

Land Use Recovery Plan

Consultation Report - Executive Summary

(Round 1 –
targeted stakeholder workshops
November/December 2012)

DATE: 21 DECEMBER 2012

PREPARED BY AERU – Lincoln University



Working in partnership with



Executive summary

- 1.1 The Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery has directed the Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) to prepare a Land Use Recovery Plan, through a collaborative multi-agency partnership with Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Te Rununga o Ngai Tahu, the New Zealand Transport Agency, and the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority.
- 1.2 Recovery involves the whole community, not just business owners, developers and other investors. Recovery also involves the rebuilding and provision of infrastructure, social facilities, recreation and other land-use activities that support and create well-functioning, sustainable places and spaces, for residents and visitors to enjoy.
- 1.3 Preparation of the Land Use Recovery Plan began with key stakeholders being invited to a series of topic based workshops to identify the issues, challenges and opportunities of recovery. A series of workshops and information sessions were run, between 13 November and finishing on 18 December (the workshops ran from 3-18 December). Eleven full workshop sessions were run along with around eight other information sessions provided to groups who were invited to provide feedback in a format that suited each group.
- 1.4 In total around 180 individuals attended workshops and 74 completed survey questionnaires. Two documents were provided containing detailed discussion on specific topics and these are included at the end of this document.
- 1.6 The workshops have generally confirmed that both the Issues Paper and supporting Context Paper reflect the current issues facing earthquake recovery in greater Christchurch.
- 1.7 However, potential solutions and options to address the challenges and make the most of the opportunities raised covered a wide cross section of initiatives and interventions. This varied from extremes of imposing further regulation to ensure good quality sustainable development, to leave developers and commercial operators to 'get on with it' and let the market decide. There are varying experiences and expectations of the planning framework, however the desire for better co-ordination between government and across different sectors (including RMA, LGA and LTMA regulation) was universally agreed.
- 1.8 A wide range of useful suggestions are being explored as a result of the workshops, and will inform the preparation of the preliminary draft Land Use Recovery Plan. The preliminary draft Recovery Plan, is expected to be released for further more detailed consultation in March-April 2013.
- 1.9 It is challenging to distil the key messages from the diverse group of participants and some divergent views around how problems should be addressed. However, some of the key Issues raised consistently across a number of different workshops are summarised below:

Summary of key topics raised at workshops and stakeholder meetings

<p>1. Vision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to work toward a vision for greater Christchurch in 10-15 years, and longer term. • Need to integrate all recovery work and programmes, especially economic recovery programme, Greater Christchurch Transport Strategy and others.
<p>2. Leadership</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being bold and provide strong leadership was encouraged. • Co-ordinated decision making is required. • Provide certainty about who is in charge and who is making decisions.
<p>3. Certainty</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development industry and TA staff (along with the community) need certainty about future development, growth, market demand etc. • Need to 'de-risk' investment decision making through providing certainty.
<p>4. Council processes (opinion differed across the sub-region)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a perception of lack of certainty and consistency in decision making. • Comments that the consenting process doesn't add value to the outcomes. • Extended timeframes cost money and need to be reduced. • Councils should be facilitating recovery, but RMA processes are holding it back. • Planning staff stated that they are keen to better understand developer issues.
<p>5. Brownfield development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complexity, constraints and profit margins are holding back necessary brownfield redevelopment and revitalisation of suburban centres and towns. • There is a desire for more mixed use, medium density development in commercial centres. • It is easier to deliver Greenfield sections and Greenfield business land to market and the development industry is not geared toward other forms of development.
<p>6. Urban design/urban form</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a perception of many poorly designed sub-divisions; Councils need stronger guidelines/rules. • Some developers stated that the process and design approval process doesn't add value to the outcome and adds costs and delays. • There was a strong desire to consolidate growth within limits, but others identified that people generally don't want to live in apartments. • More people focussed design is needed to create communities and great places and spaces.
<p>7. Housing affordability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally land supply is not an issue, but other barriers and constraints add costs (consent process, geotech requirements, etc.) • Covenants requiring large houses decreases affordability.
<p>8. Infrastructure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure providers (three waters, transport, community services, open space, electricity and others) stated that the UDS growth pattern should be maintained and followed. • Although, some industrial business owners (especially 'wet industry') say lack of supply of unconstrained and serviced land is hampering recovery. • There will be increasing implications on infrastructure from business relocation, and the associated workforce.
<p>9. Public transport and active travel</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were request for 'transit-oriented development' with better integration between land use and transport. • A need to reduce congestion and costs for road networks. • There should be a promotion of walking, cycling and a 'village' concept of walkable neighbourhoods and communities.
<p>10. Suburban centres & business land</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater control on malls is needed - car based unsympathetic design, need to integrate better with commercial centre of activity and community. • How to create a thriving central city, without regulating current businesses located in suburbs is a multi-faceted issue. • There is a need to provide diversity of business land choice post 2016.