

Submission to Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update

Martin Pinkham, 70 Adderley Terrace, RD1 Kaiapoi 7691

1. The recently published Our Space 2018-2048 document is just another example of a how our bureaucracy has kicked for touch and abrogated its responsibility towards the citizens of Greater Christchurch. It does not provide clarity for our community how it will develop over the next thirty years as required by the National Environmental Standard— Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NES-UDC) and beyond.
2. It is in complete contrast to the forward planning seen in places like South East Queensland where the state government has provided clarity and true leadership over the development of the South Queensland area, and includes the full gambit of providing a plan of what the community needs including housing, transportation, education, and health services.
3. Our Space typifies the legalistic risk and risk averse approach adopted by local government by publishing plans that have lots of words, but lack detail, and are not meeting the needs of our community. This lack of clarity was noted in Appendix B of the Officers Report where the outcome of the Stakeholders Review Workshop was summarised.
4. There are two key points I am providing further information on, following on from my submission (reference 061). These are:
 - a. settlement pattern, densities and feasibility in the Waimakariri District area
 - b. Transportation planning over the whole Greater Christchurch area.

Waimakariri District Council Approach

5. The hearings panel have received an Officers Report summarising the submissions made by the community, and also receive comments from Waimakariri District (WDC) and Selwyn District (SDC) staff. It is no surprise that WDC staff do not support better-defined settlement patterns sequencing and targets and that should be included in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).
6. WDC staff claim that the identification of future zoned land can be well managed through its District Plan Review (DPR) process which they have currently commenced, and future DPR processes. Our

community has no confidence in WDC to achieve this in a timely and efficient manner given how much time has been spent on the DPR to date with very little to show for it.

7. The WDC recently completed a District Development Strategy (DDS) process and with great fanfare proclaimed it would provide guidance on how the district would develop in the future. The actual outcome was far different from this, and the whole document was completely underwhelming in providing any meaningful guidance on future settlement pattern in Waimakariri District despite the requirements of PC 14 in the NES-UDC.
8. By comparison Timaru District Council has prepared a clear and easy to follow DDS that provides clarity on where its communities will grow and the implications for its infrastructure.
9. Over many years the Waimakariri District Council has adopted such a light handed approach that we have numerous examples of extremely poor planned communities throughout the district. The worst of these is in the Woodend area where we have the townships of Woodend, Pegasus, and Ravenswood all abutting each other but with minimal connectivity to each other. In this situation the opportunity to provide community services, and an effective public transportation system is difficult and inevitably inefficient.
10. In Rangiora we have seen the development of urban areas along the Rangiora Woodend Road with driveways from every household onto the road. Since the 1960s this road had been designated as a Limited Access Road given its strategic importance. The Waimakariri District Council appears to have no concept of strategic planning, and its recent District Development Strategy was completely devoid of any meaningful transportation strategy.
11. In contrast the Selwyn District Council has taken a much more holistic view of the development of Rolleston and has created a much more integrated community with a great central shopping area and excellent connectivity. It has also worked closely with the Ministry of Education to provide good locations for schools.
12. In the officers report Waimakariri District Council staff are putting great faith in their current DPR process but with such a poor DDS, I am not confident that we will end up with an efficient and logical

sequencing pattern. WDC officers are also claiming that subsequent DPR reviews will ensure that there is adequate urban zoned land in the future. However, this is completely at odds with the intent of the NES, and what our community would like to see.

13. The WDC staff claim that its Long Term Plan (LTP) and infrastructure strategies tell how and when development is to be sequenced. This is complete nonsense as the LTP and infrastructure strategies logically follow on from a well defined Urban Development sequencing strategy. WDC not even have any semblance of a Transport Infrastructure Strategy, and while there are development projects in its current LTP they are not linked back to any long-term strategy.

Feasibility

14. Having reviewed the feasibility methodology, and the appended report from Market Economics in relation to feasibility in the Waimakariri District area, the panel should pay little regard to this appendix. The report has overly complicated a relatively simple concept and has missed some fundamental points.
15. While market economics are important the sensible and logical sequencing of development is much more important to ensuring that Urban Development occurs to meet future demand and is feasible. For example, I have lived in an area that has been zoned Residential for around 7 years but I cannot develop it due to the inefficient sequencing of development in the area. In a previous role of mine as the Technical Services Manager at Waimakariri District Council in the 1990 s I had first hand experience in the development of North Rangiora and Southwest Rangiora and that to avoid inefficient sequencing the council has to be active in coordinating the provision of infrastructure.
16. The report by Market Economics has also is not picked up on the fact that much of the development in Kaiapoi in the Silverstream area and north east Kaiapoi area occurred under a regime where council development contributions were in the region of \$10,000 to \$15,000 per lot, whereas the current estimate for development contributions at Silverstream area is over \$50,000. The feasibility model from Market Economics also shows the council contributions for West Rangiora as being around \$21,000 but recent correspondence from WDC staff has confirmed that the development contributions in this area will be just over \$40,000.

17. It is no surprise that there have been recent calls to establish an Urban Development Authority in the Greater Christchurch area given the examples of poorly coordinated and inefficient approach adopted by the partners to date. A UDA is much more likely to be able to achieve the objectives of the NPS and lead to much more efficient development with far greater integration with future Transport Infrastructure

Density

18. The Officers report, and reports to WDC from its own officers, have shown that WDC has performed extremely poorly in achieving higher densities in new development areas. If this continues the amount of land required to provide for the expected population increases will be far greater than necessary.

19. WDC has shown little commitment to increasing the overall density of housing particularly in new and existing urban areas. WDC has completely botched the opportunity to provide significant amounts of high density housing in the Regeneration Zone around Central Kaiapoi despite considerable community support for this during the consultation processes. The community is still trying to understand why WDC has elected to create sports fields and rural areas so close to central Kaiapoi as part of the regeneration planning.

20. WDC has also not grasped the concept of improved public transport infrastructure and is in the process of selling a key piece of land in Central Kaiapoi that was clearly identified through the Regeneration process as being the optimum location for a public transport interchange.

Transportation

21. This update has placed great reliance on the Canterbury Regional Public Transport plan in providing future Solutions to transportation issues needed to address a growing city. This has been a very convenient way of ignoring the need to integrate urban development and public transport development. The public transport plan is weak on detail and completely lacking any vision. It cannot be relied on to provide a world class system our community deserves.

22. The Christchurch City Council is currently grappling with what to do in the Cranford Street area as a result of the imminent completion of the Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC). The Christchurch

City Council has been in complete denial of the implications of removing the designation for the proposal for the Northern Arterial to link to the Madras and Barbados Street one way system. It is now only at the 11th hour actively engaging with the community on the implications of the short sighted decision in the 1990's.

23. The draft Cranford Street mitigation plan that is about to go out for consultation is yet another short-term approach and is not taking the opportunity to actively promote the inclusion of a key link of a Rapid Bus Transit network that was clearly signalled in the 2008 Parsons Brinckerhoff report prepared by the Canterbury Regional Council. Overseas the development of Rapid Transit corridors and urban intensification go hand in hand, yet the greater Christchurch Partnership seems to see the development of public transport as completely separate. The development of a world class, efficient public transport network can be one of the major contributors to the economic success of the city.
24. The Greater Christchurch area is at the juncture between becoming a truly liveable city or becoming another heartless urban sprawl city relying on the private motor vehicle. The public transport plan is so full of *could* and *maybes* that the community has no confidence that it will actually deliver a public transport system that this city needs in a timely manner. We have already seen in Auckland that a lack of commitment to a truly integrated public transport / urban development plan is crucial to delivering an inefficient and cost-effective solution, and that they are now playing catch up at huge expense.
25. It is clear from this latest update that the Greater Christchurch partnership does not have the willingness, or ability, to manage this aspect of the development of the Greater Christchurch area, and should actively instigate establishment of a CCO (which could be called Christchurch Transport) based on the extremely successful Auckland Transport model.
26. The Greater Christchurch partnership has let the current process of meeting the requirements of NES deteriorate into yet another bureaucratic exercise in lots of words with little substance, ignoring the need for a simple plan that will meet the needs of the greater Christchurch area for at least the next thirty Years. I personally would argue that 30 year horizon is extremely short sighted and that key infrastructure planning should be based on 100 years of projections. The city fathers would be

dismayed at the current lack of vision and foresight in providing infrastructure and community facilities the they had the foresight to deliver so many years ago.

27. If the greater Christchurch partnership really believes in the future of this wonderful city it will abandon its current approach and should establish an independent Urban Development Authority and a CCO called Canterbury Transport, and charge them with the responsibility of providing long-term plans for the greater Christchurch area.