

EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE AGENDA

THURSDAY 7 AUGUST 2014

AT 9.30AM

IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES, 53 HEREFORD STREET

Committee: The Mayor (Chairperson) Councillors Vicki Buck, Jimmy Chen, Phil Clearwater, Pauline Cotter, David East, Jamie Gough, Yani Johanson, Ali Jones, Raf Manji, Glenn Livingstone, Paul Lonsdale, Tim Scandrett and Andrew Turner

| Principal Advisors | | Committee Advisor |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Dr Karleen Edwards, Chief Executive | Tel: 941 8554 | Rachael Brown |
| Mike Theelen, Chief Planning Officer | Tel: 941 8281 | Tel: 941-5249 |

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

| ITEM NO. | | DESCRIPTION | PAGE NO. |
|-------------|----|---|-------------|
| PART C | 1. | APOLOGIES | 1 |
| PART C | 2. | DECLARATION OF INTEREST | 1 |
| PART B | 3. | DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT | 1 |
| PART B | 4. | PRESENTATIONS | 1 |
| PART B | 5. | CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT (REPORT SEPERATELY CIRCULATED). | 1 |
| PART A | 6. | CHRISTCHURCH CENTRAL PARKING PLAN | 3 |
| PART B | 7. | NATURAL ENVIRONMENT RECOVERY PROGRAMME QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT | 47 |
| PART B | 8. | LAND USE RECOVERY PLAN - UPDATE | 59 |
| PART B | 9. | LYTTELTON PORT RECOVERY PLAN UPDATE | 71 |

EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE 7. 8. 2014

| PART B | 10. | TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT | 89 |
|--------|-----|--|----|
| PART A | 11. | AN ACCESSIBLE CITY - TRANSPORT PROJECTS 1 (HOSPITAL CORNER) AND 5 (MOORHOUSE/HAGLEY) (REPORT SEPERATELY CIRCULATED). | 95 |
| PART C | 12. | RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC | 95 |

1. APOLOGIES

Councillor Jaime Gough.

2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 Renewables Motueka

A representative from this group will speak regarding the Trans-Pacific Partnership (Clause 10).

4. **PRESENTATIONS**

4.1 Aranui and Surroundings Districts Emergency Community Response Plan

Rachael Fonotia (Manager of ACTIS), Tim Baker (Aranui Primary School Board of Trustees Chair and Community Board Deputy Chair) and Steve Hira (Pastor Christchurch Worship Centre and Chair of Whakaoranga Trust) will speak on this topic.

5. CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT

Report to be separately circulated.

6. CHRISTCHURCH CENTRAL PARKING PLAN

| | | Contact | Contact Details |
|--|--|---------|-------------------------------------|
| Executive Leadership Team Member responsible: | Chief Planning Officer, Strategy and Planning Group. | Y | Diane Campbell. 03 941 8281 |
| Officer responsible: | Transport and Research Unit Manager, Strategy and Planning Group. | Y | Michelle Oosthuizen, 03 941 8812 |
| Author: | Policy Planner – Transport, Transport team, Strategy and Planning Group. | Y | 03 941 8161 |

1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report seeks the Committee's endorsement of the Christchurch Central Parking Plan (the Parking Plan), **Attachment 1**. Note that this is a live document that will be regularly reviewed and monitored as the rebuild progresses.
- 1.2 The Parking Plan is one of the first implementation tasks within An Accessible City. The Council was last briefed on the Parking Plan on 19 May 2014 and requested that the Parking Plan is reported to this Committee for endorsement.
- 1.3 A Council Report provided an update to Council on parking in the Central City on 27 February 2014 (Agenda item 23). At the Council Meeting of 12 December 2013, Council received an update on An Accessible City and on two of its key parking facilities, the Crossing and Lichfield Street Car Parks.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 The Christchurch Central Parking Plan is non-statutory, live document with a supporting parking model. The Parking Plan forecasts the current and likely future (to 2041) parking demand and supply for the central city. This is based on the Urban Development Strategy projected land use scenario which shows the expected increase in the number of people living, working and visiting the central city. The data is used to estimate parking demand and supply for a range of activity types. The Parking Plan identifies the likely locations and quantity of parking facilities needed to support key destination areas and the central city as a whole. The recommended priority for the Council is to focus on the delivery of short stay (visitor) parking rather than long stay (commuter), through the rebuild of its own parking buildings and by working with the private sector.
- 2.2 The Parking Plan is intended to provide the key source of information for the Council, Crown and the development and business communities alike in gaining a shared understanding of ongoing parking needs and supply across the central city as it recovers. This information also enables the private sector to make informed decisions about their own parking provision and opportunities to be involved in the provision of private and public parking facilities.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Parking Plan forms part of the An Accessible City work programme, shown in Figure 1. An Accessible City is the transport chapter contained within the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan. The Parking Plan plays an important part in the larger plan for An Accessible City helping make it easier for people, cars and public transport to get to Christchurch Central and move around. Development of the Parking Plan has been led by Council staff with input from the Christchurch Central Development Unit.

6 Cont'd



Figure 1: An Accessible City work programme.

4. COMMENT

- 4.1 Increased certainty about the current availability and future provision of parking in the central city is important for providing confidence in the rebuild of a thriving central city. It is important for those working in the city, those wishing to shop and visit attractions, and developers wishing to invest.
- 4.2 The Parking Plan enhances certainty by providing information on the current availability of parking within the central city, along with information on future provision where this is known. Parking for vehicles both on and off street is included. Information on future cycle parking is also provided.
- 4.3 There are five components to the Parking Plan:
 - a set of guiding principles;
 - a short term parking forecast tool
 - an operations plan
 - a long term parking model
 - a delivery plan.
- 4.4 The findings of each of the five components have helped inform the development of the Parking Plan. What this information tells us is that generally there is sufficient car parking capacity to cater for existing demand. However, there are some "hot spots", such as around the hospital area, where demand exceeds supply on certain days and at certain times. The Parking Plan sets out the measures that are being taken to ensure adequate supply.
- 4.5 The long term parking model uses the Urban Development Strategy land use forecast for the central city. The projected number of jobs and activities from the land use model are used to estimate future parking demand and likely supply. In terms of future demand the next few years will see an increase in parking demand as construction and rapid land use change within the central Christchurch occurs. Some of this increasing demand, especially from commuters, will be able to be met through mode shift. However, some will also need to be met through the provision of public and private car parking facilities. The parking principles have been developed to help guide the design and location of new parking facilities. The parking principles are to:
 - Provide parking to support economic vitality.
 - Prioritise public short stay parking (visitor) to support businesses.
 - Ensure there is safe and easy access to all parks.
 - Design all forms of parking to integrate with the surroundings.
 - Manage all forms of parking to achieve high utilisation.
 - Minimise the on-street effects of servicing by providing service lanes.
 - Taxi and coach parking to support key precincts.
 - Cycle parking is provided in addition to vehicle parking to support travel choices.

6 Cont'd

- 4.6 The Parking Plan sets out the Council's intention for monitoring and assessing car parking demand and supply and sets out those principles that should guide future car parking provision. Council's role in parking is the management and operation of Council parking facilities and the coordination of information to encourage early investment in parking to support the recovery of the Central City. It is recommended that the priority for the Council is to support the delivery of short-stay parking, through the rebuild of its own parking buildings and by working with the private sector.
- 4.7 It is intended that the Parking Plan and parking model will be living documents that will be updated as new information comes to hand. One of the outcomes sought in the development of the Parking Plan has been to enhance the communication flow of information on parking. One of the first actions within the Parking Plan is to communicate and share the information on parking demand and supply with the development community.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The Parking Plan provides information on parking supply and demand. It summarises the preferred locations for future parking facilities, which could be provided by either the Council or commercial sector. Adoption of the Parking Plan is not a commitment to the delivery of any particular project. The detailed achievement of the plan will be determined through the Long Term Plan and work with the commercial sector.

6. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee:

- 6.1 Recommend to the Council that it endorse the Christchurch Central Parking Plan.
 - 6.1.1 Note that the Parking Plan and information will be monitored and updated regularly.
 - 6.1.2 Note that the Parking Plan will be communicated to the development community.



Christchurch Central Parking Plan

2014





8

Executive summary

Increased certainty about the current availability and future provision of parking in the Central City is important for providing confidence in the rebuild of a thriving Central City. It is important for those working in the city, those wishing to shop and visit attractions, and developers wishing to invest.

This Christchurch Central Parking Plan (the Parking Plan) enhances certainty by providing information about the current availability of parking within the Central City, along with information on future provision. Both on-street and off-street vehicle parking is included. Information on future cycle parking is also provided.

The Parking Plan is a non-statutory document and forms part of An Accessible City work programme, shown in Figure E.1. An Accessible City will contribute to a greener, more people friendly and welcoming central city. The Parking Plan plays an important part in the larger plan for An Accessible City helping make it easier for people, cars and public transport to get to Christchurch Central and move around. Further information on An Accessible City is available at:



Figure E.1: An Accessible City work programme.

There are five parts to the Parking Plan:

- A set of guiding principles
- A short-term parking forecast tool
- An operations plan
- A long-term parking model
- A delivery plan

The findings of each of these five components have helped inform the development of the Parking Plan. What this information tells us is that generally there is sufficient car parking capacity to cater for existing demand. However, there are some "hot spots", such as around the Christchurch Hospital area, where demand exceeds supply on certain days and at certain times. This Parking Plan sets out the measures that are being taken to ensure current adequate supply.

The long term parking model uses the Urban Development Strategy land use forecast for the central city. The projected number of jobs and activities from the land use model are used to estimate future parking demand and likely supply. In terms of future demand the next few years will see an increase in parking demand as construction and rapid land use change within central Christchurch occurs. Some of this increasing demands, especially from commuters, will be able to be met through increased use of walking, cycling and public transport. However, some will also need to be met through the provision of public and private car parking facilities. The parking principles have been developed to help guide the design and location of new parking facilities.

The priority for the Council is to focus on the delivery of short stay (visitor) parking rather than long stay, through the rebuild of its own parking buildings and by working with the private sector. The greatest demand for short stay parking is expected within the Core, particularly around the Retail Precinct, and the Health Precinct, shown in Figure E.2.

9



Figure E.2: Forecast short stay (visitor) demand by 2041.

This Parking Plan sets out the Christchurch City Council's plan for monitoring and assessing parking demand and supply and sets out those principles that should guide future parking provision including its focus on short stay provision. The Council will continue to work closely with the private sector to facilitate opportunities to deliver short stay parking facilities, especially at the priority locations identified in Figure E.3.



Figure E.3: Priority locations for short stay parking supply.

The Parking Plan will be a living document that will be updated as new information comes to hand. One of the aims of the Parking Plan is to improve the flow of information on parking. Up-to-date information will be provided at the following links on the Council website:

- Current on-street parking locations (short-stay)
 <u>http://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/CityLeisure/gettingaround/parking/Cordonparkingmeterandccccarparks.pdf</u>
- Current on-street parking locations (all day)
 <u>http://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/CityLeisure/gettingaround/parking/Alldayparking.pdf</u>
- Forecast demand and supply for on-street car parks to 2018 by area <u>http://www.ccc.govt.nz/cityleisure/gettingaround/parking/index.aspx</u>
- Current temporary and permanent off-street public parking facilities <u>http://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/CityLeisure/gettingaround/parking/Offstreetparking.pdf</u>
 Forecast parking demand and supply at 2041 by area
- http://www.ccc.govt.nz/cityleisure/gettingaround/parking/index.aspx

The Parking Plan will be of assistance to those wishing to access and invest in the city both now and in the future.

Table of contents

| Exec | utive summary | 1 | |
|-------|---|----|--|
| Table | e of contents | 4 | |
| 1. | Introduction | 5 | |
| 1.1. | Purpose | 5 | |
| 1.2. | Background | 6 | |
| 2. | Parking Plan | 8 | |
| 2.1. | Guiding principles | 8 | |
| 2.2. | Short term parking forecast tool | 9 | |
| 2.3. | Operations plan | 11 | |
| 2.4. | Long term parking model | 11 | |
| 2.5. | Cycle parking | 18 | |
| 3. | Delivery plan | 20 | |
| 3.1. | Council and the Crown's provision of public parking | 20 | |
| 3.2. | Private provision of public parking | 21 | |
| 3.3. | Priority actions | 22 | |
| 3.4. | Governance and management | 23 | |
| 3.5. | Communication of information | 24 | |
| Арре | andices | 25 | |
| Арре | endix A: Guiding principles | 26 | |
| Арре | Appendix B: Parking model demand and supply rates | | |
| Арре | ppendix C: Cycle parking approach | | |

1. Introduction

The Christchurch Central Parking Plan (Parking Plan) provides information on existing and future parking provision within the Central City.

The Parking Plan is intended to help the Council, the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA), the Christchurch Central Development Unit (CCDU) and the development and business communities in gaining a shared understanding of ongoing parking needs and supply across the Central City during the recovery phase.

The Parking Plan summarises and brings together five key components of parking into one plan, as illustrated in Figure 1.1.



Figure 1.1 Components of Christchurch Central Parking Plan.

The Parking Plan is a live document with supporting tools (models and maps) which identify the likely short stay (less than four hours) and long stay (more than four hours) parking demands, preferred locations and broad quantity of parking facilities needed to support key destination areas, and the Central City as a whole.

The Parking Plan and supporting information will be made available and kept live on the Council parking website at:

http://www.ccc.govt.nz/cityleisure/gettingaround/parking/index.aspx

1.1. Purpose

The Parking Plan provides clear information on parking demand and likely supply.

The purpose of the Parking Plan is to:

- 1. Provide the key source of information for Council, Crown and development sector alike to coordinate the delivery and monitoring of parking provision (in both the short term and long term) throughout the Central City. This includes the provision of parking through anchor projects, private development and Council capital asset and operational programmes.
- 2. Provide clear information on parking demand and likely supply to the private sector, development and business community alike. The aims is to enable them to make informed decisions about their own parking provision and opportunities to be involved in the provision of private and public parking facilities within the Central City.

- 3. Coordinate communication and information to the Minister for Earthquake Recovery, councillors, the development and business community and the community about parking policy planning and development opportunities in the Central City.
- 4. Inform the An Accessible City Implementation plan on the delivery of parking projects to ensure good integration with the implementation of transport projects, the Public Realm Network Plan and Anchor Projects including the Avon River and Retail Precinct Plan.

1.2. Background

The Parking Plan forms part of the An Accessible City.

An Accessible City is the transport chapter contained within the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan and supports the vision of central Christchurch becoming the thriving heart of an international city. An Accessible City provides for a transport system that will be flexible and resilient and will accommodate future population and travel growth. The An Accessible City work programme illustrated in Figure 1.2. Further information on An Accessible City is available at:

http://ccdu.govt.nz/the-plan/an-accessible-city



Figure 1.2: An Accessible City work programme.

Accommodating growth without worsening traffic congestion will be a significant challenge for the successful implementation of An Accessible City. Increases in bus patronage and those cycling to the Central City, along with associated growth in pedestrian movement, will be encouraged. People will continue to travel into the central City in other vehicles (car, taxi, truck, emergency services vehicles) through either necessity or choice. Parking provision is essential to support the transport needs of these people and the businesses and activities they support.

Increased certainty around current and future parking provision is important for those who wish to travel to the Central City by vehicle and is particularly important for those developers who want to invest in the Central City.

Prior to the Canterbury earthquakes there were more than 36,000 car park spaces within the avenues.¹ More than 26,000 of these were off-street car –parks and were mainly provided by the private sector as part of their business or were residential parking. The Council managed a total of 10,000 on-street car parking spaces.

Of the 26,000 off-street car parking spaces, 5500 were in public off-street car parks. The Council managed 3000 of these and commercial operators managed the remaining 2500. The pre-earthquake supply is summarised in Table 1.1.

| Parking type | Council managed | Privately managed |
|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| On-street | 10,000 | 0 |
| Off-Street | 3000 | 23,000* |

*Some of these privately managed car park will have been available for public visiting shops/businesses (e.g. South City) and included 2500 publically available parking spaces managed by private operators.

Table 1.1: Parking supply before the Canterbury earthquakes.

¹ Traffic Design Group (2014) Long Term Parking Technical Report pg. D2

Most of the 5500 public off-street car park spaces have been lost due to earthquake damage. In their place a number of temporary public parking facilities have been established by both the Council and third-party providers. Many of these temporary parking sites will be lost as buildings are constructed on the temporary parking sites. This loss of available parking is a risk to confidence in, and the pace of, Central City recovery.

The significant rebuilding activity occurring in the Central City over the next few years provides a unique opportunity to look afresh at the Central City parking needs. It also provides the chance to ensure parking provision is easily accessed and equally matched to business and visitor need. The An Accessible City proposals for the transformation of Central City streets will also reduce preearthquake levels of on-street parking, and so planning must take this into consideration.

There is an urgency to understand the long-term parking requirements for the Central City to help inform the design of the Central City Anchor Projects and early private developments.

2.Parking Plan

2.1. Guiding principles

Parking principles will help to guide the design and location of parking facilities.

To assist with implementation of parking in the Central City and to guide the expected outcomes of the Parking Plan, parking principles have been developed. The parking principles are to:

- Provide parking to support economic vitality.
- Prioritise public short stay parking (visitor) to support businesses.
- Ensure there is safe and easy access to all parks.
- Design all forms of parking to integrate with the surroundings.
- Manage all forms of parking to achieve high utilisation.
- Minimise the on-street effects of servicing by providing service lanes.
- Taxi and coach parking to support key precincts.
- Cycle parking is provided in addition to vehicle parking to support travel choices.

The basis of these principles is discussed in Appendix A. Figure 2.1 illustrates how the parking principles can be applied to influence the design and location of parking facilities.



Figure 2.1: Parking principles.

When the parking principles are applied, public parking buildings will be located to ensure safe, direct and easy access, preferably from local distributor streets. Conflict between vehicles accessing the buildings and other road users, especially those walking and cycling, will be managed. The design of the building façade will integrate with the surroundings, with a preference for mid-block sites that have continuous active frontages at street level. For example, the building may be sleeved by retail activities. To manage the effects on the transport network and to increase utilisation, off-street public parking buildings may need to be smaller than before the earthquakes.

The careful selection of the location of parking facilities, along with improved wayfinding (signs/apps) will also ensure quicker and easier access. Car drivers will spend less time travelling around looking for a parking space and this will allow them to have more time to shop and visit businesses. Off-street public car parking buildings will therefore ideally be located to serve key destination areas within a five-minute walking distance. In simple terms, people to be encouraged to park once and stay/shop longer.

2.2. Short term parking forecast tool

The short term tool allows Council to plan and identify when and where intervention is required to increase temporary parking capacity and improving utilisation.

The tool is a basic model of the current demand and supply projections for public parking within each of the parking zones. The parking zones are illustrated in Figure 2.2. The tool is illustrated in Figure 2.3.



Figure 2.2: Parking zones in the short and long term parking model.



Figure 2.3: Example of short term parking forecast tool. This shows the summary map of the first quarter of 2014 compared to the forecast second quarter 2015.

The tool draws on information from current quarterly physical parking surveys, the LINZ forward work planner, construction worker demands, Anchor Project effects and the impacts of construction on on-street supply. The tool uses this information to produce heat maps of where utilisation is high and includes forecast information to 2018.

The data for March 2014 indicates that generally there is sufficient capacity across the parking stock (public and private) over the entire Central City to cater for the existing demand. However, there are some "hot spots" where demands currently exceed supply at times around the Christchurch Hospital and the Civic precinct. As an example of the information available, the demand and supply rates for the Retail Precinct are summarised in Table 2.1. The current demand and supply rates are very dynamic and will be constantly monitored and updated (every quarter) by the Council. The information from the monitoring and projections will be used to ensure more car parks can be added at the right place and time.

| Parking type | Supply | Demand | Occupancy |
|---------------------|--------|--------|-----------|
| On-street Metered | 232 | 87 | 37% |
| On-Street Unmetered | 21 | 7 | 33% |
| Off-Street | 468 | 347 | 74% |
| Total | 721 | 439 | 61% |

Table 2.1: Demand and supply rates retail precinct, March 2014.

The tool can forecast the under supply and over supply of public parking facilities through to the end of 2018. The supply through this period is likely to diminish rapidly without intervention. The most significant factor contributing to this decline is the expected loss of on-street parking spaces associated with the SCIRT work programme and the implementation of the enhancements to the

public realm through wider footpaths, tree plantings and dedicated cycle lanes. SCIRT is expected to remove up to 800 on-street spaces at any one time from early 2014 to the end of 2015, while it carries out infrastructure repairs. The cumulative impact is expected to result in the removal of up to 3900 on-street spaces. This is at a time when parking demand picks up. The demand generated by construction workers is also notable and is expected to peak at around 800 spaces towards the end of 2016.

The culmination of these effects will mean additional parking spaces are needed if the objective is to keep supply at or above demand. There are also opportunities to better manage the existing parking stock. If current car parks were better used, fewer additional car parks would need to be provided. For example if utilisation can be increased to 85 per cent (currently around 60 per cent) then significantly less additional parking spaces would need to be provided. The provision of public or private temporary parking facilities remains the most effective way of meeting the changing demands being experienced now and expected over the next three years.

2.3. Operations plan

The Council needs to manage both its on-street and off-street public parking resource.

The Council needs to have a greater ability to respond to the fluctuating parking demands created by a rapidly changing city. There is also a need to maximise its parking occupancy to encourage business vitality, economic activity and accessibility. A car parking operations plan will be prepared to focus initially on the short term to 2018. This will seek to develop policy and mechanisms to ensure the correct amount and type of parking is available when and where required. This can be achieved by:

- Flexible pricing and metering to optimise parking and achieve parking occupancy targets of approximately 85 per cent.
- Extension of the delegated authority to Council staff for operational decisions, such as pricing and locations.
- Extension and review of the current residential parking scheme to use new technology to administer and monitor the scheme.
- Extension of paid parking areas to the Avenues and other/or hot spots, excluding residential parking, to increase supply and control.
- New technology to improve parking management.
- Extension of delegations to Council staff to enable them to change pricing.

2.4. Long term parking model

The long term parking model is a live document with a supporting technical report which identifies the likely locations and quantity of parking facilities needed to support key destination areas, in the Central City out to 2041.

The primary data in the model is the long term land use forecasts out to 2041, featured in the Central Christchurch Recovery Plan and the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy. The land use forecast in Figure 2.4, shows the expected increase in the number of people living, working and visiting the central city. This data also provides indicative floor areas for a range of activity types as well as the forecast number of jobs associated with each activity.



Figure 2.4: Central city land use summary.

Key variables for calculating long stay parking demands include the number of jobs, projected travel mode splits, time of day, and location. Key variables for short stay parking demand include the activity type, floor areas, parking demand rates (utilisation), location, time of day, and access to other transport modes. The model allows these variables to be tested.

The model provides the capability to assess the effects of different levels of parking supply, both on-street and off-street. The amount of on-street parking available within the city will change as key streetscape projects are developed. Off-street parking for both short stay and long stay needs is expected to be provided in a variety of forms both by private developers and by the Council.

A preliminary scenario of long term demand and supply based upon the proposals of the Central Christchurch Recovery Plan has been modelled. This provides the quantitative analysis to support the Parking Plan. The analysis is separated into long stay and short stay parking, mainly representing staff and visitor parking needs respectively. The demand and supply rates used in the model are outlined in Appendix B. The analysis has been summarised into the three parking zones outlined in An Accessible City: the Core, Inner and Outer Zones. These are shown in Figure 2.4.



Figure 2.4: Parking zones: outer, inner and core zones.

Long stay parking

Long stay parking is typically used by employees and involves commuter parking for longer than four hours. The forecast number of jobs being undertaken in the Central City by 2041 is illustrated in Figure 2.5. This shows that the highest number of jobs being undertaken will be around the Core and the Health Precinct areas.



Figure 2.5: Location of jobs in forecast year 2041.

The most critical period for long stay parking is during the week in the middle of the day because this is the time at which most employees are at their workplace. The 2006 Census information indicates that 57 per cent of employees within the Central City drove to work, creating demand for car parking. To manage congestion, by 2041, the An Accessible City sets out a transport network to encourage more commuters to travel by bus, cycle and walking. The demand forecasts in the model therefore assume a 10 per cent shift in drivers to other modes of transport by 2041. In reality, this may be higher with improved public transport and cycling networks. The analysis represents one scenario with variables which can be changed as more information becomes available or to test different scenarios.

An indication of the expected weekday, long stay parking demands and supply based on the 2041 land use information are provided in Figure 2.6 and Table 2.2. The analysis indicates that the demand for long stay parking is estimated to be around 22,000 spaces, based on 64,000 jobs by 2041. This demand will be strongly influenced by the number and location of office workers who will account for about 60 per cent of employees in the Central City and 75 per cent within the Core. The demand for long stay parking will mostly be met through a mixture of private supply within individual developments and by more people travelling by public transport, walking and cycling.

The District Plan enables developers to provide up to 50 per cent Ground Leasable Floor area as parking. The rates of provision will vary widely across the zones, based on the current and future development proposals. For the purpose of the model supply rates of 0.5 spaces per 100m² Ground Floor Area (GFA) for office activity within the core, and rates of about 2 spaces per 100m² GFA within the Outer Zone, have been assumed.

Based on these supply assumptions, the model shows that there is likely to be a shortfall in the long stay parking supply within the Central City by 2041. The predicted shortfall in the Core could be approximately 6300 spaces under the current supply assumptions. Some of this shortfall will be balanced by on-street and off-street provision in the Outer Zone.

Long stay parking is mainly used by workers. It is expected that while there is a shortfall in this type of parking, improved cycling, walking and public transport networks will encourage a gradual change in the travel modes people are using from private car to other modes as the Central City is rebuilt. In practice therefore, the actual shortfalls in long stay parking availability will be lower than these projections. For example, a travel mode shift by 30 per cent of drivers would mean that the demand for long stay parking would be met within the Central City, based on the other supply assumptions.



Figure 2.6: Forecast long stay demand to year 2041.

| Location | Demand | Supply | Shortfall | | |
|----------------------|--------|-----------|------------|--------|--------|
| | | On-street | Off-street | Total | |
| Core | 8800 | - | 2,500 | 2,500 | 6300 |
| Inner zone | 3200 | 100 | 3,100 | 3,200 | 0 |
| Outer zone | 10,200 | 2800 | 8800 | 11,600 | (1400) |
| Five Avenues (Total) | 22,200 | 2900 | 14,400 | 17,300 | 4900 |

Table 2.2: Forecast long stay demand and supply (mid-day and mid-week by 2041).

Short stay parking

The demand for short stay (visitor) parking demands will be driven by retail and hospitality activity as the Central City is reestablished. The peak demand period for these is at the weekend. Although demand will still be high during the week, it is expected to be lower than during the weekend because a high proportion of the customers are expected to be employees and residents who are already in the city and therefore do not need a parking space.

An indication of the forecast demand and supply for short stay parking at the weekend peak by 2041 is shown in Figure 2.7 and Table 2.3.



Figure 2.7: Forecast short stay demand to year 2041.

| Location | Demand Supply | | | Shortfall | |
|-------------------------|---------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------|
| | | On-street | Off-street | Total | |
| Core | 4900 | 300 | 2800 | 3100 | 1800 |
| Inner zone | 2100 | 400 | 4000 | 4400 | (2300) |
| Outer zone | 6500 | 1300 | 6100 | 7400 | (900) |
| Five Avenues (Total) | 13,500 | 2000 | 12,900 | 14,900 | (1400) |

Table 2.3: Forecast short stay parking demand and supply (weekend) by year 2041.

Across the Central City, the modelled scenario shows a peak demand (at the weekend) for short stay parking of approximately 13,500 spaces. Retail and hospitality activities account for about 50 per cent of the demand and Anchor Projects account for a further 40 per cent of the demand. In the Core the peak demand is expected to be about 4,900 short stay spaces. The short stay parking will mostly be met through a mixture of private supply within individual developments, through the supply of on and off-street public parking and by more people travelling by public transport, walking and cycling.

Within the Core area, the off-street parking supply rate for individual retail and hospitality outlets is expected to be low because there is an expectation that public parking will be provided in specific locations, either privately or by Council. The model also assumes that 1,100 short stay public spaces will be provided (Lichfield Street and the Crossing parking buildings). The number of public short stay parking spaces required will be dependent upon the level of private off-street provision within the Core and the parking demand rate adopted. The demand rate for the retail activities within the Core is expected to be about 2.9 spaces per 100m² GFA because of the central location.

The model indicates that with the assumed supply, there is a potential shortfall of around 1,800 short-stay parking spaces within the Core but there is also a likely oversupply within the Inner and Outer zones. The high level of demand within the Core is driven by the Retail Precinct containing a higher quantity of retail and hospitality type activities. The demand for parking in the northern part of the Core is related to the proposed civic and entertainment facilities located there.

There is an opportunity for some of the excess short stay demand in the Core to be met within the inner zone. This will involve customers having to walk a little further to their destinations. The ideal walking distance is a five minute walk to short stay parking facilities.

The shortfall could also be mitigated to some extent by increasing the number of Council-operated parking spaces within the Core and by encouraging more shared use of private parking facilities. This includes those primarily serving weekday long stay parking needs, to cater for the extra short stay parking demands at weekends. The demand for car parking could also be reduced through the provision of more choice of travel modes an increased number of people living within the Central City.

The short stay demand for the retail parking zone (a larger area than the Retail Precinct) is approximately 2700 spaces at the weekend peak. To understand the parking needs for the Retail Precinct Plan further analysis has been undertaken to determine the expected parking demand and supply for the Retail Precinct (bounded by Durham, Hereford, High and Lichfield Streets) as defined in the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan. This is a smaller area than the retail parking zone. This analysis is available to accompany the long term parking model.

Preliminary parking locations assessment

Based on the initial analysis, blocks have been identified where additional parking supply by 2041, would be needed to meet the expected long term parking demands for the new Central City at the end of reconstruction. These are shown in Figure 2.8.

The locations identified are intended to reflect the parking principles and transport networks outlined in An Accessible City. The locations identified for long stay parking facilities are chiefly along the northern boundary of the inner core, close to the Innovation Precinct and Stadium, and between the Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility. Short stay parking will be needed across the core area and the Health Precinct and Metro Sport Facility. Short stay is especially important in the Retail Precinct where there the greatest shortfalls are expected.



Figure 2.8: Indicative locations of where future off-street parking buildings (private or Council owned) would best support demand.

The provision of parking facilities at these indicative locations may be either by the Council or by the private sector. Implementation of parking facilities needs to be staged and monitored as the rebuild progresses and as decisions on parking are made.

The Council's priority is to focus on supporting the provision of short stay parking to encourage visitors and to support businesses. The Council will also encourage private interest in short stay parking to address shortfalls expected in the Core. Early commitments have been made to replace the Lichfield Street and the Crossing parking facilities. The size and location of parking facilities need to reflect the parking principles, especially to provide safe and easy access from local distributor streets and to support the transport networks outlined in An Accessible City.

Further investigations are needed into other opportunities to support the Central City, considering locations around the Civic, Performing Arts and Health Precincts and Metro Sports Facility. A parking facility at Performing Arts Precinct could help to replace the Manchester street parking building and to support the core north and other Anchor Projects such as the Central Library and Convention Centre.

Long stay parking can be delivered through both private developments either ancillary to individual developments (up to 50 per cent of gross leasable floor area), by private parking facility providers and by a reduction in demand due to commuters to the Central City using other transport modes. The locations identified and parking analysis provides information to inform the development and business sector of where and how much additional long stay facilities would support demand.

At this stage, there are many unknowns and in particular, there is some uncertainty regarding the actual parking provision by commercial developments throughout the city. As more information becomes available in development proposals, the parking model inputs will be monitored and can be updated to refine the parking demand and location analysis. Further investigation and sensitivity testing is required to confirm that the locations would be robust enough to serve a wide range of development scenarios.

2.5. Cycle parking

The numbers of people cycling in Christchurch are projected to triple by 2041. Cycle parking is therefore a key component of the Parking Plan.

The Parking model estimates that there will be a total car parking demand (both long and short stay) of 35,700 spaces in the Central City by 2041. The demand forecasts have been used with the transport mode share projections in An Accessible City to calculate the estimated proportion of parking demand for cycle parking in the Central City. An Accessible City aims to achieve a tripling of cycling trip numbers in the Central City by 2041. This will equate to an 11 per cent cycling mode share (a tripling) or 7.4 per cent mode share (a doubling) by 2026.

The long term (2041) demand for cycle parking in the Central City is estimated to be 4000 cycle spaces (2400 long stay and 1700 short stay) in order to support these projected mode shares. The medium term (2026) demand is estimated at 2800 cycle park spaces (1600 long stay and 1200 short stay).

Similar to car parking, short stay cycle parking is needed to support visitors to the central city and long stay cycle parking is needed to support employees and commuters. According to the Christchurch Cycle Design Guidelines², the most important aspect for short stay cycle parking is being in an easy and convenient location for the user, for example, close to a shop entrance. Short stay cycle parking may be as simple as providing a cycle hoop. Long stay cycle parks should be secure, covered, ideally have a locker and potentially showering facilities. More information on the design of cycle facilities can be found in the Cycle Design Guidelines and Appendix C.

The supply of cycle parking will be provided by a mix of individual businesses, the Council and the Crown (through Anchor Projects). The City Plan outlines cycle parking requirements (visitor and employee parking) for private developments in the Central City. Similar to car parking, additional cycle parking to that provided within private developments will also be needed for people cycling. Many individual retail and small businesses are unlikely to be able to provide their own on-site cycle parking.

The quantity and location of short stay cycle parking should reflect the demand generated from activities on each street. Short stay spaces are especially needed within the streetscape where buildings in the street have no road frontage setback (such as Victoria Street). The location of short stay cycle parking will be considered within the implementation of transport projects, streetscape and public realm improvements and private developments for each street. In some areas there will be a high demand for both short stay and long stay cycle parking facilities, especially within the Core.

The supply and location of long stay cycle parking needs to provide secure and high quality cycle parking facilities at locations where it is perceived there will be the highest demand. Parking buildings and the Anchor Projects provide an opportunity to integrate safe, secure cycle parking facilities.

These secure parking facilities would ideally be supported by one or two 'cycle hub' facilities which can provide excellent facilities such as showers, lockers, changing rooms, towels, laundry service, mechanic facilities, DIY tools, cycle shop, full time staff during normal hours, 24 hour access cards and air conditioning. Good quality 'cycle hub' facilities in a central location, coupled with secure long and short stay cycle parking facilities across the Central City will provide for the needs of people travelling longer distances. Some Anchor Projects (particularly the Metro Sports Facility, Bus Interchange, Central Library and Stadium) and key parking buildings provide good opportunities to integrate a cycle hub and secure cycle parking facilities.

² Christchurch City Council (2013) Cycle Design Guidelines

Cycle parking by zone

The long stay demand and potential location of cycle facilities by parking zone in 2041 are illustrated in Figure 2.9. A detailed discussion of the types and locations of the facilities by each zone is provided in Appendix C.



Figure 2.9 The potential locations of long stay cycle parking by 2041.

3. Delivery plan

The Parking Plan provides information and modelling to identify where the principle parking demands (short and long stay) are likely to be in the short and long term.

The Council, the Crown and the private sector all play a key role in delivering parking provision. The delivery plan identifies priority locations and 10 priority actions.

3.1. Council and the Crown's provision of public parking

The priority for the Council is to support the delivery of short-stay parking, through the rebuild of its own parking buildings and by working with the private sector.

The Council's role in parking is the management and operation of Council parking facilities and the coordination of information to encourage early investment in parking to support the recovery of the Central City.

Priority locations

Priority locations for providing short stay parking are shown in Figure 3.1. Some of these locations may also be suitable for providing long stay parking.

The short stay demand for the retail parking zone (a larger area than as defined by the Retail Precinct in the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan) is approximately 2700 spaces at the weekend peak. As discussed in section 2.4, this demand for parking will be met through a mixture of private supply within individual developments, through the supply of on and off-street public parking and by a reduction in demand for car parks by encouraging more people to travel by public transport, walking and cycling.

Short stay, off-street, public parking supply will be needed to support the retail parking zone. The Council has committed to the replacement of the Lichfield Street and the Crossing parking facilities to meet some of this short stay demand. Rather than one of two larger parking facilities, the optimal solution is to spread the supply over a number of smaller facilities (400-700 spaces). This improves access and ensures that the transport network remains efficient.

Further short stay facilities at the Performing Arts Precinct (to assist in replacement of the Manchester street parking building), Health Precinct, Civic and Metro Sports will be investigated through the Anchor Projects. The design of all facilities will be in line with the parking principles to ensure their efficient operation, as outlined in section 2.1. The Council will continue to work closely with the private sector to facilitate opportunities to deliver short stay parking facilities, especially at these priority locations.



Figure 3.1: Priority locations of for short term parking supply.

The Council and the Crown are also considering the parking and servicing needs of the individual Anchor Projects in the Central city through individual transport and access assessments. The projects vary greatly in their purposes and therefore parking needs, but all seek to contribute to the access principles of An Accessible City.

A key focus is to identify potential 'quick wins'. These are early decisions that will support investor and property owner confidence in the central city rebuild. These considerations parallel the development of the Parking Plan, and have been informed with the best information available at the time.

The Lichfield Street and the Crossing parking buildings are the first quick wins to be identified. The Council has committed to working with the private sector to ensure public parking is provided at these sites. The Council will continue to work with the private sector on other quick win opportunities where early decisions are needed, particularly for the priority sites in Figure 3.1.

On-street parking

The Council will continue to provide on-street parking where necessary and possible. However, there are likely to be significantly lower numbers of on-street spaces on many streets especially in the Core, than pre-earthquake. This is because more street space will be required for additional landscaping and new and enhanced pedestrian and cycle facilities. Remaining on-street parking will be prioritised for disabled parking, taxies, service vehicles and short-stay visits, rather than for commuters.

Short term provision through temporary parking

The development of temporary car parks on vacant sites remains the single most effective mechanism for increasing parking supply to 2018. This will, however, become increasingly difficult as rebuilding progresses. The pursuit of additional parking supply and better utilisation of existing parking will be undertaken in a strategic manner assisted by the short term forecasting tool and operations plan, as outlined in section 2.2.

The provision of logistical and resource advice to maximise the productivity of the existing parking resource and the development of additional car parks in strategic locations are key areas in which the Council needs to focus its attention. Initially, skill shortages should be addressed to bring action to this plan. To enable staff to quickly respond to increasing and differing demands for parking and improve the short term metered parking occupancy rates, the setting of all metered parking fees has been delegated to the appropriate staff within the Council.

3.2. Private provision of public parking

The Council continues to encourage private interest in parking provision.

The demand for short stay parking will most likely at times exceed what Council will be providing in some Central City parking zones. Much of this remaining demand will be met by reserve capacity in nearby zones, mechanisms to achieve better shared utilisation of all available parking stock (for example, time sharing the resource) and by private suppliers, as was the case before the earthquakes. The Council continues to encourage private interest in parking provision.

Long stay parking

As before the earthquakes, the majority of long stay parking to meet the needs of commuters and business will also continue to be met by commercial developments. The An Accessible City provisions provide developers with much more discretion about how much employee parking they believe is right for their developments. Developers will be encouraged to consider parking demands for their developments and then choose the quantum of parking they will provide up to 50 per cent of Gross Leasable Floor Area (GLFA). Where parking requirements cannot be met on site then developers might choose to liaise with other developers over opportunities for developing or leasing long stay car parks.

An Accessible City includes significant improvements to other transport options for workers to access the Central City. Increased walking, cycling and bus use, particularly by office employees, will affect the long stay parking demand.

Developers will be encouraged to provide accessible sites, by all modes, to reduce the underlying need for expensive car parking, while retaining the option to provide tenant parking to developments if they wish. Developers may choose to undertake an Integrated Transport Assessment to determine appropriate levels of parking to suit an individual development's needs. For example, a 10 per cent reduction in car drivers would result in a reduction in peak demand long stay spaces of approximately 2,200 spaces across the Central City. Achieving such a shift means that the overall parking requirements are expected to remain at around pre-earthquake levels.

Opportunities

There are opportunities for developers who wish to build their own parking facilities for either long stay or short stay users. The parking model shows where long term demand is likely to be and potential locations for parking facilities, as shown in Figure 3.2.

Private sector investment in the provision of parking buildings is encouraged, and potential developers should contact the Council's Parking Unit of the Council in the first instance. It will coordinate feedback and welcome an open dialogue to ensure good provision of parking across the city. The Council will continue to make Parking Plan information available to the private sector to help inform investment decisions. All parking facilities should be designed to reflect the parking principles as outlined in section 2.1.



Figure 3.2: Indicative locations of parking supply.

3.3. Priority actions

Ten priority actions have been identified to progress the Parking Plan over the short term.

The Parking Plan sets out the long term vision for parking in the Central City. The Parking Plan and parking models need to be kept live and information regularly updated as the rebuild progresses. Parking, planning and management will continue to evolve through the recovery phases. The staging of implementation is illustrated in Figure 3.3.



Figure 3.3. Recovery timeframe and delivery of parking.

Ten priority actions have been identified to progress the Parking Plan over the short term. Council funding for parking provision will be considered in the An Accessible City programme business case and the Council Long Term Plan and Annual Plans.

| # | Action | Indicative timing | Rough cost | Lead |
|----|---|----------------------|---------------|------|
| 1 | Quick wins: Progress commitment to quick win facilities and decisions on Lichfield | 2014 | - | CCC |
| | and Crossing parking facilities. | | | |
| 2 | Temporary Parking: Short term forecast tool quarterly monitoring and | Every quarter | \$ | CCC |
| | recommendations of temporary facilities required to address shortfalls in parking in | | | |
| _ | the short term. Integrated short term parking into LINZ tool. | | * | |
| 3 | Priority locations (Performing Arts, Health / Metro Sports, Civic and Retail): | Varies between | \$ | CCC |
| | Confirm parking provisions at these locations | anchor projects | | CERA |
| | Further investigation and feasibility of potential CCC short stay sites. Test | | | |
| | Scenarios to miorin decisions. Recommendation to Council. | | | |
| 1 | Facilitate investment by private sector in parking provision. Parking model: | 2014/15 | ¢ | 000 |
| 4 | Integrate short and long term parking model | 2014/13 | ψ | 000 |
| | Develop management protocol, share model, and develop update process. | | | |
| | Sensitivity testing of the parking model | | | |
| | Update model as monitoring information becomes available. | | | |
| 5 | Monitor: | Quarterly then | \$ | CCC |
| | Private supply of parking within developments. Further test supply | annually | | CERA |
| | assumptions as more information becomes available. | | | |
| | Supply of parking through the Anchor Projects. | | | |
| | Mode split at regular intervals and its effect on long stay parking demand. | | | |
| 6 | Communications plan: | 2014 | \$ | CCC |
| | Update parking website and make parking information available. | | | CERA |
| | Communications, engagement meetings with interested parties. | | | |
| 7 | Operations: Prepare Operations Plan workshop with Council and Council approval. | 2014 / 15 | - | CCC |
| 8 | Accessibility: Develop accessibility model to test the relationship between the | 2015 / 16 | \$\$ | CCC |
| | location of parking facilities on demand in different zones (e.g. outer zones and | | | CERA |
| 0 | Testuential areas). | Ongoing | ወ | 000 |
| 9 | buildings for cycle bub and secure long stay cycle parking facilities | Chigoling | φφ | |
| 10 | Design guidelines: Develop guidelines for parking buildings including use of future | 2015 | \$ | 000 |
| 10 | technologies | 2010 | Ψ | 000 |
| | technologies | | | |

3.4. Governance and management

The lead agency for the delivery of the Parking Plan is the Council. The Council and CERA will work closely with the private sector, which plays a key role in delivering public parking.

The governance process for how decisions will be made on parking and how public parking projects will be delivered is consistent with the An Accessible City Implementation Plan. The Council is the lead agency for the delivery of the Parking Plan because the delivery of parking projects will be completed over the long term and that the Council are the Road Controlling Authority. The Council is responsible for decisions on Council parking facilities and management. Delivery of parking will be monitored and reported through a joint Council and CERA governance structure. This enables joint decision-making and ensures road controlling authority requirements are carried out.

The Council and CERA also work closely with the private sector, which plays a key role in delivering public parking. The Council seeks to enhance information and engagement between the three groups to ensure delivery of parking is coordinated and timed to support the rebuild of the Central City. This relationship is illustrated in Figure 3.4.



Figure 3.4: Delivery relationships.

Management of the parking plan

The information in the Parking Plan and within the parking models need to be kept live to ensure that information about the demand and supply of public and private parking remains current. This includes adding to existing information around Anchor Projects, temporary parking and planned public parking facilities. The models also need to be updated as new land use information is known, such as the Urban Development Strategy land use scenario. A management protocol will be developed to ensure that the model can be shared and used to inform parking decisions. When the model is updated, information within the Parking Plan and on the website will also be updated by the Council.

3.5. Communication of information

Parking provision is a high priority for many involved in the Central City rebuild.

There is currently a high level of demand for information on parking provision and a strong desire for increased certainty around current and future supply. Developers in particular want a clearer picture on parking provision and the Council's and Crown's intentions.

A key purpose of the Parking Plan is to provide information about the demand and supply of parking within the Central City and to identify and communicate the Council and Crown's intentions in parking provision. The Council, in a close partnership with CERA, will lead this engagement.

In the early stages of delivery, the Parking Plan will inform the public with information to assist them in understanding the parking problem, options, opportunities and solutions. Early information and key messages to the public about parking has already been provided through Frequently Asked Questions on the website, further information will be provided through the:

- Website
- Frequently Asked Questions
- Information leaflet or maps
- Briefings with interested parties
- Media releases.

Once decisions on the Council owned parking facilities are made, the parking projects will move into the design and construction phase. Public consultation will be an important part of this process under the Local Government Act 2002. A new project engagement plan will be established in preparation for public consultation.

Appendices
Appendix A: Guiding principles

To assist with implementation of the general policy for parking, a range of parking principles have been developed to guide the expected outcomes of the Christchurch Central Parking Plan.

These parking principles are:

- Provide parking to support economic vitality.
- Locate all forms of parking to provide safe and easy access.
- Design all forms of parking to integrate with the surroundings.
- Manage all forms of parking to achieve high utilisation.
- Minimise the on-street effects of servicing by providing service lanes.
- Taxi and coach parking support key precincts.
- Cycle parking is provided in addition to vehicle parking to support travel choices.

The basis of these principles is described below along with potential actions and results. Further discussion of each of the principles is included in the long term technical report.

Provide parking to support economic vitality

To ensure an effective recovery, it is essential that people can travel conveniently to key destinations within the Central City by a range of travel options, including by car, cycle and motorcycle. This will require parking for all modes to be provided throughout the Central City.

To satisfy the demand for parking, a large part of the Central City parking supply will need to be provided on-site as part of commercial development. Council-managed parking facilities will also be provided to support the short stay parking requirements, particularly for key precincts and destination areas. On-street parking will also be available, although at reduced levels compared with the pre-earthquake provision.

In some cases, the use of temporary demountable parking structures will be considered to provide for a flexible response to the rebuild.

Locate parking to provide safe and easy access

Public parking buildings need to be located so that they can be accessed safely and efficiently from the supporting street network. Conflict between vehicles accessing the parking buildings and other road users is to be minimised to support travel by a range of travel options.

It is preferred that public parking buildings are located with access directly from local distributor streets. Accessing the appropriate type of street will minimise conflicts with other travel modes. Where practical, the parking buildings will also be located on the perimeter or outside of the Central City core to minimise the movement of vehicles within the Core. The use of way - finding technologies will assist drivers to locate available parking efficiently, minimising unnecessary vehicular movement on the street network.

Design parking to integrate with the surroundings

Parking buildings can dominate the surroundings and affect activity along their street frontage. Designing building facades to integrate with their surroundings can address the visual effect.

There is a preference for parking buildings to be located on mid-block sites that have continuously active frontages at street level that provide for other uses. The scale and layout of parking buildings should contribute to the usability and attractiveness of a facility, particularly for short stay users in and close to the Core, and users with special requirements such as those who are disabled.

It is anticipated that new parking buildings will typically be smaller than before the earthquakes. However, they need to be costeffective with an economy of scale that justifies the implementation of state-of-the-art operational facilities. If they are too small they will be inefficient and may introduce more access intrusion to street frontages than is necessary.

The quality of the parking design can be as important as the quantity of spaces provided. Vehicle and parking technology will change over time, and the parking facilities should be future proofed to allow for those changes. Some parking and access design related provisions are included in the CCRP, although these typically only address minimum requirements and cannot be relied on by themselves to deliver a quality outcome. It will be important to have professional design assessment addressing traffic engineering and urban design best practice to achieve state - of - the - art design and integration.

Manage parking to achieve high utilisation

Greater utilisation of parking is to be achieved through planning, design and management. Parking demand varies across the day and over the course of a week in each of the key precincts as different activities vary their contribution to the parking demands. Effective management of the parking resource will support these varying demands, whilst minimising the overall number of parking spaces required throughout the Central City.

Operational management procedures will provide the flexibility to influence the utilisation of vehicle parking spaces by means such as variable pricing, and prioritisation of spaces for particular parking stay durations.

In locating and designing parking buildings, opportunities for shared use parking will be assessed. Where there is a primary use for a parking facility, spare capacity at times of low demand may be managed to provide parking to support other nearby activities. This is expected to be particularly achievable for some anchor projects where their peak use will be either irregular or fall outside of the general Central City peak parking times. At other times it is anticipated that any spare capacity will be utilised to service parking demand

from nearby activity.

Minimise on-street effects of servicing

Within the Core and Inner Zone, the development and use of dedicated service lanes will be encouraged to minimise the on street effects of loading activity. As service lanes and access disrupt the active frontage of streets, integrated development is encouraged so that service access and service areas can be shared. Where service vehicles need access off pedestrian-only or shared space streets, their use will be discouraged during shopping and office hours. Access off main distributor streets will also be discouraged at peak travel times to ensure the road network operates efficiently.

Emergency vehicle access will be maintained at all times.

Taxi and coach parking support key precincts

Taxi facilities will be required as part of the development of key precincts and Anchor Projects within the Central City. Coach dropoff areas that service key developments such as hotels and the convention centre will be encouraged. To minimise effects on the surrounding area, coach layover areas will preferably be located where there are opportunities for public space to be shared, rather than allocating dedicated parking space.

Cycle parking is provided to support travel choices

Cycle parking will be required at convenient locations throughout the Core and other destination areas. These should be secure, covered where possible, and located at a range of key destinations. Building developers should provide cycle parking in their buildings in line with the District Plan requirements. Secure cycle parking is planned at the new Bus Interchange and at the super stops near the Hospital and on Manchester Street, so that

people can easily travel by a combination of cycling and public transport.

Appendix B: Parking model demand and supply rates

The demand and supply rates assumed (March 2014) for each activity in the parking model are summarised below. The rates will be reviewed as the rebuild progresses.

PARKING DEMAND RATES

The long stay parking demands have been based on the proportion of employees travelling by car to work. Some increased use of other modes of travel has been allowed for, reflecting the travel options available. The short stay peak parking demands have been based on available parking demand data for different activity types, and then factored to reflect the expected demands at different times of day.

Office

The long stay parking demand model for office activity is based on observed mode split information collected pre-earthquake. This indicated that 57 per cent of people drove a car to work and would generate a parking demand.

The base parking demand rate has been factored by 90 per cent to reflect the fact that not all office space will be occupied. This represents the expected practical demand. The parking demand rate has been factored down further for office activity in the core and Inner Zone to reflect the greater access to public transport.

The short stay parking demand rate is based on the City Plan requirement for visitor parking, that is, five per cent of 2.5 spaces per 100m2 GFA. Again, the rates have been factored down in the Core and Inner Zone to reflect reduced demand of the greater potential for travel by modes other than motor vehicle.

Retail

The long stay parking demand model for retail activity is based on observed mode split information collected pre-earthquake. This indicated that 57 per cent of people drove a car to work and would generate a parking demand. This represents the expected practical demand.

The base parking demand rate has been factored by 80 per cent to reflect the fact that not all retail office space will be occupied and not all employees will be on site at the same time. The parking demand rate has been factored down further for retail activity in the core and inner zone to reflect the greater access to public transport.

The short stay parking demand rate is based on the 85 percentile parking demand rate in New Zealand Transport Agency Research Report 453 "Trips and parking related to Land-use". Again, the rates have been factored down to reflect reduced demand in the Core and Inner Zone because of the greater potential for travel by modes other than motor vehicle.

Hospitality

The long stay parking demand is similar to the retail demands. However, the base rate has been reduced to 50 per cent because employees will generally work in two shifts, day-time and evening.

The base demand rate for short stay parking is based on the Institute of Transport Engineers (ITE) rate for a high turnover restaurant. This has been factored down to reflect the fact that not all space will be operational at the same time with additional factors applied to reflect reduced demand across precincts.

Hotel

The long stay parking demand is derived from the base mode split information and then factored to reflect the maximum number of employees that would be expected to be working at the same time.

The short stay parking demand rate and typical hotel occupancy have been taken from the ITE Trip Generation Manual.

The inter-peak and weekend time periods have been factored down compared with the morning and evening peaks because this represents the time between check-out and check-in.

Industrial

Industrial activity typically has a high parking demand per employee because it is usually located away from public transport services. On this basis, the long stay parking demand has been set at 0.95 per employee. The short stay parking demand reflects the City Plan parking requirement for industrial activity.

Health

The long stay parking demand is based on the mode split rate factored by 80 per cent to reflect the maximum number of staff on site at any one time. The short stay parking demand has been based on the ITE rate for a clinic. This has been factored down to reflect that not all space will be used in this manner.

Hospital

The long stay parking demand is based on the mode split rate factored by 50 per cent to reflect the maximum number of staff on site at any one time. The short stay parking demand has also been based on Research Rerport 453 50 per cent rate for a large hospital. A conversion rate of one bed per 200m2 Ground Floor Area (GFA) has been applied.

CPIT

Data from Quality Transport Planning, indicates that there are about 665 off-street parking spaces within the CPIT blocks with a total GFA of about 72,000m2 GFA. January demands were 244 spaces. The QTP data suggests that about 1,060 people will be employed at CPIT. On this basis, the long stay parking demand is about 0.23 spaces per employee. The short stay parking demand has been based on the remainder of the supply being used by 800 students, that is, 1.1 spaces per 100m2 GFA.

Bus Interchange

The long stay demand rate is based on existing mode split and a maximum of 80 per cent of employees being on site at any one time. The short stay parking demand has been set to zero.

New Central Library

The long stay demand rate is based on existing mode split and a maximum of 80 per cent of employees being on site at any one time. The periodic parking demands have been biased towards the inter-peak with lower demands expected in the morning, evening and weekends.

Performing Arts

The long stay demand rate is based on existing mode split and a maximum of 80 per cent of employees being on site at any one time. The periodic parking demands have been biased towards the evening peak period. The short stay parking demand will be generated by audiences. Typical parking demands from ITE are 0.3 spaces per seat. Based on the precinct providing about 2,000 seats across all facilities, the effective parking demand rate is about 1.5 spaces per 100m2 GFA.

Convention Centre

The long stay demand rate is based on existing mode split and a maximum of 80 per cent of employees being on site at any one time. The periodic parking demands have been biased towards the morning and inter-peak peak periods.

The short stay demand is based on a capacity of 2,000 people. Typical parking demands from ITE are 0.3 per attendee which represents a parking demand of 2 spaces per 100m2 GFA. In practice, the demands will be lower because some of the demand would be met by the hotels. A demand rate of 1.5 spaces per 100m2 GFA has been adopted. The demand has been scaled by 80 per cent to reflect typical attendance.

Metro Sports Centre

The long stay demand rate is based on existing mode split and a maximum of 60 per cent of employees being on site at any one time. The periodic parking demands have been biased towards the evening and weekend peak periods.

Justice and Emergency Services Precinct

Peak parking demands associated with the central police station are expected to occur in the early to mid-afternoon period. Court activity is expected to occur throughout the day but not at weekends. Practical peak parking demand has been based 70 per cent of all employees creating a simultaneous demand. Long stay demand reflects travel mode split of 57 per cent.

ITE suggests a justice building will generate a parking demand of 1.8 spaces per 100m2 GFA and this has been adopted as the base rate. ITE does not distinguish between visitors and employees so this has been factored by 50 per cent. A simple time distribution has been adopted with a midday peak and low weekend demand.

Stadium

The long stay demand rate is based on existing mode split and a maximum of 80 per cent of employees being on site at any one time.

Innovation

The long stay parking demands reflect office activity.

Museum / Arts Centre

The long stay demand rate is based on existing mode split and a maximum of 60 per cent of employees being on site at any one time. The periodic parking demands have been biased towards the morning and inter-peak peak periods.

Residential

The residential long stay demand is expected to be about 1 space per household for L3 and L4 zones.

PARKING SUPPLY RATES

There is currently little information available on the expected on-site parking supply for individual developments across the Central City. Supply rates for Developments have been adopted that generally reflect a lower supply rate in the denser Core and a higher supply rate in the Outer Zone. Where possible, the expected long stay parking supply levels have been based on current understanding of the level of parking being provided in new buildings. To test possible shortfalls in long stay parking, no supply has been included for Council-owned long stay parking. Within the Retail Precinct, there is only a small allowance for on-site parking to be provided by developers for short stay users. Information on the expected parking provisions for each of the Anchor Projects has been incorporated into the model. Parking supply rates for the Anchor Projects are based on current understanding and are estimates only, these will be regularly reviewed as development progresses.

Office

Based on building plans received, parking supply rates will vary significantly between the Core and Outer Zone. In the outer zone, an average supply rate of 2 spaces per 100m2 GFA could be expected while rates within the Core are expected to be below 0.5 spaces per 100m2 GFA. Within the Inner Zone, an average supply rate of 1 space per 100m2 GFA has been adopted. The short stay supply rate has been set at five per cent of the long stay supply.

Retail

The default long stay supply has been set at 0.5 spaces per 100m2 GFA. In practice, this is only likely to occur in the outer zone and the supply rate has been reduced for the inner zone and core.

The default short stay supply has been set at 3 spaces per 100m2 GFA. In practice, it is expected that different supply rates will occur in different precincts and geographic reduction factors have been applied to reflect this.

Hospitality

The default long stay supply has been set at 0.5 spaces per 100m2 GFA. This reflects the general requirement. In practice, this is only likely to occur in the outer zone and the supply rate has been reduced for the Inner Zone and Core.

The default short stay supply has been set at 2 spaces per 100m2 GFA. In practice, it is expected that different supply rates will occur in different precincts and geographic reduction factors have been applied to reflect this.

Hotel

The short and long stay parking supply rates have been based on the general City Plan requirements. No adjustments by location are proposed.

Industrial

The short and long stay parking supply rates have been based on the general City Plan requirements. No adjustments by location are proposed.

Hospital

Based on information received, 400 parking spaces have been shown in the model provided on the hospital site. This was based on early assumptions (as of June 2014 this is now expected to be 200 spaces). The number of spaces in the model represents a supply rate of 0.3 per 100m2 GFA. For the model, all of this has been allocated as long stay parking.

Health

Based on information received, 2,500 parking spaces will be provided within the health precinct to meet long and short stay demands. This represents a combined supply rate of 7.8 spaces per 100m2 GFA. Within the model, 25 per cent of this has been allocated to long-stay parking. This includes approximately 900 across the road from the hospital in the vicinity of the blue car parking building that was damaged in the earthquakes. A further number will continue to be provided in the staff car park on St Asaph Street. Within the broader health precinct a further 1000 privately provided car parking spaces are assumed.

CPIT

The QTP data indicates that there are about 665 off-street parking spaces within the CPIT blocks with a total GFA of about 72,000m2 GFA. January demands were 244 spaces. This represents an effective long-stay parking supply of 0.3 spaces per 100m2 GFA and a short stay supply rate of 0.56 spaces per 100m2 GFA.

Bus Interchange

No specific parking is envisaged for the exchange. However, a parking supply rate of 1.2 spaces per 100m2 GFA has been adopted for the exchange so that the block has 300-350 off-street parking spaces.

New Central Library

No parking envisaged.

Performing Arts Precinct

Parking for 500 vehicles is envisaged in the Performing Arts Precinct which represents a supply rate of 1.3 spaces per 100m2 GFA. About 10 per cent have been allocated as long stay.

Stadium

Parking for 250 vehicles is envisaged in the Stadium precinct which represents a supply rate of 4 spaces per 100m2 GFA. About 10 per cent have been allocated as long stay.

Convention Centre

Parking for 150 vehicles is envisaged at the Convention Centre which represents a supply rate of 0.5 spaces per 100m2 GFA. About 10 per cent have been allocated as long stay.

Metro Sports

Parking for 500 vehicles is envisaged at the Metro Sports Centre which represents a supply rate of 1.6 spaces per 100m2 GFA. About 5 per cent have been allocated as long stay. There is a possibility that a larger parking facility could be constructed for shared use with the Hospital precinct.

Justice and Emergency Precinct

Only very low levels of on-site parking are proposed. A supply rate of 0.1 spaces per 100m² GFA has been adopted.

Museum / Arts Centre

The long stay supply rate has been set at 0.1 spaces per 100m2 GFA. A short stay rate for the Arts Centre of 1.5 spaces per 100 m2 GFA to reflect current supply. No parking exists at the Museum and none is proposed.

Residential

The City Plan requirement is 1-1.2 spaces per household. An average supply rate of 1.1 spaces per household has been adopted for L3 and L4 zones.

Supply is expected to be about 1 space per household for L3 and L4 zones.

Appendix C: Cycle parking approach

The calculations and figures used are based on the figures from the long term parking model.

The Parking Plan determines there will be a car parking demand of 35,700 spaces in the Central City. To calculate the estimated cycle parking demand in the Central City, the projections from the Parking Plan have been coupled with the transport mode share projections from CERA.

By 2041, CERA is aiming to triple the number of cycling trip undertaken in the Central City. This will equate to an 11 per cent cycling mode share. Using these figures it has been forecast that by 2026 the number of Central City cycling trips would have doubled, equating to a 7.4 per cent mode share.

Cycle parking demand

Generally, it is assumed that the long term (2041) demand for cycle parking in the Central City will be 4000 cycle parks. This can be broken down as being 2400 long stay cycle parks and 1700 short stay cycle parks.

The medium term (2026) demand is estimated at being for 2800 cycle parks. This can be broken down as 1600 long stay and 1200 short stay cycle parks. The table C.1 shows the cycle parking demand for each parking zone. Figure C.1 and C.2 provide a visual representation of the data shown in table C.1.

The demand for short stay cycle parking will be provided by a mix of individual businesses, the Council and the Crown (through Anchor or transport projects). The cycle parking requirements for private developments have not been altered from those in Accessible City Chapter of the CCRP. In precincts where it is likely that there will be high private cycle parking provision then this has been accounted for and explained.

As outlined in the Christchurch Cycle Design Guidelines the most important aspects for short stay cycle parking (assuming the design is of adequate standard) is being in a 'quick' and convenient location to suit the user's needs, for example, close to a shop entrance. Long stay cycle parking should be secure, covered, ideally with locker and potentially showering facilities. More information on cycle facilities can be found in the Christchurch Cycle Design Guidelines.

| Precinct | | 2026 | | 2041 | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| | Short Stay 2026 | Long Stay 2026 | Total 2026 | Short Stay 2041 | Long Stay 2041 | Total 2041 |
| Retail | 201 | 394 | 591 | 299 | 586 | 879 |
| Core North | 125 | 103 | 212 | 186 | 154 | 316 |
| Civic | 47 | 155 | 192 | 70 | 230 | 285 |
| Innovation | 45 | 80 | 118 | 67 | 118 | 174 |
| East Frame | 41 | 20 | 53 | 60 | 29 | 79 |
| Victoria | 24 | 55 | 76 | 35 | 81 | 95 |
| Museum | 52 | 25 | 74 | 77 | 38 | 110 |
| City West | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Kilmore | 32 | 87 | 118 | 48 | 129 | 175 |
| City North | 22 | 62 | 85 | 32 | 92 | 126 |
| City North East | 8 | 12 | 20 | 12 | 18 | 30 |
| City East | 37 | 75 | 112 | 55 | 112 | 167 |
| Stadium | 27 | 18 | 23 | 40 | 27 | 34 |
| CPIT | 69 | 69 | 140 | 102 | 102 | 207 |
| City South | 121 | 135 | 249 | 180 | 200 | 370 |
| South Frame | 36 | 65 | 100 | 54 | 96 | 147 |
| Metro Sport | 68 | 74 | 126 | 101 | 110 | 187 |
| Health | 199 | 208 | 407 | 296 | 309 | 605 |

Table C.1: Long and short stay parking demand 2026 to 2041.



Figure C.1: Short stay cycle parking demand for 2026 and 2041.



Figure C.2: Long stay cycle parking demand for 2026 and 2041.

Short stay cycle parking

Before the earthquakes Christchurch Central City had approximately 500 short stay cycle parks. In order to meet the projected 2026 demand for short stay cycle parking the number of short stay cycle parks required would be approximately 1200 stands. Figure C.1 shows the demand for short stay cycle parks for each of the precincts.

As outlined in the Christchurch Cycle Design Guidelines, the most important aspects for short stay cycle parking is ensuring they are in convenient locations to suit the user's needs, for example, close to a shop entrance. A comprehensive study from Copenhagen suggests that between 30 or 50 metres would be the maximum distance that people would be willing to walk from cycle parking to their end destination. Having short stay parking located more than 50 metres away from a destination will likely lead to people using street furniture to park their bikes. Using street furniture as cycling parking has an impact on the streetscape and can damage the street furniture.

International best practice is to provide covered short stay cycle parking. In order to promote cycling as a utilitarian form of transport then it is important to make cycle as attractive as possible, providing dry conditions to leave bikes improves the appeal of cycling. The advantages of providing covered cycle parking is that it prevents bicycles from rusting, and helmets (often left with a bike) and seats do not become wet whilst they are parked. Where there are verandas attached to shop frontages it may be possible to extend the veranda to cover the cycle parking without additional shelters. Examples of covered cycle parking can be found below.

Cities across the world are seeing an increase in cycling levels. In order to facilitate this cities are retrofitting the existing urban environment to accommodate short stay cycle parking. Cycle parks are often located in 'spare' urban space as a result of this retrofitting, which often has a negative effect on the urban environment. Locating on-street cycle parking poorly can also have safety implications. Too close to the road and there is a danger of people being hit by cars, too close to the main pedestrian thoroughfare and people may inadvertently walk into handlebars sticking out. With the rebuild of Central City streets there is an opportunity to plan the street environment to accommodate cycle parking into street design from the outset. Doing this would provide areas which are well designed and able to house more cycle stands if required in the future.

A good approach is to agree upon how and where cycle parking should be located in the street environment across the city so it is easily recognisable to cyclists. An ideal location for cycle parking would be between the path and the road, where on-street parking bays are currently located. Where possible, cycle parking areas should be an extension of the pedestrian area rather than being at road level. There should be ramped access onto the roadway to allow easy access to the area from the cycle lane.

The distribution of the cycle parks is an important consideration. Fifty metres is the maximum distance people are willing to park from a destination for short periods. To ensure that the Central City is adequately covered by cycle parking, and given the relative uniformity of the streets grid form (each block being 200m x 100m), the most effective way of achieving an even distribution would be to stagger cycle park locations along both sides of the street. This would equate to four cycle park locations for every 200 metre street section (two locations on both sides of the road) and two cycle park locations for every 100 metre street section. This means that no destination along the street will be more than 50 metres away from a cycle park on a single side of the street. Having the cycle parks staggered on either side of the road will ensure people not have to cross the road to reach their final destination. Using the Retail Precinct as an example, 34 different locations for cycle parking would be required across the predicted demand of 201 cycle parks.

The staggered approach of cycle stands assumes an even distribution of land use. However, there may be sections of streets where there is an increased demand for short stay cycle parking, or sections where there is less demand. For this reason it is important that the specific location for each cycle stand group is carefully planned. Cycle fix-up stations are also becoming more familiar in urban environments.

Examples of on-street cycle facilities



Covered cycle parking with cycle information (Treehugger.com, 2008)



Fix-up station , Cashel Street (CCC, 2013)

Long stay cycle parking

The overall approach is to provide secure cycle parking of a high standard at locations where it is perceived there will be a high demand for long stay facilities. These secure parking facilities will be supported by a centralised 'cycle hub' facility which will provide facilities such as showers, lockers, changing rooms, towels, laundry service, mechanic facilities, DIY tools, cycle shop, full time staff during normal hours and 24 hour access and air conditioning. These will be similar to facilities found overseas. By having a good quality cycle hub facility in a central location, coupled with secure cycle parking locations across the city, it will provide for the needs of cyclists coming from far afield who need to shower and get changed in a central location. The satellite stations would then allow for cyclists who have final destinations relatively close (but not within walking distance) to the cycle hub to cycle the short distance across the city to the nearest secure parking facility to their destination. Here they will be able to feel comfortable about having their bike locked up for a long period.

The long stay demand and potential location of cycle facilities by parking zone are:

Core North

The Core North Precinct would provide an ideal location for the cycle hub facility. A high quality facility in this central location would not only directly serve the Core North precinct with the desired number of long stay cycle parks but would also absorb some of the high demand for long stay cycle parking generated by the northern part of the retail precinct as well as the East Frame. A facility in this area would also be well placed to serve cycling tourists. The rebuild of the Central Library provides a good opportunity to incorporate a cycle hub facility.

The estimated demand for this facility would be approximately 200 spaces for long stay users. Approximately 100 short stay spaces may also be included to accommodate a high demand for short stay parking. Although this facility is not proposed to be the largest in the Central City (in terms of parking provision) it is envisaged it will have the role of being the city's cycle hub.

Bus Interchange

The land use surrounding the Bus Interchange is predominantly retail. This has traditionally provided short stay cycle parks for customers rather than secure facilities for staff. This means that it is unlikely that long stay cycle parking facilities will be provided as part of these developments. It is likely the majority of the long stay demand will be provided in a single facility.

The Bus Interchange is likely to serve the cycle parking needs of the southern part of the Retail, South Frame and Innovation Precincts, and of course the people with bicycles using the bus network. The facility at the interchange should be secure.

36 Christchurch Central Parking Plan The demand for cycle parks is estimated to be 600 spaces by 2041. The Bus Interchange is under construction and it is unrealistic to expect the development to cater for the 2041 cycle parking demand. It is estimated 400 long stay cycle parks should be provided to meet the medium term demand in 2026. It is important the Bus Interchange's design is flexible, ensuring the space can be expanded for cycle parking in the future. Ideally this should be part of any leasing contracts for businesses in the Interchange.

There would also be a need to cater for a small number of short stay cycle parks. It is suggested that 293 short stay cycle parks would be required in the retail precinct. It is likely that the cycle stands positioned in functional locations dotted around the Retail Precinct would be better suited to meet the majority of this demand although some short stay cycle parking will be required at the Bus Interchange.

Museum/Civic

The Museum and Civic Precincts are relatively small therefore a facility located in either the Museum or Civic Precinct would serve both locations. There may be opportunities for this facility to be shared with an off-street parking building in this area. The estimated demand for long stay cycle parking in these precincts would be 268 spaces. Office developments in these Precincts should provide some staff cycle parking, therefore a lower level of long stay cycle parking will be needed to meet the demand. An estimated long term figure would be approximately 150 cycle parks.

Metro Sports/Health

The proximity of the Metro Sports and Health Precincts means it is possible to look at cycle parking demands for both these facilities at the same time. The majority of the cycle parking demand in the health precinct will be generated by the hospital. It is likely that the hospital will provide adequate long stay cycle parking for its staff. However there will also be ancillary businesses located in the Health Precinct and the need to cater for long stay visitors to the Health Precinct. An obvious location for a long term cycle parking facility would be the new Metro Sports Centre as this would allow for the potential of combining the showering and locker facilities which will already form part of the Metro Sports development.

Taking into consideration that the hospital will provide long stay cycle parking for its staff, it is estimated a long stay cycle parking facility at the Metro Sports Facility should provide approximately 200 to 300 spaces to meet the 2041 demand. To meet demand in 2026, 100 long stay cycle spaces should be provided (depending on the provision which the hospital provides). It is predicted there will be a high demand for short stay cycle parking at the Metro Sports Centre. This should also be catered for as part of the Metro Sports development.

Stadium/ City East/CPIT

The nature of the stadium development offers potential to provide secure cycle parking to meet the demands of the stadium as well as a proportion of the City East and CPIT precincts. It is likely the stadium development will not be fully utilised unless there is an event taking place, which will usually occur outside normal working hours. The site therefore offers a good opportunity to provide secure cycle parking facilities which could cater for the surrounding areas during working hours whilst also providing cycle parking at the stadium during events.

CPIT does provide cycle parking for some of its staff and students. However, there are other businesses located in this area which may not be adequately catered for. There may be an opportunity to negotiate with CPIT to allow its secure cycle parking to be used for general public use. If this option is taken forward then it would negate the need for secure cycle parking on the south east corner of the stadium development. The City East precinct has two predominant land uses, residential developments which are located towards the north and small business units located towards the south. Residential developments should provide for secure cycle parking provision. The cycle parking provided towards the north east corner of the stadium development would cater for any business requirements.

It is recommended that the stadium should provide for approximately 50 - 100 long stay cycle parking spaces. Ideally these should be split between the north east and south east corners of the site in order to accommodate the CPIT precinct and the City East Precinct. This level of provision would also serve the stadium during events.

City South

The nature of developments in the City South Precinct (retail/ small businesses) means it is unlikely that secure cycle parking will be provided by individual businesses. A secure facility would therefore provide for this Precinct, preferably in a central or slightly eastern location (some demand to the west of the Precinct will be accommodated by the Metro Sports). The estimated long term demand in the precinct is 200 spaces. However, Metro Sports will accommodate some of this, therefore a secure facility with lockers should be provided for approximately 150 long stay cycle spaces. Figures indicate there is a high demand for short stay parks in this area.

Victoria/ Kilmore/ City North

It is estimated there will be long stay demand for 300 cycle spaces in the Victoria/Kilmore/City North Precincts. The majority of this area, particularly City North and Victoria Street, is likely to be retail and smaller scale businesses and these are unlikely to provide long stay cycle parks. There is the highest demand for cycle parking in Kilmore Street. It is envisaged a single facility will be adequate to serve these areas.

The City North East precinct has not been considered for cycle parking as this area will predominantly be residential development. According to the District Plan, residential developments should provide cycle parking. The City West precinct has not been considered as there is very little demand for cycle parking in this area.



Figure C.4 The types of facilities and potential locations to accommodate the long term cycle parking demand.

7. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT RECOVERY PROGRAMME QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

| | | Contact | Contact Details |
|------------------------------|--|---------|-------------------------------------|
| General Manager responsible: | Chief Planning Officer SPG | Y | Diane Campbell, 03 941 8281 |
| Officer responsible: | Unit Manager Environment & Heritage | Y | Michelle Oosthuizen, 03 941 8812 |
| Author: | Clive Appleton | Y | 03 941 8352 |

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 This report updates the Committee on the implementation and progress of the Natural Environment Recovery Programme (NERP).

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 In May 2013, the Chief Executives Advisory Group (CEAG) agreed to the NERP Technical Advisory Group continuing in an advisory role for the implementation of the NERP until April 2016, with consideration being given to it continuing as a sub-group of the Urban Development Strategy (UDS).
- 2.2 The NERP Technical Advisory Group meets monthly and partners are collaborating to ensure implementation and reporting of the 17 NERP projects (see **Attachment 1**) is undertaken on a quarterly basis, which will be presented to the Recovery Strategy Advisory Committee. These reports will then be presented to the partner governance groups.
- 2.3 The NERP was adopted by Environment Canterbury Commissioners on 3 October 2013.
- 2.4 The third NERP Quarterly Progress Report was presented to the Recovery Strategy Advisory Committee in July 2014 (see **Attachment 2**).

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Many of the Council's programmes and projects directly support the NERP and along with **Attachment 1**, this report provides a high-level update on work being implemented by the agencies over the last three months. Quarterly reporting on the NERP is undertaken because this is the time interval that provides the best picture into progress being made against each of the projects.
- 3.2 The following programme highlights for the Council are:
 - 3.2.1 Investigate and plan for natural hazards
 - The Draft Natural Hazards Chapter of the replacement District Plan (including flooding, liquefaction and slope instability) was released on 15 March. Other hazards are to be considered in phase 2 of the District Plan review and the scope has been released to the strategic partners for comment.
 - 3.2.2 Investigate and monitor coasts and estuaries
 - Sediment and macrobiota monitoring continues.
 - Scope for the Coastal Chapter released to strategic partners for comment.

- 3.2.3 Reduce flood risks and restore drainage capacity of waterways
 - Mayoral Flood Task Force looking to identify both short term flood responses and medium to long term solutions to return Christchurch to preearthquake flood risk levels.
 - Engineering responses will consider need for red zoning where land damage contributes to flooding.
 - Land drainage recovery programme investigations on all waterways being conducted through to late 2014.
- 3.2.4 Plan for stormwater management
 - Avon River Stormwater Management Plan research/ investigations were completed and findings presented and discussed with the Chch-West Melton Zone Committee, 29 May 2014.
 - Low Impact Design approaches being integrated into stormwater management plans and district plan provisions.
 - Working with Mahaanui Kurataiao to ensure cultural matters are appropriately addressed as part of stormwater management.
 - The Council is working towards developing a comprehensive stormwater discharge consent for Christchurch and Banks Peninsula, which will replace current consents for the South-West and Styx River catchments.
- 3.2.5 Act on opportunities for stormwater treatment and improving the water quality and ecosystem health of waterways
 - Continuing to look at how low impact design approaches can be integrated into management plans, district plan provisions and in the central city.
 - Working for CCDU, with engineers, designing low impact stormwater treatment principals into central city transport corridors.
- 3.2.6 Manage sediment from liquefaction
 - Land drainage recovery programme surveys for removal of sediment from Avon and Heathcote Rivers conducted.
 - Programme of work required for land drainage remediation being put forward for LTP funding consideration.
- 3.2.7 Rehabilitate and enhance wetlands changed by earthquakes
 - Opportunities being identified through technical investigations for stormwater management plans and the land drainage recovery programme.
- 3.2.8 Act on opportunities to reduce sewage overflows and their effects
 - The Council has developed pre and post earthquake models of wet weather flows and overflows in wastewater network.
 - Next task is to develop the post Stronger Christchurch Infrastructure Rebuild Team model to enable comparison of pre earthquake to post-rebuild. This model is to be calibrated in winter of 2016 close to the end of rebuild period. Results of this modelling will determine if consent compliance is achievable or whether a new consent will be required.
- 3.2.9 Protect groundwater and springs
 - District Plan Review to consider land use controls over unconfined aquifer.
 - Stormwater management plans are identifying significant spring features and will ensure these sites are protected and managed appropriately.

- 3.2.10 Control pests and weeds
 - On-going maintenance work with some restrictions due to safety concerns on the Port Hills.
 - The Council has contributed to the Environment Canterbury Regional Pest Management Strategy Review of work required for the next financial year.
- 3.2.11 Assess, retain and enhance biodiversity
 - Avon River stormwater management plan ecological investigations have been completed and will form the basis for future management of biodiversity in the waterways.
 - The Council continues to provide technical support for the Ecosanctuary proposal being investigated by Department of Conservation.
- 3.2.12 Provide access to and opportunities for outdoor recreation
 - Coastal Pathway work progressing.
 - BMX competition track suitable for hosting national level events at Bexley Reserve, planned to be developed 2014 -17.
 - Christchurch Adventure Park (Port Hills) being planned by Select Evolution NZ Ltd.
- 3.2.13 Manage earthquake waste
 - The Council is a partner to the newly formed Combined Health and Environmental Hazards Programme Control Group. The main objective of this group is to work collaboratively on earthquake and other waste, hazardous material and contaminated land related issues that require a coordinated multi-agency response, including work place safety, disposal and impact on the waste stream.
 - The Council is a partner of the Waste Environmental Management Team that has established a "One Stop Shop" to provide advice for residential land owners regarding contaminated soil disposal, as part of the land repair project. It is also working with Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority and the Christchurch Central Development Unit with safe handling and disposal of asbestos, demolition waste and control of dust management.
- 3.2.14 Manage contaminated sites
 - Draft provisions have been developed in phase one of the District Plan review and further provisions are under development for phase 2.
- 3.2.15 Track earthquake effects on emissions and air quality
 - The Christchurch Agency for Energy Grant provides incentives for renewable energy, district energy nodes and advanced energy efficiency measures in the central city. Further feasibility work on the district energy scheme has been endorsed by the Council.
- 3.3 For detailed information on where the other NERP agencies have got to in progressing respective projects **see Attachment 1**.

4. COMMENT

4.1 See Attachment 1.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Council projects listed in the NERP are funded by existing levels of service.

6. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee:

6.1 Receive the Natural Environment Recovery Programme Quarterly Progress Report for July 2014.

Natural Environment Recovery Programme – Progress Report – Second Quarter - April/May/June - 2014

| Project | Project title | Lead agency/ agencies (bold) and partners | April/May/June - 2014 | Next steps | Emerging issues | Milestone | Date |
|---------|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | Investigate and plan for natural hazards Hazards investigations; land use planning Reassess the risks and susceptibilities of natural hazards. Report and map the results to inform land use planning and development. | ECan CERA, NHRP, GNS, UC, CCC, WDC, SDC, TRONT | MBIE MBIE-run workshop with GNS, MfE, EQC, MCDEM, CCC, T&T, and others on developing national guidance on appropriate management of development on liquefiable land. ECan ECan organised meetings: of planners and CERA to discuss rules for District Plans on active fault reports and managing the hazard. of hazards staff, planners and regional CDEM, to discuss responsibilities and rules for District Plans on liquefaction and on coastal hazards. Final Draft received for review of Ashley-Loburn Fault report Active fault investigation and reports ongoing: communications process developed with CERA and TAs Preliminary Draft of "user guide" on application of fault reports received CCC District plan review (DPR) Draft Natural Hazards Chapter (part) released on 15 March – includes flooding, liquefaction and slope instability. Other hazards considered in phase 2 of DPR. Scope for the Phase 2 of the Natural hazards Chapter of the DP review released for comment to the strategic partners | Ongoing discussion on management of coastal environment between ECan and TAs. Possibly some more detailed mapping of coastal hazard zones in some areas by ECan. ECan work with WDC to apply the fault information appropriately in their Natural Hazards District Plan change. (Also liquefaction and flooding) Complete the user guide and then use it with TAs in writing Plans. | Natural hazard risk in existing urban areas to be assessed and reflected in land planning documents, including in CCC DP review CERA holds the Geotechnical Database. Discussions between CERA, ECan, CCC, EQC GNS, LINZ on best location for database EQC groundwater monitoring will end in a year. Discussion between ECan, CCC, WDC, SDC, GNS, NIWA, LINZ, EQC and universities on value of the network and future home/funding for the work. | Student projects in place working on ECan sponsored hazards/related projects. (co-funded by CCC, WDC, SDC, CDEM and others) 4-monthly forum for TA planners, hazards staff, and Regional CDEM staff RMA /CDEM Act relationship "User guide" on application of fault reports in planning released Ashley-Loburn Fault report | July 2014 July 2014 July 2014 |
| 2 | Investigate and monitor coasts and estuaries Te Tai o Mahaanui/ Canterbury coastal investigations; estuary investigations Investigate and monitor earthquake changes in coastal and estuary processes and physical parameters. Build in sea level rise and climate variability | ECan, NIWA UC, CCC, WDC, SDC, TRONT | ECan Coastal water quality monitoring continues – within Ihutai and elsewhere on the coast Continues to survey coastal cross sections along the coast of Christchurch and Waimakariri and topographic surveys of the South Brighton and Brooklands spits. CCC Sediment and macrobiota monitoring continues released for comment to the strategic partners the scope for the Coastal Chapter | Continued data collection and analysis of coastal geomorphology | IPCC fifth assessment (AR5) and more certainty around predictions for next 100 years will require extensive community participation to resolve planning approaches for coastal settlements | CCC district plan notification | Mid 2014 |
| 3 | Reduce flood risks and restore drainage capacity of waterways Flood mitigation; stopbanks and other works; resilient sustainable infrastructure in rebuild. Includes CCC land drainage recovery programme. | CCC, SCIRT, WDC, SDC, ECan CERA, developers, TRONT | CCC Christchurch flooding: Mayoral Flood Task Force has working groups looking to identify both short term flood responses and medium to long term solutions to return Christchurch to pre-earthquake flood risk levels, particularly for Flockton and lower Heathcote Engineering responses will consider need for red zoning where land damage contributes to flooding. Land drainage recovery programme investigations on all waterways being conducted through to late 2014 Flooding task force underway to look at flood mitigation options for areas where earthquake subsidence has exacerbated inundation of properties WDC Changes proposed to Ashley River Rating district funding to spread costs more fairly. Waimakariri District Flood Team established to organise response to immediate various flood issues arising from 10-11 June 2014 flooding event, affecting towns and rural residential settlements in the east of the district | CCC Flood Taskforce to report on options for Dudley Creek and other priority catchments Working with CERA on future use of residential red zone – particularly in lower Avon catchment – and location of stopbanks, pumping stations and horizontal infrastructure WDC District flood team will also need to investigate longer term solutions to drainage issues occurring in around Kaiapoi, in conjunction with review of the LIDAR results, to look at areas where ground levels have shifted and affected the drainage network | CCC Extent of flood risk in post- earthquake environment needs careful analysis and evaluation of options – including consideration of long-term settlement patterns across the city WDC Resources required to fully support district Flood Team and funding to enable long term solutions to be implemented | CCC district plan notification Completed LIDAR data available to WDC and ECan | June 2014 Mid June 2014. |
| 4 | Plan for stormwater management by preparing Stormwater Management Plans (SMPs) Develop an SMP for each catchment to fulfil the requirement for catchment- wide stormwater discharge consent. Important for planning for the RRZ and CCDU anchor projects including in Te Papa Ōtākaro/Avon River Precinct. | CCC, WDC, SDC ECan, CERA | ECan Region-wide stormwater forum held on 2 April, on options for making stormwater management and consenting more efficient and effective – further discussion planned on collaboration, technical and regulatory support, affordability and awareness. WDC Draft Rangiora SMP - Research and investigations continue for development of SMP. Will identify methods to reduce urban stormwater contaminants into the downstream Kaiapoi and Waimakariri Rivers District wide stormwater quality monitoring methodology prepared and approved by ECan water quality scientists ready for implementation from July 2014 starting with Rangiora. A key focus is to address sources of sediment into the Kaiapoi River. CCC Avon River SMP | | CCC Need for consistency across stormwater management planning and consenting mechanisms so greater effort being made to raise awareness of stormwater management principles across the Councils operations. Proposals for Avon River/Ōtākaro city to sea link will need to be taken into account and integrated with | Final Avon River/Ōtākaro SMP completed CCC Comprehensive Stormwater Discharge Consent Rangiora SMP completed | 2014 May 2015 2014 |

EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE 7. 8. 2014 ATTACHMENT 1 TO CLAUSE 7 51

| ATTACHMENT 1 TO | | | | ATTACHMENT TO CLA | USE / | | |
|-----------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|---------------|
| Project | Project title | Lead agency/ agencies (bold) and partners | April/May/June - 2014 | Next steps | Emerging issues | Milestone | Date |
| | | | Research/ investigations completed and findings presented and discussed with the Chch-West Melton Zone Committee, 29 May 2014 LID approaches integrated into SMPs and district plan review Working with Mahaanui Kurataiao to ensure cultural matters are appropriately addressed as part of the Stormwater Management Programme Investigating comprehensive stormwater discharge consent to cover Christchurch and Banks Peninsula, which will replace current consents for the South-West and Styx River catchments. | | stormwater management requirements | | |
| 5 | Act on opportunities for stormwater treatment and improving the water quality and ecosystem health of waterways Stormwater treatment systems; stream and river restoration; riparian zones; establishment of constructed wetlands Use LID /stormwater treatment systems/wetlands to attenuate stormwater flows, reduce sediment, and improve quality of stormwater into waterways. Consider changing the form of waterways to enhance stream ecology. Plant river banks to provide food sources, habitat and shade. | CCC, WDC, SDC, SCIRT ECan, CERA, CCDU, TRONT, CDHB, developers, UC, LU, NIWA, Landcare Research, ESR, NGOs, consultants, zone committees | CCC/ECan Stormwater issues management group (SWiM) meeting regularly WDC Retrofitting treatment devices considered as part of the recovery works for the stormwater systems in Kaiapoi, The Pines Beach and Kairaki. Developed a stormwater monitoring programme to consider effects of urban discharges throughout Waimakariri District. Initial funding for the programme has now been budgeted in 2014/15. Baseline stormwater quality sampling in the Rangiora network is continuing with three of four planned samples now collated and interim analysis presented to the consent steering group. A final report is due in June 2014. CCDU Anchor project Te Papa Ötäkaro/Avon River Precinct providing limited stormwater treatment. Some stormwater treatment in east frame University of Canterbury Installing trial stormwater filter to collect data on run off from a car park. Formalising the funding agreement with ccc for this project, New landscaping around Okeover Stream being designed to include wetlands, a raingarden, and a storm filter may be installed, budget dependent student projects: Modelling and optimisation of different treatment trains, for the campus catchment. Monitoring green roof modules on the engineering building. Developing remote logging of water quality in the Okeover and Avon waterways o quantifying atmospheric deposition in different catchments in Christchurch | | | | |
| 6 | Manage sediment from liquefaction Investigations, assessment and advice on removal of sediments; sediment removal in rivers and tributaries; erosion and sediment controls | CCC, WDC, SDC, ECan NIWA, consultants, UC, TRONT | CCC Land drainage recovery programme – surveys for removal of sediment from Avon and Heathcote Rivers conducted. Programme of work being put forward for LTP funding consideration WDC Cam River Enhancement Fund Subcommittee has been established and initial projects approved by the Subcommittee are now being implemented. These include three sediment traps and bed raking riffle formation WDC, ECan and Waimakariri Zone Committee Working Party being set up to address sedimentation in the Kaiapoi River. | CCC/ECan: Develop programme for removal of sediment from Avon, Heathcote and Kaiapoi Rivers Commence first meeting of Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party in June or July 2014 once all Working Party members are confirmed and ECan level of support is determined. | | | |
| 7 | Rehabilitate and enhance wetlands changed by the earthquakes Mapping, inventory, rehabilitation of existing wetlands | ECan CCC, WDC, UC, SDC, TRONT, NIWA, zone committees | CCC Land drainage recovery programme- investigations on all waterways and associated wetlands continuing ECan In May completed re-survey of Ashley Estuary-Saltwater Creek wetland vegetation and habitats (10 years after initial survey); survey results will be entered into GIS database in June | ECan Assess earthquake changes to state and extent of coastal wetlands surveyed previously (i.e. Lower Waimakariri-Brooklands Lagoon, Ihutai) (LiDAR survey will assist with this work in eastern Waimakariri District | | Lower Waimakariri and Ihutai survey | 2015- 2016 |
| 8 | Act on opportunities to reduce sewage overflows and their effects During rebuild, improve wastewater infrastructure to reduce/avoid wet weather sewage overflows directly to waterways; minimise their effect. | CCC, WDC, SDC CDHB , ECan, SCIRT, TRONT, Papatipu Rūnanga | SCIRT Programme of repairs continues CCC Have developed pre and post earthquake models of wet weather flows and overflows in wastewater network. WDC Wastewater review for Rangiora and Kaiapoi reticulation on frequency/ location of overflows completed and presentation to stakeholders identified further factors for consideration. Repairs continuing for damaged wastewater network in Kaiapoi. Wastewater network repairs largely completed elsewhere. | CCC Next task is to develop the post SCIRT model to enable comparison of pre earthquake to post-rebuild. This model to be calibrated in winter of 2016 close to the end of rebuild period. Results of this modelling will determine if consent compliance achievable or whether a new consent will be required. | CCC Risk that extent of wastewater network rebuild not sufficient to achieve equal or better than pre- earthquake overflow frequencies and volumes. Currently flows through CWTP up to 60% higher than pre-earthquake. | | |

EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE 7. 8. 2014

| 9 | Protect groundwater and springs Ensure land use controls over unconfined aquifer. Encourage retention of natural springs and daylighting streams. | ECan, CCC, WDC, SDC, SCIRT, CCDU CERA, MBIE, TRONT, Papatipu Rūnanga, zone committees | ECan Continues to monitor groundwater quantity and quality in greater Christchurch from a set of state of the environment wells. | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 10 | Control weeds and pests that have potential to affect biodiversity, or have impact on health and safety Extend existing strategies and programmes for controlling weeds and pests to earthquake affected areas. | CCC, WDC, SDC, DOC CERA/ LINZ ECan, TRONT, NGOs | ECan Regional Pest Management Strategy (RPMS) review work continues, including efficiency and effectiveness review of existing programmes CCC Party to RPMS review work Maintenance work and weed control continuing on CCC reserves | | | RPMS review discussion document released | July/ August 2014 |
| 11 | Assess, retain and enhance biodiversity Assess, monitor highest-value ecosystems. Investigate sites for biodiversity corridors, reserves and mahinga kai. Investigate an eco- sanctuary. Rehabilitate inanga spawning sites. | DOC, CCC, WDC, SDC ECan, CERA, TRONT, UC, Landcare Research, consultants, zone committees, NGOs | DOC/ Greening the Rubble. Nature Play site at the corner of Hereford Street/ Latimer square brings conservation and native biodiversity into the city DOC/NERP/ECan/CCC/Landcare Research/Ngai Tahu/Ngai Tūāhuriri Working group developed concept plan for Waitākiri Sanctuary with pest-exclusion fence – Travis Wetland and RRZ area south of Travis CCC Avon River/Ōtākaro ecological investigations completed and will be used to inform the SMP and future development of stormwater management facilities | CCC - Inanga studies by ECan and NIWA to be included into CCC SMPs 2014 – 2016. | | | |
| 12 | Support community gardens, local food production and urban forestry 27 community gardens already exist in greater Christchurch. Support development of more community gardens, orchards, and local food production on available land. | Soil and Health Association NGOs, CCC, WDC, SDC, ECan, TRONT, LU, SCION, EnviroSchools | Soil and Health Association Two hui of representatives of an emerging Community Food Sector held at University of Canterbury (Sept '13 and March '14). These established the Food Resilience Network (a collective of agencies such as CCC, WDC, Ngai Tahu, and various NGOs) The Food Resilience Network is currently working on a Community Food Sector Resilience Programme. Some specific projects incorporated in this include: An urban agriculture project in the central city (Agropolis) has been launched and now has strategic plan with a ten year view. Short term funding secured for project coordinator and inner city waste collection and composting system Development of funding and business plans for four 'anchor' community food projects (including school garden in the Mahinga Kai Exemplar project) On-going networking and relationship building (for example with CERA re Residential Red Zone possibilities, and Project Lyttelton regarding city-wide school garden and nutrition education) Research projects supporting each of these areas are currently being undertaken by UC students from a range of courses. | Finalise Community Food Resilience Programme for Greater Christchurch Develop branding (potentially using the name EDEN CHRISTCHURCH). Official launch and fundraiser to be held, potentially in September | Lack of funding to advance specific projects to date Awaiting decisions on Residential Red Zone | Collaborative workshop to further develop the programme Finalise public communications document. Branding decisions signed off. | June 2014 July 2014 August 2014 |
| 13 | Provide access to and opportunities for outdoor recreation Promote and advertise currently available facilities; maintain and develop a network of walking paths, cycling and mountain bike tracks and other recreation facilities provide for passive recreation, visual amenity and community wellbeing. Provide access for people with disabilities. Consider establishment of water sports areas beside the Avon River/Ōtākaro. | Sport and Recreation Earthquake Leadership Group CCC, WDC, SDC, ECan, TRONT, DOC, CCDU, NZTA, zone committees, NGOs | Sport and Recreation Earthquake Leadership Group Sport and Recreation Recovery Programme; Spaces, Places and People: A recovery programme for sport and recreation in greater Christchurch - launched as a web based strategy on 31 May. Terms of Reference for Leadership Group are under review to reflect the present environment regarding sport and recreation recovery. Sport Canterbury leading discussion with sport re flat water sports lake in east Christchurch; resource document prepared on technical investigations required Avon Rowing Club temporary rowing facilities completed CCC Coastal Pathway work progressing BMX competition track suitable for hosting national level events at Bexley Reserve, planned to be developed 2014 -17 Christchurch Adventure Park (Port Hills) being planned by Select Evolution NZ Ltd WDC Christchurch Earthquake Appeal Trust funded repair/ relocation of damaged recreation facilities along Kaiapoi River and coast - Kaiapoi BMX, Cure Boating Club replacement, Waimakariri-Ashley coastguard facilities, Kaiapoi riverside walkway, Pegasus Bay walkway and mountain-bike trail between Kairaki and Woodend. ECan Will clarify with recreational users of the Estuary/lhutai the methodology for grading suitability of Avon Heathcote Estuary/lhutai for contact recreation | | | | |

EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE 7. 8. 2014 ATTACHMENT 1 TO CLAUSE 7 53

| 14 | Manage earthquake waste Improve monitoring and tracking of earthquake waste; enforce and manage aftercare of storage, sorting and disposal sites. Maximise recycling at or near source. Reduce illegal dumping by increasing compliance monitoring and enforcement. Prepare waste management plans for future disasters. | ECan (WEMT) CCC, WDC, SDC, waste industry, CanCERN, CERA, MfE, CDEM | Combined Health and Environmental Hazards Programme Control Group (CHER PCR) The main objective of the CHER PCG is to work collaboratively on Earthquake and other waste and hazardous material, and contaminated land related issues that require a coordinated multi-agency response - including work place safety, disposal, impact on the waste stream A Draft MOU for this strategic group that sits over the operational WEMT team has been drafted and is awaiting sign - off by all the agencies involved in the CHER group. Waste Environmental Management Team (WEMT) A "One Stop Shop" has been established to provide advice for residential land owners regarding contaminated soil disposal, as part of the land repair project. Environment Canterbury is also leading the work into reducing or removing associated costs for contaminated soil disposal, to encourage correct disposal. Approximately 86% of all Residential Red Zone properties have been checked and cleared of hazardous material. In total 320,500 kg of hazardous material has been removed, of which 257,079 kg was paint. The Waste and Environmental Management Team has worked closely with the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority and the Christchurch Central Development Unit to enable land remediation and construction works in both the Justice and Transport Precincts to progress expediently. These collaborations have highlighted potential issues regarding asbestos, demolition waste and dust management. The management of asbestos containing material in waste with backfilling on sites and home DIY demolitions has also been a significant issue during this reporting period. The Waste and Environmental Management Team is working closely with Work Safe NZ regarding both these. ECan Continues with investigations, enforcements and prosecutions where demolition material buried or disposed of illegally | Clearance of household hazardous waste on track to be operationally complete by December 2014, with the exception of some Port Hills properties that will be demolished beyond the project lifetime. | | Next RRZ HHW Programme project milestone Final project milestone | June 2014. March 2015 |
|----|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| 15 | Manage contaminated sites | ECon | ECan/CCC | | | | |
| | Undertake a programme of HAIL site identification. Inform and educate on the requirement to comply with the NES. | CCC, WDC, SDC, TRONT | Developing a shared services model for technical support on NES consent applications. May consider similar arrangement with all other TA's ECan leading the HAIL identification process, supported by CCC - HAIL sites have been identified and landholders notified. Community workshops are occurring. CCC District Plan Review has contaminated land draft provisions integrated into phase one of DPR and are available online since 25 Feb 2014. Provisions for phase 2 under development. | | | | |
| 16 | Track earthquake effects on emissions and air quality Continue monitoring changes in use of different heating appliances and air quality. If necessary amend Air Plan to meet 2016 targets and National Environmental Standard (NES) requirements. | ECan | ECan Investigations undertaken within Christchurch have identified that emission reductions are still required to achieve compliance with the NES targets Final stages of planning for: Consultation document for the Air Plan Review Social marketing campaign targeting better burning to reduce chimney smoke. This will include social media such as Facebook Ongoing wood burner compliance checks Continuing to work with social agencies to assist vulnerable households with home heating. Draft Health Impact Assessment (HIA) been developed for air plan review – for stakeholder consultation; home heating survey for Christchurch, literature review underway. Consultation with key stakeholders as part of a review of the Canterbury Air Plan Working with Canterbury District Health Board, Warmer Canterbury Group and Healthy Christchurch focusing on clean air and warm homes supporting health outcome | | A large number of older more polluting wood burners are still in use over winter Wood burners smouldering overnight resulting in high early morning emissions Burning of inappropriate materials for home heating due to availability of increased amount of freely available construction wastes Every winter the community debates whether polluted air or cold homes have the worst impact on health. In Canterbury, we should be able to have clean air and warm homes. | Final HIA report Let's Clear the Air Programme Public consultation on Air Plan Review | July 2014 June 2014 June 2014 |
| 17 | Act on opportunities to restore and enhance mahinga kai Restore and enhance mahinga kai resources and sites and traditions of customary use; promote the principle of Ki Uta Ki Tai. Establish pā harakeke, rongoā and native plantings. | Ngāi Tahu (Ngā Papatipu Rūnanga, TRONT) ECan, WDC, SDC, DOC | Mahinga Kai exemplar project being progressed for Anzac Driver Reserve with Avon Ötākaro Network taking a lead role; local primary schools involved; community planting day 28 June 2014 | | | | |

EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE 7. 8. 2014 ATTACHMENT 1 <u>TO CLAUSE 7</u>54



Recovery Strategy Advisory Committee Paper

| Paper Title | Progress Report of the Natural Environment Recovery Programme – second quarter report |
|--------------|---|
| Author | Chrissie Williams, NERP Programme Leader |
| Meeting Date | 11 July 2014 |

Purpose

This report updates RSAC on the implementation, reporting and risks of the Natural Environment Recovery Programme (NERP) for the second quarter of 2014, and seeks feedback.

Background

- 1. CEAG has agreed to the three-year NERP programme leader position, based at Environment Canterbury. Chrissie Williams's contract has been renewed to May 2016.
- 2. The NERP Technical Advisory Group is meeting regularly, providing guidance to the programme, input to progress reporting of the NERP projects, and, where appropriate, support for specific projects.
- 3. In April, Prime Minister John Key announced there would be community participation on the future use of residential red zone (RRZ) land. CERA is working with the strategic partners to design the approach for wider community participation in determining the future of this land. From the development and implementation of the NERP there is information that can help inform the policy development for the future use of RRZ land.
- 4. Implementation of the NERP includes:
 - quarterly progress reports on the 17 NERP projects to the Recovery Strategy Advisory Committee. The TAG members then present these reports to the partner governance groups. The report for the second quarter 2014 is attached
 - facilitation and advocacy for projects in the NERP that require leadership and co-ordination
 - the first annual forum with all stakeholders was held on 2 July 2014. It was attended by 70 people and included updates on the NERP implementation; Te Papa Ōtākaro/Avon River Precinct project in the central city; CCC's stormwater treatment and land drainage recovery programme; community gardens projects; Waitākiri Sanctuary and Mahinga Kai exemplar; and an update on bird populations since the earthquakes. Information sheets were available for these and other projects
- 5. Once the progress report has been presented to RSAC, it is reported to the district councils. CCC considered the first quarter report on 5 June 2014 at their Earthquake Committee of the whole, and sought reports on
 - the alignment of SCIRT's work with the NERP and the CCC's Surface Water Strategy

- asbestos management, and
- CERA's process for considering a flat-water facility on red-zoned land.
- 6. Integration with other plans and programmes continues:
 - future use of residential red zone land seeking to contribute to the technical and planning work being led by CERA
 - linking with Zone Committees and zone implementation programmes (ZIPs) for Christchurch West Melton, Banks Peninsula, Waimakariri zones
 - working with the Sport and Recreation Earthquake Leadership Group
 - participating as an observer on the Project Steering Group for anchor projects Te Papa Ōtākaro/Avon River Precinct and North and East frames.
- 7. Contribution will be made to the recovery strategy transition planning for NERP projects.

Risks

A risk assessment is undertaken and presented to CEAG quarterly, with any urgent or high risks being taken to the chief executives as they arise. Main risks and mitigations are:

| NERP – Risk assessment and control – second quarter 2014 | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Risk | Risk Mitigation | | | | |
| Delay in initiation and completion of projects because of uncertainty of decisions on the future use of residential red zone (RRZ). Projects 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17 | In April, the Prime Minister announced there would be an engagement process for the future use of RRZ land. This process is being designed by CERA and is yet to be announced. Decisions on the future use of RRZ are unlikely to be made before 2015. | | | | |
| Competing interests and raised expectations from stakeholder groups with engagement on RRZ land | Involvement of stakeholders in workshops and forums. Sharing of the information being used to inform recommendations and decisions about the projects. | | | | |
| Opportunities for introducing more resilient systems not taken because of a focus on repairing infrastructure – projects 3 and 5. | Strong and frequent engagement between CERA, CCC and SCIRT | | | | |
| Reduced community consultation and potential for limitation of alternative options, when mechanisms in CER Act are used to truncate resource consents processes | CEAG agreed that strategic partners discuss a consistent approach to increasing consultation with the community on resource consents, to transition to normal RMA processes in 2016. UDRMG have agreed to initiate those discussions and acknowledge this is not only a NERP issue. | | | | |
| Lack of funding for implementation which results in delays or reduced outcomes because of competing priorities in LTPs | Many of the projects are already budgeted. LTPs need to recognise on-going operational commitments as well as capital funding. | | | | |

Legal compliance

The NERP aligns with the purposes of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 Part 1 s3 and the Recovery Strategy.

Financial Implications

The programme does not commit to specific projects, with those decisions being with lead agencies that have these included in their programmes of work/LTPs, or will consider them in future planning and budgeting.

Consultation

NERP engagement with partner organisations is through the technical advisory group (TAG) and stakeholder workshops.

Publicity / Communication

- The final document is available on the Environment Canterbury (www.ecan.govt.nz/nerp) and CERA websites.
- Media includes articles in Living Here, in CERA's Greater Christchurch Recovery Update, and through a series of information sheets for the 17 projects in preparation.
- Media requests are responded to, with involvement and statements from relevant partner organisations
- Presentations on the NERP have been requested and made to a number of groups including schools and universities.

Recommendation

That RSAC receive the progress report, and provide feedback and guidance on the NERP implementation.

Attachment

NERP Progress Report – second quarter 2014

8. LAND USE RECOVERY PLAN - UPDATE

| | | Contact | Contact Details |
|------------------------------|---|---------|-----------------------------|
| General Manager responsible: | Chief Planning Officer, Strategy & Planning | Υ | PA Diane Campbell 8281 |
| Officer responsible: | Unit Manager, Transport & Research | Y | PA Michelle Oosthuizen 8812 |
| Author: | Unit Manager, Transport & Research | | |

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 This report updates the Committee on progress of the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP). The LURP was endorsed by the Council on 28 November 2013 and gazetted by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery (Minister CER) on 6 December 2013. The Committee was updated on LURP in April, and separate reports were provided on LURP Actions 7, 8 and 33 to this Committee and the Council from February through to May.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 This report updates the Committee on progress of the LURP. The following topics are addressed:
 - LURP Actions 7, 8, 9, 14 and 33
 - Elderly Persons Housing
 - The LURP Working Party
 - Review of the LURP.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The LURP was endorsed by the Council on 28 November 2013 and gazetted by the Minister CER on 6 December 2013. It sets a framework for rebuilding and recovery that supports existing and new communities, commercial and business needs, infrastructure requirements and environmental constraints. This report updates the Committee on progress with its implementation.

4. COMMENT

4.1 LURP Actions

The LURP contains 50 actions, 25 of which apply to Council, with 11 of these directing either the review of the District Plan, or immediate changes to the Operative District Plan. The District Plan Review will be progressed in accordance with the Order in Council. Of the fourteen remaining actions for the Council, five have specific timeframes, and the remainder are 'on-going'. To date, resources have been focused on those actions which have specific timeframes. An update on these is provided below:

Action 7

This requires the Council to develop a package of instruments to promote intensification and city living, including affordable and temporary housing. This may include financial tools, regulatory incentives, reviewing the development contribution policy and other initiatives. This package is to be developed in collaboration with the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) and the Ministry for Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE).

Progress on this action was reported to the Council in May. The process for delivery of Action 7 has been to identify and examine options potentially available to the Council and other organisations to promote and encourage intensification. This has included an assessment of potential barriers to intensification in the general areas of finance, regulation, environment, and the costs associated with the development process. The mechanisms which already exist to overcome these barriers have been identified. Demand side drivers for buyers of medium density development have also been assessed. Council staff have met with CERA and MBIE officials to agree timelines for completing Action 7. CERA staff will then report these timeframes to the Minister CER.

Action 8

This requires the Council to enable a range of exemplar medium density housing projects, including the design and testing of projects. The action states that Bryndwr and Shirley are the locations for the Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC) exemplars and that two locations need to be confirmed by the Council. It also states that decisions on whether proposals at Riccarton Racecourse and Halswell will be approved as exemplars needs to occur within 9 months of the LURP's gazettal. Therefore, Council has three roles in the exemplar process.

- To develop the exemplar criteria, in collaboration with the other partner agencies for Action 8, against which the candidate schemes can be evaluated.
- In accordance with the second bullet point of Action 8, it has to provide two projects of its own for consideration for Exemplar status.
- As lead agency for Action 8, Council has to 'enable' the Exemplar projects.

In its role in developing the exemplar criteria, the Council agreed these with the partner agencies to Action 8 and they were approved by Council in February 2014. The table below outlines the status of the exemplar projects:

| | Site Endorsed | Approval 'in | Approval | Building | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Provider/Site | | Principle' | | Commences | | |
| | Location and broad suitability of site agreed | Fully evaluated concept proposal for the site is approved 'in principle' agreed by the LURP partner panel and endorsed by Christchurch CC | Consent (or other key regulatory hurdle) is satisfied with parties signing binding legal agreement to deliver exemplar development or associated incentives. | All consents are granted and building work commences | | |
| Housing New Zealand | | | | | | |
| Clyde Road, Bryndwr | 27/2/14 | (Target – Sept '14) | | | | |
| Emmett Street, Shirley | 27/2/14 | (Target – Sept '14) | | | | |
| Christchurch C | ity Council | | | | | |
| Andrews Crescent | 22/5/14 | | | | | |
| Carey Street | 22/5/14 | | | | | |
| Private Sector | | | | | | |
| Speydon Lodge | - | 28/4/14 | | | | |
| Champions Mile (Riccarton Racecourse) | - | (Target – 6/9/14) | | | | |

As noted above, the LURP requires a decision on whether Riccarton Racecourse is approved as an 'exemplar' within nine months of Gazettal of this Recovery Plan. That date falls on the 6 September 2014. As outlined above, an exemplar process has been agreed with the partner agencies and approved by Council. Discussions with the Riccarton Racecourse representatives indicate they are unlikely to meet the nine month timeframe. To help facilitate the process, the Council has written to the Riccarton Racecourse representatives and has invited them to apply in writing for an extension to the LURP timeframes. The application to extend the timeframe will go to CERA and will likely seek a 3 month extension until 6 December 2014.

For the Council exemplars the process is dependent on the completion of the current consultation on the future of social housing. It will not be possible to confirm the date for the next stage in the Exemplar process until this consultation is completed (and the outcome known). It is also partly dependent on the receipt of the Earthquake Commission settlement for the sites. However, it is noted that Andrews Crescent is in the current work programme that runs until June 2015.

Action 9

This requires the Council to work with lead developers on non-statutory masterplans for the Community Housing Redevelopment Areas, where appropriate. This needs to be completed by 6 December 2014. The Community Housing Redevelopment Mechanism (CHRM) was inserted into the Operative District Plan when the LURP was gazetted. It enables opportunities for medium density comprehensive redevelopment of community housing environments to support residential recovery needs.

The basis for the masterplans was to identify local impacts and resultant improvements arising from residential intensification within the CHRM areas. Housing New Zealand, as the principal developer, would drive this process giving a clear indication of its redevelopment programme which in turn could inform Council advice as part of a process of dialogue. In turn, advice would lead to proposals for local improvement (e.g. stormwater management, intersection safety improvements) within which the Council might facilitate, for example, through land swaps or 'in kind' funding. In terms of progress, we have recently written to HNZC to confirm whether they are seeking to pursue masterplanning exercises for any of the ten areas that are subject to the CHRM.

Action 14

This requires territorial authorities to identify and implement programmes through the relevant Local Government Act instruments for public facilities, services and amenity improvements at Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres. It needs to be completed within 12 months of Gazettal of this Recovery Plan, which is the 6 December 2014. It is noted that Council has numerous enhancement programmes that are underway, some are being delivered as 'Business as Usual', some through the major facilities rebuild, and others as part of the Masterplan process. Work has been initiated on collating this information so it can be reported to Committee/Council and then the Minister CER.

Action 33

The purpose of Action 33 is to enable quick amendments to Local Government Act (LGA) instruments, without going through unnecessary process, to ensure infrastructure supports development in growth areas. However, as the LURP was gazetted on 6 December 2013, the 6 month timeframe for completing this action coincided with the Annual Plan process for Council. The Annual Plan contains the budget and funding impact statement for the 2014/15 financial year, and identifies any variations to year two of Council's Three Year Plan. The Annual Plan process is the established LGA mechanism for aligning infrastructure with development in Council's long term planning documents. As the Annual Plan process coincides with the 6 month timeframe for Action 33 of the LURP, Council noted to the Minister CER that it does not consider it necessary to recommend any changes or variations to LGA instruments.

Therefore, Council has reported to the Minister CER on Actions 7, 8 and 33 in accordance with the timeframes outlined in the LURP. The Council subsequently received acknowledgement of these reports from the Office of the Hon Gerry Brownlee (**attachment 1**). At the time of writing this report no other formal correspondence has been received from CERA regarding how the Minister CER will progress Council's response to these actions.

4.2 LURP Working Party

The Working Party of Councillors and staff has been established and has met twice. The Terms of reference for the Working Party are included within **Appendix 2**.

4.3 Elderly Persons Housing

As outlined in the Committee update in April, the Minister CER removed the 'written approval' rule from the Elderly Persons Housing (EPH) controls. The Minister CER considered the rule was unnecessary and would potentially hinder the use of EPH by those who did not satisfy the criteria and did not include it within the final LURP. Council required that a letter be written to CERA seeking clarification of this. Council's letter, and CERA's response form **Attachment 3**. In summary, CERA considers that the rights of existing owners of elderly persons housing are still protected because the legal covenants of existing owners, and therefore their tenants, are not overridden by the amendments. This was reported to the LURP Working Party who asked that it be reported to Committee/Council.

4.4 LURP Review

Section 5.4 of the LURP states that ECan will formally review the LURP in collaboration with the strategic partners by April 2015, or sooner if directed to do so by the Minister CER. Work is yet to be initiated on this, however, Council should note that the LURP will be reviewed and it is anticipated that Council staff will work with the Working Party and report through Committee to Council on any possible changes to the document.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 None of the proposed issues identified in this report have additional financial implications for Council.

6. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee:

- 6.1 Receive the report, noting that:
 - 6.1.1 The Office of the Hon Gerry Brownlee has acknowledged receipt of Council reports on Actions 7, 8 and 33.
 - 6.1.2 The nine month timeframe for approving the Riccarton Racecourse proposal as an exemplar project is unlikely to be met.
 - 6.1.3 The Council has written to the Riccarton Racecourse representatives inviting them to seek an extension to the nine month timeframe.
 - 6.1.4 A letter of response has been received from the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) regarding Elderly Persons Housing (**Attachment 3**).
 - 6.1.5 Work will need to commence on the review of the Land Use Recovery Plan and Council staff will work with the Working Party and report through this Committee to the Council on any possible changes to the document.
 - 6.1.6 Work is ongoing on the remaining Land Use Recovery Programme actions.

Construction of the second sec



MP for Ilam Leader of the House Minister of Transport

Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Minister Responsible for the Earthquake Commission



12 June 2014

Richard Osborne Transport and Research Unit Manager Christchurch City Council PO Box 73012 Orchard Road CHRISTCHURCH 8154

Ref: CERGB 13-14/0746

Dear Mr Osborne

On behalf of Hon Gerry Brownlee, Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery, thank you for your letter of 6 June 2014 regarding the Christchurch City Council response to Actions 7, 8 and 33 of the Land Use Recovery Plan.

Your comments have been placed before the Minister for his consideration and you may expect a reply in due course.

Yours sincerely

James Wigzell on behalf of Jacinda Lean Private Secretary: Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

Land Use Recovery Programme (LURP) Implementation Working Party Terms of Reference

1. Background

The Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) was gazetted by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery (Min CER) on 6 December 2013. The LURP's purpose is to ensure that efforts to restore and enhance greater Christchurch are well coordinated and facilitate a timely and expedited process for recovery. To achieve this and help implement the LURP a working party has been established of elected representatives and staff.

2. Objectives & Outcome

- Keep political arm of Council informed on progress with the implementation of the LURP
- Advise staff on political issues and priorities
- Enable Council to make informed decisions

The desired outcome of the Working Party is the implementation of the LURP to the satisfaction of the Elected Representatives, the Executive Team and the LURP strategic partners.

3. Membership and Meetings

The Working Party will comprise of elected representatives and staff:

- Councillor Clearwater (Chair Environmental Committee)
- Councillor Johanson (Chair Community Committee)
- Councillor Gough (Chair Strategy & Planning Committee)
- Councillor Livingstone (Chair Housing)
- Councillor East (Chair Regulations & Consent Committee)
- Richard Osborne (Transport and Research Unit Manager)
- Carolyn Gallagher (Community Support Unit Manager)
- Terry Howes (Asset and Network Planning Unit Manager)
- Sharon Threadwell (Rebuild Liaison Manager)
- Representative from the Mayor's Office (TBC).

Meetings will be held on a monthly basis.

4. Scope

The Working Party has been established to assist Council in its role in implementing the LURP. The Working Party is not the formal decision makers on LURP implementation matters. Matters of LURP implementation will be reported back to Council via ERCOW on issues for information and matters requiring formal decision.

5. Operating Philosophy

The Working Party will at all times:

- Ensure a shared and thorough understanding of the LURP and the actions that relate to Council.
- Work collaboratively together to form an agreed view on the LURP priorities.
- Share our current issues, constraints, objectives and strategies for delivering the LURP.
- Identify potential barriers and solutions for the successful implementation of LURP.
- Deliberate in a collaborative and co-operative manner and seek consensus decision making.

6. Responsibilities

Elected members:

- Nominate a Chair for the Working Party.
- Provide their perspective on matters being discussed.
- Make decisions on behalf of the Working Party.
- Recommend the output of the Working Party for Council consideration through the ERCOW.

Staff:

- Provide information to the Working Party in a timely manner.
- Circulate the agenda and minutes in advance of each meeting.
- Facilitate discussion and debate and provide professional advice to the Working Party on matters to be considered.
- (Note staff do not have any voting rights, in terms of any decisions or recommendations to be made by the Working Party.)

14 April 2014

Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority Private Bag 4999 **Christchurch 8140** Via email – benesia.smith@cera.govt.nz

Attention: Benesia Smith

Dear Benesia,

Re: Land Use Recovery Plan – Request for Information on Elderly Persons Housing

At the Earthquake Recovery Committee of the Whole meeting of 3 April 2014 an update on the Land Use Recovery Plan was considered. Various questions were asked about the amendments to the Elderly Persons Housing (EPH) provisions in the gazetted LURP. The Council was concerned that the Minister CER had advised that EPH owners and tenants would be no worse off as a result of his decision to modify the provisions. To clarify this, the Council requested that CERA provide the following information:

- that existing tenants, living in EPH units, are still protected subsequent to changes made to Rule 2.3.9 of the Approved LURP (Occupancy of an EPH Unit, p. 9 of the Committee agenda).
- that legal covenants protecting existing tenants in EPH cannot be overridden by the amendments made to Rule 2.3.9 of the Approved LURP.

The request for information was approved by Council on 10 April 2014. The committee report can be accessed at the following link:

http://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/TheCouncil/meetingsminutes/agendas/2014/April/CommitteeoftheWhol e3April2014AgendaFull.pdf. Can you please provide the information to the undersigned and it will be reported back to the Committee in due course.

Please do not hesitate to contact me on 941 8407 should you have any queries.

Yours sincerely

Richard Osborne Transport & Research Unit Manager



13 May 2014

Reference A448047

Richard Osborne Christchurch City Council PO Box 73012 Christchurch 8154 NEW ZEALAND

Dear Richard

Re: Land Use Recovery Plan – Request for Information on Elderly Persons Housing

I refer to your letter dated 16 April 2014 regarding Christchurch City Council's request for clarification regarding Elderly Persons Housing, that:

- existing tenants, living in Elderly Persons Housing units, are still protected subsequent to changes made to Rule 2.3.9 of the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP); and
- legal covenants protecting existing tenants in Elderly Persons Housing cannot be overridden by the amendments made to Rule 2.3.9 of the LURP.

The Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) considers the amendments to the Christchurch City Council's City Plan by the LURP that removed the restrictions on Elderly Persons Housing still protects the rights of existing owners of the elderly persons housing. The legal covenants of existing owners, and therefore their tenants, are not overridden by these amendments.

Rule 2.3.9 relating to occupancy of an Elderly Persons Housing unit enables Elderly Persons Housing (in specified localities) to be converted into general residential units provided certain minimal conditions are met. Such conversions do not occur automatically and are at the discretion of the unit's owner. The existing covenant or bond requiring such housing to be used for elderly persons would have to be removed first.

It is CERA's understanding that Elderly Persons Housing is normally subject to covenants to which the Council is not a party, or subject to a bond to the Council (which is not a Resource Management Act bond). In converting an existing Elderly Persons Housing unit into a residential unit that may be occupied by any person(s), it is up to the owner(s) of the unit to ensure that the existing covenants or bonds in place are removed to allow for the conversion into a residential unit. This would require agreement between those owners of the elderly persons housing complex subject to the relevant covenant, or between the owners and the Council in the case of a bond. It cannot happen just because of the amendments made to Rule 2.3.9.

CERA is aware that uplifting a covenant or bond does not necessarily ensure protection of existing tenants' rights occupying the property. However, tenants in Elderly Persons Housing do have rights and responsibilities under the Residential Tenancies Act 1986 and this includes the
tenant and property owners having rights and responsibilities regarding standard of living (including peace, privacy and comfort), rent increases and termination of tenancy.

Yours sincerely

Bronwyn Arthur Acting Deputy Chief Executive, Strategy & Governance

9. LYTTELTON PORT RECOVERY PLAN UPDATE

| | | Contact | Contact Details |
|--|---|---------|------------------------------|
| Executive Leadership Team Member responsible: | Chief Planning Officer, Strategy and Planning Group | Y | Diane Campbell DDI 941 8281 |
| Officer responsible: | Unit Manager, Transport and Research | Y | Richard Osborne DDI 941 8047 |
| Author: | Emerson Yeoman, Policy Planner – Transport, Transport and Research Unit | | |

1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT

- 1.1 On 19 June 2014 the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery (Minister CER) directed Environment Canterbury (ECan) and Lyttelton Port of Christchurch (LPC) to produce a draft Recovery Plan (herein 'the Recovery Plan') under the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act.
- 1.2 This report updates the Committee on process and developments regarding the Recovery Plan, including the Minister's Direction, the Port Lyttelton Plan, the Lyttelton Access Project, the Council Working Party, issues surrounding the re-opening of Sumner Road and the Lyttelton Access Project.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 The Minister's direction sets out the scope of the Recovery Plan and requirements for LPC to carry out consultation and provide information to ECan to feed into the development of the draft Recovery Plan.
- 2.2 LPC are currently carrying out consultation, which is centred around gathering stakeholder feedback on their 30-year vision for the Port's development, entitled "Port Lyttelton Plan: Our Future" (herein 'the Port Lyttelton Plan'). The Port Lyttelton Plan is the key component of LPC's consultation strategy.
- 2.3 Once ECan are satisfied they have received all the necessary technical and consultation information from LPC they will prepare a draft Recovery Plan.
- 2.4 The Council has established the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan Working Party to be the key channel for Council input into the development of the Recovery Plan.
- 2.5 The report also updates the Committee on the Sumner Road access issues, as they interact with the Recovery Plan, and the Lyttelton Access Project draft report.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Port suffered extensive damage as a result of the earthquakes. While the Port has been able to continue operations it has been working at constrained capacity. LPC is now in a position to commence recovery of damaged infrastructure. The work that LPC plans to do would likely require approximately 150 to 200 individual resource consents.
- 3.2 The scale of this recovery task was not envisaged by the planning framework set out in ECan's Regional Coastal Environment Plan, nor is ECan resourced to deal with such a number of complex consents. This number of individual consents would also place a substantial burden on the public who may wish to submit and be involved in shaping the process and outcomes. As a result ECan approached the Minister CER requesting assistance. The Minister CER directed the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) to work with LPC, ECan, the Council, the New Zealand Transport Authority (NZTA) and Ngāi Tahu to consider possible planning approaches. The preferred option identified through this process was the development of a Recovery Plan.

9 Cont'd

- 3.3 Council staff and the Chief Executives Advisory Group contributed to the development of a draft direction and scope, and the Council endorsed the development of a Recovery Plan in principle, as reported to Council on 10 April 2014.
- 3.4 The Minister CER's direction to ECan and LPC, under section 16(4) of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act, to prepare a Recovery Plan has now been released and the process is underway.

4. COMMENT

- 4.1 Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan Ministerial Direction
 - 4.1.1 On the 19 June the Minister CER issued a Direction for the preparation of a draft Recovery Plan for the Port of Lyttelton. The lead agencies are ECan and LPC. Key points of the Direction are bulleted below. The full Direction is provided in **Attachment 1**.
 - 4.1.2 Extent of Recovery Plan:
 - Lyttelton Port, the surrounding coastal marine area, Norwich Quay and other pockets of land within that geographic area under separate ownership (a map indicating the area covered by the Recovery Plan is included in **Attachment 2**).
 - ECan may include other land if it is considered necessary after consultation with the Council, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils, DOC, NZTA and Ngāi Tahu.
 - ECan must consider issues and effects that may occur outside the geographic boundary.
 - 4.1.3 Matters to be dealt with include:
 - The recovery needs of the port, the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of surrounding communities, including the economic sustainability of Lyttelton town centre.
 - Connectivity to the town centre, freight access to the port, public access to the inner harbour and the location of the passenger ferry terminals and public transport stops.
 - The needs of port users including iwi, commercial and recreational users and the public.
 - Amendments to documents prepared under the Resource Management, Local Government and Land Transport Management Acts.
 - LPC must provide ECan with all necessary information.
 - ECan must prepare a draft Recovery Plan in consultation with the relevant councils, Ngāi Tahu, Department of Conservation (DOC), NZTA and CERA.
 - LPC and ECan must ensure that public information is freely and easily available.
 - 4.1.4 Matters outside of scope

The Recovery Plan may not direct or implement changes to:

- Lyttelton town centre and Lyttelton Suburban Centre Master Plan.
- Council-owned community facilities within Lyttelton town centre.
- Sumner Road re-opening (discussed in Section 4.4 below).

4.1.5 Timelines and consultation

The Direction provides for three phases of Plan development and consultation:

| Phase | Timeline | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1.LPC must undertake appropriate consultation with relevant communities and interested persons (see discussion under Section 4.2 below). They must also prepare a report on consultation undertaken and how it influenced the preparation of information and development plans. | LPC must provide information to ECan within four months of the Direction (i.e. 19 Oct 2014). | | |
| LPC must then provide ECan with all necessary information (both technical information and information resulting from consultation) to enable ECan to prepare a draft Recovery Plan. | | | |
| 2.ECan must develop and consult on the draft Recovery Plan and provide for Hearings to inform decision making before finalising the draft Plan. The composition of the Hearings Panel is at ECan's discretion. The Hearings panel will decide on the final draft Recovery Plan to be presented to the | ECan must have a draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan ready for notification by the Minister within nine months of receiving all necessary information from LPC (by 19 July 2015 , provided all necessary information is received by LPC by 19 Oct 2014) | | |
| Minister. 3.The Minister CER intends to publicly notify the draft Recovery Plan once its received from ECan. | Timeframe for Ministerial notification of the draft Recovery Plan and final decision on the Recovery Plan | | |
| Written comments will be invited from the public. The Minister CER will then make a final decision on the Recovery Plan. | is at the Minister's discretion but must be in time for the Minister to notify his final decision before the expiry of the CER Act which is (currently) 18 April 2016. | | |

- 4.2 LPC's Port Lyttelton Plan
 - 4.2.1 Following the release of the Minister CER's Direction, LPC released the Port Lyttelton Plan, their 30-year vision for the Port's development. The link to the Port Lyttelton Plan is as follows: www.portlytteltonplan.co.nz.

They have also launched a consultation programme to accompany this and support the preparation of the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. This forms the basis of Phase 1 in the table above.

- 4.2.2 Key matters of likely community interest in the Port Lyttelton Plan include:
 - The intention that Norwich Quay will continue to be the primary heavy vehicle access to and from the port. The Port Lyttelton Plan is silent on Norwich Quay (though it is important to note that Norwich Quay is within scope of the Recovery Plan).
 - The intention that the passenger ferry terminal be relocated from its current location to a new location in Dampier Bay (the western end of the inner harbour) in the near future.

9 Cont'd

- A 30 hectare land reclamation in Te Awaparahi Bay (at the eastern end of the Port, in the outer harbour)
- Proposed provision for improved public access and commercial activity in the vicinity of Dampier Bay over time. The Port Lyttelton Plan also points out that this improved access is contingent on other aspects of the Plan going ahead (such as the land reclamation).
- 4.2.3 LPC has also set up 'Port Talk', a drop-in information centre on the corner of Oxford and London Streets in Lyttelton. Port Talk will have LPC staff available at advertised times throughout the week and will provide information displays and opportunities to ask questions, post feedback and ideas. In addition to a series of stakeholder workshops Port Talk is intended to be the focal point for the community to feed into LPC's consultation process.
- 4.3 Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan Working Party
 - 4.3.1 The Council has established an internal Working Party of Councillors and Community Board members to receive information from and provide feedback to staff regarding the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. The Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan Working Party is the Council's primary channel for feeding into the Recovery Plan development.

The Working Party membership is:

Councillors:

Ward Councillor – Andrew Turner (Working Party Chair) Deputy Chair Environmental Committee – Councillor Jimmy Chen Deputy Chair Strategy and Planning – Councillor Paul Lonsdale

Lyttelton-Mt Herbert Community Board:

Community Board Chair – Paula Smith Christine Wilson Jane Broughton

The Working Party Terms of Reference are provided in Attachment 3.

4.3.2 The Working Party has met three times (19 June, 1 July, 16 July) and has set up a series of meetings through to the end of 2014 (these will be ongoing in 2015). The Working Party has been apprised of progress and has provided feedback to LPC and ECan on the Port Lyttelton Plan and LPC's proposed consultation programme.

The Working Party's key feedback to LPC and ECan on LPC's proposed consultation programme is that while LPC have proposed a good plan for engaging with stakeholder groups, and the Port Talk drop-in centre is also a good avenue for the public to feed into the process, the Working Party's view is that LPC should also provide an opportunity for the community to come together and provide feedback in more of an event-type format, such as that used for 'Share an Idea'.

9 Cont'd

4.3.3 The Working Party has also been briefed on the Lyttelton Access Project (LAP). The LAP is an input to the development of a 'Lyttelton Access Statement' (an initiative that responds to the objectives of the Greater Christchurch Transport Statement and the Land Use Recovery Programme).

The LAP is an NZTA led project to identify options for:

- Establishing reliable, resilient 24/7 access to the port (catering for freight growth, cruise ships, commuter and recreational use)
- Identifying appropriate public access to the waterfront.

The LAP identified and analysed 5 key options for freight access to the Port:

- i. Retaining Norwich Quay as a freight route under its SH74 status (with improvements and implementation of safety, amenity and efficiency management measures).
- ii. A new local road link to the north of Norwich Quay to separate local traffic from freight traffic on existing SH74.
- iii. A new at-grade 500 metre Port access road that runs parallel to Norwich Quay within LPC's land holding on the northern side of the rail lines.
- iv. A new 900 metre access road that runs adjacent to the rail lines on their southern side next to the harbour. 'At grade' or bridging structure suboptions are possible.
- v. A variant of option iv. above, with an additional 100 metre of structure at the western end connecting directly to the Lyttelton tunnel.

These options were evaluated against their ability to deliver the study's two goals of 24/7 freight access to the Port and public access to the harbour. The study found significant impediments exist with all options.

Option i. was found to be feasible and cost-effective (and public waterfront access could be achieved via a pedestrian bridge), but this option does not deliver on the aspirations for the area set out in the Lyttelton Master Plan.

Option iii. was found to be most promising in terms of construction costs and compatibility with the Lyttelton Master Plan, however it faces three key obstacles: it would conflict with port operations and no viable alternatives for operations have been identified by the Port; LPC estimates the value of the port land required for the road at \$10 million, and overall cost (land and construction) would be in the vicinity of \$13 million plus ongoing maintenance.

The LAP recommended:

- Irrespective of which long-term option is pursued, a pedestrian over-bridge is recommended to connect Lyttelton to the waterfront.
- Irrespective of which long-term option is pursued; there are shorter-term measures (next 5 years) that should be implemented focussing on safety and amenity issues on Norwich Quay as per the CCC Lyttelton Master Plan.
- That the Council's Lyttelton Recovery Plan Working Party be briefed on the LAP report prior to it being released to the public (this briefing occurred on 16 July 2014).
- That the LAP report then be made available to the public to assist with input into LPC's consultation on the Port Lyttelton Plan, and ultimately ECan's development of a draft Recovery Plan.

- That the report be circulated to the UDS strategic partner governors and officials.
- That the Lyttelton Access Project Steering Group considers how to progress the objectives sought for the Lyttelton Access Statement with the draft Lyttelton Recovery Plan process.

The LAP has now been publically released. The release of the LAP will provide the community with information on possible measures in relation to Norwich Quay and waterfront access to inform public input into LPC's Port Lyttleton Plan consultation and in turn ECan's draft Recovery Plan.

4.4 Sumner Road

The Ministerial Direction specifically excludes Sumner Road from the scope of the Recovery Plan but also makes provision for ECan to propose changes to the scope in order to include other matters if it deems necessary.

A report from the Council's Road Corridor Operations Manager to this Committee on 1 May 2014 outlined the proposed approach to the reopening of the Sumner Road corridor. The view of council staff is that there is little benefit to be gained by including Sumner Road in the Recovery Plan and to do so would potentially delay the project given the timeframe for the Recovery Plan's completion.

The key 'benefit' to the Sumner Road project of including it within the Recovery Plan would be the streamlining or removal of the normal resource consent requirements, i.e. a timelier or more certain outcome. However, Council has received legal advice that the proposed works are likely to be within the scope of the Canterbury Earthquake (Resource Management Act) Order 2011 (RMA OIC). If the project is within scope of the RMA OIC, the Council (as consent authority) is obliged to process it under the streamlined process of the RMA OIC. It should be noted that the RMA OIC streamlines process, not substantive outcome – the application may still be declined, or conditions imposed that are more limited than those sought by the applicant. However, the key point is that a streamlined process already exists for 'consenting' the Sumner Road project.

The key obstacle to the project proceeding is funding and this issue would still need to be resolved if the project was to be brought within the scope of the Recovery Plan. Bringing the Sumner Road into the Recovery Plan would also reduce the Council's control over the ultimate outcome in terms of the project and its funding. Therefore, it is the staff view that the Sumner Road project should remain outside the scope of the Recovery Plan and that the Council should continue to work with NZTA and other partners to resolve the funding issue. Assuming a resolution is reached the project can proceed as planned (as was reported to this Committee on 1 May 2014).

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The Recovery Plan may direct amendments to Council plans prepared under the RMA, LGA and Land Transport Management Act. This could include the Council's Long Term Plan and Annual Plan, and the Regional Land Transport Programme. Additionally, none of these plans may be inconsistent with the Recovery Plan.
- 5.2 The Recovery Plan must include a statement of the possible funding implications of its implementation and indicate the possible sources of funding. This may include the identification of options of different funding sources.
- 5.3 The bulk of the cost of preparing the Recovery Plan sits with ECan. The Council's primary contribution is through the staff resource required to support the Working Party and feed into the Recovery Plan development.

9 Cont'd

6. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee:

- 6.1 Receive the report, noting that:
 - 6.1.1 The Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery has issued a direction for the preparation of Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan.
 - 6.1.2 The Lyttelton Port of Christchurch have released and are seeking feedback on the "Port Lyttelton Plan: Our Future", which is their 30-year vision for the Port's development.
 - 6.1.3 The Lyttelton Port Recovery Working Party has been established and is providing input from the Council into the draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan development process.
 - 6.1.4 The Working Party has been briefed on the draft Lyttelton Access Project report and this document has been publicly released.
 - 6.1.5 The reopening of Sumner Road can continue to be pursued outside the scope of the Recovery Plan.

19 JUNE 2014

NEW ZEALAND GAZETTE, No. 65

Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011

Direction to Develop a Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan

Pursuant to section 16(4) of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011, the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery gives the following notice.

Notice

1. Title—This notice is a direction to develop a Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan.

2. **Direction**—Pursuant to section 16(1) of the Act, I direct Lyttelton Port Company Limited and Canterbury Regional Council to develop a Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan in accordance with the process set out in this direction.

3. Responsible Entities' Roles

- 3.1 Lyttelton Port Company Limited must provide Canterbury Regional Council with all necessary information to enable it to prepare a preliminary draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan.
- 3.2 Canterbury Regional Council must develop a draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan for public notification by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery.

4. Geographic Extent

- 4.1 The Recovery Plan must focus on Lyttelton Port and the surrounding coastal marine area as illustrated generally on Map A. (Refer to the website
 - cera.govt.nz/news

for more detail and a copy of Map A). This area includes all land in the Lyttelton Port area owned, occupied or used by Lyttelton Port Company Limited at the date of this direction, pockets of land within that geographic area under separate ownership and the area of Norwich Quay.

- 4.2 Canterbury Regional Council may include other land or areas within the geographic extent of the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan, if it considers it necessary after consulting the following agencies: Christchurch City Council, Waimakariri District Council, Selwyn District Council, Department of Conservation, New Zealand Transport Agency and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu.
- 4.3 In developing the draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan, Canterbury Regional Council must consider issues and effects that may occur outside of the geographic extent of the Recovery Plan, including matters relating to land use and transport associated with the recovery of Lyttelton Port, the social, economic, cultural and environmental well-being and effects on surrounding communities and Lyttelton harbour, and wider transportation issues across greater Christchurch.

5. Matters to be dealt with

- 5.1 The matters to be addressed by the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan must include, but are not limited to:
 - 5.1.1 The recovery of the damaged port, including the repair, rebuild and reconfiguration needs of the port, and its restoration and enhancement, to ensure the safe, efficient and effective operation of Lyttelton Port and supporting transport networks;
 - 5.1.2 The social, economic, cultural and environmental well-being of surrounding communities and greater Christchurch, and any potential effects with regard to health, safety, noise, amenity, traffic, the coastal marine area, economic sustainability of Lyttelton town centre and the resilience and well-being of people and communities including the facilitation of a focused, timely and expedited recovery;
 - 5.1.3 Implications for transport, supporting infrastructure and connectivity to the Lyttelton town centre, including, but not limited to, freight access to the port, public access to the inner harbour and the location of passenger ferry terminals and public transport stops;
 - 5.1.4 The needs of users of Lyttelton Port and its environs, including, but not limited to, iwi, importers and exporters, cruise ship passengers and crew, tourism operators and customers, commercial fishers, recreational users and public enjoyment of the harbour and well-being of communities.
- 5.2 If Canterbury Regional Council considers that amendments to documents and instruments prepared under other legislation, including the Resource Management Act 1991, Local Government Act 2002 and the Land Transport Management Act 2003, may be necessary for implementation of the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan it must state and describe the nature of those amendments. The Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan may identify programmes of further work to be undertaken before specific amendments are proposed.
- 5.3 Canterbury Regional Council must ensure provisions of the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan are consistent with the Land Use Recovery Plan and the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan, and must have regard to any other recovery plans that are in force or being developed. It must consult with the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority to ensure that the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan is consistent with and supports existing or developing Recovery Plans.
- 5.4 The Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan must include a statement of the possible funding implications of its implementation and indicate the possible sources of funding. This may include the identification of options of different funding sources.
- 5.5 The Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan may not direct or implement changes to documents or instruments prepared under other legislation in relation to the re-opening of Sumner Road/Evans Pass; Lyttelton Town Centre and the Lyttelton Suburban Centre Masterplan; and the provision of Christchurch City Council community facilities (for example libraries) within Lyttelton town centre.

6. Development of Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan

6.1 Pursuant to section 19(1) of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011, and having regard to the matters in section 19(2) of the Act, I direct that the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan is to be developed in the following manner, including the following consultation requirements:

EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE 7. 8. 2014 ATTACHMENT 1 TO CLAUSE 9

NEW ZEALAND GAZETTE, No. 65

19 JUNE 2014

80

Lyttelton Port Company Limited

- 6.2 Lyttelton Port Company Limited must undertake appropriate consultation with relevant communities and interested persons to inform and seek feedback on its proposals, including but not limited to:
 - 6.2.1 Lyttelton Port Company Limited's long-term vision for the efficient, timely and effective repair, rebuild and restoration and enhancement of Lyttelton Port; and
 - 6.2.2 The scope of, and matters to be addressed in, technical reports necessary to explain and justify the long-term vision, proposed activities and any amendments to existing instruments and strategies for recovery purposes.
- 6.3 Canterbury Regional Council may require Lyttelton Port Company Limited to undertake further consultation or engagement if it considers the process to be inadequate to properly inform the preparation of the draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan.
- 6.4 Lyttelton Port Company Limited's consultation must include, as a minimum, targeted stakeholder workshops. It must also undertake consultation in an appropriate manner with Te Rununga o Ngai Tahu. A consultation strategy should be prepared with advice from Canterbury Regional Council, Christchurch City Council, Department of Conservation, Te Rununga o Ngai Tahu and New Zealand Transport Agency.
- 6.5 Lyttelton Port Company Limited must provide Canterbury Regional Council with all necessary information to enable preparation of a preliminary draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan, commensurate with the scale and significance of the recovery task and the complexity and interrelated nature of the recovery. This must include information to address the matters in clause 5 of this direction, and must also include, but is not limited to:
 - 6.5.1 A port redevelopment plan, clearly illustrating and describing the necessary repair, rebuild, reconfiguration, restoration and enhancement proposals to facilitate recovery, including timing and sequencing of recovery activity;
 - 6.5.2 Amendments to relevant instruments considered necessary to facilitate recovery;
 - 6.5.3 All relevant technical reports to support proposed amendments to relevant instruments, to the satisfaction of Canterbury Regional Council;
 - 6.5.4 A Cultural Impact Assessment;
 - 6.5.5 The first phase of an "Impact Assessment", as required by section 7.1 of the Recovery Strategy for Greater Christchurch Mahere Haumanatunga o Waitaha;
 - 6.5.6 An assessment of the proposal against the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011, relevant considerations of the Resource Management Act 1991, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010, the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan and other relevant statutory and non-statutory plans;
 - 6.5.7 A report on consultation undertaken. That report must list the parties consulted, state how consultation was undertaken, and summarise the information received and how it influenced the preparation of information and redevelopment plans; and
 - 6.5.8 A statement on staging and funding of the restoration and enhancement of Lyttelton Port, including implementation of relevant actions to effect recovery.
- 6.6 This information must be provided to Canterbury Regional Council within four months after the date of this direction. If the necessary and sufficient information is not provided in accordance with clause 6.5 of this direction to the satisfaction of Canterbury Regional Council within the specified time period, Canterbury Regional Council may request further information from Lyttelton Port Company Limited.

Canterbury Regional Council

- 6.7 Canterbury Regional Council must develop a draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan for public notification by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery within nine months after receiving all necessary information from the Lyttelton Port Company Limited. This time period does not commence until all information required by Canterbury Regional Council is received from Lyttelton Port Company Limited.
- 6.8 Canterbury Regional Council must develop the draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan in consultation with Christchurch City Council, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils, Te Rununga o Ngai Tahu, New Zealand Transport Agency, Department of Conservation and Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority.
- 6.9 Canterbury Regional Council may consult to the extent it considers necessary with Lyttelton Port Company Limited and any central government department.

Hearing on preliminary draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan

- 6.10 Canterbury Regional Council must consult on a preliminary draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan before providing the draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan to the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery. Canterbury Regional Council must provide for an appropriate hearing process to inform decision making before finalising the draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. In particular:
 - 6.10.1 Canterbury Regional Council must call for written submissions (such written submissions may include or attach expert opinion, technical information and any other relevant information) and must provide an opportunity to be heard in support of any submissions.
 - 6.10.2 The composition of any hearing panel and any matters not prescribed by this direction shall be at the discretion of Canterbury Regional Council.
 - 6.10.3 Any allocation of time to those parties being heard by a hearing panel (either personally or through representatives) on their written submissions shall be at the discretion of the hearing panel and must take into account the need for a focused, timely and expedited recovery.
 - 6.10.4 In conducting a hearing, the hearing panel must:

6.10.4.1 Avoid unnecessary formality;

6.10.4.2 Not permit any person other than a member of the hearing panel to question any person being heard; and

- 6.10.4.3 Have regard to tikanga Maori and the New Zealand Disability Strategy.
- 6.10.5 The hearing panel shall not make a decision but must make a report and provide recommendations to Canterbury Regional Council on the matters heard and considered. Canterbury Regional Council must consider these

19 JUNE 2014

NEW ZEALAND GAZETTE, No. 65

recommendations but is not bound by them.

6.11 Canterbury Regional Council must satisfy itself that a sufficient assessment of technical information and the views of the public have been undertaken, and provide a report to the Minister on how it informed its decision making on the content of the draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan, and the reasons for reaching its decisions.

7. Making Information available

7.1 At all stages during the development of the preliminary and draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan, Lyttelton Port Company Limited and Canterbury Regional Council must ensure that public information relevant to the preparation of the draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan is freely and easily available.

8. Other Recovery Plans

8.1 The Christchurch Central Recovery Plan and the Land Use Recovery Plan are the other Recovery Plans in force.

9. Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

9.1 Upon receipt of the draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan from Canterbury Regional Council, the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery intends to publicly notify it, in accordance with section 20 of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011. Written comments will be invited from the public.

Dated at Wellington this 18th day of June 2014.

HON GERRY BROWNLEE, Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery. $_{\rm go3801}$

Indicative Geographic Scope of Lyttleton Port Recovery Plan



EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE 7. 8. 2014 ATTACHMENT 2 TO CLAUSE 9 CEERA



LINZ Primary Road Parcels

Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority Te Mana Haumanu ki Waitaha

Legend

Lyttleton Port - Boundary Information Indicative Geographic Scope of Recovery Plan (**Note** - Boundary falls downslope of Sumner Road) ECan - Coastal Marine Area Boundary ---- LPC - Operational Area Boundary LPC - Site Boundary NZTA - Lyttelton Tunnel CERA - Residential Red Zone as of 04/12/2013 Lyttelton Port Company - Existing Infrastructure Existing Quarry 10 Ha Consented Reclaimation Existing Port Roads Categorised Land Ownership Lyttleton Port Company DOC - Public Conservation Areas Central Government Local Government

Man Purnoso:

Map Purpose: Display indicated future plans related to the Port of Lyttelton for internal CERA discussion. Please note -Map supplied 'In Confidence' according to State Services Commission guidelines. For more information see: http://www.gcsb.govt.nz/newsroom/reports-publications.html

Publication Date: 3/06/2014

Scale: 1:5,250

(Original sheet size A0)

Disclaimer

This map is a static output of depicted layers and is for reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable.

Coordinate System:

NZGD 2000 New Zealand Transverse Mercator

Map Document: 6319 - LPC Future Planning Map A0 v2.mxd

For re-prints and map production contact NorthSouth GIS: Servicedesk@nsgnz.co.nz

| ocality |
|---|
| Harewood Casebrook Parklands |
| Bishopdale Papanui Mairehau Burwood Brighton Pegasus Burnside Brundur Shirley Avandala |
| Avonhe ad Russley II am Fendalton St Albans Dallington Wainoni Bay St Albans Dallington St Albans Wainoni |
| roomfield Upper Riccarton Christenurch Brighton |
| Hornby Waltham Spreydon Waltham Southshore |
| Bald ands He Cashmere He athcore Scarborough Te Onepoto / Taylors |
| Halswell Cracroft Mistake |
| Lyttelton Harbour/Whakaraupõ |
| Diamond Barbour Barbour |
| |
| Tai Tapu |
| NEEDEN ANTEN CONFIDENCE |
| · A BY BELLEVEL AND A BACK |
| K REALESSON ENTER |
| Basemap data sources: LINZ, CCC, SDC, WDC, Transit NZ, Koordinates |

Lyttelton Recovery Plan – CCC Working Party Terms of Reference - 5 June 2014

1. Background

- 1.1 The Minister CER is considering making a direction that a formal Recovery Plan be prepared for Lyttelton. Council has endorsed, in principle, a Recovery Plan for Lyttelton Port which focuses on land owned by Lyttelton Port of Christchurch (LPC) and the surrounding Coastal Marine Area.
- 1.2 The development of a Recovery Plan will be undertaken under the provisions of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 (CER Act) and direction from the Minister CER. As a significant amount of the repair and rebuild issues for the port lie within the Coastal Marine Area it is likely that the Minister will direct Ecan to be the lead agency, and that the plan should be developed in consultation with Council, similar to the process used for the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP). If this situation changes these Terms of Reference (TOR) may need to be reviewed.
- 1.3 On 10 April 2014 Council resolved to establish an internal Working Party (including representation from Councillors and Lyttelton-Mt Herbert Community Board members) to consider issues raised in the development of the Recovery Plan.

2. Purpose

2.1 To enable elected members and staff to work collaboratively in the preparation, consultation and recommendations for a Lyttelton Recovery Plan.

3. Objectives

- 3.1 To ensure that the Lyttelton community through the Community Board are actively engaged in the Recovery Plan and its development.
- 3.2 To ensure that the Council is able to support CCC staff in their engagement on the Recovery Plan with the strategic partners.
- 3.3 To enable Council to make informed decisions and provide timely advice to the Recovery Plan lead agency, CERA and the Minister CER.

4. Scope

- 4.1 This Working Party has been established to assist Council in its role in contributing to the Recovery Plan process for Lyttelton.
- 4.2 Neither the Working Party, nor Council will be the formal decision makers on either the draft or final Recovery Plan.
- 4.3 Depending on the extent of the plan (to be determined by the Minister CER) there could be significant implications for Council in respect of the District Plan, transport infrastructure and the interface with the township of Lyttelton.
- 4.4 As Council has responsibilities in these areas and knowledge of the local conditions, other projects within the area and the community, it is critical that it plays a significant role in contributing to the development of the draft Recovery Plan. The Working Party's role in helping to achieve this is as follows:

- a) Receive information from staff, the lead agency and CERA regarding development of a Recovery Plan.
- b) Consideration of issues:
 - Scope physical extent and range of matters to be addressed within Recovery Plan
 - Consultation and community engagement advising the Minister CER, CERA and Ecan on who, when and how to engage on the draft Recovery Plan
 - Resourcing CCC staff time, cost sharing arrangements for plan production and financial implications arising from the Recovery Plan
 - Liaison with LPC & Christchurch City Holdings Limited (CCHL).
- c) Report back to Council via Earthquake Recovery Committee of the Whole (ERCOW) on issues for information and matters requiring formal decision.
- d) Prepare formal comments for Council on the draft Recovery Plan.

5. Membership

5.1 <u>Councillors:</u> Ward Councillor – Andrew Turner Deputy Chair Environmental Committee – Jimmy Chen Deputy Chair Strategy and Planning – Paul Lonsdale

- 5.2 <u>Lyttelton-Mt Herbert Community Board:</u> Community Board Chair – Paula Smith 2x Board members to be determined by the Community Board (Christine Wilson and Jane Broughton)
- 5.3 The Working Party will be supported by staff including: Unit Manager, Transport & Research – Richard Osborne Senior Planner, City Planning – Mark Rushworth Policy Planner, Transport – Emerson Yeoman Community Board Adviser, Governance & Civic Services – Liz Beaven Other technical advisors as necessary.

6. Responsibilities

- 6.1 Elected members:
 - a) Nominate a Chair for the Working Party members.
 - b) Provide their perspective on matters being discussed.
 - c) Make decisions on behalf of the Working Party.
 - d) Recommend the output of the Working Party to Council consideration through the ERCOW.
- 6.2 Staff:
 - a) Provide information to the Working Party in a timely manner.
 - b) Circulate the agenda and minutes in advance of each meeting.
 - c) Facilitate discussion and debate and provide professional advice to the Working Party on matters to be considered.

(Note: for the avoidance of doubt staff do not have any voting rights, in terms of any decisions or recommendations to be made by the Working Party.)

7. Organisation arrangements

- 7.1 It is intended that the Working Party will meet monthly. Dates will be determined around elected members availability. It may be necessary to vary the frequency of meetings to respond to peaks of activity or priority issues as and when they arise.
- 7.2 Three Working Party members will form a quorum, with a minimum of one Councillor and one Community Board member.
- 7.3 The Working Party is not a 'meeting' for the purpose of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).attachment to clause 4
- 7.4 The Working Party may invite external parties to attend meetings. External guests do not have any voting rights.
- 7.5 The Working Party Chair does not have a casting vote.

8. Confidentiality and Respect:

8.1 To maintain strict confidentiality on all commercial issues and sensitive material and respect the views of others in accordance with normal Council protocols.

10. TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

| | | Contact | Contact Details |
|--|-------------------------------|---------|-----------------|
| Executive Leadership Team Member responsible: | Chief Planning Officer | | |
| Officer responsible: | Strategic Policy Unit Manager | Υ | 941 6430 |
| Author: | Siobhan Storey | | |

1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT

1.1 This report provides comment on a petition to the Council from "The Renewables Motueka" group requesting the Council adopt the group's petition on the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement. The Council directed staff at the 24 April 2014 Council meeting to prepare a report on the petition for this committee.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) agreement is an Asia Pacific regional free trade agreement between 12 countries including New Zealand, currently in negotiations.
- 2.2 There is mixed support from the business community and the wider community for what is understood to be the content of the TPP and its economic, environmental and social impacts. The Renewables Motueka petition reflects a view that the TPP will have a negative impact.
- 2.3 The content of the draft TPP is not publicly available as it is still subject to negotiation. Community groups opposing the agreement state their knowledge of the TPP comes from leaked documents. The Government has noted that any final TPP agreement would require legislation so would go through the select committee process for consultation at that point.
- 2.4 Five territorial authorities have decided to support, in varying ways, the Renewables Motueka petition that seeks to have the New Zealand Government conclude negotiations in a way that provides net positive benefits to each region and New Zealand, and subject to 12 specific objectives (Attachment 1).
- 2.5 The nature of the decision being sought of the Council is largely political, and there is limited direct advice on the direction the Council might take that staff can offer.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 A group called The Renewables Motueka wrote to the Council on 20 March 2014 requesting that the Council adopt the Trans-Pacific Partnership resolution for Local Government consideration provided by the group (**Attachment 1**). The resolution seeks to have the Council make a statement to the New Zealand Government that the Government, among other things:

"conclude negotiations on the Trans-Pacific Partnership and Free Trade Agreements in a way that provides net positive benefits for Christchurch City and New Zealand".

4. COMMENT

What is the Trans-Pacific Partnership?

4.1 The TPP agreement involves 12 Asia Pacific countries: Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Japan, Peru, Singapore, the United States, Vietnam, Mexico, Canada and New Zealand.

10 Cont'd

- 4.2 The TPP aims to create an Asia Pacific regional free trade agreement by:
 - 4.2.1 Opening up trade in goods and services including providing a "level playing field" for New Zealand exporters to the Asia Pacific countries. The parties to the TPP account for 45 per cent of New Zealand's total trade.¹
 - 4.2.2 Boosting investment flows through, for example, access to government procurement contracts.
 - 4.2.3 Promoting closer links across a range of economic policy and regulatory issues such as tariff elimination and reduced compliance costs for goods exporters.
 - 4.2.4 Shaping future trade liberalisation in line with the original Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement 2005.
- 4.3 Negotiations between the 12 countries concerning the TPP are ongoing. The Government has signalled that until those negotiations are complete and an agreement is signed there will be no public release of the contents of the TPP. At that point the agreement would go through a select committee process for consultation.
- 4.4 As a result the costs and benefits of any potential agreement may only be estimated. The New Zealand Ministry of Foreign² estimate export gains for New Zealand of US\$4.1 billion in the year 2025 (a 6.8% increase in exports) while a Sustainability Council³ review concludes that the total benefits are likely to be less than a quarter of the estimated US\$4.1 billion of gains for New Zealand.

Community and Business Response to the TPP

- 4.5 Concerns about the TPP focus on the potential negative impact on national sovereignty, local procurement policies, increases in the cost of medicines, and restrictions on the use of the Internet as well as the lack of visibility of the negotiations. "It's Our Future" is a campaign (<u>www.itsourfuture.org.nz</u>) that seeks to make the negotiations public.⁴ Many commentators on the site maintain that the United States is bundling significant TPP proposals that inhibit or prohibit the exercise of national autonomy and are not trade issues into the TPP. The campaign's website states their knowledge of the TPP comes from leaked documents.
- 4.6 On 23 June 2014 the Federated Farmers National President Bruce Willis supported a speedy resolution of the TPP saying that "New Zealand farmers will support leaving countries behind that are not prepared to eliminate agricultural tariffs." On 5 July 2014 Mr Willis commented that "the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) remains a prize we must pursue with all the vigour we can.⁵"

Other Local Authorities' Actions

- 4.7 As of June 2014 five other territorial authorities or their committees have considered the issue of providing comment to the Government on the TPP. It is unknown to what extent this has impacted on their relationships with Government:
 - (a) Greater Wellington Regional Council expressed concern at not knowing what impact any such agreement would have on local government. The debate within Greater Wellington included concern that it was not Council's place to get involved in the Government's trade negotiations. However they voted to ask the Government to oppose any part of a Pacific-wide trade deal that would curtail the way it does business.

⁴ <u>www.itsourfuture.org.nz</u>

¹http://www.mfat.govt.nz/Trade-and-Economic-Relations/2-Trade-Relationships-and-Agreements/Trans-Pacific/index.php ²http://mfat.govt.nz/Trade-and-Economic-Relations/2-Trade-Relationships-and-Agreements/Trans-Pacific/index.php

³ http://www.sustainabilitynz.org/tpps-benefits-less-than-a-quarter-of-governments-claim/

⁵ http://homepaddock.wordpress.com/tag/bruce-wills/

- (b) Auckland Council's Regional Development and Operations Committee, and Nelson City Council have both moved to support the lodging of a statement to the Government with the same wording as is in **Attachment 1**.
- (c) Horizons Regional Council agreed to send a letter to the Prime Minister asking him to submit any agreement that New Zealand reaches in the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations to the scrutiny of Parliament, including consideration by a Select Committee, before a democratic decision is made on signing the agreement.
- (d) Tasman District Council adopted the same resolution as Auckland and Nelson with the addition of a clause to refer matters to the Parliamentary Select Committee process, allowing adequate time for public submission and the amendment of point xii (the last point) removing the requirement for public consultation during the negotiations.

Implications for the Council if the TPP is Adopted by the Government

- 4.8 If signed, the TPP may affect national legislation. Although the extent of any impact is unknown at this stage, one area that may be affected is any preference for local suppliers in procurement policies. Christchurch City Council's procurement policy does seek to give local suppliers full and fair opportunity to bid for contracts. However, the Council "will buy from the best source available, according to its own judgement of all costs, benefits and overall value for money." The group, 'It's Our Future', suggest that the TPP will enable large transnational firms with more competitive rates due to scale to squeeze out smaller local firms.
- 4.9 A further impact for the Council may be in the area of intellectual property rights⁶. Librarians, archivists, scientists and educators are particularly concerned about the TPP's digital rights management (DRM) provisions. DRM is placed on content, such as on DVDs or e-books, to prevent the material from being copied and shared. While there are fair use provisions that provide exceptions to copyright, the TPP's provisions would make it extremely difficult for people to access content for these purposes because the tools to break the locks are themselves illegal to distribute and share. These provisions may have some implications for the Christchurch City Council's librarians and for the people who use our libraries.
- 4.10 It is difficult to assess the TPP as very little is formally known about the content of the potential agreement.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no direct financial implications to the Council arising from this report. However there may be financial consequences that arise directly or indirectly as a result of any TPP, although these will occur as a part of any wider implementation of public policy.

6. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee:

- 6.1 Note that the nature of the decision being sought of the Council is largely political, and there is limited direct advice on the direction the Council might take that staff can offer. Attachment 1 is the draft of the submission that the petitioners, the group 'The Renewables Motueka", have suggested that the Council could adopt, and it is open to the Council to do so.
- 6.2 Receive the report.

⁶ <u>http://www.ifex.org/international/2012/11/22/tpp_censorship/</u>

Attachment 1 Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement Resolution for the Government's consideration

That the Christchurch City Council encourages the government to conclude negotiations on the Trans-Pacific Partnership and Free Trade Agreements in a way that provides net positive benefits for Christchurch and New Zealand, that is, provided the Partnership and Agreements achieve the following objectives:

- i. Continues to allow the Christchurch City Council and other Councils, if they so choose, to adopt procurement policies that provide for a degree of local preference; to choose whether particular services and facilities are provided in house, by council-controlled organisations (CCOs) or by contracting out; or to require higher health and safety, environmental protection, employment rights and conditions, community participation, animal protection or human rights standards than national or international minimum standards;
- ii. Maintains good diplomatic and trade relations and partnerships for Christchurch and New Zealand with other major trading partners not included in the agreement, including with China;
- iii. Provides substantially increased access for our agriculture exports, particularly those from the Canterbury region into the US market;
- iv. Does not undermine PHARMAC, raise the cost of medical treatments and medicines or threaten public health measures, such as tobacco control;
- v. Does not give overseas investors or suppliers any greater rights than domestic investors and suppliers, such as through introducing Investor-State Dispute Settlement, or reduce our ability to control overseas investment or finance;
- vi. Does not expand intellectual property rights and enforcement in excess of current law; vii. Does not weaken our public services, require privatisation, hinder reversal of privatisations, or increase the commercialisation of government or of Christchurch City Council or other local government organisations;
- viii. Does not reduce our flexibility to support local economic and industry development and encourage good employment and environmental practices and initiatives which enable marginalised young people to develop their skills and transition into meaningful employment;
- ix. Contains enforceable labour clauses requiring adherence to core International Labour Organisation conventions and preventing reduction of labour rights for trade or investment advantage;
- x. Contains enforceable environmental clauses preventing reduction of environmental standards for trade or investment advantage;
- xi. Has general exceptions to protect human rights, the environment, the Treaty of Waitangi, and New Zealand's economic and financial stability;
- xii. Has been negotiated with real public consultation including regular public releases of drafts of the text of the agreement, and ratification being conditional on a full social, environmental and economic impact assessment including public submissions.

11. AN ACCESSIBLE CITY - TRANSPORT PROJECTS 1 (HOSPITAL CORNER) AND 5 (MOORHOUSE/HAGLEY)

Report to be separately circulated.

12. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.

THURSDAY 7 AUGUST 2014

EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely item(s) 13 and 14.

Reason for passing this resolution: good reason to withhold exists under section 7. Specific grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution: Section 48(1)(a)

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE 7. 8. 2014

| ITEM NO. | GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED | SUBCLAUSE & REASON UNDER ACT | SECTION | PLAIN ENGLISH REASON | WHEN REPORT CAN BE RELEASED |
|-------------|--|--|--------------|---|--|
| 13. | PROVISION OF SLOPE STABILITY ENGINEERING SERVICES – PANEL AGREEMENT | Enable Council to carry out commercial activities without prejudice or disadvantage. | 7(2)h | Withholding the information is necessary to enable the Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities. | At the expiry of the agreement. |
| 14. | FACILITIES REBUILD PROGRAMME SOCIAL HOUSING WORKS PACKAGE 2: HP SMITH, BERWICK COURTS AND HARMAN COURTS INTENSIFICATION TENDER RECOMMENDATION | Prejudice commercial position. | 7(2)(b)(iii) | Commercial negotiations yet to be finalised. | Outcome of report can be released after commercial discussions finalised with Contractor. |

Chairperson's Recommendation: That the foregoing motion be adopted.

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

- "(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):
 - (a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and
 - (b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority."