This will simply mean the reproduction of standard plans and house styles which will allow housing at the market rate. This is a big issue moving forward.*

Another participant thought there were disparities in the quality of design between subdivisions and asked who should pay for urban design to be maintained where such disparities exist.

#### **4.11.4 After 18 months**

One participant called for a visionary approach in the longer term that produces housing that is “affordable, accessible, habitable, and sustainable”. Another thought it was important to achieve a range of housing options in the longer term:

*...high density, medium density, low density and rural/residential. Not everyone wants to live in terraced townhouse or 400-500 m<sup>2</sup> section!*

One participant expressed concern about residential intensification leading in the longer term to sprawl and “ghettoisation”. Another was concerned that visual amenity and long-term residential value could suffer over the longer term due to affordable/fast housing.

### **4.12 Quality of urban design and housing (options)**

**Comments: 42**

#### **4.12.1 Planning approaches**

A number of participants focused on planning approaches to development problems. One participant stated that it was important that there be:

*An emphasis on Place Making and development of current best practice guidelines on good urban development (with concessions/incentives for those that achieve high standards)*

Another participant stated that it was important to determine the densities and standards for housing that ensure good quality urban design is achieved. In relation to a perceived issue of micromanagement of subdivisions, one participant however suggested the option of removing detailed density controls. This would allow market forces to ensure variety “as can now be seen.”

Another person suggested:

*Remove unnecessary restrictive planning constraints e.g. Outline Development Plan requirements for Greenfield areas. Unrealistic for individual land owners to develop when multi landowners and cost. Councils need to prepare now because no developer can proceed without them*

Similarly, one participant advocated abolishing Urban Design Panels, claiming if the plan zoning was correct the market would control the look. Another participant commented:

*Ease off control to encourage development. Create a more flexible and less restrictive plan that enables the developers and the community to express their vision (urban design panel is uni-dimensional in its reins) avoid indecision*

A number of participants stated that incentives could be used to improve design. One participant suggested incentives could be used to encourage amalgamation of sites, for example, by allowing higher densities on big sites. Another suggested:

*Incentives to encourage more sustainable building design when rebuilding existing properties, i.e., enhancement and betterment that is affordable.*

Solar design: two comments were made concerning solar design. One participant suggested there should be a strong link between solar design and subdivision/development layout. The other suggested this could be achieved by maximising the solar orientation of all new housing developments. The Land Use Recovery Plan could provide the regulatory framework to ensure new houses are oriented towards the north for maximum solar gain.

Resource Management Act (RMA): One participant thought it was necessary to get rid of the RMA. Another that the RMA notification provisions should be amended to enable earthquake responses to be considered. A third suggested the creation of:

*...an RMA framework that is based on good environmental/design outcomes but also includes commercial realities, engineering considerations and a clear and accurate understanding of development process.*

#### **4.12.2 Specific policy suggestions**

- There should be more transparency in the Urban Design Council;
- an Urban Design Council for key city & suburban locations;
- provide for quality residential development, especially quality of life, by upholding the bar for quality developments and by developing rules for “green” development;
- urban design rules rather than guidelines are needed urgently; strong building standards and design controls are needed to ensure health, safety and best practice;
- comprehensive and integrated development of ODP areas incorporating good urban design;
- stop zoning high density miles away from central nodes;
- rules in plans;
- guidelines outside of plans;
- provide land for urban designers to go wild and enable flexibility of design and room for personal taste;
- need the ability to say no to poor design, new developments will be around for the next 50-100 years;
- support high quality urban design by creating a stronger rationale through the plan including long term sustainability, economic viability, and amenity.

#### **4.12.3 Education**

One participant thought the public should be encouraged to use the best possible design, another that the public should be educated as to what this entails, especially in relation to energy efficiency. Another person thought that, in relation to density and subdivision layout, there was a need for education concerning urban design and subdivision layout.

#### **4.12.4 Priorities**

In relation to design priorities one participant thought public transport to shops, schools, TECs should be established before housing development occurs. Another thought there should be improved accessibility for non-car modes of transport (better permeability).

Urban food systems were seen as a priority by several participants. One stated that:

*Space for food growing, fruit trees, civic agriculture is a necessity - failure to provide for this is denying the capacity for people and communities to tend to one of their most basic needs – food.*

Another participant also felt that urban environments should be designed to include spaces for community gardening and urban agriculture. In the wider context of Christchurch as a garden city one participant suggested that:

*Toning definitions, conditions on subdivisions and relevant urban design guidelines could integrate sustainable food strategies with the design of new housing areas through the incorporation of edible planting in streetscapes, space for communal food growing and social areas, public orchards and semi-wild foraging and also naturalised treatment of waste and storm water systems, streams and waterways to create habitat for increased biodiversity and aquatic wildlife.*

One participant suggested an approach to the development of such spaces:

*Direct the setup of a funded programme to coordinate the setup of community gardening and local food initiatives through the LTPs.*

#### **4.12.5 Incentives**

A number of participants suggested developing incentives that could encourage better design. One suggested working with developers to identify incentives for them to “develop better”. Another echoed this by suggesting incentives to encourage best design outcomes and diversity. A third asked:

*What can we do to help reduce development risk.*

#### **4.12.6 Other**

One participant commented that quality and affordability need to be closely aligned and that there is a possible role for the ‘Healthy Housing Index’.

#### **4.12.7 After 18 months**

Two participants emphasised the importance of connecting housing with green infrastructure. One suggested:

*Integrating Land Use Recovery Plan with NERP, e.g. ensuring that NERP has connections/networks and is accessible to housing and business areas.*

The other was also concerned with accessibility:

...providing access from housing to the NERP network of green infrastructure.

### **4.13 Natural hazards and constraints (issues)**

#### 4.13.1 Policy issues and constraints

Identification of hazards was considered to be important by a number of participants. One participant considered that rockfall and other hazards should be well defined and that standards need to be defined to protect people from such hazards. Another stated that appropriate, realistic thresholds are needed. One person suggested the effect of sea level rise on liquefaction should also be considered.

Avoidance of hazards and reduction of the effects of hazards was also considered to be important by several participants. One participant felt there is sufficient new residential land available to be able to avoid all natural hazards. Another thought there should be greater ability to discourage development in areas with natural hazard constraints. One person suggested the Land Use Recovery Plan should reduce vulnerability to hazards by incentivising protection from and avoidance of hazards.

One participant however felt that natural hazards could be overcome and should not be left out of the plan:

*Natural hazards can be overcome. Don't leave them out of the Plan i.e. Henderson and Cranford basins should be zoned special areas that have mixed development i.e. housing on higher areas, recreation and native landscape on lower areas. Final layout to be decided at zone change stage. Don't leave them as gaps in Plan.*

Another participant felt it was important for there be coordination between development plans:

*REDZONE: terminology is intimidating. Leaving out of Land Use Recovery Plan is okay, if it is clear there is a plan for it. Otherwise, who wants to develop near it? External perceptions are key and confidence will only return if there is genuine coordination of strategies.*

Other policy and action-related issues commented on: that there is a broad-brush requirement for geotech reports on every subdivision; there is a need for greater certainty around geotech investigation (to establish what type or level of investigation is required where); support is needed for residents of TC3 land facing insurance issues and loss of land value; a communication plan should be developed in conjunction with the Flood Plain Group focusing on flood plain areas, insurance (rebuilding and repairs), consenting and height levels; leniency and common sense is required from CCC and ECAN in relation to uncompleted work or construction issues, for example dust control and completion certificates.

This comment was made with regard to red zone consenting in Christchurch:

*Urgent need to address the fact the CCC staff has to agree to building consents on land in red zone> Shows that need to address these anomalies for red and other areas in relation to new city e.g. state of land, flood plain etc.*

#### 4.13.2 Other

Land drainage was seen by one participant as an important issue in the medium to long term:

*Land drainage for the medium- long term e.g. springs – do we need to consider further land employment areas where springs are a major problem?*

Building height was also seen as an important issue by one participant:

*High rise living apartments of 5-10 stories are structurally problematic as they vibrate at the same frequency as the ground beneath leading to amplitude of sway. They are dangerous and people know it.*

Solutions to TC3 land issues were considered urgent by one participant.

#### **4.13.3 After 18 months**

One participant commented that hazards need to be considered in the context of economic productivity in the longer term. Another stated that people should be better informed about future land risks and the mitigation/safety offered by alternative locations when choosing where to live. Another suggested the need to consider the impact of climate change on food systems.

### **4.14 Natural hazards and constraints (options)**

**Comments: 16**

Options suggested for the identification of hazards included: constantly review geotech requirements on all subdivisions as more information becomes available and focus on where needed; a common sense approach to geotech and NES assessments.

One participant commented that:

*the natural character of the land is not a constraint, it is a living entity we have been severed from in a number of ways*

Options for the avoidance of hazards and reduction of the effects of hazards included: in the context of climate change, take a risk-averse approach to coastal and flooding hazards so don't create more problems for 2050-2100.

In relation to risk, one participant said:

*Relax constraints imposed since the earthquake. Life a risk. Natural rock fall barriers should be allowed (trees ,bunds) / The professional are concerned with liability and now seeking belt and braces!*

Another participant suggested the following in relation to a brownfield land bank:

*Speed up processing of Brownfield sites and mechanisms to get sites on the market*

*- bring in more site resources*

Other options proposed: get rid of the RMA; include a sustainable food strategy in land use plans; use the NERP to provide high-quality environments that add value to housing and business areas and create a new "green" urban identity; need to plan much more proactively and urgently for peak oil and climate change.

One participant commented:

*TC3 – workable/fixable, the uncertainty here is cost*

#### **4.14.1 After 18 months**

One participant suggested planning for local- and place-based solutions to the impact of climate change on food systems.

Another suggested that constraints could be viewed differently longer-term:

Reassessment on the weighting of development constraints were previously seen as cost factors – should they now be regarded as permanent constraints (i.e. no-go areas)

#### **4.15 Other (issues)**

**Comments: 47**

**Government actions** - were the over-arching theme of most comments for this section; however, they were varied in content as follows. Two comments suggested that Land Use Recovery Plan- should be supportive of Council's policies and plans, as well as, identify projects that are necessary and desirable for recovery. Land Use Recovery Plan could then provide a streamlined consenting path.

Individual comments consisted of protecting special amenity areas 'SAMS' in the city plan; to use existing positive regulation and funding to protect heritage landmarks, character areas, and trees; to incorporate Red Zone land use in the recovery plan and amend RMA notification provisions to take EQ recovery into account at notification.

Once comment discussed the legal outcomes of UDS Change 1. They thought there should be no fighting with land owners and keeping them out of Environment Court and that all the costs that different parties have invested in the UDS change 1 to be compensated. They questioned the evidence of people living close to where they work and stated that the market should be left to decide through stating, 'get out of the way and let it happen.'

**Perceptions and time scales** - relayed by one commenter was that the CBD is not the thriving heart of an international city and that it should be seen as a 30 year canvas and allowed to evolve. Another suggested the need to define the wider vision for Christchurch to set the pattern for development beyond 5+ years. Additionally, there was a comment advising provision of a few years and then looking at options where infrastructure requirement is minimized for opportunities to "catch up."

**Changes for Attitudes and Terminology** - were commented on twice wherein one said that consenting authorities needed to change their attitude toward developers, while another said that the term 'recovery' implies all land in question is damaged and from an external perspective gives negative connotations. As a solution they offered the term: 'Development Strategy.' There was one comment calling for a 'Social Recovery Plan' to provide stronger focus on social wellbeing. They recommended it was necessary to focus on people ahead of profits.

**Essential plan citations, coordination and timeliness** were themes in the following comments. One comment stated it was essential for CCC city/district plan citations to be included, as well as the coordination between policymakers-providers-funders. Another expressed that it was important to get councils to stick to statutory processing times. One said that the CCC is currently undertaking Plan changes for ODP's but not rezoning and the areas in question should be rezoned at the same time to maximise the effort going into ODP's. Speeding up the planning processes was recommended and another comment stated that CERA needs to implement more staff for all councils to ensure timely processing. One comment suggested that business land should be put within urban planning.

**Better sequencing and location** for housing could be influenced by Councils' ability to 'bat away' private plan change applications outside the preferred locations, while another comment desired minimizing private plan changes.

**Pressures to the system** - included a comment about the large range of different statutory documents – making it a complex system. Another said that pressure for City Council Development Contributions discounts at a time when the budget was under massive pressure made incentives unachievable without much higher rates which were also under pressure.

**Developments - creating more certainty, education and ensuring timeliness, prioritisation and integration** were the main themes in the following comments: One comment suggested that currently brownfield developments were subsidising greenfield developments and there needs to be more certainty of where residential development is to occur. Another stated that new housing should be logically located in the context of existing infrastructure services. There was a call to look more closely at the impact of compliance costs to the delivery and cost of development (NES/GEOTECH/RFI's). One comment stated that a lack of commitment from insurers means it is impossible to get financial investment loans for developments.

There was a comment to educate developers and house building companies about the need for diversity, and a comment about ensuring that developers and council take a comprehensive approach including timeliness, prioritization and integration with business and residential land as well as for the location of workers along with employment areas and services amenities.

There were two comments on water issues - one requesting new housing developments incorporate rainwater capture and re-use and another comment requesting waste water be captured and disposed of in a sanitary manner to avoid communicable diseases.

One comment stated that more land won't solve these issues:

*remediated land subdivision buyer resistance: a) Price, b) Delivery of Title, c) Expense of (1) Foundations (2) Insurance + 30% (3) Bank equity to fund 30%; housing lost: costs are rising, land costs too high, (More land won't solve this), however DC's/reserves, create more choice through different sections;*

*Construction Difficulties-inflation-available contractor-consent compliance e.g. dust control.*

**Transport, connectivity, 'building back better'**—were thematic in the following. One comment stated that there was a need to anticipate transport networks for the increasing numbers of people in the central city. Another said that connectivity—supportive public transport and active transport planning needs to be a prime consideration and not an afterthought. There was a request to review the new bus routing to see if it is working well. Another said that high permeability and accessibility for active transport (walk and bike) and public transport and reduced accessibility for motor vehicles (thereby engaging non-car modes) was important. One commenter said it was serious to consider commuter rail and light rail options for PT and a need for the provision of cycle ways to facilitate physical activity, while rebuilding roads utilizing a "building back better" concept.

**A sustainable food strategy** for Christchurch that reserves high quality soils for arable production purposes was provided and it is included in full in the Appendix (see Bailey Perryman comment)

#### **4.15.1 After 18 months**

One comment suggested there was not enough information and that there should be reflection about what has been learned in the past two years that would better facilitate future discussions. Another suggested that post-earthquake recovery needs to consider sustainability of built environment beyond 15 years. One comment stated that there should be more concentration on Civic spaces and how they integrate into urban environments and another recommended a stronger emphasis of design guidelines and respect of context.

Another comment discussed the implications for the transport network, in light of the potential for much more car travel from fringe areas being developed, and a need to focus on “P.T. - T.D.D., rail options, etc.”

## **4.16 Other (options)**

**Comments: 27**

### **4.16.1 Policy Actions**

**Perceptual** - individual suggestions were to make consents easier to obtain; make rulings to assist those people rebuilding their homes; have disputes handled by independent organisations; adopt consultation; require no consent fees for over time processing; let the market decide what is appropriate; listen to the business community and developers; create a vision that is realistic, inclusive, and several comments called for more flexibility around decision making and enable certainty while creating opportunity.

**Environmental** suggestions were presented by one commenter as:

- *Preserve class 1 and 2 soils for agriculture, protecting it from conversion to new subdivisions or other commercial land uses*
- *Engage with key stakeholder groups including the Canterbury Community Gardens Association, Soil and Health Association (Canterbury Branch), Avon-Otakaro Network to ensure the land-use recovery plan integrates food security and access to food growing aspects with the Community Resilience Programme and social recovery objectives.*
- *In partnership with key stakeholder groups above, map urban areas suitable for community gardening, including recommendations for the integration of interim use options for the residential red zones and private property where temporary use may benefit landowners and the wider public in terms of safety and security (e.g. reduction of fire risks, vandalism, increased public amenity and social connectedness).*

Another comment stated: engage key stakeholders to ensure the land-use recovery plan integrates food security with the Community Resilience Programme and social recovery objectives Stakeholders – Canterbury Community Gardeners Association, Soil and Health Association, Garden City 2.0. Additionally, the idea to map urban areas suitable for community gardening, including recommendations for the integration of interim use options for red zones and private property was suggested and to enable and support the creation of community gardens and local food initiatives within urban areas and walking distance of all neighbourhoods = allocation of land for public use. One comment suggested that peri-urban land should be preserved for small scale agriculture as part of a Christchurch sustainable food strategy.

Another suggested to extend the concept of the GREEN Frame to develop network throughout the city to help define a range of centres assuming a polycentric city. Another comment cited Portland, Oregon as a good example of a polycentric city which would not be at the expense of the city centre. Another comment called for leaving space for events, to make Christchurch an ‘eventful’ city.

**Development** - areas for development were discussed in one comment as best to be supported ‘in the places that we want it, of the type that we want it’ while another suggested that prioritisation of places and development areas needed to support critical mass and to provide certainty.

Another commented that the prioritisation of areas for redevelopment needed to be in alignment and certainty of the infrastructure rebuild and development paired with leadership in respect to government agencies.

**Land Use Recovery Plan Process** one comment stated that 6 months will not allow development of a plan based on rigorous factual analysis of issues and that a mechanism needed to be put into place for flexibility, re: implementation and review—so that proposals of merit which do not “comply” can be properly considered.

There was also a comment calling for a “proper survey” using “proper statistical methods” to determine the communities’ wants and needs as a first priority of connecting data for Land Use Recovery Plan. There were two comments about brownfield and greenfield developments, one for government low cost loans and other incentives and one stating that to not do the easy development first, but to build the town centres in new greenfield first.

#### **4.16.2 Other**

One comment suggested that there needed to be more staff available for each stage and that everyone within the council needed to ‘play by the same rules and interpretations’. Another said that there needed to be a shift in the teaching and education system for educating the youth for future jobs of high value and the highly skilled. One comment requested a creative/fundamental shift in approach to the transport policy. They said that the current vehicle travel is singular priority and there was a need to create a system/network for choice (bike lanes, car share/bike share).

# 5 Business land - issues and options

## 5.1 Business land - overall issues and options

### 5.1.1 Shifts in location

The effects of shifts in location of businesses (and residents) from city to suburbs and from east to west came through as a significant issue. There was concern about the effects of these shifts on existing business and residential areas, especially the CBD and KACs. It was felt that shifts in business and residential locations need to be understood, planned and coordinated.

Accurate information on land supply and demand was thought to be needed to guide business relocation and development, as was information on hazard location and mitigation.

### 5.1.2 Rule changes and rezoning

Planning rules were thought to be stymying development. Many thought such rules should be loosened and become more enabling, however there was some support for imposing restrictions on use, for example on the development of suburban offices and retail to protect the CBD. Zoning was identified as a key tool. Zoning changes however need to be implemented carefully and appropriately, for example avoiding non-agricultural uses on high quality agricultural soils. The use of incentives also had support, to encourage the development of brownfield land.

### 5.1.3 Coordination and collaboration

Coordination was considered to be important, with respect to both physical locations and timing. Participants emphasised the importance of coordination: of plans (e.g., central city recovery plan and suburban master plans); of businesses (e.g., via clusters or hubs); of business centres and population centres; and of infrastructure such as transport networks.

### 5.1.4 Time scale (looking beyond 15 years)

There was concern about the long-term effects of actions implemented in the short-term under the Land Use Recovery Plan, for example former CBD businesses could remain permanently in suburban or residential areas rather than returning. Planning for long term implications of climate change was also discussed.

### 5.1.5 Topic based issues

**Availability, market functioning and location of business land** generally seems to need more future discussion to gain a better understanding of available land. Some state there is enough land while others state that there is a need for more land. There are concerns for the availability of land in the CBD; land banking issues have been raised. To avoid business fragmentation integrated business land locations such as clustering and business/industry hubs were

supported. Ensuring transport links for business land was commonly stated. There is a need to consider land in light of redistributed labour force patterns, in particular East to West relocation.

Business land locations have been suggested with brownfield land and North-West/airport areas. Many comments called for more understanding and clarification, in particular how to reduce risk for investors and developers. Zoning recommendations were made and the Suburban Centre and Master Plan tools were suggested.

**Changes in commercial centres and the central city** and in particular the current and future relationship between Key Activity Centres (KACs) and the central city was commonly commented on. Mixed use and urban design were discussed across a number of locations. Encouraging development was recommended by several and relaxing development rules was recommended by some.

**Business (industrial) land supply** comments called for timeliness in the provision of infrastructure and that building consent processes need to be sped up. Development contributions and levies were viewed as having a negative impact by some. Zoning issues covered protection of industrial land from residential influences, being appropriately styled, and market led. There was call for the Airport and North West Area to be reviewed and land supply opened up by some.

**Implications for the transport network** suggestions were aimed at identifying priorities and, then managing with flexibility (to accommodate rebuild change) and certainty. Aligning business placement with quality transport planning was commonly discussed, as well as ensuring the GCTS is included in the Land Use Recovery Plan. Changing traffic patterns needs more investigation, in particular with regard to the East West commute. A need for hub areas for freight task (rail/road) and a Lyttelton port recovery plan was requested. There was a desire to provide for cyclists and public transport.

**Business land servicing needs** focused on certainty to enable development. Network up grades and waste water infrastructure including new pump stations were specific projects referred to. Sequencing and timing are important issues. Outline development plans were considered prohibitive by some developers. Comments discussed the need for new, innovative and sustainable options.

**Natural hazards and constraints** had very few comments in this section.

**Other** comments mainly discussed issues about streamlining or simplifying bureaucratic processes.

## **5.2 Availability, market functioning and location of business land (issues)**

**Comments: 76**

### **5.2.1 Land Availability**

**Understanding supply and demand** for commercial centres, brownfield sites as well as understanding the relationships with population movements, infrastructure, business needs, relocations, land availability and location options was recognised as issues. Two comments were made that land availability for the next 18 months is adequate (both in Selwyn and the City).

*Now & Ongoing: Understanding of Supply and Demand within sub-markets in Res and Bus. Business – Commercial activity in existing brownfields, centres. – Wet industries. – Large space activities, transport/storage, large format retail. Connectivity and Transport Infrastructure in North West.*

*Business land type to meet modern market needs and consumer employment needs and changes over time.*

**Supply of land** particularly in the CBD was identified as a concern. There was a concern that areas of business zoned land is in the control of a few companies and the supply is limited, or “rationed” to maintain or maximise prices. Reduced supply of land was also stated to be placing great demands on using rural land for business activities resulting in illegal businesses. Similarly, comments relating to land banking issues were made.

*Anecdotal evidence from some sources that a disproportionate share of the land supply is taken up by only very few developers and that is “rationed” in release to the market in order to maximise prices and profitability.*

**Affordability** comments were made. Sufficient availability of business land was thought to keep land prices down. It was also suggested that zone rules need to be realistic and that we need to ensure development levies do not stymie business development. Rental costs for tenants need to be affordable and the market needs confidence for the next 10-15 years – the cost will depend on the supply although value needs to be retained.

### **5.2.2 Integrated business land locations**

**Clustering and business/industry hubs** were supported to avoid fragmentation. These need to be complementary businesses; industrial and residential use and commercial and industrial activities were cautioned against due to issues such as noise and smell of industry for residents and being very different activities. Similarly, reverse sensitivity issues may arise, for example residential land that encroaches on business land. Business land uses also need to be provided for – particularly land uses associated with bulky materials.

*Fragmentation of industry/business – develop business hubs.*

*Commercial and industrial activities very different*

**Ensuring transport links** for business land was commonly stated. Clustering businesses around transport infrastructure was identified as being important to ensure accessibility, sustainable transport patterns, self-sufficiency, efficiency and rapid connectivity between land use and freight. A specific example where land is not utilized due to having no transport connection was given and illustrates the implications of not connecting with transport links.

*Tools, incentives, plans need to support and direct business development to support the transport and services infrastructure and population distribution.*

**Business location with consideration of population patterns** in terms of where workers live, impacts on lifestyles, where schools are located and general growth and re-distribution patterns.

*Identify needed land having regard to redistributed labour force patterns*

### 5.2.3 Business land locations

**Brownfield land and North-West/airport areas** were suggested. The land in the North West was recognised as being solid land and that the airport control over development needs to be reduced. There was also a suggestion to implement the North West Review Area. In contrast, peri-urban and urban land – particularly those with high class soils, was stated as needing to be preserved for food growing. Looking into alternative uses for brownfield, less accessible or less desirable industrial areas was also suggested.

**Suburban business land location issues** were identified. Many businesses have established in suburban centres and residential areas and in most case have a medium to long-term lease but there is uncertainty as to what happens when these temporary consents expire in 2016. It was also commented that car park requirements is driving development of centres and affecting ability to rebuild viably.

*Location of business – supply & demand: Many businesses now established in suburban centres/residential areas (largely through the Order in Council which runs to 2016). Business owners will in many cases have medium to long-term leases and have invested significantly in these locations. Residential tolerance for this situation getting less. How will business be directed? Where to? Incentives? Council could have a real issue seeking to enforce these operations.*

Businesses currently locating in existing premises or out of zones was also identified as undermining the rebuild of centres in Master Plans and that this has a flow on effect of illustrating a lack of leadership and certainty for investors. Similarly businesses located in the suburbs were identified as having implications for the CBD. There was a desire to restrict retail, mall, suburban development and the spread of offices outside the central city.

**Shift from East to West issues** were identified. Concerns about quality of land in Eastern Christchurch is causing a lot of movement of industrial businesses to the West which has implications particularly for infrastructure and questions were asked as to whether wet industries, for example, move and where to.

*Industrial land supply – identify what needs, use, more accurately and provide for alternatives other than west Christchurch e.g. North ChCh (Belfast) e.g. for 'wet industries' where no provision budgeted for infrastructure servicing*

### 5.2.4 Policy issues and constraints

**Need to improve understanding and gain clarification** around a variety of issues. This included:

- Query in relation to supply of CBD land for redevelopment;
- Query as to why land supply is not equating to business units;
- Desire to improve understanding of realistic 'out of centre' industrial land demand and resolve uncertainty around availability;

- Clarity sought over aquifer protection in NW of city;
- Complete expansion of Economic Futures Model to include all of greater Christchurch to better understand the economy risk implications;
- Determine the significance of conglomeration economics in Christchurch and input this to business land policy development;
- The timing and price of CBD vacant land following CERA compulsory acquisition process;
- Need to quantify the amount of small-medium enterprises operating out of residential and how much space will be required when temporary consents expire in 2016.

**Reducing risk for investors and developers** through understanding constraints for development such as transport, infrastructure, reverse sensitivity and other barriers and providing co-ordination, incentives and creating certainty. It was also suggested that Councils need to take on an enabling and pioneering culture.

*Reduce risk for investors and developers: Be Bold and Clear: Need to deliver greater certainty on: Land (availability and cost-includes existing used land), Finance (capital/insurance pay outs), Infrastructure (timing and scale quality), tenantability*

**More generally** it was stated that the RMA deters land development.

### **5.3 Availability, market functioning and location of business land (options)**

**Comments: 20**

#### **5.3.1 Zoning**

Recommendations were made in relation to restricting retail, mall, office and suburban development outside of the central city; and airport zoning was contested. It was also suggested that zoning of business land close to urban fabric is allowed, such as adopting recommendations for PC1 to allow for development in the Cranford Basin. It was also noted that the Regional Policy Statement and identification of Key Activity Centres is outdated and provides hurdles which limits development in new growth areas.

#### **5.3.2 Suburban Centre and Master Plan**

Tools were suggested. More power to facilitate development in damaged centres was desired as well as more statutory weight given to council, community master plans and registration plans for suburban centres. The Suburban Centres/Master plan process was stated to need to be implemented by the City Council and the relevant district plan parts of these non-statutory documents to be incorporated into the City Plan without going through a Schedule 1 process.

#### **5.3.3 Incentives**

Incentives were suggested for enabling private businesses to move back to the CBD and more generally to help reduce the risk for developers and investors. Incentivising businesses to stay in the East as well as ensuring land is readily serviced to support businesses in the East was also suggested.

#### **5.3.4 Other suggestions**

Included using S27 to increase business land supply and requiring malls to provide more public space when expanding or developing.

## **5.4 Changes in commercial centres and central city (issues)**

**Comments: 43**

### **5.4.1 Key activity centres (KACs)**

Comments received were mostly related to the relationship between KACs and the central city and the growth and development of suburban commercial centres (KACs). There were also some comments on specific KACs.

Relationship of KACs to central city: several comments expressed concern about the relationship between development in the KACs and the central city. One comment stated that the growth of suburban commercial centres should be balanced against the desire for recovery of the central city. Another commented that it is important to have:

*An understanding of key commercial and industrial areas, including town/suburban centres and their relative roles and functions, including in relation to the central Christchurch area.*

With respect to relationships between the central city, suburban and city edge business locations, one participant thought it was necessary to be realistic about what type of businesses will go back to the central city. They thought it was important to consider competitive advantage and to not put unrealistic restrictions on locations of businesses that were unlikely to be set up in the city centre. Another participant felt there was a lack of business coherence due to the relocation of businesses in suburbs. Hubs and networks were lacking. Another felt new development outside the CBD or Town Centres was detracting from these centres.

Growth and development of suburban commercial centres: With regard to the future development of KACs, one participant emphasised the importance of planning to enable market-led expansion of existing commercial centres. Another commented there will continue to be uncertainty around commercial centres. The identification of key activity centres and definition of their location and spatial extent was considered important in another comment. One comment stated that the creation of the red zone, and the resulting population movements which are associated with the opening up of large areas of greenfield land, meant that the commercial centres framework needed to be entirely reviewed. This view was shared by another participant:

*Review the Centres Strategy – if ICAC’s are used – define what they are;  
Review in light of population changes; Enable change.*

Several participants thought the future development of KACs could provide opportunities for change. For example, one participant suggested a broader mix of use is possible, including large scale commercial activity and residential development, resulting in a move away from retail. Another felt such changes should be planned for:

*Assessment and plans for Key Activity Centres for interrelated business, residential (sp?) intensification and required transport and network improvements/restoration.*

One participant cautioned there was a need to protect KACs from “out of centre” growth across the whole area, another that the growth of key commercial centres needs to tie in with neighbourhood plans, e.g., in the Hornby area, key growth, residential and business land.

It was suggested however by one participant that not all suburban centres were suitable for future development:

*Complete round of strategies for suburban centres **BUT** make realistic assessment of prospects and if necessary strategize to transition lesser centres to alternative land uses (premised on prospect insufficient suburban activity in total to “revitalize” all damaged centres...develop implementation plans (sequencing and funding).*

One participant submitted an extensive explanation of perceived flaws in the KAC framework and this is reproduced in full in the appendix. (See Appendix - Brooke McKenzie comment)

Comments on specific KACs: One participant was concerned that the Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres were suffering from prolonged delays in the resolution of building safety issues and felt that a flight of commercial and retail business activity seemed likely. Another participant was also concerned about impediments to the redevelopment of the same centres, as well as about the protection of the heritage values of those centres. Along similar lines, another participant commented that town centres within Waimakariri District should be encouraged to have a district identity which sets them apart from other places.

#### **5.4.2 CBD development**

Some comments focused on the relocation of business activity away from and back into the CBD. One participant thought it important to ask what types of firms don't suit the CBD and where those that don't should go. Another participant observed that time frames need to be set for the rebuild of the city centre, otherwise it will be hard to bring business back to the city centre. Further to this, another commented stated:

*Some at least of business relocation to suburbs is temporary — has to encourage return to CBD - ‘trends’ etc. from stats may be misleading and not helpful to CCRP.*

These comments were specific to the CBD:

*CBD. Developments restricted minimum 7500m<sup>2</sup>*

*Multi-owners may not be agreeable to be a part of overall development.*

*Encouraging and facilitating Central City Development. It's going well, but it needs to be sped up to encourage investment in commercial, business, retail and other developments.*

*Costs associated with height restrictions for hotel developments.*

*Need to provide for effective and well-designed mixed use developments.*

#### **5.4.3 Policy issues and constraints**

Suburban master plan issues: One comment stated that suburban master plans should not take precedence over other work or the central city rebuild. Another participant was concerned about integration with council (CHCH city) master plans. Another said:

*CCC's finalised suburban master plans – agreed council/community regulatory changes must be fast tracked.*

Mixed use: One comment suggested there be a mix of residential, retail and commercial use, e.g., in New Brighton. Another stated it was important for the vibrancy of the central city that more offices and retail be allowed in the mixed use zone – these are being forced out.

Urban design issues: One comment stated that good urban design should be encouraged but that development should not be constrained because of it – there is a fine line to tread. Another

comment stated that urban design rules were needed urgently, rather than guidelines, and that master plans should be used to give statutory effect through the Land Use Recovery Plan.

#### **5.4.4 Other**

One participant commented that there was reluctance by building owners to make decisions. Two participants were concerned about transport issues. One participant thought PT/Active transport accessibility was important. The second commented:

*Need to consider commuting to avoid future transport issues i.e. workforce and business land closely related.*

One participant thought certainty of location of employment was important. Another was concerned about the health and wellbeing effects of commercial centres:

*This has an impact on the surrounding community and should not always be considered the 'centre' of each community, more often schools are this centre, for many more reasons. Land-use and market functions might lead to better health outcomes for people and the environment if they are considered in this light - how does this decision impact on the health and wellbeing of people and their communities... i.e. the purpose of the RMA.*

#### **5.4.5 After 18 months**

One participant thought temporary consents could cause longer term problems:

*Difficulty with temporary consents for businesses relating due to earthquake. 4yrs (to 2016) timeframe not always realistic/ given cost of set up.*

Another participant commented on possible undesirable long term issues:

*Some commercial centres have failed due to excess business land e.g. New Brighton blighted for decades due to excess low value retail space (discourages new investment) likewise Sydenham has been poor—ravaged by Malls in West/North.*

Longer term effects of lack of coordinated planning was considered to be an issue by another participant:

No agreed hierarchy of commercial centres below KAC's means no common view of how large and what purpose each centre should play leading to damaging competition and inefficient investment infrastructure and amenity by council.

## **5.5 Changes in commercial centres and central city (options)**

**Comments: 21**

### **5.5.1 Policy and actions**

Several participants commented on the need to encourage development. One participant felt there needed to be a mechanism for facilitating/enabling development. Another echoed this view, commenting that development should be encouraged by relaxing development rules and allowing extra land, rather than being discouraged by difficult consent processes. Similarly, another

comment called for no false caps or restrictions. One comment stated that development should be encouraged in some KACs, e.g., Hornby and Kaiapoi.

Other participants however cautioned against undermining the central city. Two participants thought that office growth should be constrained in suburban areas, one stating that:

*Suburban Centers should be limited in their ability to compete with the City for major office use. Offices should not be permitted in Industrial areas. The CBD will recover well with the CCDU plan.*

One comment stated concern that central city and KAC offices and retail should not be undermined.

### 5.5.2 Other

**Market-related options:** one participant thought that the market (tenants) will decide. Another participant thought the CBD had a competitive advantage. Another thought it was necessary to manage the release of supply of land in greater Christchurch to some extent to ensure sufficient demand in the CBD to give investors confidence.

**Key Activity Centres (KACs):** One participant thought KACs should not have lettable area caps as this can distort the function of the KAC. Another suggested looking at office distribution because at the moment it is easier to develop outside the CBD than within it. Refiguring suburban activity centres to integrate public/civic space with private retail and transport hubs was suggested in another comment.

One comment called for incorporation of food growing areas into commercial and retail areas for employee health and wellbeing.

### 5.5.3 Next 18 months

With respect to the relationship between central city business provision and “out-of-centre” provision one comment stated that enabling and realistic planning provisions would provide a realistic approach to managing this relationship in the longer term.

With respect to longer term development of centres, one participant thought that there was a role for public bodies to facilitate and enable a market-led expansion of existing zoned centres, based on sub-regional/KACs centres. Another participant suggested the promotion of mixed use and better transport integration within sub regional centres, similar to Business Zone B Auckland or Styx Centre ODP.

*The use of LTP and investment-based implementation programmes for approved town centre/suburban centre plans and strategies was suggested in another comment.*

## 5.6 Business and industrial land supply (issues)

**Comments: 46**

### 5.6.1 Policy and Actions

Several key themes emerged under this section.

**Timeliness.** There was a desire for greater certainty regarding the timing, availability and processes regarding the provision of infrastructure and sequencing of business relocation. Participants noted that the building consent process appeared to be delaying the timeframe and the ability of landowners to bring new sections to the market.

**Development contributions** and levies were seen as having a negative impact on industrial development, forcing industry to leave. However, one participant suggested increasing development contributions for business developed outside the CBD. The differences in development contributions on greenfield development compared to brownfield were questioned by one participant.

*Policies for changing development contributions seem to favour greenfield development rather than brownfield. Are councils using this as a 'money maker' rather than cost recovery? Wouldn't it be lower cost to develop brownfield?*

**Zoning.** Several participants were concerned over the development of long term or permanent businesses in residential areas. The appropriate location and use of zoned land were discussed.

Industrial development and business needs were a common theme. This included the need for the protection of industrial land from non-industrial uses, the appropriate design for purpose including air and water discharge consents, and the use of incentives and barrier removal to release more industrial land.

Likewise, the need for appropriate styled businesses for each zone was raised by another participant, particularly, limiting the use of office space in Business Zone 4; and avoiding non-food producing business on high quality agriculture soils.

Market led vs. government planned business location and development was raised by a couple of participants. One participant recommended rezoning ample land and allowing market-led growth. While another participant cautioned that there is already an excess of zoned business and its location could be problematic which has emerged as a consequence of market led rather than plan-led development.

**Other comments relating to policy and actions** included: the importance of open discussion with all key staff (including Wiamakariri DC Planning Action group); urgency regarding the need for business land decision making by CERA; and the opportunities for 'hubs' outside the city centre.

*Determine potential for out of CBD innovation precincts/zones and candidate locations as basis for prioritised public realm investment.*

*Sufficient business land to enable a shift towards greater self-sufficiency with a focus on satellite towns.*

**Airport and the North West Area Review.** The removal of airport noise restriction without curfew concerns for the airport was suggested for increasing business land. Several participants commented on the 'clarification' sought by the CIAL for development of non-air related business within Dakota Park. The importance of the airport as an asset was also questioned by a couple of participants, questioning it as a strategic asset, rezoning requirements, and its low return to CCC.

*If strategic infrastructure means "strategic asset" then its referring to CIAL and Lyttelton Port. CIAL in particular is a white elephant, however there are ways to create a profitable future and a balance with neighbours and redevelopment of business and residential to the west on the TC1 land.*

*...Ironically the Airport has 80 hectares of industrial which they wish to open to all business park tenant types (against their zoning). This development falls within the 57 – 62dbn ldn area. Ironically the CCC has to go through a huge process to rezone 100 HA for business to the west for land not currently within*

*the 50dbn ldn noise contours. Something is certainly wrong where we protect a dying asset returning \$ 3 million in dividend to CCC shareholder this year.*

One suggestion was the make the airport create a runway 1500 metres out so there is not a need for special zoning.

### 5.6.2 Supply and Demand

Several participants commented on the supply (and demand) for business purposed land, particularly in the west. One participant felt there was sufficient supply for the next 18 months, while another indicated there was a lack of business land supply within the urban limits in WDC. One participant stated that although the supply of land was adequate, infrastructure was questioned.

**Movement and relocation of business.** This was a theme that emerged with several implications that need to be understood and planned for. In particular, eastern based industries (Bromley and Woolston) received focussed attention, with one participant noting the high demand for wet industry, and the need to find appropriate alternative locations. The lack of industrial land negatively impacts new business growth. Environmental concerns and whether people are land banking also need to be identified and resolved.

*Availability of land to ensure (particularly wet) industry that needs to relocated can do so within city so we don't lose business to other centres.*

Other issues discussed included: the movement of light industries out of the central city and affecting mixed use; the changing location of existing and future business and the location of the workforce; and the effect of movement to Selwyn on the Central City.

*Selwyn has been very business friendly with attracting businesses to i Zone since no DC's and aggressive marketing but is it good for ChCh if this moves companies from Woolston/Bromley, etc. and makes harder for low cost housing for workers.*

### 5.6.3 Other

**Design.** A couple of participants commented on applying urban design principles to large scale industrial or commercial developments. Another participant urged the careful consideration of the aesthetic and wellbeing appeal of the city, particularly where intensification is considered. One participant commented that high density commercial centers and hubs is not appropriate as a solution, particularly given the current size and accessibility of Christchurch.

*Consider mental and physical health of workers, green space/food, access/parking, transport modes, Garden City as a choice for choosing to work in Christchurch area.*

Another participant commented that while the Land Use Recovery Plan is intended for short term decision making, the implications will have long term effects, so decisions should be made carefully.

**Other comments** included the importance of identified brownfield land as an area of redevelopment; and the utilization of current employment modes were discussed.

*Promote better utilisation of existing employment modes where employment densities/infrastructure already in place. Key modes Christchurch Airport/ Izone/ Southbrook/ LPC/ Bromley*

One participant identified the damage suffered by the tourism industry.

*...Tourism won't ever recover to pre quake levels although "quake tourism" is developing. We never were a destination. We were simply a city people had to fly into to get to where they really wanted to go. Queenstown is taking huge traffic from Christchurch Airport and if they get their act together it will increase further. There are many factors involved and a huge conference centre and huge covered stadium are going to do SFA to change a trend already started before the Qvents.*

#### **5.6.4 After 18 Months**

A variety of topics were discussed in this section, with most focusing on the future growth of industry and business, such as the need to encouraging short term, high standard solutions for the growth of the earthworks industry and the need for more affordable commercial units. However, one participant expressed concern that the airport would take over too much employment, negatively impacting the central city.

There is a perceived lack of good drainage contractors.

One participant commented over the exclusion of business land in the UDS and identified a need to address this (Including the types and locations of business). Another participant expressed the importance of the re-emergence of the CBD as a thriving retail, entertainment and accommodation hub.

### **5.7 Business and industrial land supply (options)**

**Comments: 11**

#### **5.7.1 Policy issues and constraints**

One participant recommended increasing development contributions for those establishing businesses outside the CBD. The use of barrier-removal and incentives was suggested for the release of more industrial land.

**Increasing land supply**, in the right location, was commented on. One participant suggested there was adequate supply of business land, particularly considering the use of the Airport and Waterloo Park. The type and distribution of the business land needs to be assessed holistically, including population, growth location, and availability of land. Another participant suggested avoiding oversupply of land to ensure business moves back into the CBD.

**Other.** Several participants suggested clustering businesses to improve the economy; one participant suggested identifying unused brownfield land to develop before greenfield land; and the identification of industry priorities beyond the rebuild.

One participant recommended

*...supply businesses first with a lesson on life-cycle analysis, then question them on whether their business is worthy of land supply.*

### **5.8 Implications for the transport network (issues)**

**Comments: 30**

#### **5.8.1 Policy Issues and Constraints**

**Identification, prioritisation, (with) flexibility, certainty and actively managed.** A recommendation was made that identification and prioritisation of key transportation issues

should be part of Land Use Recovery Plan. Transportation management needs to be flexible to facilitate rebuild one comment said, while another stated that there was a need to provide certainty (or greater certainty) of local and central government funding in infrastructure and community facilities to encourage investment. Another said that the certainty of CSM2 was occurring and has the effect of deferring decisions on land alongside or located nearby. And, another made the comment that to allow 20 years of certainty to allow new plant development to provide for planning.

One comment stated that the transport network needs to be more actively managed by area wide traffic control. Another stated it was important to promote patience and understanding of change in network pressures with local residence. One comment stated that area wide management must take into account the impact of road works and localised demand patterns in an ongoing way. And, another said that it might be best to improve transport management and functioning in the short term and then recognise the new transport patterns. One comment said traffic management was needed for the west side, Memorial Avenue and the Airport into town and that road workers should be working double shifts.

**Alignment, streamlining** - One comment suggested that aligning factory placement alongside suitable workers would flow through to the transport network. Another said streamlining of functions was needed between route planner, infrastructure provider and the RCA. They also suggested that a commissioned partner's arrangement would help to deal holistically with regional public transport and active transport.

The change in transport patterns between new residential hubs and business hubs was commented on, as well as, that road projects were not receiving funding at the appropriate times. Another requested hub areas for freight task (rail/road) and another claimed that heavy port traffic must be separated from local traffic at Lyttelton by incorporating a Lyttelton port recovery plan or some other mechanism.

### 5.8.2 Other

Various - One comment suggested that a review of the historical discussions by NZTA/C amends should be considered in view of EQ relocation of businesses and population. Various other issues raised were about the location of buses; equity of access; identification of road up grades such as Wigram/Magdala Place needing urgent implementation; improve the public transport system and encourage more people to use it (reducing air pollution); ensure easy and equitable access to food growing and food buying opportunities (to avoid food deserts).

Future and Recovery transport - recovery transport corridors for large construction/demolition traffic that recognise community and business interests was suggested in one comment, while another said there is a need for transport and freight routes supporting business land. Another commented that if land use is encouraged to move from East to West, there will be big costs of transport infrastructures (both cost of building new and cost of abandoning old/existing infrastructure and not just roads). Various individual comments were for a need to accept lower levels of service on transport network until the adequate improvements are in place; pressures on residential/local roads and streets, through traffic, parking; protect key future PT [or] at least keep rail (light or heavy) or mass transit systems as a possibility; and seriously consider rail and light rail options for PT.

### 5.8.3 After 18 months

The following are all various comments by individuals: peak hour commuter impacts need to be understood and managed (issue related to commercial land and residential locations); enable a freight network [that was] partly accomplished in RTA; recognise the significant movement of workers into satellite towns and understand what types of businesses they travel to and the

implications for peak hour traffic (and provision of public transport); implement/provide funding for major infrastructure in attractions that will facilitate private sector investment; access to airport for goods and people; accelerate CSM2 by 1 year; coordinate business development with transport network improvements and ask 'what is the Greater transport plan for Christchurch post-quake, and is there any change?'; provide alternate parking within development and upgrade roads; more **investigation** needed into greater efficiencies in existing networks i.e. rail; need to change high employment use and be in central city and/or at nodes—T.D.D. as less reliance on car for commuting; and post census review the journey to work and other trends and reassess transport strategic transport options.

## **5.9 Implications for the transport network (options)**

**Comments: 18**

**Linking** - There must be a link to public transport and incentivising the use of PT for major employers according to one comment. They also insisted that it was crucial for cycling access and provision for cyclists' needs (showers, storage, etc.) in business parks. Another comment stated that it was vital to implement PT cycle provision to a level where it is very attractive and lending support to implement the Christchurch Trans Strategic Plan.

Another comment stated that an Ilam to City cycling route would be the best demonstration of cycle commuting. And, another said there was a need to connect industrial developments into transport network – and put requirements on developers around this; and one comment stated that proximity of housing to industry/business was important to transport infrastructure. There was a comment that said link into GCTS and that it was as much about waste water as network constraints on business recovery.

**Change** - Stop building roads was one comment. Another said changing transport patterns will need to be addressed. CRETS and CSM2 should be accelerated where possible because Brougham Street will need upgrading soon and that cross town e.g. Merivale to anywhere for workers is really frustrating according to one comment.

**Various** - some individual comments were listed as follows: East to West commute?; location of business; accessibility Port Rail; Highways; Airport; Workforce; Balance Highway Road Network; Rail; Integration of Transport Modes; Clusters of uses around Transport Modes.

Another stated that governance to coordinate whole Network including funding, L.A. & P.T. & Rail, Sea, Road, and Air. One comment said (roads of national significance) RONS not sterilising land for business - allow for access points.

## **5.10 Business land servicing needs (issues)**

**Comments: 28**

### **5.10.1 Sequencing and Timing**

**Prioritisation** was desired. Identification of 'winners' such as those most easily serviced was suggested before then looking at sequencing and timing. Suggested priorities included:

- Network upgrades;
- Waste water infrastructure including new pump stations;
- Commercial activity in the central city to attract implementation of the central city plan.
- Funding priorities were also suggested in the order of: levels of service to suburbs, water supply, waste water, housing (low income and social responsibilities).

**More certainty** in terms of timing of infrastructure was desired. A specific example noted that council requirements of Outline Development Plans for new businesses in greenfield areas was onerous for land owners and developers and created delays and uncertainties.

**Timing and coordination** was desired. Servicing existing and future areas in a timely manner was desired but also coordinated timing such as commercial development timing with the fibre broadband roll out, or ensuring coordination of infrastructure connectivity, sewage, water and transport for commercial land. The delay of development levy payments until development is operational or there is an agreed timeframe was also suggested.

*Medium/Short: Need to provide infrastructure providers with certainty and direction to allow prioritisation. Places, timing and sequencing.*

### **5.10.2 Policy issues and constraints**

Existing use policy and consenting issues were identified. Greater flexibility and no unnecessary constraints were desired.

### **5.10.3 Other comments**

There were also a few comments relating to transport: access to public transport could include paths through residential areas if it provides direct access to busses; provision of rail and provision of cycle ways to encourage and facilitate physical activity.

## **5.11 Business land servicing needs (options)**

**Comments: 11**

### **5.11.1 Options**

Opportunities for new, innovative and sustainable options for servicing were queried, and suggested. Two specific suggestions for innovation were in relation to storm water management and industrial business waste water and air; an eco/sustainability ethos was suggested for the airport. Resilient trade waste was also stated. Similarly, the “building back better” concept was suggested when rebuilding roads in relation to provision of cycle ways.

*Are there new/different ways for processing industrial businesses waste water and air—to enable new areas to be opened up to this type of business?*

*Provide direction on modern approaches to connecting buildings with infrastructure networks for efficient servicing and resilience*

Other suggested actions included:

- Identify businesses that are suitable for mixed use areas;
- Address existing use problems by not having to prove previous buildings were lawfully established and by removing the 6 month limit;
- Provide more controls and requirements on developers/owners;
- Enable or empower investment identification and roll-out business support infrastructure in alignment to priority areas for recovery;
- Public bodies to support projects on business that enables self-supporting and not dependent on greater public body decision making and infrastructure provision;
- Address consenting issues (e.g. chimneys, waste) for relocating factories;
- Urban consolidation – establish businesses close to existing urban fabric to reduce servicing costs;

- Ensuring an eye to the future is kept, and to undertake a future study for CHCH business; Other suggestions were related to specific services – a variety of food services including healthy food, provision of recreation, amenities and green spaces for workers to take breaks in.

## **5.12 Natural hazards and constraints (issues)**

**Comments: 9**

Comments on the effect of natural hazards on business land use were mostly concerned with the need for information on hazards for businesses to guide development or with increased costs to businesses due to natural hazards. One participant commented that:

*The Land Use Recovery Plan needs to be totally clean and unequivocal on where land use is encouraged and where it is otherwise prohibited, i.e., if there are “no-go” areas then let’s say that so we don’t waste time contending use/development there.*

In relation to increased costs, one participant thought insurance costs were limiting the ability of businesses to relocate or establish in Christchurch. Another commented on the importance of:

*Acknowledging increased cost of building in some areas – need to balance desirability of location, work force location, costs and reluctance to re-negotiate consents, risk.*

Most other comments from participants related to specific land and water hazards and constraints.

**Land hazards:** One participant thought ground condition knowledge was important. Another participant thought lightweight construction options for soft land were needed.

**Water hazards:** One participant was concerned about the availability of land for industrial activities above known aquifers without discharge constraints. Another was concerned that industrial development over unconfirmed aquifers be avoided. In relation to water hazards in general, one participant commented:

*Develop policies of [sic] rules for sea level rise and tsunami’s.*

*Re-examine flood risks, high river flows/tides.*

**Other comments:** Connect new business zones to network upgrade NERP.

### **5.12.1 After 18 months**

The long term effects of climate change such as sea level rise were commented on by three participants. One participant was concerned about the effects of climate change and fossil fuel availability on agriculture and food systems. The second commented that land use designations must be cognisant of potential sea-level impacts over the next 60-70 years. The third participant concerned about sea level rise saw the problem in the context of possible future urban/suburban form:

*Infrastructure lifeline- will infrastructure rebuild of lifeline set urban/suburban form on trajectories that will be problematic w/r/t unsustainable Greenfields development and sea-level rise issues.*

Another participant was also concerned about the longer term effects of such development on agriculture:

*Need strict controls on development in areas of good-quality agricultural soils. These are also potential areas of aquifer groundwater recharge.*

**Other comments:** Artificial and problematic division between short term and long term priorities; it is important that longer term insurance and finance costs be at the same or similar cost to the rest of New Zealand; economic opinions for land remediation are unclear and assessments vary widely.

### **5.13 Natural hazards and constraints (options)**

**Comments: 10**

The range of suggestions were from broad to quite specific ideas. One participant commented it is important to avoid or mitigate hazards, another that insurance was important.

More specifically, industrial land in the east was suggested by one participant as a potential source of cheap land for business use. Another participant suggested looking at international examples (impacts, land supply needs). Another commented that it is important to not forget adequate building standards.

Finally, one person made the observation that:

*Nothing new here except that some people are thinking that the earthquakes have finished!*

### **5.14 Other (issues)**

**Comments: 52**

#### **5.14.1 Policy issues and constraints**

Planning processes, particularly consents, but also attitudes and responsiveness of council (not enabling) and general 'roadblocks' were identified as creating time lags, inefficiency and causing frustration. The cross-over of documents and wide range of applicable statutory documents was also noted to be overly complex. A streamlined or simplified process, particularly for consenting, was desired.

*Regulatory processes: Need to streamline processes as much as possible ex. Streamlined consenting one-stop-shop consenting hub. Reduce cross-over in docs. Alignment critical.*

#### **5.14.2 Environmental issues and opportunities**

Christchurch was stated as needing to lead by example in the rebuild. Promotion of true sustainable development such as walkable neighbourhoods connected by public transport; environmental standards; be an eco-city; zero carbon goals and "green" industry was suggested. It was noted that this would require collaboration. Protection of Christchurch aquifers was also desired. It was also commented that there is still an emphasis on private transport.

### **5.14.3 Vision and sustainability**

A number of comments alluded to a vision and reference was made to the issue of how to separate recovery from longer term sustainability. A vision in terms of a clear statement of the future form of Christchurch was identified as being needed to be able to then inform a pathway of action and consider what is needed to achieve that vision. It was also observed that this vision needs to align with other various recovery strategies.

### **5.14.4 Integration with other plans and strategies**

It was stated that Land Use Recovery Plan needs to inform, and be informed by other recovery programmes and plans – both those being implemented, and those being developed. The alignment of the various recovery strategies is important for the vision as noted above, but also more generally for certainty and clarity. It was recognised that we need to work together – that it's not a competition.

One comment was sceptical about the process:

*Will the UDS partner's version of PCI be adopted as the recovery plan or will ECAN actually consult in good faith? Recent history suggests that ECAN will not consult in good faith.*

### **5.14.5 Integrated land use planning**

The relationship between business land and residential land with location of workers, accessibility to employment and service amenities was identified. It was suggested that location of residential and business land should be guided by infrastructure and supported by new investment and that this may require controlled development and land zoning decisions. This is important for retaining and attracting investment and would be assisted by the provision of early information and certainty on land-use priority areas, phasing and timing of development.

*Land Use Recovery Plan needs to provide early info and certainty on land-use priority areas (Res and Bus) including phasing and timing of development (incl. areas only released when needed). Critical to inform infrastructure rebuild decisions, including decisions being made now*

### **5.14.6 Need for understanding and clarity**

Understanding in relation to expected demographics and business changes (particularly for the East and red zoned business land) and the desired urban form of Christchurch was sought. Confirmation and clarity around existing green field spaces was also sought.

Uncertainty around insurance and pay outs was identified as an issue as it constrains business recovery decisions. Insurance was stated as needing to be quantified and qualified in terms of the scale of the issue.

### **5.14.7 Density, mixed use, incentives and disincentives**

Density, mixed use and innovation around this was desired, along with incentives for developers and investors. It was, however, recognised by one participant that the pressure on the CCC for development contribution incentives is a significant affordability issue for council.

### **5.14.8 Residential land**

Greenfield residential land was identified as being expensive and that a range of residential offerings aimed at the various life cycle including properties that are affordable but also option of these being in greenfield was noted.

### 5.14.9 Other comments

There was a range of very varied comments including: descriptions of a city that inspires or appeals, sewer/storm water issues, opportunities for education, recreation and tourism, for Land Use Recovery Plan to produce a budget funded by priority, what can Land Use Recovery Plan offer to local and national businesses to reduce offshore appeal, need to avoid triplication of solutions and be mindful of the impact of repair on economic performances of businesses.

## 5.15 Other (options)

*Comments: 25*

### 5.15.1 Options

**Policy and planning process** options suggested were:

- Streamline regulatory processes;
- ECAN must continue to be managed by Commissioners;
- Take consultation seriously;
- UDS partners plan should not be adopted;
- PC1 version as adopted by commissioners should be starting point.

**Density and mixed use options** suggested were to have density centres for the CBD; centres with different intensities and mixed uses; and edge large box businesses with mixed uses.

**Incentives and disincentives** tax and finance incentives were suggested for private investors when developing, and development contributions, rates relief and tax incentives were suggested for brownfield redevelopment. A disincentive of shaming poor developments was suggested.

**Suggested approaches** for Land Use Recovery Plan generally centred on integrated land use planning and coordination:

- Develop concepts for clusters;
- Coordinated policy – all government departments saying “come to Christchurch”
- Plan for key routes, key freight modes;
- Engineer led planning;
- Growth focus;
- Community focus.

**Affordability options** suggested for both business land but also residential were:

- reduce rent/capital investment to enable rent affordability;
- Government to develop the greenfield land it owns and not expect to make a commercial return on it.

**What happens to low cost labour when rebuild is done?**

- Use international 5 year contracts

Understand implications for business and residential development across all sectors

# 6 Individual session summaries

## 6.1 Planners workshop summary 3-12-12

### 6.1.1 Issues

**Previous Plans such as the UDS tackled issues but how far can Land Use Recovery Plan go in solving them?** A lot of planning work has already been completed in previous planning processes, such as the UDS and Plans. The issues now, are more acute as a consequence of the earthquakes and the real issue is how effective the Land Use Recovery Plan can be in tackling these issues.

Identifying the key priorities within a broad range of issues will be a challenge.

There is also a need to assess what planning tools are currently available and what new is needed to address challenges and ensure that standards are not lowered in what could potentially be a narrower process than what has been done in the past.

**Enabling confident quality investment** means that planners need to have a good understanding of developer issues and in particular what is holding developers back from investing in developments - controls, supply, infrastructure timing, and contributions.

**Need to keep an eye on the long term**, while the scope of the Land Use Recovery Plan is for 10-15 years, the implications will be felt for a very long time. There is a need to keep the long term future in mind when considering the implications of decisions.

### 6.1.2 Options

**We need to understand demand and provide diversity** in relation to residential demand into the future and providing housing options for the emerging demographic such as migrants and what they may want into the future. There is a need to lead development and not just respond to what has happened in the past. Providing diversity was also something that should be considered and not just density.

**Temporary housing solutions** are needed, but we also need to have a long term view when developing these solutions so the legacies are positive rather than negative. Alternative options, such as lodgers and home sharing should be considered.

**Speeding land supply to the market** and understanding what is slowing potential residential land getting to the market is required. The impact of the need for more work around land conditions was discussed as an issue as well as the potential to do things differently to speed up the market, such as time limited zoning and restructuring development contributions for

brownfield land as an incentive. Speeding up land development via ensuring certainty in the market for factors such as where infrastructure is going, was also stated as an option.

**Affordability is not just about providing cheaper land** - affordability is a complex issue and requires a multi-faceted solution. Suggestions made included: reducing compliance costs and development contributions where possible; reduction in the size of houses; reduction in geo-tech requirements for land that there is enough existing information on and; including transport and infrastructure into affordability costs when development of green-fields outside the city is considered.

**Quality urban form** was desired. Comments covered the location and design of communities to include neighbourhood centres that include amenities and well laid out developments, as well as the quality of individual buildings. Planners also thought there was a need to be able to say no to low quality developments.

**Minimising business land change impacts through integration** was discussed. There is a need to integrate business land with residential land within the changed and emerging city environment. This is to ensure there is not reverse sensitivity from within residential land located next to business land and also to ensure that workers are close to business centres to reduce transport costs. There was a desire to ensure that the central city recovery occurs and to minimise the amount of change and disruption that occurs through business relocations. This could be done by taking actions (incentives) to keep businesses in the East.

There is a need to look at the full cost of relocating business from the East to the West, and not just the immediate rebuilding costs on current land. The changes to infrastructure will also a considerable cost that needs to be considered.

## **6.2 Commercial Centres/Business Land Supply workshop summary** **4-12-12**

### **6.2.1 Issues**

**The need for certainty.** Overall, there was a desire for certainty but also (and associated with this), timeliness, consistency and decisiveness. The desire for certainty was often linked with reducing risk for developers and hastening recovery. Comments relating to certainty ran across a broad range of topics:

- infrastructure and growth;
- population movements;
- issues for developers;
- land status (including availability and existing land use);
- future business needs; and
- costs

It was suggested that the provision of information on the above topics would assist this uncertainty. Consistent advice from one geo-tech to another was also desired.

### **6.2.2 Other important issues discussed**

**Short term supply impacts on market and business location (suburban v Central city growth).** The balancing act in the city versus suburbs situation was recognised. Some thought there should be a focus on retaining large employment generating industry and providing for their needs outside of the CBD while others thought we needed to constrain office growth in suburbs. It was noted that while we have to provide for the needs outside of city we also don't want to create an environment where it will become difficult to implement the vision for the central city and other plans. The CBD was also recognised as needing to have a competitive advantage; it should be a place you want to be.

**Coordinated decision making required.** It was stated that councils need to have a culture that is enabling and pioneering, everyone is in this together and it is not a competition between parties. This links with comments around needing coordinated governance for transport, but also a similar comment about needing infrastructure or engineer lead planning where someone is there to make decisions, but that they are coordinated decisions. Bold, decisive and timely decisions were also desired.

**Transport network implications** were also discussed. Locating or clustering businesses around transport routes was suggested, as was a potential corridor study for Brougham and freight hubs as freight routes strengthen between the airport and port. Consideration of public transport including cycle infrastructure and rail was sought. There was a desire for coordinated transport governance.

**Bigger long-term picture is needed to be kept in mind** to avoid oversupply; this resonated with people around the room. Land Use Recovery Plan, while recognised as a recovery plan was suggested as needing to have a growth focus as we need to provide growth opportunity for the next 30 years.

### **6.2.3 Other discussion centered on:**

**Arduous requirements for developers** such as requiring comprehensive plans of areas before they develop it, even if it's only a segment of the land being developed. Developers have simple

calculations for assessing profit – cost + margin - and if the development can't be brought to market to sell at a reasonable profit it won't happen.

**Temporary housing and attracting workers** was viewed as needing to provide quality temporary housing with a view that these workers are not likely to be temporary and to be mindful of how these temporary properties will look in the future i.e. slums.

**Christchurch promotion** was stated to be important; the right messages need to be sent out, particularly if we want to attract workers.

**Low cost home** alternative, such as state advancer's loan was suggested. Affordability was stated not to be an issue from a bank perspective; rather it was uncertainty over land.

**Sufficient labour supply** needs to be ensured for building. Drain laying was identified as in demand labour supply.

**Do more with less space developments.** This was a suggestion that attracted debate. It was thought that this works for manufacturing spaces but not office spaces. It had been observed that the majority of manufacturers were moving in to new buildings with a lot more space with a future view that they will grow or the space will provide more options. It was also recognised that there is a trend towards working part time, desk sharing and working from home that can be taken advantage of.

## **6.3 Infrastructure Session Summary 5-12-12**

### **6.3.1 Issues**

**Certainty in maintaining UDS growth pattern.** Overall, there was a desire for Land Use Recovery Plan not to divert significantly from the UDS plans. Primarily because infrastructure planning in the last few years has been based on this plan and subsequent growth patterns and changes would be costly in terms of time and money, to move infrastructure development from one area to another. This point was made by Christchurch, Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils and Orion. The implications of these changes would be oversupply in areas where infrastructure has been provided that don't grow to planned sizes; undersupply in areas where growth occurs but infrastructure hasn't been provided, additional costs through having to change from existing plans; and as a consequence slowed progress.

A specific example in changes to planning would be the impacts in the South West where water management issues could occur if there is a deviation to the current plan.

**Water management** was noted to be the key infrastructure preventing people moving back and caution was urged to ensure the Regional Water Strategy does not become a constraint to growth but also for there to be a balance between cost and environmental impacts.

Catchment wide approaches are more efficient, effective, cheaper and preferred.

**Changes in the makeup of the city and subsequent implications** were another theme. Wet industries and businesses moving from the East to West and having to potentially cater for a residential shift that might follow was noted, as was the recognition of rural roads being used more like urban roads and the likelihood that these will need upgrading. Interconnectedness between the central city and outer areas was noted and the opportunity to assist this through the opening of streets in the city centre to widen them and accommodate bus and cycles was observed.

The need to identify land with high levels of resilience and to select the best land for development was also stated. It was believed that there is enough land to choose from to build on it is just a matter of choosing the best land that will incur the least cost and be most suitable to develop, rather than less suitable land that will be more expensive to develop and have less successful long term outcomes.

**Future constraint caused by short-term decisions should be avoided.** The airport and the port were examples where decisions could be made to fix a short term problem that could have long term significant negative implications – particularly for business development.

**Identifying priorities** such as the most pressing infrastructure challenges and focusing on them was suggested as a strategy for prioritising efforts to maximise returns and speed progress.

### **6.3.2 Other important issues identified**

Other important issues recognised were the opportunity to:

**Plan more for natural hazards** as there is an opportunity now to plan for flooding related to sea level rise and the similar issues.

**A longer-term timeframe** than the 10-15 years outlined for the plan to progress should be kept in mind. Standard infrastructure planning looks normally with a 50-100 year time frame in mind.

**Integration and coordination in repairs** is necessary if disruption is to be minimised and efficiency in terms of opening roads as few times as possible. There was a suggestion to empower SCIRT more to do this.

**Funding certainty** to enable confident infrastructure planning was desired.

**Being open to new ideas** such as temporary housing under airport noise contours.

**Need certainty about red zone's future and city.** Currently infrastructure planners are assuming that there will be no rebuilding on red zone land, so there is no need for infrastructure planning for these areas. The Councils would like this confirmed. To ensure efficient infrastructure development of the central city there is a need to have accurate projections of expected demand within the central city.

### **6.3.3 Other discussion centred on:**

**Certainty is needed** across a broad range of areas: what is happening with the red zone; understanding market forces in relation to growth in green-field and no intensification in the east; and understanding the allocation of numbers in the Waimakariri District.

## **6.4 Partnership for Economic Prosperity and Recovery Summary 4-12-12**

### **6.4.1 Issues**

**Changing location of businesses and the implications need to be considered.** There is pressure to move west for many eastern located businesses. This is being driven by difficulty in reinsuring to rebuild on damaged land. It was identified that there will also be other impacts (and costs), such as greater stress on the transport network with more people commuting greater distances. Also there is likely to be a population migration from East to West as people choose to live closer to their work.

There is need to provide direction on either prioritising brown field development (where infrastructure is already provided) and/or allowing greenfield development.

Question asked over where actually wet industries can be relocated to.

Question was asked if a list of business infrastructure needs (especially wet industries) can be drawn up to assist with planning.

**Risk and uncertainty reduction – certainty needed.** It was stated that many decisions are made to manage risk. As long as there is uncertainty related to being able to, and the cost of rebuilding in the East is unknown, then uncertainty will remain. Uncertainty will be removed, for some businesses, by moving to the west. Increasing certainty about being able to rebuild and trade out of premises in the east is likely to reduce the pressure to move west.

Related to this was providing certainty to businesses and home owners by indicating where infrastructure will be developed. There is also a need to state where infrastructure won't be provided. It was stated that public money should be best spent on providing good infrastructure rather than subsidies. An example given was providing water to areas for businesses that require water to operate.

**Significant relocation of lower cost housing** has caused pressure on the housing industry to deliver. In recent times (pre earthquake), standard new homes have been relatively large and sell for reasonably high values. The industry knows how to make returns from this model. There is a challenge now to produce a significant number of lower cost houses.

**Lower cost business premise options** have reduced in quantity through damage and removal of previous older and cheaper business stock from the market through premise demolition. There are options to replace this stock through business collocating as small units within large premises, especially with shared business-type interests, such as ethnic restaurants.

The ability to do this economically without subsidies was questioned as the leading example at the moment – Epic, required free land (from CCC) and other cash injections to make the project viable.

**Joint thinking needed.** The example given was linking the Economic Recovery Programme and the Land Use Recovery Plan – especially links with the top 20 economic projects.

An example given was clear direction on where hotels can go so the tourism industry can rebuild.

**Dispersal or conglomeration of businesses.** Finding the best way to ensure an eventual thriving heart to the city and balancing business continuation through remaining where they have

relocated to in the suburbs was considered a difficult issue. There are benefits to businesses of being located near each other and the central city is the best example of this, but how this will happen is a challenge. Consideration should be given to the government creating certainty by identifying where business can and cannot be located. But there needs to be a balance between directing and growing naturally.

**Time-period of the Land Use Recovery Plan.** The 10-15 year Land Use Recovery Plan timeframe may require five year monitoring and review to ensure it is on track.

**Increasing land supply** was considered a complex issue. But it was felt that developers need to have certainty that what they bring to market will provide them with an economic return. It was identified that there was a labour shortage (eg drainlayers) that is slowing getting work done to develop land.

Development contributions were identified as one area where cost could be reduced for developers. Currently the cost is paid up front by the developer; spreading payment over the life of the asset (or 30 years) was raised as an option.

**Other comment** included this being an opportunity to look at things differently; building costs are high in New Zealand compared with other countries; insurance decisions are currently being made from offices outside of Christchurch where the local situation may not be known so well; the full cost of repairs need to be included, including those for decanting businesses while repairs happen.

## **6.5 Urban Oversight Group Summary 6-12-12**

### **6.5.1 Issues**

**Housing diversity** was regularly identified as a key issue. This included needing to provide and enable a variety of house types and sizes but also managing expectations of residents in relation to their thinking about different housing types.

**Housing affordability** was also identified as a key issue. Affordable housing needs a framework around it and needs to meet minimum standards. Consideration to the brownfield versus greenfield development issue was stated as being needed.

**Integration, vision, certainty, timing and phasing** were identified as being needed across the functions of Land Use Recovery Plan. It was stated that Land Use Recovery Plan needs comprehensive planning and good communication and to integrate all the different ideas and needs. Attention to be paid to timing and phasing as well as giving Land Use Recovery Plan a vision. Certainty and early provision of information around land use priorities was desired.

**Business growth in suburbs** was identified as a problem and questions presented around whether they are going to be moved, given direction to move or whether there are incentives for them to move.

**Active Transport** such as provision of cycling ways was desired.

### **6.5.2 Other discussion centred on**

**Housing provision** was generally discussed. Many comparisons and examples were given about Auckland although the comment made that Christchurch is distinct from Auckland. It was noted that subdivisions are available in Christchurch but not being taken up as they are expensive and on the periphery. It was also noted that we are providing either large family homes, or small elderly homes, and not much in the middle and that there is a need to do groundwork on medium density sites.

Housing provision for temporary workers and their families was also raised; this needs to be quality.

**What people value** and what people are looking for when they purchase was discussed in relation to how we 'sell' different property types. It was noted that community connections such as family, school and transport is highly valued and should be a focus. Quality housing was also suggested.

**Options** in relation to housing were suggested including: setting aside a proportion of housing development for low income; using a designation approach; restricting size of units for development;

**Need coordination, prioritisation and certainty** (particularly certainty around infrastructure).

**Suburban business growth** was also discussed again. Uncontrolled growth results in poor outcomes and general questions around assisting business relocation or not, WET industry clarity and not wanting to be too prescriptive or constraining suburban centres.

## **6.6 Housing and Residential Land Supply Summary 7-12-12**

### **6.6.1 Issues**

**Process issues and general blockages resulting in time delays, cost and frustration** were heavily discussed and ranged from process issues such as resource consents, to general rigidity of rules, and attitudes of council. These issues were particularly common for subdivisions.

Comments included:

- Council not sticking to time frames, having too much control and being risk adverse with no trust in applicants or professionals to sign things off
- ODPs not on council radar and need to be created (by the developer) for areas that do not currently have them. The developer may only own part of a larger area of land that the ODP will apply to
- Consent processes taking too long – CCC specifically referred to
- Urban design taking precedence over other matters (such as consenting)
- Only one person in CCC doing engineering approvals
- There being no accommodation or flexibility when it comes to plan variations
- Compliance costs and process and regulations and too much detailed required early on

**Affordability** was another significantly discussed topic and was interlinked with other topics, particularly blockages. These included blockages in affordability due to time-lags in processing and at the urban design panel level where it was argued urban design considerations are taking precedence over other matters (such as consenting) and moreover, there seemed to be no appreciation for alternatives. This then creates a time-lag and adds to cost.

It was noted that high density is often assumed to result in affordability, but it was argued this is not the case; it is more expensive for developers and it is more risky. Similarly, brownfield development and affordability are often linked but developers argued that this is also risky and there are not the same development contributions when you go past building a single story.

**Density levels** attracted a lot of dialogue. It was commented that councils are pushing high density in plans, but when developers are doing this in practice it's not working although it was then commented that the example referred to may be doing medium and not high density. There was recognition of the difficulty of predicting demand and market ahead of time and the risks there are for developers. It was also commented though, that in some cases you need to go out on a limb, because if people don't know it exists there won't be a demand; it's not until it's been built, that the demand begins to rise.

Frustration was expressed at the lack of a density range.

The observation was also made that you can sell larger sections to individuals, but if you create an intensified box on that section, you can't sell it to individuals, you have to sell it to builders. Individuals are post-earthquake less interested in buying complexes where you have to work with body corporates and joint agreements and take other peoples considerations into account; it is much safer to own your own site.

**The vision of Land Use Recovery Plan** was commented on as Land Use Recovery Plan being a plan delivering to the Ministers direction rather than to a vision; how can you develop an effective plan if there is no clear vision? The mismatch of timeframe of 10-15 years and buildings that are aimed at last 100 years was also identified and questioned as to how you take sustainability into account.

### 6.6.2 Options

**Options for blockage issues** were identified, these included:

- More staff or international firm to take over engineering consent approvals
- Flexibility around processing consents
- Accountability in timeframes with council
- Reduce detail required (at early stage)
- More flexibility and transparency with the urban design panel
- Reduce control of council and trust the market
- Behavioural improvements of council culture from defensive outlook to enabling and permitting.
- Flexibility in plans and speedy process – e.g. British model after 20 working days need a decision
- Council to be adaptive and accommodating of change

**Options in relation to affordability** were also suggested including defining actual value of affordability; managing expectations about affordability (what can be possible for lower cost); Government or council intervention; incentives such as zero rating, GST rating; alternative ownership models and for council to enable this; mixed use; density bonuses; more transparency in the urban design panel; streamlining process timeline.

**Options for density** included provision of wider ranges of density zones (for example in PC1 rules cannot have section choice of 1000-2000m<sup>2</sup>) and land lot sizes are needed. Also need to define density zones.

## **6.7 Professional Bodies Summary 10-12-12**

### **6.7.1 Issues**

#### **What will the plan deliver?**

There were questions asked at the start of the session about what the plan will deliver and if it will just be a new version of PC1. This was responded to by representatives stating that this is not a normal response to regional planning and that it will be clear and directive.

**Planning timelines** There was significant comment that there is a need to look out beyond the 15 year timeframe that is stated in the direction of the plan. With long term changes occurring to the planet this is a unique opportunity to plan resiliently to put the city in as good as possible position when it considers the future. A comment was made that.

*We should use the long term assessments to determine urgency of short term needs.*

Long term and integrated planning was linked to joining the Land Use Recovery Plan with the NERP (natural environment Recovery Programme).

**Land availability and planning engagement between planners and developers** There was a discussion about there being enough land coming to the market. A comment was made that there has always been a need for lots of work to get land to market, but this has just become more obvious in the current environment.

It was stated that there is need for greater engagement between developers trying to get land to market and local authorities. Christchurch City Council was identified as being the most difficult Council to deal with for developers.

The ability to work collaboratively to develop urban hubs by including civic functions in private developments (malls) was suggested as a possible positive development – Northland (North Island) was referred to as a case study.

**Certainty** The need for certainty to enable confident development was touched on. Greater certainty will lead to faster rebuilding of the city.

**Housing diversity** Comments were made that there is a need for greater freedom for developers to enable diversity and intensification related to diversity. A comment was made that developers can come up with their own ideas for diversity but they need overarching guidelines. Overseas examples were referred to as options to copy – Queensland, Europe and UK were mentioned. With regard to diversity and consolidation/intensification there was general discussion over how to consolidate sites and have a holistic approach to areas

**Brownfield and greenfield development and cost of development** There was discussion about how best to develop brownfield land and the need for incentives to do this. There was also comment that over the last 10 years, that there has not been increases in intensification by 'letting the market' decide. It was suggested there is need for greater intervention to enable intensification. The provision of temporary housing that can be converted to a long term use after its initial purpose expires was mentioned.

Affordability related to where developments occur was discussed. The point being made that the long term affordability related to whether a site needs more or less infrastructure development, determined by it being located close or far from Christchurch city. This is especially the case for the transport network.

**Preservation of quality food growing soils** Comment was made that it is important for future sustainability that people have the opportunity to grow food close to where they live. This is especially true for people who don't own land and can't grow food at their own home. The opportunity to make things better for the future was mentioned, as this issue is likely to increase in importance. An option was to provide UK style allotments.

**Big opportunity for Christchurch** It was stated by one respondent at the close of the session that Christchurch has a unique opportunity based on the situation it finds itself in and the resource that we have to build on to do something great for the future.

## **6.8 Community Facilities, Sport and Recreation Summary 11-12-12**

### **6.8.1 Issues**

**Land availability, acquisition of this land; timing and rezoning** were identified across the group as important issues. There was a desire to find the right land, and then be able to acquire it ahead of its development so that it is cheaper, but this means being able to predict population movements which is difficult. These facilities need to be close to population centres. Fast-tracked re-zoning was suggested, although was also cautioned against.

**Integration and linkage opportunities** were identified. Linking key facility hubs with urban and suburban planning was noted as well as the need to integrate with the transport network. The opportunity for 'hubbing' was identified including potential integration with school land as well as potential for consolidation and sports clubs working together. Part of this integration idea included a desire for local authorities to work together and for there to be flexibility in boundary lines to cut out unnecessary difficulties and to maximise environmental and recreational benefits.

**Some specific issues and challenges** were also identified: the accelerated growth rate in Selwyn and the associated exponential demand for sports; the lack of flexibility and thus limitations by boundaries; and the increased costs with recovery of facilities and small groups are having to grow because of influxes of people, but facing costs and constraints with being on a single site.

### **6.8.2 Other important issues identified**

Other important issues recognised by participants included:

**Opportunities for integration** also came up in relation to integrating residential, business, school and open spaces. Similarly, hubbing was supported across the group to maximise usage and encourage collaboration.

**Relationships with existing plans** was discussed in relation to still using some of these, such as the Places and Spaces documents, but also in relation to the need to monitor the impact and adapt revised plans. It was cautioned that partnerships and expectations will need to be managed.

**Infill areas provision for open space** was identified as an issue to make up for lost backyards.

**Access to 'quiet roads' for cyclists** – usual areas for cycling and holding events such as in Tai Tapu are fast becoming busy areas where traffic management is quite onerous. There is a lack of quiet roads to host events.

**Consistent zoning instruments** are desired as they are all different between authorities. Only using designations are considered not ideal.

**Timing and pressure** was identified; the length of time for building infrastructure can impact on the delivery of services to the community, it may need to be staggered. There is pressure in the Waimak for links into the city; doesn't happen as cannot get across the bridge.

**Focus on communities** - providing for what is lost before planning for green-fields, keeping a health or equity lens over this and taking into account community provision and residential patterns.

### 6.8.3 Other discussion centred on

**Integrated planning** came up again in the general discussion. An enabling option identified was to have a plan or map with all the layers on it so that 'hot spots' can be identified – GIS could be utilised for this. It was noted some synergies and dialogue was beginning with other stakeholders including Ministry of Education and that there is potential for partnering in terms of businesses and facilities.

**Challenges** for integrated planning and general challenges were discussed. These included getting out of working within a 'facilities bubble'; the desire from transport for sports fields to be located outside of the boundary and; the fundamental challenge that exists for sport and rec in regards to needing large pieces of valuable land and this being in contest with other uses.

**Potential spaces and opportunities** for hubs, facilities and sport and recreation grounds were identified and discussed.

**Relationships with existing plans and documents** came up again in the general discussion, mainly that the Places and Spaces document is good but it falls short of identifying locations. There was also talk around Community Facilities Rebuild Plans, community expectations and

## **6.9 The Greater Christchurch Transport Group Summary 13-12-12**

### **6.9.1 Issues**

**Integrated land use planning, better utilisation of what we've got and consolidating land use particularly around Key Activity Centres(KACs)** were key desires across the room and were interlinked with each other and other issues. It was stated that there is the opportunity to do what many cities talk about and have a resilient sustainable transport network – this could be achieved through undertaking these types of changes. Integration in terms of Land Use Recovery Plan integrating and supporting other key documents was also desired.

**Hubbing and mixed use** was regularly suggested as ways to enable integrated land use and transport (including public transport) and to assist in reducing travel and creating efficiency.

**Public transport** was important and there was a desire for it to integrate with developments in existing corridors. Riccarton Road and northern arterial public transport were identified as priority areas.

**Travel demand management (TDM) and non-planning solutions** were desired. This included suggestions around incorporating TDM into legislation or policy. This could be through development contributions to public transport for example although this was recognised as potentially being difficult and perhaps seen as hindering developers, but it was also understood that bold things need to be put on the table.

**Freight corridors** implications and opportunities were identified. Concern was expressed at reverse sensitivity issues in relation to the likely 24/7 operations and the impacts this would have on communities and whether communities were aware of what such operations were like. The opportunity for 'high noise' corridors for new corridors was identified.

**Strain on transport networks** was identified as an issue both through the unexpected speed of greenfield development and subsequent pressures it has placed on the network as well as the strain created from business movement patterns.

**Utilisation and integration of brownfield** through strong leadership, a champion or through incentives was desired. Brownfield sites were also linked with being an option for building short term accommodation.

**Clarity** around land use decisions as well as the location of wet and dry industries was desired.

**Funding** was also identified as an issue and comments were made around funding incentives like development contributions, although these were observed as being difficult in terms of boundaries and where users of network services are not necessarily from that TA [eg Waimakariri users in Christchurch].

### **6.9.2 Other Important Issues Identified**

**Working collectively and being coordinated** came through in various comments. There was a desire for Land Use Recovery Plan to provide support for working collectively and it was recognised how vitally important the relationships that are now occurring between council and major transport are; especially those formed out of the Greater Christchurch Transport Strategy (GCTS). Comments were also made in relation to existing streams of work, noting that it is important to get together and integrate streams of work to ensure there is not overlap and frustration. Similarly, land use location tools in TDM and land use design as well as information contained in the RLTS are valuable.

**Integrating public transport with both existing and intensified land uses** was desired and more generally, active travel was stated to be a real potential to realise. Public transport links with the airport as noted above was also identified.

**Airport links and access** were stated to be important. Public transport links and freight distribution functions at the airport were desired although noted to be a much longer term desire.

**Opportunities for:** freight and hubbing; for Land Use Recovery Plan to assist with funding packages; temporary housing to deliver campus-style residential development in the city that could be utilised by university students and linked with transport;

**Specific issues** were identified such as the need to support issues around with port in Lyttelton; to address operational issues between road and rail with congestion around key level crossings; and bird-strike was brought up as a major issue that the airport is facing and is being made even more difficult due to lack of clear leadership for managing the bird population.

**Other comments** included temporary worker housing possibilities in greenfield areas; not to forget about rural links and a desire for council to stop introducing new plan changes.

### **6.9.3 Other discussion centred on**

**Ideas to deliver mixed use and housing** such as incentives and understanding developers' needs and any roadblocks for them were discussed. Suggestions included tax breaks and fast tracking or streamlined processes for development in areas where development was sought – such as brownfield areas. The flipside of incentives, disincentives, was also discussed although had mixed appeal. The provision of any information that may help developers was also identified – demographics for example, to assist in understanding future markets were suggested.

**Difficulties with brownfield developments** were discussed. The perception that the land was not quality if a building has been demolished on it and the associated implications with insurers was noted. Feeling is that overseas insurers are not reinsuring building on brownfield (considered vulnerable) land

**Consolidation and intensification of land use** was acknowledged as best practice in international planning and without it, recovery is hampered thus it's vital that efforts are focused on it.

**Prioritisation** as a tool in relation to infrastructure was suggested and more generally commented on in regards to very busy traffic in Addington/Riccarton area being a priority.

**Reverse sensitivity issues and housing location** were also mentioned, especially in relation to noise from traffic.

## **6.10 Disability Action Group 14-12-12**

### **6.10.1 Overview**

Overall the group had uncertainty in what to provide in terms of input into the Land Use Recovery Plan to make changes such as improving certain areas (like Lyttleton, Linwood and Spreydon) and other things such as making Sumer village more accessible and having a particular set of requirements (in terms of building/development). There was some uncertainty about whether this was much of a submission process, and the relationship of the Land Use Recovery Plan with other plans such as the City Council Master plan and the Transport Plan.

#### **The main concerns raised where**

- Accessibility
- Development of low cost housing and temporary housing
- The power of the Land Use Recovery Plan to make changes

#### **Summary of general discussion**

Issues arose around accessibility to and from venues (such as sporting venues, malls) and also accessibility to houses and buildings. Suggestions were made that there should be minimum standards that can be put in place to make buildings more accessible and still allow choice, but without this standard it won't be done.

There were a number of comments referring to the building of low cost/ social housing. Concerns arose about what will stop developers from simply putting in middle/high class housing and how to go about getting low cost housing built. Some comments showed animosity towards developers who they believe only care for profit and not the great need for low cost housing.

Following the concerns over low cost housing was the issue of temporary housing and the fear that developers will build "cheap and nasty" work houses for the influx of workers. However, without temporary housing there will be shortage of housing and affordable rental accommodation for local families.

Finally there were comments on what power the Land Use Recovery Plan has in terms of i.e. changes to schools and communities and getting minimum requirements enforced to allow accessibility to houses and buildings.

## **6.11 Government Leaders 18-12-12**

There was a significant question and answer component to this session, the main topics are below, (see full transcript for questions and answers):

- Business relocation
- Land Use Recovery Plan process involvement with other groups
- What happens after CERA
- Did sustainability emerge as a key issue?
- The place of DOC in the process
- How will adequate information be given to future participants
- How will Share an Idea be tapped into
- Could the 'Great Walk' promoted by the tourism industry be part of the Land Use Recovery Plan
- What government networks and others have been involved

There was a short open forum discussion at the end of the session. The main point covered was points covered were about a government level cabinet paper that is discussing the delivery of services, and so on. This is a very good opportunity for innovation. There is a desire to get action behind these discussions, so that it's not just talk – we need action.

There will be further follow up with this group next year re property and infrastructure