

Briefing - Council

NOTES – LTP 2024-34 JOINT DEVELOPMENT

Date: Tuesday 8 August 2023
Time: 09:30am and 11:00am
Venue: Council Chambers, Civic Offices,
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

Principal Advisor
Mary Richardson
General Manager
Tel: 941 8999

2. LTP 2024-34 - Joint development briefing

Presenters: Peter Ryan (Head of Corporate Planning & Performance), David Griffiths (Head of Strategic Policy & Resilience), John Higgins (Head of Planning & Consents) and Bruce Rendall (Head of City Growth and Property)

In attendance: Mayor Mauger, DM Cotter, Cllrs Field, Scandrett, Coker, Peters, Henstock, McLellan, Johanson, Templeton, Harrison-Hunt, Gough.

Online: Cllrs Moore, Donovan

Lateness: Cllr MacDonald

Chair: Mayor Mauger

Apology: none

Principal advisor: Mary Richardson

==

Strategic Policy and Resilience (9:38am)

Introduction to the activity and the services it provides; Strategic Policy, including bylaws and regulatory policy, strategic policy and advice, and submissions on government reforms and issues critical to Council, and Climate Resilience, including climate change strategy, policy, planning and advice, emissions reduction and strategic analysis, and resilience

partnerships. Effectively, this activity includes advice to elected members, executive team, and the rest of the organisation.

There are a number of changes being made to levels of service, reflective of internal changes to the organisation, this revised activity plan delivering the services just outlined.

Open for questions:

Scandrett: How closely are we working with central government on climate resilience? Some of the decisions that are made in Wellington hamstring about what we can do in certain areas.

Response: Through the formal submissions processes that we undertake, we are engaging through those formal processes. We also undertaken have other engagements with colleagues in government departments, for example, relationships with staff in MfE, and we engage with them on the work they are intending to do and undertake, and we are part of networks with central and local government.

Scandrett: I know we are not alone – South Dunedin has flooding issues, and Invercargill airport is low lying, so these issues are going to start to become more prevalent.

Response: in terms of the draft Strategic Framework climate resilience is one of the councils priorities, This is going to become a growing area, which is why we have reshaped internally, put more emphasis on climate resilience, created a Climate Resilience team that can work across the organisation with our colleagues, and externally with others, representing councils views.

Templeton: With the recent government move to what's being called a 'climate buy-out', a 50/50 split between central government and councils (we've yet to consult and vote on that). Until now council has not had legal responsibility for private property for this kind of hazard stuff. This is likely to set some kind of precedent and it's something we haven't addressed as a Council because it hasn't been a legal responsibility of ours Last term the coastal hazards working group looked at some sort of levy, which would be enormously, which adaptation is going to be.

Can we get some advice on the impacts of that potential precedent-setting move up north, there will be impacts for our planning and finances, but also advice on the climate levy, so we are taking intergenerational equity into account, for paying for the adaptation that's going to be needed, sooner rather than later.

Response: Response to be provided outside of the activity plan process.

A number of colleagues in councils in the North Island are concerned about the 50/50 split policy, because it does present a significant liability, something we are trying to understanding.

Across the adaptation programme of work currently in play for our district, the programme of work sits with Strategic Planning and Resource Consents activity, coming next.

Johanson: How do we get a strategy around EVs in the city? Money is on budget that we haven't yet spent, towards coordinated EV charging infrastructure strategy as a city. There is talk about shared EV fleet, there is a number of things we do outside of that through our council companies such as Orion and working with government and sustainability funding. Around an EV strategy for the city, what is it and if we don't have one what's the best way to get one?

Response: The whole area around EVs and EV charging is developing technology and that is being rolled out in a number of ways, both privately and publicly. There are a number of private organisations putting in place EV charging across the country and the government is involved in this space. We can work with our colleagues in property and infrastructure around what a strategy for EV charging for council land would be, but would say we need to consider what our role is in this space and what the private sectors role is in this space, and we don't want to double-up.

Johanson: Orion putting pricing up on their chargers on council facilities, saying that was what the market was doing, where the market is also providing free EV charging in a number of places as well. Some community centres that don't have any EV chargers, where as other have an oversupply. I understand we have money on budget that has yet to be spent, but am not sure where that's got to.

I would welcome us having something in this plan that provides a high level look at what our role is.

Johanson: Healthy Food action plan and Food Resilience. When we adopted the climate change strategy we did talk about that being important. I'm not seeing anything about this in the activity plan.

Response: We haven't gone down to that level in the activity plan. There are 10 streams within the strategy, so we're not calling out any particular streams, but we are calling out implementing the strategy itself.

Johanson: Support for locally grown food, debates around funding support for alternative healthy food. Is there something we can give more visibility to?

Response: As part of the work of implementing the strategy that we have now those are the sports of things that would come out, and we will bring these back to council, but this is not the sort of detail you would see in the activity plan.

Johanson: Land use planning, strategic advice around Masterplans/ Areas plans / spatial plans? Where would I see this?

Response: Coming up with Strategic Planning and Resources Consents activity,

Coker: How do these three plans today fit together? Does Strategic Policy activity over-arch everything else?

Response: Nothing is prepared that acts as a diagram to explain the three activity. They have been put together as a group today by way of explaining their separate services

following structure change since the previous LTP. There isn't a diagram that explains what each activity does and does do.

We can take it offline and explain the differences, rather than prepare a diagram, which wouldn't be simple.

Coker: There used to be structure of units and functions, how things aligns, who the Head of Service is?

Response: LTP is structured by activity rather than how the organisation structures itself as staff, being what services we deliver to the public – so the LTP makes sense to the community.

Can work with you to understand what falls to each activity and how they relate to each other.

==

Strategic Planning and Resource Consents (9:52am)

Mayor: How are we going with the amount of resource consents we are getting in and the amount we are getting out?

Response: Resource consents processing is improving. Last year ended up with 79% being processed on time, as this year begins we are up to 90% processed on time presently. We are making some good inroads there. This is due to the combination of strategies to get through the process quicker and lower numbers of applications coming in.

Mayor: Talking to the chair of Ecan, if we are running behind in time for a consent we have to refund some fees?

Response: Yes, 1% for every day we exceed the statutory timeframes for processing consents, up to a maximum of 50%.

Introduction to the activity and the various services it provides. A broad range of independent services.

Some of the services we deliver are statutory, otherwise there is strong alignment with our community outcomes, strategic priorities and climate resilience goals.

Levels of service that reflect the services being delivered. Key change is change in resource consent timeframes processing target from 99% on time to 95%. Doesn't negate the statutory requirement of 100% on time, but allows the team some flexibility due to the lumpy nature of resource consents received.

Otherwise the remainder of the LOS stay similar.

In terms of funding, this activity is largely rates funded with the exception of resource consenting which is user-pays, predominantly fees funded through resource consent processing.

There are some proposals to put forward with this joint development process.

Firstly, Coastal Hazards Adaptation Planning, to accelerate the planning side of this programme of works. Approx. \$1.75m is required to accelerate this planning.

The second relates to spatial planning. We have a number of spatial plans that will be finalised early 2024 onwards, and we require more specialist support to implement these plans, mainly around local area planning.

The third is around Heritage incentive grants, the grants scheme expires mid-2024, and we're proposing a continuation of this scheme, approx. \$500k.

Open for questions

Scandrett: Spatial planning, due to intensification, local schools are struggling to cope with the influx (MoE). How is the rest of our infrastructure underground, eg high flood areas such as those in Spreydon, and coastal hazards areas, how does this fit in with central govt planning, likely to cope?

Response: Spatial planning is looking at areas where we want to grow and areas where we don't want this to happen. Aside from PC14 being imposed upon us, after the spatial plans are ready it is about identifying areas where we do want to look in terms of growth and hazards. This is an ongoing piece of work that will start soon. This is part of the proposals mentioned, to fund these pieces of work.

Scandrett: in coastal hazard areas, what are we planning, and how we link this with central government planning

Henstock: Acceleration for climate resilience works planning, with the acceleration request, are you proposing reduction or deferral of other programmes or works to fund/resource this?

Response: There will be a diversion of work, but this won't be in terms of the Coastal Hazards Adaptation Planning work. There is some proposed diversion of resource for this but new resource is also proposed for this.

Henstock: New specialist resource, many places are looking for this kind of resource due to RMA reforms. Can we anticipate what our needs are, and where we would source the resource from, where are the people going to come from? How are we going to do this? Deliverability perspective.

Response: For the planning side we have a hump for PC14, where a lot of resource is being used. Once PC14 is completed, resource will be directed elsewhere, such as the plan change priority programme, and secondly to the spatial planning/local area planning. There is some shortfall in the local area planning, so we are proposing more funding to

support this work and also the coastal Hazards Adaptation planning, which is a different skillset.

In terms of deliverability for Spatial planning, District planning, and local area planning, will be able to divert some of the existing resource once PC14 is completed. We largely have the right skillsets. And we are able to move the resource around. But we are missing some specialist people. The market is getting better for this type of resource.

Templeton: Coastal Hazards plan change, due 2018? Been pushed out by other urgent things. Where are we sitting with timing for this, so that we can stop people building and sub-dividing in areas that are likely to be affected?

Response: Unsure of the exact timing for commencement. It has been delayed by PC14, which has the qualifying matters around coastal hazards (PC14 concluding likely middle of 2024), which has acted in preventing some of this from happening, could proceed then. There are qualifying matters/overlays in place that will address intensification in those areas, some restrictions. There are still high flood management areas where there are existing use rights. Not able to build new in these places.

Templeton: Adaptation planning, upscaling the current plan, using what we are doing in Whakaraupo/Lyttelton Harbour and starting in other parts of the district, how much is proposed by way of resource for this planning? To look at this before this happen, rather than after an event or situation occurs. It would be cheaper for us to get ahead of things. How much extra resource would we be putting in? Are we looking at doubling?

Response: Proposal is for a second team, so that we can undertake planning in two separate adaptation areas at any one time. It takes approx. 1.5-2 years to go through a full process, it works as fast as the community and mana whenua are able to work with us. This can be different in different areas. We are piloting in Whakaraupo and learning from this.

Communities are starting to ask us when we are coming to their area to start planning, and infrastructure and asset managers are asking what is the long term plan in different areas to inform investments and renewals and infrastructure. We also have initial analysis around criticality window, with 20cm of sea level rise (approx. 25 years away), a quarter of our roads and a third of our pipes will be at risk (approx. \$3.2b infrastructure).

Templeton. Is the new team going to be larger, capable of dealing with bigger communities? So, once the adaptation plan is adopted by council everything will be monitored, so we can see what's going on.

Response: Proposing the additional team of the same size, but with additional monitoring and reporting and implementation resource across the whole adaptation programme.

Templeton: Funding for adaptation, we've seen lots of sudden events around NZ, and we are planning to get ahead of things, the adaptation stuff. The working group last term looked at the potential for a 'climate levy' so we can have a 'fighting fund' for adaptation, so we can have the headroom financially to be able to cope with a large event. Has this

been planned for in the activity plan? Can we get some advice for the working group to explore, to enable us to be prepared for these things? To fund the adaptation.

Response: Advice will be prepared and provided.

Johanson: How much capacity do we have to do plan changes? Can any plans change outside of PC14 be worked on?

Response: There are some plan changes being worked on, mainly being carried over, but this is a small amount. PC13 and PC14 taking up almost all of the available resource.

Johanson: How can we get away from the communities being continually frustrated by delays? What's the best way we can have some discretionary resource available to respond to things that come up, to process other plan changes?

Response: PC 14 is unusual in how it is being imposed on us, and how much resource it is taking, much more resource intensive. Aside from saying we will have staff freeing up from mid-2024, we don't have the amount of resource to do other plan changes at this stage.

Johanson: What about external consultants? To do things in a more timely manner.

Response: We will prepare some information for this question and come back to you.

There will be resourcing coming available, more space to spend on other plan changes once POC14 has been completed mid-2024. We can consider some other options about how we accelerate the plan change programme. The other caution for this is we do have the new RMA changes replacement coming online from approx. end of August.

Johanson: I'm worried that by the time we get on to getting resource to do resource planning that we want to do we won't even be responsible for it anymore.

Response: We will need to keep that in the back of our minds around when is it wise to spend money on doing new plan changes when there is a whole new scheme coming into effect. We don't want to be spending money on plan change that are only going to be around to the next, say, 2 years.

Johanson: Local area planning, how will you prioritise within that programme what gets done, and how will that compete with existing demands that people have already made or requests that have already been made around planning?

Response: There will be a mix of plan changes and implementation of the spatial planning, which is local area planning. That is being done jointly with the City Growth and Property activity. It is to prepare those plans, the areas plans.

Johanson: Is the map what is going to inform the area planning?

Response: Yes, largely.

Johanson: So the areas like Woolston, that have areas of interface between residential and industrial, that have had difficulty getting any progress through council, how can they have

confidence through this LTP that resource will be made available and the work will happen for plan changes?

Response: There is a plan change priority programme that this plan change is part of. There is a careful balance between progressing the priority plan changes and progressing local area planning work. There will always be a demand for time. We are proposing to progress both these streams of work. We can come back with more information about how we can split the resources between these.

Johanson: At a high level, with environmental damage happening in certain areas of the city, we don't seem to have enough resource to proactively manage and monitor that risk, whether it is sediment, adverse events, toxic spills. What can we do at the District Planning level to have better monitoring of consents around consented activity, and also how we can make resource available to look at the high risk or high impact things that are happening.

Also, in regards to Heritage, can we look at using sustainability of building materials, retaining existing buildings rather than building new. Have we given any thought to doing things differently as a city in terms of incentives around retaining existing building from a sustainability pov, rather than having them knocked down and rebuilt at a cost to the environment?

Response: We can come back to you with more information on this. There are another grant funds, such as around sustainability, which is minor, and may not help with building retention.

Johanson: Is this where we talk about the Greater Christchurch joint work programme?

Response: We support the Greater Christchurch programme with planning resource but the rest sits within another area.

Johanson: We have a range of planning activity happening with other entities (Mayoral Forum, GCP, Urban Growth Partnership, Ecan etc). There can be a lot of duplication, especially across the climate space. How we can streamline this?

Mayor: Are we asking for a whole lot of work, that you may not be resourced to take on?

Response: The main question seems to be, is there adequate planning resource to be able to do this, these different pieces of work, priority plan changes, local area plans etc.

Johanson: How can we ensure we have the resource to do the work, to respond, and thinking ahead for the next 10 years, look at trying to retain building from a sustainability pov, rather than just a heritage pov.

Coker: Urban design level of service, the design panels. Target for 2024/25, but nothing for after this. Is this correct?

Response: We will have a look at this. Our intention is not to cease the Urban Design Panel after that period of time. Will take a look and come back to you.

Coker: Multi-unit builds, developments, seeking units all the same colour. What's happening with the advice around this, to make them look more, aesthetically, broken up?

Response: It can relate to the provisions of the district plan. If they are in a different zoning they can often have different urban design requirements. Some areas will not have any urban design requirements, and some will allow us to assess urban design. If we able to assess those proposals for urban design matters, then we will be looking at matters such as that.

Scandrett: With regards to what we can dictate in our city plan and retain, it would be good to send out a brief, or a memo about that. There have been a few questions raised today about district plan and areas. Some of this is over-ridden by central government. And also in regards to building materials, to explain that what we would like to set out, and what is dictated by MBIE, not us, and we actually can't step outside that, we have no real say. To give us councillors a lead on this.

With regards to sea level rise, (20cm rise in the next 25 years), can we get a monitor on the accuracy of that? To understand how quickly this is occurring? We need to have a realisation this is coming. It would good to have an understanding, to extend our vision beyond electoral 3-year terms.

Response: The costs will not all be 20 years off. We do monitor, we have peculiarities in Christchurch with post-eq vertical land movements. We have a lot of this information on our website. Part of the proposed additional resource funding is for additional risk screening, so that annually we can produce a report for the district with the most accurate information, across all climate hazards, so we can see where the risks lie, and find where the priorities are for our attention.

Scandrett: Surely a lot of that is coming from the government or NIWA?

Response: Much of this is largely funded by council. Monitoring role is something central government, or regional council, is something they could or should be doing more of. We are having conversations but at present this is not in their work programme.

Moore (online): How much of the PC14 resource goes into qualifying matters? Would fighting for less of them require less resource?

Response: It is hard to split it up like that, but there is some resource going in to those specific qualifying matters. But this is more of a package and hard to split out. Overall there is a large resource being dedicated to PC14. They are preparing evidence for the hearings, and the evidence requirements for the IHP are high, across a range of matters, meaning it's a lot of work for the team.

Templeton: Levels of service, Heritage, administer grants, could this grant LOS be amalgamated across council?

Also, there is a new LOS to hold the annual heritage festival, which is in the events and festivals programme, it's contestable funding. It would be a difficult thing to weigh up against, and seems much less important than, for instance, risk screening and monitoring for hazards.

I'd like to see us have a level of service about actively screening and monitoring for the hazards that are likely to impact our communities. That would be really useful.

Response: Noted

Donovan: Climate resilience programme, have we looked at what additional resource might be useful for community boards who will be responding to some of the programmes of work that will be focused in their areas? To bring communities on that journey.

Response: We are actively looking at that aspect. An ongoing discussion. Operational cost associated with running an adaptation programme, some of this is focused on community capability and capacity, for example there is a community board member sitting on the coastal panels. We also work closely with our community governance colleagues, so there is some cross-over there. We have had the same thoughts about what opportunities exist, something that is being actively explored.

Donovan: With some of those community boards, some of the community development advisors are quite stretched, managing other workstreams, could additional resource be dedicated, knowledge and expertise in climate adaptation work, to sit on those community boards, to provide advice to communities. Not just utilising existing resource. How could this resource be added to teams? If we can get some advice on this, that would be appreciated.

Response: This would sit more with the Community Development and Facilities activity plan. This question will be passed on.

Harrison-Hunt: Te Tiriti, which activity plan would this sit under? Treaty advisors.

Response: Those targets will be integrated across activity plans. There was to be a small activity plan for this team, but the advisors have identified that this is not their preference. They want to see it embedded across council activities.

Harrison-Hunt: How would we ask questions in that space, if they are across activity plans?

Response: We can have a presentation from that area, but we wouldn't normally build an activity plan for this.

Concluded.

==

City Growth and Property (10:30am)

This activity has three main functions, property, broadly local area planning/urban regeneration, and case management. These areas are focus on Christchurch being thriving, prosperous and confident.

Three minor functions as well, the other housing initiatives such as regional housing, which is essentially the stuff not funded by the housing development fund, we have a business liaison, and an economic development role. These are about trust, confidence and partnerships.

We work closely with ChristchurchNZ, joined up and collaborative on property and growth matters.

The main strategies over the next 10 years, more specifically over the next 3 years, to utilise councils land to generate community outcomes. That might include releasing capital, but might include other outcomes as well. We will do this as council but also in collaboration with other agencies such as ChristchurchNZ, and Rūnanga and Ngai Tahu.

We also support the organisation through transactional property activities. Acquiring land, leasing it, property rights, disposals. Disposal programme will go forward with the LTP, approx. 80 properties. Small amounts compared to our total portfolio.

One of the other sub-strategies is to increase our transparency around acquisitions. We know we have had over 1% per annum growth in the portfolio over the last 11 years, we are anticipating over the next 10 years to be between 0% and 1% growth each year. That's a net figure, even after disposals.

Overview of Local Area Planning Christchurch Urban Area Spatial Priorities. We are trying to put together an achievable programme within existing resources. We are looking at focusing on a small number of locations within the wider strategies.

Initial focus will be on central city (map), and starting to work with other partners on the eastern areas, the western end of that, beginning with Linwood. There is some new capital identified for that, later in the presentation.

We also provide non-regulatory options for council intervention, such as noise issues. Others include the vacant site differential rating, and extending that into suburban areas. We are looking at extending that programme through the LTP.

We continue to encourage and support develop that addresses problems and creates employment in particular through our case management service where we work with developers and others, such as government depts, to make it easier to deal with council and make it easier to work through our processes. We will continue that programme.

Changes to LOS, one new LOS proposed, to generate positive community outcomes through the acquisition and disposal of property. We are already doing this but have never has a LOS that clearly identifies and tells the public we are doing this, what is the basis for a lot of our work. We want to make this more obvious.

Impacts on opex and capex. We will be looking for an opex increase associated with Court Theatre maintenance and operation. This is a site that sits within the Corporate portfolio. We will be searching for substitutions to make this happen, we are early days in this search.

Within capital we have allowed for acquisitions to cater for some for densification. This will need to be assessed through the capital prioritisation process. Particular focus for these are densification areas in Central City SW neighbourhoods and Sydenham. Types of things we will be looking at is acquisition for things like greenspace to assist in those areas.

There will be some capital revenue, we are not at the stage where we will know what this will be.

Risks and challenges that we face with this activity. One is, our ability to deliver vs expectations. From the map shown, from various planning documents and existing plans, there is a of potential activity and we cannot deliver all of that. If we are trying to keep within the resources we have got we will need to prioritise and take a limited focus.

We have also identified the potential for climate change-induced weather events and their consequences. And by consequences looking at the impacts on the insurance and mortgage markets, to lead to a rapid red zoning exercise. We have seen this as a risk, we have seen that happen this year already. We need to be ready for it, not just having that funding and the policy, we know the implementation will be difficult, especially as it appears the government is delegating that implementation to council. We are dealing with one presently. If this becomes 100's we are going to have to really ramp up in this space.

Open for questions:

Mayor: We recently sold 1% of our surplus land, received approx. \$40m, and we don't miss that 1% of land that we sold. If we are anticipating we are increase 1% per year through bits and pieces we inherit, with the likes of the Transitional cathedral land, what are the options for future?

Response: This is something we can exam, look at alternate uses for the site. Will these impact on, for instance, Te Kaha, and do we need to take action to mitigate those. We can exam and provide advice on this.

Templeton: You've mentioned trying to provide services within existing budgets, looking at areas of intensification (referring to map), areas that have had intensification of time with no public amenity, no planning. With other areas, such as those affected by MRT, what resource would be required if we wanted to be able to do those areas. How are we planning to support areas involved with MRT? Areas of greenspace?

Response: The areas mentioned as being affected by MRT would be managed through the Strategic planning and resource consents activity. The Sustainable Economic Development activity (ChristchurchNZ) will be responsible for development in the Sydenham and Addington areas).

The City Growth and Property activity is focusing on the central city and eastern/Linwood areas (the existing master plans and area plans). There is a further area towards the east where discussion is being had as to which agency is best placed to lead further development. One of the key restrictions we have is implementing – we know from the suburban masterplans that once we get to the capital we need to prioritise and sometimes those masterplans have a lesser priority, so we don't want to over promise up front with the planning and then not deliver something.

Templeton: And the capex that you've been asking for, does this cover other areas, such as Riccarton, which would benefit from some greenspace amongst the medium density?

Response: At the moment it's only Sydenham and central city where the capital is focused for acquisitions at this stage.

Templeton: Can we get some advice for the potential for adding capex in years 2-3-4-5, for those areas that are bereft of greenspace, where there is lots of intensification happening?

Response: Yes, we can provide that. In addition, there is another mechanism that we can fund some of that stuff from, which is around development contributions. Further advice can be provided about how to use this mechanism to fund these things.

This is part of the strategy to have this in the plan (City Growth and Property activity), so we can receive development contributions, so that might also be looking at a general acquisition aspect, though this will need further looking at when the time comes.

Scandrett: We have had dialogue from developers, being in the 'dark' around streets. Previously we have had a developers working group, there appears to be a disconnect presently. Can we get some advice around what is proposed to close the loop, to remove angst and additional work.

Response: This won't be part of the LTP, but a memo will be prepared to provide, including a staff proposal for doing this. This will have a development focus.

Action item

1048: Mayor departing, DM took the chair.

Johanson: Relative housing affordability continues to worsen, demographic changes are exacerbating unaffordability, transitional homelessness, but we haven't made progress on our housing affordability plan. The Mayoral Forum (and other entities) are now doing something about housing. What is the best way through this activity, and the draft LTP, to inform what we are doing in this housing space?

Response: The work happening is trying to align the mayoral forum and Greater Christchurch Partnership. Looking at focusing on the matters we can actually influence, addressing the problem areas (as seen through the Community/social housing activity plan), there is work going on to present that, we will focus on advocacy plans, some work on what councils may do with any surplus land they may have and how this might address any housing affordability, noting that we are already working in that space – whenever we

are disposing of land we are really focusing on housing outcomes as part of that. There is a broader piece, of lifting the quality of existing housing, while still keeping it affordable. This is a problem area but we don't have many levers to pull on this. So that would be where we are pushing the plan to achieve that.

Johanson: In terms of what we can doing from a council perspective, recognising that this is not mentioned among your priorities, that where we will look it is trying to achieve additional housing through disposal and development programme, so looking at sites that we will be disposing of and working with affordable housing providers and consortia to provide that housing

Should we be putting into out LTP the work already done around the GCP around the draft plan, the number of things in there, CCC to lead the acceleration of the provision of affordable housing over the next 12 months (from November 2022).

Response: Not a lot has occurred to date within the existing resources. Action is happening now as we are getting some assistance and resources to achieve things. For the LTP the broader function of working in that space is in the LTP already, so no additions needed.

Johanson: There was discussion regarding housing sustainability and affordability items identified in 2007 action plan, eg inclusionary zoning.

Response: The zoning needs to be done at a national level, which is advocacy driven.

Johanson: In 2022 there was a joint strategy on the issues of homelessness, emergency and transitional housing. Do we need resource for this?

Response: There is information coming through from the CHIP sector, that space is not one council operates in directly, if council wishes to do this then council needs to make that decision.

Johanson: We are dealing with the consequence – having to deal with safety patrols in the central city. What resource do we provide to GCP and mayoral forum, to should we instead hold that resource and undertake the work for ourselves, rather than in a collaborative approach which has ended up missing most milestones?

Response: We can discuss further to understand what's needed.

Coker: Recently there was a meeting with Kainga Ora, intensification areas, wanting to be proactive with council, neighbourhood planning, what to do with roads, parking, increases in traffic, amenity, parks, waste management. What's the best way to look at this?

Response: We are already working with KO, doing exactly this kind of work in Shirley. We will contact them (KO) again to figure out if this is something we can work closely with them on, to ensuring relationships are understood and departments are working together.

Concludes.