Submission No: 013

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

	-Received via online submission form-		
Submitter details			
First name	Andrew		
Last name	Long		
Email			
Street name			
and number			
Suburb			
Town/City	Christchurch		
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			
	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	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			
	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 to own their own 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.		
	pace 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 Agree			
Comment	office space at the airport should be capped at currentl levels to encourage development in the		
Comment	city centre		
Ouestion 5: The C	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. <i>Do you agree or</i>			
יוי אוו אווי וויטווענע וויטואיזוווארע איז וויאנוער וויטו אוויאנוער וויטו אוויאנוער וויטו אוויאנוער וויטו אוויאניע			

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	proposals in Our Space are informed by a Capacity Assessment that considers future demands for
housing and busing	ness land, based on demographic changes and projections from Statistics New Zealand, and likely
changes in our ec	onomy (including through business sector trends and impacts from technological change). Do you
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 alon	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 con	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	rn Update?
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	