

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

-Received via online submission form-

| Submitter details | |
|--|---|
| First name | Peter |
| Last name | Wells |
| Email | [REDACTED] |
| Street name and number | [REDACTED] |
| Suburb | Christchurch |
| Town/City | Christchurch |
| Postcode | 8013 |
| I am completing this submission | For myself |
| Hearings | |
| Do you wish to speak to the hearings panel? | I do not wish to speak at the hearings |
| 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 around Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. <i>Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why?</i> | |
| Agree/disagree | Somewhat disagree. |
| Comment | <p>Whilst our region will certainly need to accommodate additional housing in the coming three decades, developing arable or ecologically valuable land is a poor investment in our future. As we transform living landscapes into urban areas through paving, underground utilities, above-ground structures; we introduction new toxicities into these areas and render them ecologically inert. Once this transformation occurs, we cannot change it back; not without costly remediation which takes hundreds, even thousands of years. As they exist today, subdivisions outside our existing urban fabric are built with cheap materials stock on a 30-50 year horizon, are expensive to extend infrastructure to, and increase the social isolation of their residents. Indeed it has been estimated that every 10 minutes of additional driving time between home and social activities predicts a 10% decline in civic involvement (Robert Putnam quoted in Frumkin 2002).</p> <p>To avert deteriorating our land-base, over-taxing our 20th-century infrastructure, inhibiting Christchurch's net-zero carbon goal by 2030, and escalating social divides with rural communities & commuters, we need prioritize human-scale civic development above other forms of housing and allow greenfield development ONLY if it has a regenerative impact on it's surrounding ecology, alleviates the load on central infrastructure (three waters, energy, transport), and contributes to the social well-being of it's residents.</p> |
| 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. <i>Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why?</i> | |
| Agree/disagree | Agree |
| Comment | Given the rapid change in demographics and housing needs of Cantabrians, the Settlement Pattern Update should actively encourage new forms of human-scale, place-based, and environmentally restorative housing. As a millennial with very little prospect of home ownership, |

| | |
|---|--|
| | I would be thrilled to see our councils enabling tiny houses, co-housing schemes (such as Peterborough Village), live/work artist studios, Living Buildings, passive houses, and utilizing heritage buildings for young & old people to live in. This type of urban living arrangements add tremendous value to the urban fabric through closer communities, introducing sustainable solutions into the building vernacular & codes, and building with our shifting ecology rather than over it. Enabling these citizen-led solutions delivers not only on the outcomes of this Update, but on the Resilient Greater Christchurch Plan, the CCC Climate Smart Strategy, CCC's Long Term Plan, and even Share and Idea! |
| 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. <i>What elements should be included in this action plan?</i> | |
| Comment | |
| 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. <i>Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why? What further measures would support such development?</i> | |
| Agree/disagree | Somewhat agree |
| Comment | <p>Commercial vitality in the central city is important, however, its success will hinge upon the character of the development. The vibrant, prosperous, opportunity-rich atmosphere that Christchurch is aspiring to is inherently an adaptable and a livable one. The most common sentiment I've heard (almost universally) of the Christchurch rebuild is: "we had the opportunity to do so much more in the city center, not just 4 stories of concrete, glass, and steel . . . I miss the old alleyways, the diversity of places, and shops, and the people in them." As Anake Goodall put it simply, we re-constructed a 20th-century city.</p> <p>Commercial development in greater Christchurch needs to embody the shifting currents of different use which all cities go through. Whether office, retail, hospitality, or production, any building in a prosperous urban area must be to adapt with it's surroundings and climate, to weather the wear & tear of use over decades (and centuries), and to live many different lives supporting the needs of it's occupants. Developments which can take on this character are not only future-proofed, but represent more stable investments with longer returns, build social capital around them, and become landmarks (even commonplace ones) in the urban landscape. Some of our most successful urban developments in Christchurch are living examples of this. What was an old pickle factory next to the railway has for 5 years been home to the XCHC, an exemplar hub for the creative community, now featuring a cafe, co-working space, & boutique accommodation. The Arts Centre is a similar story of set of buildings designed as a place which has gone from housing a university to galleries, a theatre, cafes, maker spaces, and world-class events. In a world of city regions which have been built for singular moments in time, the greater Christchurch area should focus its commercial development on creating quality, livable spaces which will grow with the city as the city expands and contracts.</p> <p>Our commercial developments should continue to focus on our urban centers rather than proliferating into undeveloped land and above all should add to a livable atmosphere that will which will enrich their surroundings over time, rather than becoming a series of cheap frontages for an easy boom & bust.</p> |
| 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. <i>Do you agree or disagree this is sufficient and in the right location and why?</i> | |
| Agree/disagree | Neither agree nor disagree |
| Comment | |
| Question 6: The proposals in Our Space are informed by a Capacity Assessment that considers future demands for housing and business land, based on demographic changes and projections from Statistics New Zealand, and likely changes in our economy (including through business sector trends and impacts from technological change). <i>Do you agree or disagree with our evidence base and why?</i> | |
| Agree/disagree | Neither agree nor disagree |
| Comment | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Question 7: Our Space promotes greater densities around key centres to increase accessibility to employment and services by walking, cycling and public transport. This aligns with recent transport proposals that signal more high frequency bus routes and an intention to deliver rapid transit along the northern and south-west transport corridors. <i>Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why?</i></p> | |
| Agree/disagree | Agree |
| Comment | <p>The map of cycle accessibility from activity centres (page 27) is an excellent picture of how urban transport should work. Living in the city centre, I would say that Christchurch is an extremely easy city to navigate. With no desire (or excess income) to own a car, I find it easy to walk, cycle, and for longer trips bus, to work, errands, friends, events, and everything else I need in the city. Cycle lanes and boulevards like Manchester St (after the 3rd excavation) have made things very efficient, the 30km limit in the CBD is marvelous for safety, the buses are consistent enough, and the Green Spire through the River Corridor is going to be an unprecedented asset of the city (and New Zealand as a whole). But there is one more piece I wish we had working . . . the tram.</p> <p>Like it or not, the tram is effectively a light-rail system waiting to be restored. At present it's mostly treated like a circus animal for tourists, but an electric tram system is something many cities around the world wish they could bring back to their urban environment. The possibility of light-rail for greater Christchurch is very enticing and would invite a host of neighborhood-scale development ecological regeneration opportunities, however this would have to be brand new infrastructure and new land-area to support those lines. An alternative to this might in fact be the existing train system.</p> <p>Not only do our existing train lines run through Lyttleton, Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Templeton, & Rolleston, but they connect Christchurch to much of the South Island. Given the recent reinstatement of the Napier / Wairoa section of Kiwirail (with 5M in support from the Provincial Growth Fund) this trend may be one worth perpetuating in the greater Christchurch region. If feasible, this would both utilize predominately existing infrastructure and open opportunities for new urban development or revitalization around rail infrastructure.</p> |
| <p>Question 8: Our Space aligns with broader infrastructure planning (including wastewater, water supply, stormwater, energy, telecommunications, community facilities, schools and healthcare) to help create sustainable, cohesive and connected communities. <i>Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why? What more could be done to integrate infrastructure planning?</i></p> | |
| Agree/disagree | Do not agree |
| Comment | <p>From the detail provided in this Update, the current plan appears to be more of the same; amounting to an increased load on a three waters system already at capacity. The centralized water/waste system which takes the form of the 600M Bromley Treatment Plant for Christchurch is highly susceptible to disruption. As the effects of climate increase and stresses will dramatically build on the city's infrastructure, this solution to waste treatment will no longer be viable. Rather than continuing to invest in intensive, monolithic systems, we have the opportunity to explore what our utilities look like at a town / village scale and transition towards it. At this scale, waste & water systems in particular are more resilient to disaster, ecologically compatible, easier to manage (in volume), less expensive to maintain/operate, and engender greater awareness in communities of their resource use and indeed, the value of infrastructure. For an exemplar space like the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor, such applications of 21-century infrastructure are essential for its success.</p> <p>If the Settlement Pattern Update were to allow for exploration of on-site storm-water management, rainwater harvesting, localized composting systems, renewable energy generation, and similar innovative infrastructures, increased demand from urban growth in the greater Christchurch area could be offset, new models of civic infrastructure could be tested and implemented over time and in-tern, propagated to other area of New Zealand.</p> |
| <p>Question 9: What other points do you wish to make to inform the final Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update?</p> | |
| Comment | <p>Regarding Question (other infrastructure) attached is a resource from the International Living Future Institute in Seattle, which researches and pioneers such systems.</p> |

Attachments

007 Attachment 1 – Urban Sprawl and Public Health

007 Attachment 2 – A Life Cycle Analysis of Alternative Wastewater Treatment Strategies in the Puget Sound Area