

Greater Christchurch Partnership
Our Space 2018-2048 - Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update

-Received via online submission form-

Submitter details	
First name	Don
Last name	Babe
Email	don@blueberrybliss.co.nz
Street name and number	██████████
Suburb	██████████
Town/City	Christchurch
Postcode	████
I am completing this submission	For myself
Hearings	
Do you wish to speak to the hearings panel?	I wish to speak at the hearings
Phone number	██████████
Preferred location to be heard	Rolleston
Questions	
Question 1: Our Space highlights there is significant capacity for new housing through redevelopment in Christchurch City but to accommodate housing growth in Selwyn and Waimakariri it identifies additional greenfield land around Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why?	
Agree/disagree	Somewhat disagree
Comment	Make more of an effort to have more of the growth within the Central City.
Question 2: Our Space adopts the current planning framework that encourages a range of new housing types, especially in the central city, close to suburban centres within the City and around existing towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri. Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why?	
Agree/disagree	Somewhat agree
Comment	Need more mixed use buildings in the Central City
Question 3: Our Space proposes to develop an action plan to increase the supply of social and affordable housing across Greater Christchurch and investigate with housing providers different models to make it easier for people to own their own home. What elements should be included in this action plan?	
Comment	Less caveats on new developments. Development levies discounts for affordable housing within new developments.
Question 4: Our Space adopts the current planning framework that directs new commercial development (office and retail) to existing centres to retain their viability and vitality, especially the central city, suburban centres and town centres in Selwyn and Waimakariri. Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why? What further measures would support such development?	
Agree/disagree	Somewhat disagree
Comment	There is a lot of commercial development along the axes between the Central City and Rolleston and Rangiora so existing plans are not concentrating development around the centres.
Question 5: The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the District Plans for Christchurch City and Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts have already identified sufficient capacity for new industrial businesses. Do you agree or disagree this is sufficient and in the right location and why?	
Agree/disagree	Somewhat agree
Comment	No real opinion but there is a lack of cheap rental properties for start up businesses like High Street used to provide.

Question 6: The proposals in Our Space are informed by a Capacity Assessment that considers future demands for housing and business land, based on demographic changes and projections from Statistics New Zealand, and likely changes in our economy (including through business sector trends and impacts from technological change). Do you agree or disagree with our evidence base and why?	
Agree/disagree	Somewhat agree
Comment	It is hard to argue with Statistics but the 2013 Census was biased by the part completion of earthquake remediation work so can not be relied upon for trends. Not a lot of recognition of climate change impacts.
Question 7: Our Space promotes greater densities around key centres to increase accessibility to employment and services by walking, cycling and public transport. This aligns with recent transport proposals that signal more high frequency bus routes and an intention to deliver rapid transit along the northern and south-west transport corridors. Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why?	
Agree/disagree	Do not agree
Comment	Provide excellent services within the Central City to encourage re-population. That may replace the need for continual upgrading of the access from the outlying areas.
Question 8: Our Space aligns with broader infrastructure planning (including wastewater, water supply, stormwater, energy, telecommunications, community facilities, schools and healthcare) to help create sustainable, cohesive and connected communities. Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why? What more could be done to integrate infrastructure planning?	
Agree/disagree	Somewhat agree
Comment	Yes but concentrate them around the central city.
Question 9: What other points do you wish to make to inform the final Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update?	
Comment	See attached written submission.
Attachments	
Regenerate Our Space DB	

Submission on Our Space.

It is commendable that this planning document is being compiled and the degree to which its predecessors; the Urban Development Strategy of 2007 and the updated Action Plan of 2010 were followed by the affected local authorities. Having Bob Parker, the champion of the 2007 Strategy become mayor of its largest council certainly helped this process but a number of planning constraints included in the earlier plan are still evident in the proposed plan, a testament to the success of the earlier plan.

The proposed plan follows the same overall strategy with almost 50% of the projected growth in households planned to be delivered in the outlying districts.

This approach will continue the trend of the past 15 or 20 years where the periphery of the city is thriving but the centre is struggling. This is detrimental for residents of both the centre and the periphery.

The new Strategy feels like business as usual and this concept needs to be tested. There are a number of factors that have changed since the original strategy was developed;

- There are infrastructure changes with more roads either installed or under construction to service the outlying areas.
- The earthquakes had an impact with a number of houses being completely lost in the city and the underlying land being declared unfit for future residential development. Whilst the September 2010 earthquake was centred in Selwyn District the outlying districts are considered safer places to be for residents during periods of seismic activity.
- There are more climate change concerns. The population are now expecting there will be changes to coastlines over the planning period. What they are and how they will manifest is still uncertain but the impact is mostly expected to be within city boundaries.
- The Central City commercial areas are continuing to be rebuilt with some changes in the way it is used. There are less on-street car parks, more cycle paths and a much better city bus exchange. Old buildings that were under-utilised before the earthquake have disappeared and new buildings are mostly occupied.
- Dwelling numbers have declined substantially in the central city and in some suburbs to the east. There has been a less substantial decline in a number of other central city areas, particularly to the north and northwest from the city centre. (quickstats-greater-chch.pdf reported by Statistics New Zealand on the 2013 Census results.)
- A new generation of people have made their presence felt in work forces, target markets and politics. The new generations have some values that are different to their forebears; they are likely to be more concerned about the environment, have different aspirations in terms of work and there are less of them becoming licensed drivers as young as their parents did.
- Our population mix has changed. The influx of immigrants over the past ten years has meant there are significant numbers of us from different cultural backgrounds.

As well as the differences there are some things that have not changed;

- The central city is still struggling to compete with suburban malls for retail dollars.
- The population of the area is still getting older
- The size of the average household is still declining.
- The preferred mode of transport to work is still a single occupancy motor vehicle and there are more of these being provided by employers.

The proposed strategy recognises some problems with this business as usual approach. These have been encountered by most other sprawling cities so are nothing new.

This proposed strategy fails to address the changes that have occurred since the original Urban Development Strategy nor does it fix the problems that remain or halt sprawl.

Most of the problems would be solved if the increase in housing stock was closer to a common percentage increase across the 3 territorial authorities.

Census 2013 data reports there were almost 150,000 dwellings in Christchurch, a little over 20,000 in Waimakariri and just under 17,000 in Selwyn. The housing target is an additional 86,600 units so applying a constant uplift percentage would see almost 70,000 of them in the city, 9,000 in Waimakariri and the last 7,600 in Selwyn.

The proposed strategy recognises that most of the jobs in the future will be in the central city or along the axes from Rolleston to the Central City, from the Waimakariri Bridge to the Central City and between these two axes at the airport. Travel from these outlying towns to the Central City will continue to be important, it is the degree of importance that this strategy can shape.

The proposed strategy targets a further 17,290 housing units in Selwyn so a doubling of the existing number. That will require major changes in the provision of transport for these residents. Limiting the increase to 7,600 could mean that the infrastructure currently under construction may be sufficient. The same may be true for Waimakariri.

Furthermore, increasing the number of housing units in the city has a number of advantages;

- Infrastructure improvements can be concentrated on the Central City. An individual named James Dann recently posted an article on The Spinoff website with a suggested Central City rail network. See <https://thespinoff.co.nz/society/24-11-2018/a-new-plan-for-christchurch-rail/?fbclid=IwAR38oLO7yzCPvjfbfZN9iT2C6Pfzh2EV04x5y-BP13TjUhzXh9zkGTPnrHw>. This is not necessarily the best rail system we could have for our Central City but it is a good point from which discussions could be had and may be possible in the planning period if less road improvements to Rolleston and Rangiora are required.
- The extra people in and closer to the Central City will go a long way towards the revitalised centre citizens have been seeking since before the earthquakes.
- Active transport becomes viable for people that live less than 10kms from their place of work. It is no surprise that the most people that walk to work live in or close to the Central City.
- The number of motor vehicles coming to the city will not increase as rapidly because of the transport options available to commuters and visitors.
- Many services become so much easier to deliver. In addition to the obvious supply of roading, power and water and the removal of waste, waste water and stormwater there will be advantages for emergency services too.
- The agglomeration effect of concentrating businesses in close proximity will be improved if people do not have to rush away for long commutes home at the end of the working day. With the dominant mode of travel being single occupancy motor vehicles it is difficult for workers to socialise at the end of the day. If they lived a 20 minute walk, bike or bus ride from work there are more opportunities.
- There are social benefits from people using alternatives to single occupancy motor vehicles for their trips to and from work. Single occupancy motor vehicle users are usually the unhappiest commuters and are quite isolated. They know the yellow Toyota they see every day but do not have any contact with other users.
- The health benefits of using active transport for short journeys to and from work are well documented. To put it in context, Type II diabetes costs the Canterbury District Health Board about \$100million per annum to treat. It is 80% avoidable by an active lifestyle. If

one quarter of that benefit could be channelled back into infrastructure improvements our active transport modes would be very well catered for.

- Developers of large, greenfield estates often protect the neighbourhoods by imposing building caveats that exclude certain people. This has resulted in a separation of housing types with less well-off people clustering together in older housing whilst the more affluent congregate in the more pricey and newer areas. This has had quite an impact on social cohesion. Redevelopment of small city areas of one or two sections would mean the developer does not feel as pressured to maintain standards so may build more affordable housing. Society may find it benefits from being mixed up again.

The proposed strategy puts forward the concept of the 10 minute neighbourhood. This is well presented but has been around for some time, especially in the United States. They have a concept called a walkability score where each address gets a value assigned from 0 to 100. A low number means there are few facilities within walking distance whilst a high score indicates the presence of most amenities close by. This score can be applied to New Zealand addresses and this has been done on a random basis in Christchurch.

This submission suggests that the efficacy of the walkability score in Christchurch be assessed and if it is good then all new developments should have a minimum they need to achieve. This may change over the distance from the Central City. For example Central City units may require scores in excess of 90. That could reduce to 85 outside the one way streets but within the four avenues. Maybe the next suburbs are at 75 and some on the edge of town may be permitted to have scores as low as 60.

This submission has some lofty goals and some may say they could never be implemented. That is the advantage of a long term strategy, significant changes can be signalled for the future so changes can be made. This approach worked well for the dairy industry where effluent limits were signalled 5 years out so farmers were able to modify their behaviour to meet the targets as they became operational.

In order to encourage more development in the city a carrot and stick approach could be used. Part of the carrot would be to allow mixed use buildings anywhere within the Central City. A building may have retail and hospitality on the ground floor, office space above that for a few floors then residential at the top. These buildings would not have to be excessively tall, they could be accommodated in 5 levels.

A further carrot would be ensuring development levies make it more attractive to build closer to the Central City. This gives developers some of the gains from the lower service costs highlighted earlier.

Sticks generally involve the taxing of unwanted activities. Hong Kong imposes a steep tax on empty houses in order to utilise more of the existing housing stock before expensive reclamation projects are undertaken to provide more. There are a large number of unoccupied dwellings in central Christchurch although the 2013 Census figures that are available would have included red zone houses awaiting demolition. It will be interesting to see what the 2018 data has to show. If the number of unoccupied houses is still high then this issue needs to be addressed.

Undeveloped sites are also a drag on re-population. Maybe empty sites have a year to have a new dwelling built or the rates are increased to the average of the addresses around them. This would mean the owner would be paying rates on a house that is not there and service costs for services that are not being used. Putting a time limit on the increase would mean that the transfer price would

reflect how much of the time is left before the rates are increased so encourage developers to sell quickly.

From a commercial point of view, one of the big losses from the earthquakes was the small, old shops in town. These were great business incubators. People with an idea could rent a shop quite cheaply and if their idea worked they could move onto bigger and better locations. There were a number of apparel shops for instance that started their life in High Street. These are missing from the Central City now and we are poorer for that. Mixed use buildings may be part of the solution.

In summary this submission suggests that more housing needs to be provided within the city and preferably close to the Central City. This will address a number of the changes that have happened since the original Urban Development Strategy was adopted and provide much better transport outcomes and choices.