Submission No: 013

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

-Received via online submission form-

	Received via crimic submission form	
Submitter details		
First name	Andrew	
Last name	Long	
Email		
Street name		
and number		
Suburb		
Town/City		
Postcode		
I am completing	For myself	
this submission		
Hearings		
Do you wish to	I do not wish to speak at the hearings	
speak to the		
hearings panel?		
Phone number		
Preferred		
location to be		
heard		
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 ar	ound Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why?	
Agree/disagree	Do not agree	
Comment	There is no justification for doing so. These towns clearly do not have employment sufficient for their populations, as the 100000 vehicle trips per day shows. the plan includes very little in terms of additional business land or encouragement for businesses to locate there. the shortfall in housing predicted is premised on commuting to christchurch, not any demand from industry. it isn't sustainable in terms of the RMA or in any other way, including fossil fuel use, emissions, road network capacity. do you actually hate polar bears? 30000 more houses is a significant amount. PT uptake in these places is very low.	
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	agree in relation to the city. selwyn and waimak don't need any more housing, as above.	
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		
	home. What elements should be included in this action plan?	
Comment	distribution of units within GC and in relation to shops/services, and urban design.	
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		
	support such development?	
Agree/disagree	Agree	
Comment	office space at the airport should be capped at currentl levels to encourage development in the city centre	
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 disagree
Comment	as above, selwyn and waiak have a massive employment shortfall, resulting in 100000vpd into
	christchurch. there is evidently insufficient industrial or other activities on these districts.
Question 6: The p	roposals in Our Space are informed by a Capacity Assessment that considers future demands for
housing and busin	ness land, based on demographic changes and projections from Statistics New Zealand, and likely
changes in our eco	onomy (including through business sector trends and impacts from technological change). <i>Do you</i>
agree or disagree	with our evidence base and why?
Agree/disagree	Do not agree
Comment	as above, 100000vpd into christchurch daily for work would suggest insufficient employment
	base in selwyn and waimak, so whay make it worse worth 30000 more houses. are you
	expecting taxpayers and ratepayers to pay for the lifestyle choices of selwyn and waimak
	residents.
Question 7: Our S	pace promotes greater densities around key centres to increase accessibility to employment and
	ng, cycling and public transport.
This aligns with re	ecent transport proposals that signal more high frequency bus routes and an intention to deliver
rapid transit along	g the northern and south-west transport corridors. Do you agree or disagree with this approach
and why?	
Agree/disagree	Somewhat disagree
Comment	RT is fine but are ccc ratepayers going to bear the brunt of that cost? i don't see why they
	should when the benefits will largely be to selwyn and waimak commuters. also given low PT
	uptake, i'd suggest it won't be used and people will till commute from selwyn and waimak by
	car.
	transport within the city - phasing of traffic signals is a massive problem in the city. it seems
	they are phased to disrupt and slow traffic in peak hours to encourage use of bikes or PT and
	then they stay phased like that outside peak hours. uses more fuel, creates more emissions and
	slows bus trips.
Question 8: Our S	pace aligns with broader infrastructure planning (including wastewater, water supply,
stormwater, ener	gy, telecommunications, community facilities, schools and healthcare) to help create sustainable,
cohesive and conf	nected communities. Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why? What more could be
done to integrate	infrastructure planning?
Agree/disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Comment	
Question 9: What	other points do you wish to make to inform the final Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch
Settlement Patter	
Comment	selwyn and waimak seem to contain very few hazards, including appearing immune to sea level
	rise or tsunami.
	selwyn and wamak reisdents don't contribute to providing or operating costs of ccc assets.
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Attachments	