

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 07/03/2025

First Name: (required) Jesse **Last Name:** (required) Reynolds

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Cycle routes are important and is money well spent

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Libraries, cycle transport. Museums

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

Rugby stadiums etc

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 08/03/2025

First Name: (required) Richard **Last Name:** (required) Hall

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I feel the rates are too high as they are. The increase should be capped at 5%.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I feel that we are spending too much on cycleways. As a central city resident who regularly walks in the area and around the city, I'm sick of the large number of cyclists who ride on the footpath at speed. I have been close to being knocked over on a number of occasions. Many cyclists ride on the footpath even though there is a cycle lane next them. Cyclists always ride on the footpaths in 1 way streets (like Durham St) in the opposite direction of traffic flow because they are too lazy to use a street a block away.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

Water leaks need more urgent attention than they currently get. It annoys me to walk past some of the leaks around water toby's etc. and seeing all that clean water running down the stormwater drain.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

No. We need to keep the maintenance up on these.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I don't want any of my rates spent on this. Ratepayers should never have been contributing towards this anyway.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 3: Fixed volume rate

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

It would be far easier to implement and administer

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

The previous shuttle service was widely utilized by inner-city residents, holidaymakers, and tourists. Its popularity not only

demonstrated its necessity but also contributed significantly to reducing the number of cars in the central city area.

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Sell them, but don't sell off any of our parks or reserves. We need to retain green spaces.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 08/03/2025

First Name: (required) Nicola **Last Name:** (required) Nicholson

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 08/03/2025

First Name: (required) Wayne Last Name: (required) Henderson

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I see it as beneficial to giving the Air Force Museum a loan in the range of \$5. It will draw in more tourists, and be a loan that will keep giving to Christchurch Rate Payers.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

It will draw in more tourists and be a feature for Canterbury!

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 08/03/2025

First Name: (required) Mat **Last Name:** (required) Logan

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

Council should have left the rates increased at the proposed levels to smooth the increases out over subsequent years. The decision to reduce the short-term burden is very short-sighted - we elect our Councillors to take a long-term view. Next years' increase will, as a result, be much larger which is not "better".

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Overall I think it's important to retain front-line services at high levels for communities, and if services such as libraries, recreation, community development, etc., are expected to find savings, the Council commits to finding these savings only in back-of-house functions.

I would oppose reductions in hours or days for the likes of libraries and pools which are largely affordable to

operate at the front-line, considering they are staffed by among the worst-paid employees within Councils.

To maintain no reduction in service levels, back-of-house efficiencies could be found through a streamlining of "specialist" support staffing.

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

Are so many community boards and governance support staff required - a reduction in the number of community boards and members would make sense. I would also question the value of the International Relations and Sister Cities work streams and the return on investment of hosting delegations - they rarely (if ever) result in any tangible business, tourism, or economic benefit for residents.

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

Are so many community boards and governance support staff required - a reduction in the number of community boards and members would make sense. I would also question the value of the International Relations and Sister Cities work streams and the return on investment of hosting delegations - they rarely (if ever) result in any tangible business, tourism, or economic benefit for residents.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

Why would local government fund a project that is owned and operated by central government through the New Zealand Defence Force? Why don't they fund it? This government has shown they have a similar attitude toward local government via drastic cuts to transport funding, capital education funding, and so on.

Regardless of the rates impact, it's absurd for the Defence force to ask a Council for funding.

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 08/03/2025

First Name: (required) Jordan **Last Name:** (required) Taylor

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

it should be lower

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

it should all go ahead

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

The spending should be increased

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

they should be sold

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 08/03/2025

First Name: (required) Chelsea **Last Name:** (required) Perkins

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

it is a better revision of the increase

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.4

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

not sure

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

the tram should be have an electronic system to make it user friendly for locals and vistors to easily get around the city.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 08/03/2025

First Name: (required) Michael **Last Name:** (required) Thorley

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

If we need it then fine, but if it is miss used and wasted then the rates rises are not.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

The transport funding is far too focused on public transport and cycleways. There should be a more balanced approach for passenger and freight vehicles and public transport. If the road network capacity was improved then we wouldn't need alm these separate bus lanes etc. We should be working towards 4 laning major arterials, replacing the bridge on Colombo st next to the south library and a proper intersection with capacity at the start of Colombo St. CCC needs to move back to road and street rentals where all services and infrastructure are replaced together to bring the overall cost down and improve service levels. Ripping up our streets for 2 waters leaves a substandard road surface and does address stormwater and is too piecemeal. The road surfaces across southern Christchurch are knackered and we are missing out because the street renewals programme got cut after the earthquakes, and our roads have been continually patched and resealed and they are still crap! One of the key areas for protecting cyclists has been completely left out. This is the creation of shoulders and cycle lanes across Dyers Pass, and around the lttleton harbour.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

Akaroa WW scheme has got far too expensive. There is a huge risk that this scheme won't achieve the desired outcomes either. Again, back to basics, street and services renewals to sort the ancient conyence systems, high quality ww treatment and long offshore outfall. Christchurch needs to massively improve and increase investment in water and renewals should be done as street renewals where possible. Selwyn St is a classic example where the whole street should be replaced including the Somerville ww main. This should have been done for the eastern terrace water pipeline too. We need to modernize our water supply system and work towards transparency and visibility of out drinking water.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

Funding for the implementation of the Mid Heathcote Masterplan should be reinstated and be done as part of street renewals and

the south library project. Main Pumps park should go ahead as part of the library rebuild. The parks budget is unfairly focused on the avon river corridor and the heathcote corridor needs work too.

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

South library rebuild should also include the creation of the park across the Main Pumps site and opening of the area in accordance with the mid heathcote masterclass.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

This question is hard to understand and the information provided does tell me what is actually changing.

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

I do not agree with this as we have to borrow for this. We don't really know when a lot of this is actually needed. If there is a project that is needed and it can be done in a way to address climate, then all good. But this fund could end up being a slush fund for climate activism.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Yes Do it

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 08/03/2025

First Name: (required) Lindsay **Last Name:** (required) Sandford

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

Far too high. Our mayor campaigned on going through expenses line by line, and not having increases. So far he has failed badly. Elections are coming up this year.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Hardly a week goes past when I don't come across a new road bump at an intersection or pedestrian crossing. While some, e.g. Dyer's pass/Cashmere Rd roundabout, were needed and create a balance between different modes of transport, many, e.g. new pedestrian road-bumps on Cranford street, and on Gayhurst Road, strike no such balance, and punish car drivers with no benefit to pedestrian/cyclists over the existing traffic lights. This wastage must be stopped. As a keen cyclist, I am always happy to see more cycle lanes, however the continuing approach of creating a small number of hugely expensive bike lanes needs a new approach. They currently create a bike vs car environment, and therefore many car drivers hate them. This causes push back (hence the government reducing funding) and will be a short term win for long term loss.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

Where is the plan and funding to remove chlorine? We were promised one year of chlorine, and it is getting very tiresome.

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

There seems to be a consistent lack of sufficient swimming lanes around - at least in the South and West of the city. When I travel around the country, it is not hard to find a lane to swim in, either by myself, or one other person. Here in Christchurch there is always too much congestion. Building pools with an extra lane or two, when doing rebuilds etc, would cost a tiny fraction extra, and not increase running costs in any meaningful way.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

The \$4M collected and not used, should be taken back.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

1.2.4

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

We should find savings by not building more road bumps and other things that detract from the use and enjoyment of our city's infrastructure. Then we can decrease our borrowing costs, and have a better city transport network.

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

We would like water without chlorine.

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

We do not want roads with lots of speed bumps - especially where there are already traffic lights to control safety.

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

Recreation centers are great, but I do think they could be more automated. Why not scan-in type things like many gyms. Needing to pay staff to take every payment is way over the top.

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

Funds should be generated when they are actually needed. Saving money for "something" that we don't even know will happen is madness.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 08/03/2025

First Name: (required) Darryl **Last Name:** (required) Washington

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I accept rate rises must happen, but these figures are constantly ridiculous.

Ratepayers have been gouged of money in recent times. One of the prime responsibilities of a council should be to keep rates rises to an absolute minimum by prioritising projects and spending. The rate payer really has no say on rate rises, and seems to be a bottomless pit to cover short falls or mismanagement.

Rate rises will soon have homes not being able to afford them as theses constant rises strip out their yearly income.

What sort of a city will we have when people are driven from their homes with unaffordable rates?

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I am a regular cyclist.

The City to Sea pathway is an excellent cycleway project. A great use of the red zoned area, through awesome scenery and vegetation and away from the roads. Very well built.

Please do not wreck anymore city streets/roads with cycle lanes. All road users need to share the road in a safe manner with each other, like we all use too. I think the council over thinks cycle safety.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining

three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

Hold the commencement of the cathedral rebuild until we have surplus funds to complete it.

Again, prioritise spending.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

This is an asset for the city. Conserving our military history and being proud of it, for all future visitors and residents to see.

The Air Force museum has some extremely valuable exhibits and assets that need to be looked after appropriately for all time.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 08/03/2025

First Name: (required) Laura **Last Name:** (required) Goodman

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

The forecasted increase for the fiscal years 2026/27 and 2027/28 has risen from approximately 5.8% in the Long-Term Plan to 10.4% and 8.6% respectively in the Annual Plan? It feels that Mauger et al may be disingenuously attempting to present a lower rate increase this year as a favorable narrative for the upcoming election, only to impose significantly higher rates on ratepayers in the subsequent non-election years.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I think it is important to continue progress on these projects but agree it needs to be done in a fiscally responsible way. I support completing a business case for the Lincoln Road PT project to enable consideration for NZTA co-funding, however I would be disappointed if the business case was a lengthy and expensive process when the case for change is very clear.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

I support the additional investment for reducing water leaks.

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

Page 13 reads as though Jellie Park will be closed when Parakiore is opened. If this is the case, I don't believe it's been well communicated that the community will lose this facility.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining

three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

I do not support the council giving money to the Cathedral.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

Would like to see increase to charge for high water usage to encourage high water users to reduce usage. Appreciate this is likely to be a LTP matter rather than AP.

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 3: Fixed volume rate

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

I would prefer a trial rather than a study

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

I support disposal.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 08/03/2025

First Name: (required) Tim **Last Name:** (required) Watts

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I believe it is still way to high.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

the projects should have a fixed cost and completed within budget and on time. No cost blowouts

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

It may have been an icon in the past but it's a church! Why should we put millions into it when other churches around the city get nothing. I much preferred the Catholic Cathedral - where is it now. Rate payers should not be contributing to this project.....

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to

keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

1.2.4

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

How about having a year of minimal spending and completing the projects within budget and on time.

No new big projects and spending only on maintaining essential things will give the council more money to spend

the following year. Rates are still collected

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

fees and charges are already to high

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

water and sewage, waste disposal

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

can they be rented or leased to someone?

If they are sold off where would the money be invested?

Pay off interest on loans...

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 09/03/2025

First Name: (required) Jan **Last Name:** (required) Edwards

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

The proposed increase is way too high. Everything is over engineered and costing way too much. No more Wings to Wheels. No more speed bumps. Reduce cost of every project. Get real and listen to the people

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curlletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

All of these should be put on hold or canned. They are nice to haves that serve a very small number of Cantabrians. Reduce our rates! Stop Wings to Wheels completely. Put all these projects to the vote

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

Once again, exhorbitant pricing! Way over engineered. Do your job properly CCC staff and listen to the people before we all lose our homes due to rate rises

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

Do less. Too many planter boxes and other fancy things that then need to be maintained and never are

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

Again, costings way over the top. We dont need the Mercedes model, just the Toyota is what we can afford

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

1.2.4

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

Instead, reduce other over engineered jobs and pay down debt

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

We could do without all the fancy planter boxes and road markings that are totally unnecessary

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

Tired of seeing ccc workers sent to do a job then stop halfway through eg tidying up ccc berms. Then they have to come back again and again to do the job properly

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

These changes should be slowed down. We do not need to be world leading in this stuff. Its just some Councillors egos that drive this. Put it to the vote at next election

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

Increase car parks and this wouldnt be required

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Sell them. Pay down debt

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

I am sick and tired of seeing a group of Councillors deciding on things that they have no mandate for

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 09/03/2025

First Name: (required) Ginny **Last Name:** (required) Lovrich

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

If the airforce mueseum is getting 100,00 visitors a year why can they not support their own development by charging visitors with a tiered charge i.e. nominal charge for CHC residents slightly higher for NZ residents outside CHC and higher charge for overseas visitors.

I would rather see less of a contribution and using less borrowing which is still costing our council funds reducing the overall increases to our rates further.

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 09/03/2025

First Name: (required) Tony **Last Name:** (required) Stevens

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

At the current time of hardship for many, any rate increase is only acceptable if our lifestyle is much improved. This includes all aspects of living within the council controlled area.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curlletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Spending on infrastructure is always money well spent. This covers all services provided by council and should also include the provision of wholly new projects such as cycleway and remediation for projected climate change matters. Non-essential projects, should if possible, be either abandoned or delayed indefinitely. A case in point would be the cathedral. If the Anglican church wants a cathedral, it is up to them to find the finance, not ratepayers.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

Nobody can live without water! The town supply should be of acceptable quality, chemical-free. Keeping the three waters "in house" gives far greater control over planning and expenditure. We must spend for the present and for the future.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

Parks and reserves are an essential part of urban living.

Access to green space is a great health benefit and a great recreational asset. It is not only calming to have green space, but medical research has found proof of the lessening of the need for treating medical problems of many kinds. The chemicals released by certain trees for instance, can reduce the risks of cancers and respiratory disease. Parks and Reserves are not just nice to have but essential. Wilding of the red zone is a low or minimal cost to rate payers and the benefits gained far outway the minimal expenditure. Fencing of such areas is the greatest cost and must be done to prevent fly dumping etc.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

Ratepayers should not finance the Anglican church. They have sufficient assets to fully finance the cathedral and should only come to the general public when all assets are realised

1.2.4

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I am not qualified to comment.

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

Fees and charges should reflect the cost of the service. Rebates may be applicable in cases of financial hardship.

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

It would appear to be the most fair

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Expenditure on CLIMATE CHANGE. All infrastructure and last but by no means least, our environment.

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

Traffic engineers.

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

Roading! Throughout the city there have been some very poor decisions. The latest being speed bumps at intersections controlled by traffic lights. Another totally bizarre design is the intersections of Marine Drive, Mount Pleasant Hill, Ferrymead Terrace and Bridal Path Rd. and the approach to the Heathcote River bridge. We, the residents questioned the competence and, yes, even if the traffic planners had appropriate qualifications. Sack the planners and employ a couple of long haul truckies who are aware of how a road should be designed for maximum efficiency.

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

No

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

Is this essential expenditure?

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

Public transport use is to be encouraged above private motorised transport.

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

If the property is not performing an essential purpose or earning a profit, it could be disposed of at a profit to be added to the general fund.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 09/03/2025

First Name: (required) Sue **Last Name:** (required) Allard

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I would like to see the rates increase being the same as the annual rate of inflation.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I am very supportive of cycleways and support any work on those.

I am in support of the \$200,00 scoping exercise related to reintroducing the central city shuttle bus

Also i would like to see the shuttle bus reintroduced. That was great for inner city residents when it operated before. Now that there are lots of new apartments in the central city, people who live there are reliant on public transport, given that these apartments have no parking spaces for cars. Currently they have to ealk everywhere in the central city.

Older / retired people would be more keen to live in the central city if there was a shuttle. Especially for doing things like shopping in the central city.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

No

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

The proposed spending looks good

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

No

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

No

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

I value the city libraries and would not want any cuts made to the services that they offer.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

Comment made under the transport section. I fully support the scoping study for reinstating the central city bus

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

No

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 09/03/2025

First Name: (required) John **Last Name:** (required) Humphreys

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

no

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

keep it simple

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

No

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

No

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

finish the cathedral in timber as originally designed = huge savings

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

keep them affordable for us ratepayers

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

library - do not change

art gallery - do not change

museum - complete renovation.

cathedral - rebuild in timber as originally designed.

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

chalice exhorbitant repairs. Surely it's cheaper to build a new one? Ghastly looking piece anyway.

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

Volunteer pensioners to repaint the chalice - better still replace it with the totem pole.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

This is a valuable tourist attraction for the city.

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

again this will encourage locals and tourists with \$

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Reallocate where practical or dispose.

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

Seriously need to finish the cathedral in timber to the original design. Save \$ & have a more open interior space as some columns could be removed.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 09/03/2025

First Name: (required) Luke **Last Name:** (required) Dennison

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I think as a city we need to come up ideas/ proposals/plans that make money for the city and can offset the need for rates increases. For example, long term plan to use the stadium for sports/music and other events and use the extra revenue generated.

Furthermore, it is a bad look for the city and council to spend \$400,000 on maintenance for the Chalice Art Work in town. 99% of ratepayers would see this as wasted money for something un-important and not necessary.

Moreover, I think more care and diligence is needed for contracting work out by the council. The best bang for ratepayers buck needs to be priority. Companies should compete to get the work at the most cost effective price for the city.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curlletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

More focus is needed on maintaining the state of our roads instead of bulring cycle lanes at the present point.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

I do not know much about it to pass comment.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

Parks and reserves need to be maintained at a cost effective rate for ratepayers.

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

Just referring back to the comment about the perceived wasteful spending on the cities Challice artwork \$400,000 is not the best use of ratepayers money, especially in the economic environment we are in.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

I think fees and charges need to be kept in check for the ratepayers of Christchurch. You need the people of the city to be on your side and endorse your decisions.

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Bin collection

maintaining parks

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

Dont spend money on renovations of the chalice artwork.

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the

Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

No comment

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I think its important to invest in something that can generate and repay back overtime.

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Get rid of them and build something in their place

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 09/03/2025

First Name: (required) Sandra **Last Name:** (required) Pilet

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

Too high

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

We don't have the money leave it for a year or two.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

leave it for a year or two

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

Only spend on mowing and general maintenance

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

no. we dont have the money. Stop the spending

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

not sure how to answer that. just stop spending the money

1.2.4

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

again a convoluted question just stop spending money

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

if the fees and charges go down im all for it

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

no idea just make sure the rate payers arent forking out for it

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

I am sure everything can be reduced

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

surely you cut out some services. I dont use buses

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

All of them I imagine if you really wanted to

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

stop the climate change scam its all about the money

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

sell them off and pay off some debt

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

just stop with the rate increases

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 09/03/2025

First Name: (required) Mike **Last Name:** (required) Stopforth

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

In my view the rates increase should be limited to the rate of inflation. This should be what the budget is and the budget balanced within that amount.

The government have given Local Councils a strong directive about keeping to core business such as roads, waste, water etc

On one of the pages I added up \$30m to be spent on cycleways - this is way too much.

There are numerous "nice to haves", but these need to be limited.

7.40% increases and year on year large increases is not acceptable.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

See above comment - too much being spent on cycleways.

The numerous speed humps being put in are a terrible waste of money

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.4

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

As per the comment at the start - in my view the rates increase is CPI only. The increase in rates to minimise borrowing is a great idea but if it can't be afforded in this CPI increase then it has to go

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Water, waste, roads (NOT cycleways)

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

Reduce the rate - we can't afford it

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

How can scoping cost \$200k? Way too much

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 10/03/2025

First Name: (required) Cindy **Last Name:** (required) Bryant

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

no thanks our rates are the new mortgage! What do we even get?? Rubbish & street sweeping. Water us awful , inner city transport & parking awful, heaps empty sections , lack of cctv , druggies, theft, broken footpaths, how long has it been since the earthquakes. I travel to cities regularly & I know how a functioning city operates.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curlletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

no

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

No

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to

keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

stadium. Cathedral out done its time! We are all sick if having to continually fund stuff that insurance should have covered. No our fault they uninsured everything! Also original quotes for projects should be held accountable.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

yes to inner city transport

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, 8 March 2025 8:30 pm
To: CCC Plan
Subject: Residents vote to rebirth of the Shuttle

[REDACTED]

Hello there!

I live on Salisbury Street and I would love to see the Shuttle on the road again. It was a fabulous service to get to the shops from home without having to take my little car into town. Lately, it can get quite stressful with the roads, the stressed drivers, parking times and fines in car parks, which are a nuisance!

We are an aging neighbourhood and it would be greatly appreciated if this service could be resurrected.

Thank you
Shala Hall
[REDACTED]

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 10/03/2025

First Name: (required) Kyle **Last Name:** (required) Sutherland

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I strongly oppose the proposed average rates increase of 7.58%, which far exceeds the rate of inflation and places additional financial strain on households already struggling with the rising cost of living. Rate increases should be kept in line with inflation to ensure affordability and fairness, rather than forcing residents to absorb excessive cost escalations. The council must prioritise essential services, identify efficiencies, and curb unnecessary spending to ease the burden on ratepayers.

Furthermore, reducing rates during an election year while deferring financial pressures to the following year is an incredibly disingenuous approach. This tactic misleads voters and fails to provide sustainable financial management. Councils should take a long-term, responsible approach to budgeting rather than delaying difficult decisions for political convenience. I urge the council to reconsider its approach and implement a fairer, more transparent rating strategy that does not disproportionately impact residents.

Forecast 2026/2027 in the Long Term Plan was 5.80% and now the proposed is nearly double at 10.38%. How can Council expect ratepayers to budget when cost escalations of this degree are accepted?

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I strongly support the continued development of the **Wheels to Wings** cycleway, as increasing active transport options provides significant long-term health benefits and cost savings. Evidence consistently shows that communities with better cycling infrastructure see higher levels of physical activity, leading to reduced rates of cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and other preventable illnesses. This results in lower healthcare costs and a healthier population overall. Investing in cycling infrastructure is not just about transport—it is a proactive public health measure that will save money in the long run by reducing the burden on our healthcare system. The proposed staged approach is a sensible way to move forward despite funding challenges, and I urge the council to prioritise completing the full route to maximise these benefits for the community.

I strongly oppose the proposed deferral of the **Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project**, as delaying this crucial work will only lead to increased costs in the future while failing to address the urgent

demand for reliable public transport along this corridor. Lincoln Road is already one of the most heavily used routes into the city, and without completing the bus lanes as planned, it will create major bottlenecks that undermine the effectiveness of the entire network.

Significant work has already been undertaken in Halswell and Aidanfield to improve public transport access, but without this section being completed, those investments will be wasted as congestion will continue to slow buses down. Instead of deferring, the council should prioritise this project to ensure a continuous, efficient bus route that encourages public transport use and reduces traffic congestion. Waiting for additional government funding should not come at the cost of worsening transport issues for the thousands of residents who rely on this route every day.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

I support the suggested Three Waters network spending. I however urge Council to not delay the Flood Protection & Control Works 69267-SW Nottingham Stream from 2025/26 year into 27/28-34 period, as these works are critical to help reduce flooding from increasing heavy rain events.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I agree with Cr Andrei Moore's comments that the funds already collected for the reinstatement of the Cathedral should be used to offset rates at the earliest convenience.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

1.2.4

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I do not support this proposal, as it adds further costs to already overburdened ratepayers at a time when many households are struggling with rising living expenses. While the idea of reducing borrowing costs in the long term is sensible in principle, the

council has repeatedly demonstrated an inability to manage finances responsibly. Instead of continually increasing rates, the focus should be on improving fiscal discipline, identifying efficiencies, and prioritising essential spending. Ratepayers should not be asked to contribute even more when there are already concerns about how existing funds are being managed.

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

1. Improving Operational Efficiency

Process Optimisation: Streamline processes and eliminate inefficiencies, particularly in administrative functions. This can include automating tasks or merging overlapping services.

Shared Services: Collaborate with neighboring councils or regional bodies to share services such as waste management, transportation, or procurement, reducing duplication of resources.

Outsourcing Non-Core Services: Where appropriate, outsource services that are not central to the council's mission (e.g., janitorial services, some IT functions) to more cost-effective providers.

2. Embrace Digital Transformation

Digital Services and E-Government: Shift many services online to reduce paper-based transactions and staff requirements. This can also improve access for residents, leading to greater satisfaction and cost savings.

Data-Driven Decision Making: Use data analytics to identify areas of inefficiency, overstaffing, or underperformance, allowing the council to make better informed, evidence-based decisions.

3. Innovative Procurement Practices

Bulk Purchasing and Group Buying: Work with other councils or government agencies to aggregate purchasing power, securing better prices for goods and services.

Contract and Supplier Audits: Regularly review contracts and suppliers to ensure competitive pricing, identify opportunities for renegotiation, or consider alternate suppliers if savings can be made.

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

I strongly support the Fund, as it represents a proactive approach to managing the long-term financial impacts of climate change on our infrastructure. By starting to accumulate resources now, we ensure that future generations are not left with an overwhelming financial burden when it comes time to adapt our assets to the changing climate. This is especially important for infrastructure projects such as stormwater basins, which will become increasingly crucial in managing flooding risks and enhancing water resilience in our communities. Investing in such infrastructure now, through a dedicated fund, not only addresses immediate climate-related challenges but also provides a sustainable financial solution that can be used to future-proof essential services. This approach spreads costs equitably, ensuring that ratepayers share the responsibility of adaptation and that we are prepared for the challenges ahead.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

I strongly urge that as many surplus properties as possible be transferred for the purpose of building social housing. With the growing need for affordable housing in our community, it is critical that we prioritise the use of available land for the benefit of those in need. Rather than selling surplus properties on the open market, these lands should be directed towards trusted housing providers who can develop affordable housing options. This aligns with the Council's Housing Policy and helps address the housing crisis that is impacting so many families. By repurposing these properties for social housing, the Council can create long-term, sustainable solutions to housing inequality while maximising the value of public land for the broader community.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 10/03/2025

First Name: (required) Mark **Last Name:** (required) Jermy

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

It is still too high. You cannot just keep raising the burden on ratepayers. I think it is time to take a serious look at all things the council does, and stop those things which are just not needed.

I would like to see the Council concentrate on the core services of roads, water supply and drains, garbage collection, parks, and key services like libraries and sports centres. Other things should be cut right back.

The Council should not be putting money into events.

I do support the \$5m for the Air Force Museum. It is an excellent museum providing a high quality experience.

I do not support further funding for the rebuild of the Anglican Cathedral. While I loved the Cathedral, it is clear there isn't enough money, from any source, to finish it. Pouring more money in does nobody any good. It is time to stop.

Building consent should be made easier.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Road repairs take too long. Traffic diversions are left in place for too long, cause a nuisance to residents and delay workers. There should be a big effort to find ways to make them more efficient. If this needs more equipment and more employees trained to operate the equipment, this is a good use of council money.

Cycleways are a nuisance. They displace parking, narrow the roads making accidents more likely, and don't encourage much additional cycle traffic. Cycling has reached its peak, there aren't many people who want to switch from cars to cycling. I say this as someone who cycles to work daily.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

Parks and reserves is something the Council does very well. Thank you.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

Cycleways

Memorials

Support for events, with the exception of provision of space in parks

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

I don't see why it would cost \$200,000 though. Seems too expensive for a simple task.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 10/03/2025

First Name: (required) Ana **Last Name:** (required) Connor

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

please spend more on cycle and pedestrian friendly teansport options. Each person riding a bike is taking a car out of the traffic we see daily. The environmental and healrh benefits of active transport are well known and we need to have more support for these modes of transport.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

libraries and community soaces, parks and other facilities are essential to our community well being.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

the central city shuttle is a missing link in our transport network. With a free shuttle people can park further from their destination and it also services residents and visitors in the city centre who would otherwise be making short car journeys when their destination is just a bit far to walk.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 10/03/2025

First Name: (required) Sharyn **Last Name:** (required) McNaught

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

too high still

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

Bring back the yellow city bus

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

sell

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 10/03/2025

First Name: (required) Jo **Last Name:** (required) Hanham

Feedback

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

I would like to endorse the proposed study related to re-installing of the inner city free shuttle bus. I used it extensively when it was operating prior to the earthquakes and would do so again as we now live within the four avenues

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 10/03/2025

First Name: (required) David **Last Name:** (required) Thomson

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

Given the rate of rises, it annoys me when the money is spent on cycleways and unnecessary "safety" improvements.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I would prefer that cycleway & safety changes were deferred until there is less pressure on rates. The transport changes in particular are over engineered and do not seem to be good value for money. Given how much rates are rising, and other real problems that exist (e.g. maintaining the water infrastructure), it is annoying to see excessive upgrades done to the transport network. Some "safety" upgrades are plain ridiculous and should not be done under the current financial climate. Cycleways can also be deferred. For many people riding a bike will never be practical so we should stop spending so much money on a small minority. I would prefer money was spent on converting buses to electric, in preference to cycleways.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

Since it's such a large part of the budget, perhaps some form of user-pays is appropriate.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

The cathedral should be demolished like the church originally wanted. Unfortunately it is too far gone to be practically repaired. Build something more inclusive in it's place.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

1.2.4

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

Spending less, rather than borrowing more, seems more appropriate.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

Lime scooters exist now. Making the city center better for walking is probably also a better option.

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Sell them and use the money to pay down debt.

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

Please stop installing "safe speed platforms" on main roads.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 10/03/2025

First Name: (required) Jean **Last Name:** (required) Smith

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

At least it is not the rumoured 10% .

It is still very high though.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Papanui wheels to wings should be shelved.

What a total waste of money in this time of recession. Not to mention the businesses that will be impacted!

There is a cycle way in Epsom road and one of the residents who has compromised parking because of it has sat outside his house for 3 days and only counted 4 cyclists in the entire 3 days!!

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

library.

Aquatic centres.

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

yes, the hiring of road cones.

We as tax payers are paying for these lying around the city.

Why is there all of these road cones lying about and no evidence of road works sometimes for over a week.

Why cant you watch what Auckland city council are doing about this, they are going to fine contractors for leaving them lying around.

Please do something about this it does make a lot of people very angry.

Can you not see these contractors are ripping the taxpayers off.

Can you not get somebody to audit their use??

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Yes sell them.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 10/03/2025

First Name: (required) Simon **Last Name:** (required) Cutler

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

Does the council even listen to the public that votes for them. Have a budget and stick to it. If it is over the budget then take things out, or adjust expectations. Need to haves first, nice to haves last.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Its a nice to have. Asking this question just after saying rates are going up shows how out of touch you are.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

Stick to a budget

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

Should never have been rebuilt in the first place.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 10/03/2025

First Name: (required) Georgina **Last Name:** (required) Barugh

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

A bit much

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

alternative forms of transport should be promoted and expedited. Increasing people biking/walking/bussing to work will help reduce congestion on roads if there are less people driving cars. I know first hand, I bike to work and it is half the time to ride compared to when I drive. The Wheels to Wings Cycleway need to be started ASAP as a fully separated path from the road and the entire length of Harewood road. I have biked the length of Harewood road and have been subjected to several close passes - whether the driver intended to or not. I live in Burnside and none of the 3 mains roads in North west Christchurch have a cycleway for the entire length of them, Memorial ave doesn't have one and is very busy - have experienced several close passes along there and neither does Wairakei Road after Aorangi. So the Harewood cycleway therefore should be the full length of the road from Papanui to the SH1 roundabout and should be a fully separated path, not just a painted line (which doesn't stop cars crossing over the line). I have been struck by a car crossing the painted line in the cycle lane. people in the Northwest deserve to be able to cycle safely.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

parks and reserves should be maintained and kept tidy and lots of trees planted. Regular emptying of park bins as our local reserve often has bins overflowing with dog poo bags.

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

more cycleways and more alternate transport options. A commuter rail connection between Christchurch and towns such as Darfield, Ashburton, Amberley etc should be introduced to help reduce road congestion and help reduce emissions

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

parks and reserves up keep/ maintenance

cycle network need expanding and regular sweeping for debris. Library and public pools should be maintained as is

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

refurbishment of the Chalice in the Square

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

in support of a grant but for less than 5 million

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

in support of the idea but why does the cost have to be that much?

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Matthew **Last Name:** (required) Tolan

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

It's lower than what other cities are proposing (eg Auckland and Wellington), and it includes a contribution to the new stadium, so in that context it isn't too bad.

I also read in the Press that councillors voted to delay some works, which means the rates increase is lower in the 25/26 year but will be higher than it otherwise would in the 26/27 year. This is a short sighted decision, and a false saving.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

You should continue to invest in public transport and cycleway infrastructure. These are worthwhile and prudent investments for the future, regardless of what a noisy minority might say on social media. You are denying people who use bikes from safe cycling infrastructure in the Bishopdale/Harewood suburbs. Also delaying the bus lane project on Lincoln Road will simply mean more congestion from buses using the main traffic lane, and discourages people from using public transport. These are short-sighted decisions.

My main frustration is that the saving from the above reprioritisations are minuscule in the context of the capital spending programme. The council has over \$700m planned for spending in the next year, 12% of which is just for the new stadium. The cycle lane and public transport projects are a tiny fraction of this total budget, yet they are singled out even though they make no material difference to the rates increase (as much of it is funded by debt).

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

It's hard to say, as there isn't any context provided in the Consultation Document about what these projects are required for, and what any alternatives might be. I assume they are necessary investments.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

Parks and reserves are important community assets and should be maintained.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

1.2.4

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

The council should be funding its planned expenses from its usual revenue sources, not by increasing debt. While I understand what is proposed, it evidences poor financial planning by the council. The big item in the council's budget is the new stadium, and the fact that the council can't run a balanced budget does bring into question the affordability of this enormous project.

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

No

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

I don't think the council should be reducing services, it should be managing its finances in a more prudent manner. As said above, by a large margin the most significant item in the council's capital spending budget is the new stadium. While this is a popular project, the council has failed to fund it in a prudent manner (eg not getting confirmed support from neighbouring councils, not getting support from the rugby unions etc). Now all of the council's projects are under financial pressure.

I also don't think Christchurch's rate increases are that high compared to other cities.

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

The new stadium.

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

The new stadium.

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

This should contribute towards flood protection and protection against sea level rise. Are there any best management practices you can learn from other cities? It's a bit difficult to make an informed comment on this without any more information.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Kate **Last Name:** (required) Bint

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

acceptable

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

no

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

no

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

no

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

I fully support the contribution of \$5m to the Air Force Museum for construction of a new gallery. C-130H and P-3K are two incredibly significant aircraft with more than a century of combined service to the people of Aotearoa New Zealand. They should be on permanent display for everyone to view, enjoy and learn from.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

no

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

sensible

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

I fully support the contribution of \$5m to the Air Force Museum for construction of a new gallery. C-130H and P-3K are two incredibly significant aircraft with more than a century of combined service to the people of Aotearoa New Zealand. They should be on permanent display for everyone to view, enjoy and learn from.

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Ursula **Last Name:** (required) Gooby

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

We DO NOT want the wings to wheel cycle way to go ahead.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Looking after Nunweek Park

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Lyndsay **Last Name:** (required) Schmutz

Feedback

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

I think the central city shuttle would get a lot of use and be great for city central residents.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Christine **Last Name:** (required) Nicoll

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

do not want an increase

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I want the traffic lights Breens and gardiners and harewood school crossing .

but no other changes needed.

Cycleway idea is not thought out well.

Do not want a cycleway.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

taking away rubbish bins in parks was not good.

Nunweek pk is well kept.

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

too many consultations -they cost money.

one consultation only.

provide green waste compost bins for households -then do not have to collect green waste so often

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

2.5 million dollars is plenty

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

electric bus good

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

sell them

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Mitchell **Last Name:** (required) Cameron

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I would rather you just bit the bullet and put rates up to a point where they will not need to go up for a while.

The constant change in rates makes it difficult to budget for.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

The cycleways are fine- Great even.

The process that needs to be completed to get the work approved is far too long.

In an ideal world the council would have more autonomy to make decisions without consultation to the public.

and you may already do this but if you need to consult the public consolidate meetings, so the process is streamlined

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

No comment if it needs to be done then it needs to be done.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

No Comment

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

Nah most stuff is good.

Just want the council to stop getting bogged down dealing with chronic complainers. Who ultimately hold up processes and cost rate payers' money.

The saying is "the squeaky wheel gets the oil" but often times the squeaky wheel doesn't represent what the majority wants

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

Please for the love of god just get rid of the cathedral.

If its desperate to stay, then bowl down most of it and make some form of "ruins" memorial.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

1.2.4

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

Yes- Hell raise it even more than that. But please give rate payers some surety that if it does go up then we won't have another increase over X number of years.

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

I can appreciate an increase in costs.

Can't appreciate if this happens recurringly

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

Unsure on the proposal so trusting the CCC on this

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

access to public facilities eg libraries, pools, gyms etc

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

consultation to the public

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

consultation to the public

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

no

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

Only saying no as I dont have an interest in the air force museum.

If the return on 5 million is able to be made back of lets say 5-10 years then sure go ahead

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

no

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

no

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Nick **Last Name:** (required) Carvel

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I would like to see traffic lights at the intersection of Breens and Gardiners Road with Harewood Road and nothing else in the propped "cycleway".

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

There needs to be BBQ areas and much stricter controls on dogs in parks which are not specifically designated as being "dog parks".

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Bin collection

Libraries

Park maintenance

Street lighting

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

Cycleways

Urban sculpture

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Sell them at a realistic market rate

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Chris **Last Name:** (required) Davey

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

These aircraft are taonga and have served our country for many years. The men and women who operated these aircraft deserve to be able to see them and for their descendants to visit them in the years to come. The aircraft are a part of Aotearoa's history.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Anna **Last Name:** (required) Gruczynska

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I would like to thank those Councillors who have been fighting on behalf of ratepayers to reduce the annual increase from 8.48% which was initially proposed. I acknowledge that the proposed increase of 7.58% is an improvement, but in my view the efforts to reduce the rates burden on ratepayers have not gone far enough. The proposed increase is a multiple of the annual CPI, significantly higher than any increases ratepayers are seeing to their incomes, and maintaining the current trajectory of increases is unaffordable. I note that the proposed increases are below the CCC determined "rates affordability benchmark" of 10.5%, which I think is misleading. I don't know what methodology is used to set the benchmark, nor how this benchmark relates to actual affordability. I do not consider a benchmark which is 5x the current CPI to be affordable by any definition known to me, and I would like to see greater scrutiny of how these benchmarks are set in the financial strategy so that they more realistically reflect what is affordable rather than provide a soft landing for excessive increases because they are "below affordability benchmark".

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I have a general comment to make about how decisions are made about spending, effectively locks Council into projects which are poorly costed from the start, with little or no debate around budgets, no scrutiny of cost increases and little opportunity for the more fiscally responsible Councillors to intervene and stop/re-assess projects when costs start getting out of hand. If we take the Antigua Street Project as an example, the initial report to Council in December 2022 did not even mention the cost estimate, which was buried in a staff paper under an appendix to the main report. Concerns regarding this raised by Cr Keown were brushed aside and there was literally zero discussion about whether the \$3.7 million budget is reasonable for less than 500 metres of a road. The recommendations related to design only, there was no suggestion that Council should discuss or approve the budget, which was probably buried as a small print line item somewhere in the 500 pages or so of the LTP or AP. The subsequent budget increase to \$4.5 million, over 20%, surfaced in an Info Session in July 2024, not even a full Council meeting, with no reports to explain the increase. Those raised concerns about the increase were brushed aside and told this is not the right space to discuss costs, it's all about design again. Once again, the cost was sneaked in as a small print line item somewhere in the 500 pages or so of the AP. When the cost increased once again, now to \$5 million, approval was not sought for the increased budget, it was packaged up as "reallocation" from Wheels to Wings to squeeze it into the current financial year. Once again, the cost was assumed to be approved with no discussion or scrutiny, and those Councillors who once again tried to raise concerns about the blank chequebook approach were ridiculed in both the Council meeting and on social media. My comment regarding the proposed spending on the transport network is therefore that the process for approving initial budgets, and any budget increases needs to be more transparent for significant projects. I implore Council to apply scrutiny to any proposed change which starts with "Adding an additional xxx" and seek ways to deliver a functional outcome without adding the additional cost to the projects. In particular I do not support Adding an additional \$1.25 million in 2025/26 for Antigua Street Cycle Network (Tuam – Moorhouse) to support the initial design for the project. This would be rewarding reckless behaviour of some Councillors to spending ratepayers' money.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

I think CCC should prioritise critical infrastructure projects like three waters network. I therefore support adding an additional \$10.8 million, over and above what was indicated in the LTP, to the water supply mains renewals programme to help reduce water leaks across our network.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

I cannot really see from the Consultation Document what is being proposed, so I have no specific comments, but generally support maintaining parks and reserves to a high standard to make them safe and pleasant places to be, because with the annihilation of the tree canopy for development, parks and reserves will play an even more important role in making the city livable.

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

I think Council should stop building and acquiring community facilities which it then cannot afford to operate and maintain, and look at de-commissioning some facilities it already owns, which cost a lot to own, but do not deliver benefits to justify the expense. There are some eye-watering costs anticipated for renewals and replacements in the outer years of the LTP (e.g. lines 59931, 59922, 65433) which look to be much higher p/a than spending in this and next year. I think a good stocktake is needed now to identify and consider de-commissioning those community facilities that "don't wash their face", have limited usage, bring inadequate income from user fees and cannot demonstrate sufficient benefit to the community to justify ongoing investment in their upkeep and to avoid future maintenance costs when they can still be avoided, rather than face these costs further down the line when they have become unavoidable.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I think this targeted rate should continue, but be ring-fenced for Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement when it restarts, or for a re-allocation to another (preferably heritage-related) project if a decision is made to abandon the Cathedral reinstatement for good.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

1.2.4

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

I do not support increasing rating for renewals because I feel there is too much waste across Council which should be eliminated first to find the \$2 million a year, before any consideration of additional ratings or further borrowing. Agreeing to the increase equals acceptance of the wasteful spending, would dis-incentivize fiscal responsibility and would reward continuation of wasteful spending therefore I strongly oppose it.

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

I have no comment on specific changes to fees and charges, but in general terms I am supportive of the cost of services being borne primarily by the users of those services, with some partial subsidization of costs for low-income users (e.g. student ID holders, Community Services card holders, Gold card holders etc.) by all ratepayers. I do not believe that making rates more unaffordable for all ratepayers so user fees stay affordable for some ratepayers is an equitable approach. It would be helpful to see in the Annual Plan not only the current fees and proposed new fees, but also what percentage they represent of the cost to provide these services so it can be seen clearly by how much ratepayers are subsidizing the cost for various user groups.

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

I have no preference personally, but support the option which is the preferred option of the majority of businesses directly affected by these changes.

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

- Rubbish collection
- Maintaining 3 Waters infrastructure to a functional standard
- Maintaining the transport network to a functional standard
- Core library services, core recreation centre services

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

I would be ok with libraries focusing on core library/information services only, and providing fewer events, classes and programmes, unless they are rates-neutral.

I would be ok with sport & recreation facilities focusing on core services only, and providing fewer classes etc., unless they are rates-neutral.

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

- I think the greatest opportunity for savings exists in the manner in which Council spending decisions are made, currently allowing unreasonably expensive projects to be approved on design and feel good factor but without any scrutiny of initial cost or subsequent budget blowouts - projects which would very likely fail the reasonableness and value for money test if such a test was part of the consideration. See my comments on Antigua Street. See also the recent Chalice refresh fiasco. I can only imagine how many other similar horrors are buried as small print line items in huge documents so they can gain Council approval without any scrutiny being applied to the cost side.

Other opportunities for savings:

- I think CCC owns too much stuff it cannot afford to maintain and operate. There seems to be a fixation on building and acquiring assets without taking a long term view of what it will cost to operate, what it will cost to maintain, and how this will be paid for.

- I think some community facilities are underutilised, cost money to maintain and operate but sit empty a lot of the time. Those who cannot demonstrate good usage rates should be reviewed and possibly de-commissioned.

- I think that there needs to be greater accountability around community funding and the actual benefits delivered by initiatives funded by CCC. I've attended a number of events supported by CCC which attract very low numbers, but continue to be funded year after year. For example, there seems to be a lot of fragmentation and duplication of services and events in the multicultural space, facilitated by easy access to CCC funding. I think there is an opportunity for savings here and definitely a necessity to tighten accountability for grants received.

- CCC events could be rationalised - e.g. Heritage Festival which I think was better when it was a one week event, now it seems drawn out, filled with uninspiring/repetitive events just to populate the schedule over two weeks. Perhaps there is an opportunity for savings by bringing the event back to one week. I note that the event was once sponsored by Beca but now is presumably fully funded by CCC. Are there no businesses interested in such partnership to reduce the burden on ratepayers? If there are, partnerships with private businesses should be pursued for this and other CCC events like Kidsfest, walking festivals etc.

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

No.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I don't support Council borrowing to fund this grant. I would be more agreeable to the \$5 million being offered as a repayable loan covering the principal amount and any cost of the bank borrowing. Air Force Museum hosts various private events which give it an income stream, and is in this sense different from other museums and any discussion of a non-repayable grant should take this into account.

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

1.3.5

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I think information should still be available from when the shuttles previously operated before the earthquakes to allow an informed decision to be made whether there is a case for reinstating the shuttle. I don't see the need to spend \$200k for consultants to tell Council what it already knows or should know. I do, however, support the return of the shuttle, free for Christchurch residents with a Metro card or equivalent, and chargeable for out of town visitors. The shuttle could be expanded to provide "Park & Ride" facility from free car parking on the edges of the CBD to help resolve the ongoing dissatisfaction with carparking availability and cost in CBD itself.

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

If the property is not "washing its face" and there is no clear benefit to the community that would justify carrying it at a loss, then I support it being disposed.

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

I found this consultation form quite cumbersome. It would be helpful to see the form in its entirety to know exactly what questions are coming on the subsequent pages. It wasn't clear to me if I could save the submission form part-way and return to it later, and providing a detailed submission takes quite a lot of time. Perhaps this is to discourage people from making a submission, but if not, then I would urge you to make it more straightforward in future. And cater for ratepayers who do not have easy access or are not comfortable making a submission in this manner.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Graeme **Last Name:** (required) Wood

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

NO! Please put Harewood cycleway on hold and put traffic lights at Harewood-Breens-Gardeners as well as outside Harewood Primary School.

I believe this was the first proposal when the estimate costs were affordable than today's costs. The speed reduction from Wooldridge to Russley has made it safer for cyclists although 90% don't wear helmets.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

We are known as the garden city however grass and weeds seemed to be neglected in some areas.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

We have a spectacular city which visitors and citizens comment on the beauty of what has been achieved after the earthquake

rebuild. Lets keep it clean and tidy.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Robert **Last Name:** (required) Upton

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

It is my view that the Harewood Road (Wheels to Wings) project should be put on hold or even better cancelled completely. I do support the immediate installation of traffic lights at the Harewood/Breen/Gardiners road junction

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I fully support this loan

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Michael **Last Name:** (required) Gooby

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

terrible and shows how poor the council is at reining in spending. You are experts at wasting money and moaning about needing more more more. Take a look at how you can reduce waste before putting rates up

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Harewood cycle way is not needed nor wanted. Will ruin a well functioning road. Do not go ahead!

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

no

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

reduce the cost. What is needed is all you should spend

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

waste of money for a vanity project no one wants and the council is unable to control spending on. Stop immediately

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

1.2.4

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

sell off assets that are not needed by a council. Stick to your knitting and stop wasteful spending

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

lower them

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 3: Fixed volume rate

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

no e cut spending across the board.

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

libraries on every suburb. Staff numbers too high.

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

libraries and swimming pools in every suburb. Not needed

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

stick to your knitting stop wasting your time and money

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

sell them and use to reduce debt. Don't waste it by spending

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Jenna Last Name: (required) Stace

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I don't think we should borrow money to support this.

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

This was an excellent service and reinstating it would benefit tourists, as well as the thousands that live in the central city. It would also reduce car traffic in the CBD.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Helen **Last Name:** (required) Stowers

Feedback

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

This would be a great idea. I live in the inner city, and as I get older, using a scooter is not so safe, and it's also hard to bring home your shopping on a scooter. This service would be well used I am sure.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/03/2025

First Name: (required) Derek **Last Name:** (required) Wallace

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

it seems reasonable.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Given that costs are increasing, it would seem sensible to do more now where possible, rather than delay. This would apply more to the cycle way. I can see the point about waiting to see if Waka Kotahi will provide funding on the Lincoln Road project.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

I can see the importance of the issues Council is trying to address.

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

I would favour drawing on the fund as needed. This could mean using it before the end of the ten-year period to address issues before they worsen. My reading of the research indicates that \$127 million will be a fraction of what will be required for adaptation.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

This proposal seems a better candidate for delay. I would prefer available funds go to addressing climate change, such as the cycle way or the climate resilience fund.

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

See comments I made in a separate email as Chair of ICON-Inner City West Neighbourhood Association.

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

My preference would be to exclude from the sale process for the time being those properties that are classed as parks or reserves. These may become important sites of open space as the city grows. Growth might be a lot faster than currently predicted once the full impact of the climate crisis on migration flows is realized.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Hamish **Last Name:** (required) Dickson

Feedback

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Peter **Last Name:** (required) Floris

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I'm ok with this.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I want to comment on the Wheels to Wings cycle route. The proposed work is necessary but not sufficient. There is a real danger to cyclists on Harewood Road and I would like to see the council commit fully to the work needed to complete the full cycle way. We have already been waiting some years for this and it is only a matter of time before a cyclist is killed or seriously hurt. In addition the council needs to do all it can to encourage cyclists in Otautahi so that we can meet our climate change goals.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

I would like to see all council contributions to the cathedral reinstatement cease. It is time for the Anglican Church to step up and fund this project themselves.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

The Air Force Museum is a real asset for Christchurch, and the toanga contained within it a important part of our history. The museum is a major tourist attraction for Christchurch so the economic benefits from the investment will come.

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Surplus properties should be disposed of.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Amy **Last Name:** (required) Douglas

Feedback

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

Great cities offer easy ways for people to get around their congested areas - and in lieu of a tram or train, our shuttle provided that.

Thinking about some of our biggest assets - our new pool, MM Playground, and the hospital - the ability to take the bus from home and a shuttle from the exchange maximises on our investment into these assets. In particular, people should be able to access the hospital with ease - which we currently cannot.

The shuttle could be a paid service, but perhaps it starts out as free to encourage a change in behavior. Then it can be monitored to see if the movement of people around the city encourages spending and pays for itself.

While different to the bus, there are still some attitudes that will flow over. Christchurch has an oddly negative view of bus users, so I imagine it will be the non users of this service that need to be convinced that this will benefit our city. Perhaps if this was pitched as a functional way to reduce congestion (good for those that choose to remain a driver) and create a vibrant city with people moving with ease around it, it may stand a chance. I worked on the new Metro buses, and there was a very fine line with what people would tolerate as a benefit to them as a non user. For users they know and love the benefits!

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Kiri **Last Name:** (required) Armstrong

If you're responding on behalf of a recognised organisation, please provide the organisation name: (required)

Meadow Mushrooms

Your role and the number of people your organisation represents: (required)

Head of R&D and Technical

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

The rates increase will have a significant impact on our business and is not a cost we can pass on to our customers.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

These projects are not a priority for our business.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 2: Two-tiered volume rate

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

Options 1 and 3 will substantially disadvantage our business compared to the current charges. Option 1 would prompt us to store more tradewaste, and discharge less often, to target a higher daily rate and cheaper discharge price. This would work against the objective to prevent hydrogen sulphide build up, and could also work against the objective to avoid overloading the system, if other users do the same.

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

Right now - festivals and events are a luxury that we can do without.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Robyn **Last Name:** (required) Campbell

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

Seems reasonable

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I want to put the Harewood Road cycle way on the back-burner, only proceeding with traffic lights at Harewood-Breens-Gardiners Roads and at Harewood Primary School.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

I'm aligned with Council's thinking in this regard

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

No comments

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

No

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

No

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

Makes the most sense equitably

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

Hold off on any Harewood Road cycleway

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Gavin **Last Name:** (required) Blackwell

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

not ideal, we cant keep putting rates up. People cant afford to live in chch. Things need to be cut just like people have to do in the household

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

don't need to keep spending on cycle lanes, its too expensive

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

Water is fundamental, So Council need to stick to core services and make sure functioning correctly but also make sure not wasting money

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

park spaces etc are fine to spend on, just make sure value for money

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

keep fees to a minimum

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

not sure

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

water, library, roading, parks, swimming pools

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

everything else

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

sell properties or repurpose

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

Have the traffic lights at breens Harewood intersection. But defer any other spending on cycle way

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Mitchell **Last Name:** (required) Coll

Feedback

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

Development should be focused in our central city

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

We need to do everything we can to make a central city more livable. Most new developments don't have car parks, we need to make living with no cars easier for the residents

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Geraldine **Last Name:** (required) McCormick

Feedback

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

I believe the Council owes inner city residents this basic service as they increasingly are issuing building consents with no or limited car parking which has pushed cars onto our streets as residents still need these to access basic services. This has negatively changed our streets eg: Gracefield Ave etc.

If the Council want to continue with desire to rid/minimise cars in the inner city then they need to provide a public transport system that allows the residents easy access to supermarkets and other services and this city shuttle goes some way to addressing this and ensuring the council goals are somewhat consistent.

It really is a no brainer and so ideally it would be great for the council to recognise that and save the \$200,000 for a scoping study and just put this towards getting this up and running asap.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

[REDACTED]

From: Alex Segec [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 11 March 2025 8:30 pm
To: CCC Plan
Subject: Bringing back central city Shuttle

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Good Day CCC team,

I was not sure where to go online to join the initiative for bringing central city Shuttle back, but I would like to use this form of communication to have a say and express my support. My address is [REDACTED]

It would be amazing to get the central city shuttle back. In the new times it would be super useful to get rid of more cars and have again Shuttle for inner-city residents and all of our precious tourists and visitors, anyone who wants to get into or around the CBD. Most of the amazing cities of the world have similar lines that run on a loop every 10-15 minutes. I learned, in the past, the yellow city shuttle was going by the Casino, up to Moorhouse, with stops by supermarkets, Ara, now Turanga, Cranmer Square and some more... It would be a super practical and sustainable addition to our amazing city transportation and much easier and cleaner than driving..

If you provide me with the link I am happy to submit my say online too but I am hoping you will find a way to acknowledge and submit my opinion in this email.

Thank you in advance.

Alex Segec

Communications, Risk and Development Specialist

[REDACTED]

Save a Tree – Think Before You Print this Email

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Robyn **Last Name:** (required) Newman

Feedback

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

[REDACTED]

From: Derek Wallace [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 11 March 2025 11:06 am
To: CCC Plan
Subject: ICON Submission on 2025/26 Annual Plan

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

ICON - The Inner City West Neighbourhood Association has a special interest in supporting the proposal in the draft annual plan to fund a scoping study on reinstating the Council-subsidized central city shuttle.

Members have consistently raised this matter, and it is therefore one that, as the current Chair, I feel confident about formally supporting on behalf of the association as a whole, not just as an individual (which I will also do as part of a full response to the online survey).

Many of our members can recall when the shuttle was previously operating, and the benefits it provided. In particular, residents in our neighbourhood are often older, with limited capacity to walk, or in some cases to drive, to necessary amenities such as supermarkets, or to Turanga, etc. The shuttle service would improve their lives considerably.

I strongly encourage Council to investigate further the current feasibility of restoring the shuttle service.

Derek Wallace
ICON Chair

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Paul **Last Name:** (required) Williams

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I am opposed to the Harewood Road Cycleway being put on hold and only traffic lights at Harewood Breens Gardiners as well as Harewood Primary School, i want the whole complete project to go ahead ASAP. Harewood Road is an extremely dangerous road for Cyclists and pedestrians. The cycleway is an absolute must and any way we can reduce traffic on Harewood Road would be positive move for the whole community.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Jan **Last Name:** (required) Bierman

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Cycle route expenditure does not correlate with usage. I do not support the proposed expenditure on Wheels to Wings cycle route. The current disruption on Wairakei Road (to road users and businesses) will be extended with the the introduction of cycle lanes - Aorangi Road between Wairakei & Condell, & Matsons Ave are both wide enough to accommodate cycles & cars (& traffic is minimal). It is time for council to get realistic about expenditure on cycleways. Our current economic circumstances as residents, a city and a nation should exclude nice to haves at this time. The proposed annual rates increase is not in line with inflation & is not sustainable for ratepayers. Think again!

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

I would question whether payment for Duvauchelle wastewater treatment project with the Akaroa Wastewater Treatment Plant should be paid for by city residents - our rates burden is already very high.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

Parks should be maintained but further enhancements should be shelved at this time until we are in a better economic situation.

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

Focus should be on maintenance and renewal - our water supply and stormwater infrastructure, roads & footpaths, climate mitigation. Other projects should be deferred.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

Rates are not sustainable for residents, most especially for people on fixed incomes. Valuations have no correlation to actual price that can be achieved by a house sale. Valuation data are not equitably applied across the city. Our current economic circumstances as residents, a city and a nation should exclude nice to haves at this time. The proposed annual rates increase is not in line with inflation & is not sustainable for ratepayers. Think again!

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

No increase in fees & charges. Savings must be made within Council operations.

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Core services water, maintenance etc. The library is my most valued community service.

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

Core services water, maintenance etc. The library is my most valued community service.

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

All Council operations must be reviewed to improve efficiency and accountability. Stop the nice to haves and ideological stiff.

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the

Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

Need to know more, why, how etc. Need to be assured that funding allocated appropriately & it does not disappear over time into council coffers

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

Canterbury Museum should be the priority in terms of funding

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

1.3.5

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

No scoping needed - need to provide a free shuttle to the other side of the Square (entertainment/dining quarter) where public transport does not reach

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

If they are surplus to requirements then they should be sold or disposed of.

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

Stop the ideology and grand-standing. Maintenance of core services the priority. Stop the wastage. Internal cost-savings are essential, not carrying on regardless. Facilities & services that have been receiving council funding, eg the Arts Centre, should be now fully in cost-recovery mode (& not succumb to the vociferous claims of an affluent minority). Rates increases must attuned to the cost of living increases- no more. Like its residents Council must live within its means. Think of the people you are serving and their ability to pay an ever increasing rates burden. Listen to the feedback!!!

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Ross **Last Name:** (required) Watson

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I wish to put the Harewood Road cycle way on hold and only put Traffic lights at the Harewood -Breens -Gardiners intersection

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

These properties not being used at present should be sold as long as they won't be needed in the future .

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Da **Last Name:** (required) Steel

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Please don't go ahead with this ridiculous spend. I live Becmead Dr and come out of Nunweek Boulevard to get onto Harewood Road. At time there is a serious delay. If lights were put at Breens Road intersection that would enable people in this area to move around much easier. And what a terrible corner that is. Lights there please. Harewood school on such a busy main road needs a pedestrian light there too. To make it easier for cyclists few as they are, could the footpath not be made dual pedestrian and cyclists as it is around Nunweek Park. And if the cycle way was to go ahead how does Copenhagen and the Charity Hospital manage for parking etc. Please rethink this.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

Needs to be done

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

Obviously the council has looked at this and agree that it is the way to go.

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

The parks and gardens must be kept in a tidy condition.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

We love the Air Force Museum and have taken visitors and grandchildren there over the years and always loved it.

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

1.3.5

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I am not a bus user but the amount of times you see buses with just 1 or 2 people in a large bus is ridiculous

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding

your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) John **Last Name:** (required) Cumberpatch

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

This is too high and should not be above inflatio

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

The Wheels to Wings is an over engineered program that could be achieved by painted lines on the road. No need for the type of nonsense seen in Ilam Rd. The unnecessary of parking will have negative impact on residents, particularly the Charity Hospital.

Please note I support cycling - My over-engineering comment applies to all cycle ways.

Lights at Harwood Gardiners rd is sensible improvement.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

We have kicked the can down the road for too long so need to do this as efficeintly as possible

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

These are a real asset to Christchurch and need to be maintained to an appropriate standard. New Parks should only be considered when exiting one are up to standard.

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

Stop all Vanity Projects !!

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

The Cathedral needs to be fixed as it is an impediment to the development of the Square and surrounds that will benefit all .

The Church (The legal owner and decision maker) can raise the funds but chooses not to and is holding out for Rate and Govt funding. Either way I will end up paying through local or central govt taxes.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

Use your balance sheet to free up Capital.

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

Dump arges are ridiculously high now, especially for green waste

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Water, Roads, Rubbish, facilities

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

Council owned housing

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

every cycleway and pathway, Akaroa Wharf, Organic processing plant

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

The Climate Change Industry is unfortunately wasting \$ billions trying to stop nature. Ie too many people and natural temperature cycles. This does not mean we should not do undertake practical mitigation, but the reality is that our well intention efforts are lost in Indi and China in a few hours.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

A valuable asset

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

We simply dont have a population base that wants it, a rates base that can afford to subsidise , or a frequency that is attractive

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Yes - sell all ththat we dont need

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

I commend your efforts and sympathise with the politcing that gets in the way of common sense.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) John **Last Name:** (required) Oatham

Feedback

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

Don't agree with targeted rate ever being imposed whole project has predictably turned into a disaster that will be a blight on city rebuild for many years to come

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Central library

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Bevan **Last Name:** (required) Phillipson

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I believe Residential Rates below 5% p.a. are achievable, and all Councillors must strive to achieve this.

Furthermore, The ECAN "crowd" should be aiming, doing likewise.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Long term, we will need to encourage more use of walkways, cycleways, skateways even.

Congestion type of "taxes" may be required to help drive this outcome.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

Without water we die.....hence, we need to constantly be "moving towards" BETTER systems , and always consult with Residents on any Improvements suggested.

Costs are required, I get this. And, my opinion is "water wasters " should pay .

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

we need them , so am happy to go along with Improvements which can be made , within The < 5% overall Rates increase.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

The Cathedral is becoming a greedy, money"devourer", so stop giving. Time to start "taking" from The Churches.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

1.2.4

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

Under a previous CCC, which I will not name here, we Residents were informed that our City could loan more because we had the ability to service any such increase in our City's loans. This was a poor,bad choice to make. Servicing Loans costs , the "Loaner Pays", ie, Us Residents of Christchurch. This was " crystal ball" politics, and I am definitely against any Christchurch City Councillors who believes in FUTURISTIC Fortune Telling.

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

Please aim,try and DO keep increases to an amount where 80%+ of our adult Residents can afford.... it's common sense, really

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

I can do without Luxury items, things.

But, i can not do without Essential items, things.

Your job is to always Know, / or seek to know the difference.

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Ask you to always consult our Residents before acting towards Selling.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) [REDACTED] **Last Name:** (required) [REDACTED]

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

STILL WAY TOO HIGH. DEFINITELY NOT enough work being done to reduce costs. TOO much double dipping you are supposedly "fixing" things (roads, etc) that don't need it, making changes to roads that INCREASE traffic congestion that is NOT smart it is incredibly backwards and should NOT be happening. WHY are you allowing this? There are ALWAYS ways to reduce money but CCC doesn't listen to the people and keeps spending on irrelevant, useless and just plain stupid things. When will you listen to us?

This so called "proposed" increase is too much. Reduce your costs again, STOP the nice to haves, STOP the road bumps everywhere, REINSTATE the original speeds on the roads, (why did you keep reducing them when you were told by the then new govt that they would revert back? WHY did you not put that on hold? I said to you in writing that is what you should be doing but, by ignoring everyone YOU cost the city more money, WHY did you NOT LISTEN? Classic CCC and it's road planners (they still need to be sacked they are incredibly anti car and it's not acceptable behaviour) IS costing us the ratepayers more. STOP with the cycle lanes - they are creating issues and ALL people who ride a bike MUST be responsible for their actions and be AWARE of what is happening around them NO ONE should be babying them (life is hard they have to learn to use their brains not be moddy coded) - if they cannot (or will not) use their brains and expect to have everything done for them and expect to do what ever they like then THEY ARE AT FAULT. YOU, CCC have allowed this mentality to continue it must stop. The cycle groups are incredibly rude, disrespectful, derogatory, racist and arrogant they are NOT people CCC should be listening to as that means you are all of those things also.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Can you please remove the maori words - very confusing and frustrating to read. And, should NOT be on any official document did the govt not say that? I have lots of doubts about the crossing on harewood rd can see that causing major issues (idiots pressing it for fun and running away) ESPECIALLY when there is a new one at the railway crossing.

Patience and common sense is a virtue and definitely things that are severely lacking now. I have crossed this road numerous times on foot and had no issues at all. I did have to use my brain and wait until it was clear but I did cross with NO problems at all. There are pedestrian islands there now (and HOW much did they cost?) and they work so why the need for a signalised crossing? HOW MUCH TO REMOVE SAID ISLANDS??

The question has to be asked, are you babying people? Is CCC being complicit in dumbing them down? Yes, on many many occasions council is. Traffic lights at breens and gardiners and harewood rd's ok with that and is should have happened years ago if council had actually LISTENED to the people of the area!

OH and what about the Wairakei Rd end of Breens at the STOP sign? The end where VERY few people actually stop (and that includes council vehicles) what are you going to do about that? WHY is nothing getting done about enforcing the road rules?

NO TO REMOVING LANES, CAR PARKS, TREES, ETC AND PUTTING IN CYCLE LANES ON HAREWOOD ROAD. A VERY FIRM NO TO CYCLE LANES ON HAREWOOD RD. NO. NO. NO. NOT EVER. CCC has blatantly and purposely wasted money on this stupid idea and did NOT listen to the people (only the cycle groups who are rude, just plain nasty, disrespectful, racist, and arrogant, and believe they're right and every one else is wrong) that, CCC WAS WRONG. You MUST listen to the people NOT groups with an agenda! Shame on you for wasting MILLIONS AND MILLIONS of dollars. I want the plans for the cycle lane to be scrapped and to NEVER EVER be implemented.

Not entirely happy about Harewood School either seems to me that it's not really needed and again can see major issues with it especially with traffic coming off the motorway. With all the parents that park down there surely that is a huge learning opportunity for them to teach their kids on how to cross the road safely? WHY is it needed? Traffic has to slow down anyway when school is in/out so EXACTLY WHY is a signalised crossing needed? There is a pedestrian island there already surely that works? (EXACTLY HOW MUCH DID IT COST TO INSTALL AND EXACTLY HOW MUCH TO REMOVE???) Every single time I've been there there were NO issues so why change it? If something works, then LEAVE IT ALONE! WHY spend thousands when there are already things in place? I do NOT believe it's necessary and should never have been suggested.

In conclusion, NO to any cycle lanes going down Harewood road ever, yes to lights at breens, harewood, gardiners rds, signalise crossing near mitre 10 don't agree, same with Harewood school - parents and caregivers pick these kids up they should be teaching them. Is there a road patrol out at all? I think there is. Why not just have that and save money? The teachers could do it along with teaching the students. I loved doing that when I was at school and learnt a lot too. That would make more sense. You can't always press a button to get what you want and should always be using your brain not being a sheep.

Bus lanes are a lot of rubbish. Definitely don't agree to them roads are not wide enough now and buses are dangerous. The drivers do NOT pay attention I have been nearly killed a couple of times while passing a stopped bus and the latest I was 3/4 of the way going past them and they pulled out on me they did NOT look, you couldn't miss me. I was nearly killed and they didn't look. When reporting it they did not care either (ecan) no accountability at all. THAT is what needs looking into. It happens a lot.

So, you plan on deferring Lincoln rd bus mess hmm, but are going to spend "some" of the money on other illogical ideas? WHY NOT JUST HOLD ONTO THE MONEY PUT ASIDE ALREADY? You're charging rate payers at least twice for the same thing. WHY not just hold onto the money and NOT spend it. WHY? That's illogical. IF (and it's a big IF) you are looking at "reducing wait times" (ha ha) and "improving" (aka making it worse for everyone else) the operation of existing bus lanes (really?) then that is a separate issue altogether and you should NOT be taking money set aside for a project (even if it is delayed) and using that for these so

called "improvements". NO to using that money for your ideological things that probably work perfectly well now. NO CCC STOP TAKING MONEY FROM ONE PROJECT TO GO TO YOUR SILLY IDEAS. SAVE IT AND IT'LL EARN INTEREST. SIMPLE

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

NO TO CHLORINE. What are you doing to STOP it and save us, the ratepayers millions of dollars? Nothing on that? Why?

So, you're adding "extra" to fix holes etc in the pipes? So, WHY are we getting charged extra when you obviously have NOT been maintaining them as you should? As one of councils CORE RESPONSIBILITIES? (not cycle lanes, all underground infrastructure!) WHERE HAS THAT MONEY GONE? WHY do you need more? Why cannot you work smarter with the money you have? Why are you NOT maintaining your core responsibilities as a council above all other things CCC? WHAT IS GOING ON? WHERE IS THE MONEY GOING?

Not enough information provided to ALL ratepayers on a timely basis (or at all really).

CCC MUST BE OPEN AND TRANSPARENT AND YOU ARE NOT AND HAVEN'T BEEN YOU MUST CHANGE.

You cannot do "nice to have's" or "lets put heaps of road bumps in (and remove give ways and cause MASSIVE congestion) because we can spend money like water with no repercussions" this is happening now and must stop.

CORE RESPONSIBILITIES MUST COME FIRST AND FOREMOST.

Oh and the Duvachelle thing is wrong and will not work. It's going to turn into a massive money pit and ecological disaster due to you determination to NOT listen to the people. You again are NOT listening to the people there it will NOT work and you are wasting our money. CCC is hell bent on doing this when it has been proven to not work. WHY? And yes, I have spoken to residents of the area and agree with them. CCC this should NOT go ahead as it is now. It will be a disaster.

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

Are you spending money on them? Really? Seems to me that cricket pitches and rugby fields get maintained ALL the time but anything outside of that doesn't. NO edges EVER GET TRIMMED, TREES very rarely get trimmed (ESPECIALLY those on the grass berms around the city), rubbish everywhere (no bins), stuff getting dumped, (for crying out loud how about a free inorganic collection once a year to start with as people CANNOT AFFORD the rubbish tip fees and a lot don't have any way to get rid of "bigger" rubbish. WHY aren't you doing that? They put their stuff on the grass berm, some people would want it and remove it (very green) and then the rest gets picked up at NO EXTRA CHARGE! THAT would reduce fly tipping and is a logical idea. Trees and bushes very rarely get trimmed at all incredibly frustrating. What about all those grasses you put everywhere (horrible

things) they NEVER get maintained. So much needs to be done and never is - it's all hit and miss apart for the ruby and cricket fields... WHY exactly is that please?

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

How about sorting out the toilets at Bishopdale Mall? They're icky and need upgrading. A lot more work required. STOP spending so much money on creating chaos on the streets (stupid speed bumps, narrowing roads, removing give ways signs that actually work, the list is so long) and more on what is REALLY needed. NOT NICE TO HAVE. The city is going backwards and the city centre is NOT THE BE ALL AND END ALL.

Oh, and remove parking fees on Hagley Park - you had NO proof (only hearsay) and instead of getting parking people to monitor the parking better (makes sense doesn't it?) you put in meters and fees. You didn't even TRY and other way. WHY DIDN'T YOU?

You had no proof at all and it was admitted so how can you justify doing that with NO PROOF??? Typical CCC looking at fleecing ratepayers at every turn without doing due diligence. Shameful and incredibly unprofessional! Shame on you.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

CANCEL it altogether NOT wanted and should NEVER EVER have gone ahead.

REFUND THE RATEPAYERS.

THE MONEY IS NOT TO BE USED ON ANY HISTORICAL ANYTHING - GIVE IT BACK TO RATEPAYERS.

It needs to be bowled over. Get rid of it now. It's pathetic and a waste of space.

TEAR IT DOWN AND GET RID OF IT NOW.

1.2.4

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

If your "avoiding" paying something you are NOT saving money as it STILL needs to be paid (with interest).

AGAIN, ccc, reduce your costs. STOP adding speed bumps for no real reason (apart from angering people in vehicles), STOP ALL nice to haves, STOP loaning/gifting/giving money to anyone, STOP giving money to ANY AND ALL BUSINESSES, if they cannot survive then they need to close, STOP with all the incredibly expensive cycle lanes we cannot afford it and CCC needs to STOP spending money like this. STOP listening to they cycle groups (rude, nasty, aggressive, racist as well that is NOT acceptable)

Get back to your core responsibilities - get that sorted first BEFORE anything remotely "nice to have" and do it now.

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

I cannot find ANYWHERE what is changing and what the old and so called "proposed" new fees are? So, until I sight that it's a NO from me.

Scale back on your fancy new buildings (aka hoonby, etc) don't need fancy just need operational so WHY do you spend so MUCH on these places? Is it necessary? Really? is it a want or a need?

CCC you're spending is OTT and cuts are needed NOW. Reduce your costs, tie down contractors to do the job once, clean up after themselves (NOT happening), and do IT RIGHT FIRST TIME. THAT IS NOT HAPPENING AND CCC IS LETTING THEM DO IT WHAT A WASTE OF RATEPAYERS MONEY! That would be a huge saving.

You need to get non council people in to go over your books and they would DEFINITELY find savings where you can't (or refuse) to do so. \$400,000.00 on the chalice? Really? Yet another waste of money like the statue in the avon.

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

Don't understand any of that. Probably OTT again

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Harewood road to REMAIN CYCLE LANE FREE. Since the earthquakes it's used a LOT more and should NOT have cycle lanes on it. Dangerous and illogical idea. NO TO HAREWOOD RD CYCLE LANES IT MUST STAY AS IT IS.

Libraries - roster them so they are not all open on Saturday am. Alternate weeks is good. Save money. Do NOT close them.

I'd like more rubbish bins not enough in parks especially. Core responsibilities council NOT nice to have.

RE-INSTATE the give ways signs around church corner/bush inn that actually worked and got traffic flowing it's DIABOLICAL NOW AND MASSIVE CONGESTION. Unacceptable. It should never have been changed it is NOT an improvement.

NO MORE REDUCING ROAD SIZE FOR BIKE LANES NO MORE NARROWING STREET ENTRIES/EXITS FOR CYCLE LANES. STOP ALL CYCLE LANES.

CORE RESPONSIBILITIES ONLY.

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

STOP AND CANCEL HAREWOOD RD CYCLE LANE. NEVER TO BE DONE. CANCEL.

ALL of the speed bumps, any new and to be built cycle lanes (odd and expensive, where is common sense?), removing stop/give way signs, lanes, 30km speeds in city centre and streets in chch, REMOVE ALL illogical and wasteful decisions by council staff, STOP ALL ANTI CAR SENTIMENT which is rampant in this council (just look at what's been done and has been made so much worse now because of it) Reduce council cars - exactly how much is that costing?

CANCEL ALL sponsored events in the park by the council - stop them. Cost a fortune ESPECIALLY fireworks and they damage the atmosphere too.

Remove the stupid bike lane on park terrace and re-instate it as a car lane. No need for it and there are already existing bike lanes WHY on earth was this put in?

STOP ALL CYCLE LANES. All cycle users should be responsible for their actions (aka abiding by the road rules, NOT riding 2 or more abreast, NOT riding in the middle of a lane, etc) and NOT riding on footpaths when stupid cycle lanes are right beside them and they DO NOT use them!

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

CANCEL ALL sponsored events in the park by the council - stop them. Cost a fortune ESPECIALLY fireworks and they damage the atmosphere too.

STOP AND CANCEL HAREWOOD RD CYCLE LANE. NEVER TO BE DONE. CANCEL.

STOP ALL CYCLE LANES. All cycle users should be responsible for their actions (aka abiding by the road rules, NOT riding 2 or more abreast, NOT riding in the middle of a lane, etc) and NOT riding on footpaths when stupid cycle lanes are right beside the and they DO NOT use them!

ALL of the speed bumps, any new and to be built cycle lanes (ott and expensive, where is common sense?), removing stop/give way signs, lanes, 30km speeds in city centre and streets in chch, REMOVE ALL illogical and wasteful decisions by council staff, STOP ALL ANTI CAR SENTIMENT which is rampant in this council (just look at what's been done and has been made so much worse now because of it) Reduce council cars - exactly how much is that costing?

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

Not enough info. If you did core responsibilities ONLY then you'd have the money wouldn't you? STOP allowing buildings on iffy areas - stop being greedy. NO to this.

You are not providing enough detail and could mean you're hiding something. And, can you 100% GUARANTEE THAT THIS MONEY WILL NOT BE USED FOR ANYTHING ELSE?

Your track record suggest not, and you will spend it. Until such time as ALL money that has been set aside for SPECIFIC PROJECTS is ONLY used for those projects 100% guaranteed by council and there will be repercussions if used elsewhere I DO NOT TRUST YOU TO SAY IT WILL ONLY BE USED FOR THIS. SO NO TO THIS

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

As a ONE OFF ONLY. NO more. Better go to this than cycle lanes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

NO. NO. NO. NOT ACCEPTABLE. NOT needed or wanted. Please STOP wasting money with "nice to haves" it will NOT get people into city at all. STOP being anti car CCC.

This is a joke and should NOT go ahead yet another scheme of the councils to waste money and get more out of the people who CANNOT AFFORD IHINGS NOW! For heaven's sake just stop these "nice to haves". Good grief.

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

1. I want a full list of all of these properties please. WHERE is it on this "draft" plan? NOT on page 28 or 29 tat's for sure.
 2. A FULL list in front of me so I do NOT have to go searching - they should be on the "draft" plan already. WHY aren't they? What are you hiding?
 3. It's a NO from me as you have NOT provided me with any details (and that is your responsibility ccc I should NOT have to go looking for things ESPECIALLY when you are so called "proposing" on getting rid of them
 4. YOU CANNOT SELL ANYTHING WITHOUT ASKING ALL PEOPLE OF THIS CITY.
 5. NO. NO. NO. NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION (or none) provided to be on this plan.
 6. This is DEFINITELY NOT a "consultation" at all as you have not provided the info on the plan so how can I make an informed choice? Stop hiding things and put them on the "draft" plan
 7. NO. NO DETAILS PROVIDED ON THIS PLAN BY COUNCIL SO THE ANSWER IS A VERY FIRM NO. MUCH, MUCH MORE REAL CONSULTATION REQUIRED - page 233 makes NO reference that I can see for disposal? (only list of trusts and bequests and no mention at all of disposal) SO NO UNTIL REAL INFO SUPPLIED TO ALL
-

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

Will you listen?

Will you act on core responsibilities first and foremost?

Will you stop the nice to have spending?

Will you stop the speed bump madness?

Will you actually cancel projects?

Will you STOP funding businesses, etc?

Will you STOP giving/loaning/gifting OUR money?

Will you STOP waiving interest payments and writing off loans for that matter (aka cricket oval, etc) and so many more?

Will you SAVE MORE MONEY?

Will you let the residents of this city look at your books and provide savings? huh, that'll be a no.

Will you STOP listening to cycle groups only who have one agenda only and will not and do not care about anyone else?

Will you do ANY of the above?

Much room for improvement and it's not happening

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

[REDACTED]

From: CCC Plan
Sent: Wednesday, 26 March 2025 2:32 pm
To: CCC Plan
Subject: Annual Plan 2025/26 submission

[REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, 20 March 2025 2:17 pm
To: CCC Plan <CCCPlan@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: Re: Annual Plan 2025/26 submission

Hello,

[REDACTED]

Oh, and I would like to add also that council needs to notify people with the rates demands that ALL homeowners are responsible for trimming their plants back from the footpath. There needs to be a proactive measure put in place as there are numerous plants which are encroaching on the footpath which are a health and safety issue.

Council should be reminding people of this and it (hopefully) would reduce the costs of council sending out letters to the owners to do something. This is a huge problem and council needs to be proactive in it's approach (and firm) and stop being reactive and expecting people to report it to them all the time.

[REDACTED]

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Peter **Last Name:** (required) Fletcher

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

naturally: too high!

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I realise the council are ideologically in favour of cycle lanes, and are egged on by the cycle lobby (many of whom do not even live in ChCh).

However, in the case of Wheels to Wings: this will make Harewood Rd unwieldy and congested as a driving route, (for me personally reversing a trailer into a driveway will become distinctly dangerous when 2 lanes are unnecessarily reduced to one), be massively disruptive and of course add to the endless rates increases higher than inflation.

And the result will be a highly engineered 'lane' that will BARELY BE USED. And yes, people should be able to cycle from Papanui to the Airport, but they already can: there is plenty of room to the left of Harewood Road's lanes for cycles.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) John **Last Name:** (required) Mackey

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Harewood Road cycleway - I am keen commuter cyclist travelling 5000km on my bike annually for the last 4 years. My assessment is that the proposed cycleway is not justified on a cost versus benefit basis. I have lived in Skyedale Drive for over 19 years and have commuted to work and other activities, safely during that time. I have not had any near misses in Harewood Road in that time. Therefore, I oppose continuation of the \$32 million cycleway.

I support traffic lights at the Harewood-Gardiners-Breens intersection as I have seen many near misses at it.

I question the merit of traffic lights at Harewood School as the pedestrian crossing combined with the school patrols seems to work effectively. Drivers who ignore pedestrian crossings and patrols are likely to run red lights.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

The Anglican Church was 'forced' to restore the Cathedral when the Church did not see it as a viable strategy. It is totally unfair to then 'punish' the Church for following public pressure to saddle them with further debt and expense and be no closer to a permanent solution to the replacement of the Cathedral.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Core infrastructure which excludes cycleways.

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

Community halls

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

Infrastructure construction and renewals by having a more streamlined and focussed consultation processes.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Sandra **Last Name:** (required) Blain

Feedback

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

The shuttle would be useful and I would use it frequently especially as have foot problems sometimes, making it difficult to walk about, I know there is bus access, but the shuttle would be closer for me.
Thanks for your consideration.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 12/03/2025

First Name: (required) Robin **Last Name:** (required) Chambers

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

o'kay

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

No

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

No

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

No

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

No

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

No

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

Makes sense

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Waste Management

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

No

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

If they are no longer fit for purpose, the council should dispose of them.

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

No

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

----- Original message -----

From: Chris Doudney [REDACTED]

Date: 12/03/25 17:13 (GMT+12:00)

[REDACTED]

Subject: Fwd: The central city shuttle service: scoping study

Hi Richard,

My submission below, fyi.

I didn't find the usual submission form, but assume that the Council will accept this.

I forgot to add that the vehicles need to be small electric buses (as the original shuttle appeared to be but I think wasn't).

Regards,

Chris

Begin forwarded message:

From: chris doudney [REDACTED]
Subject: The central city shuttle service: scoping study
Date: 12 March 2025 at 4:50:02 PM NZDT
To: cccplan@ccc.govt.nz
[REDACTED]

I wish to make a submission on the following proposal:

Proposal to allocate money for a scoping study for the central city shuttle service

I believe that the free city centre shuttle service should be reinstated. I found it a valuable service during the time that it was in operation, and expect that its effectiveness would have been very apparent to the City Council during that period. Until 2010 I was a frequent visitor to Christchurch and enjoyed making use of the shuttle. It was a useful and non-threatening way of seeing the City, as well as taking me as often as not to or close to my various destinations. Since 2010 I have been resident in Christchurch and have enjoyed frequent use of the City's public transport system, but still feel that there is a place for the free central city shuttle service - just as there is one for the tourist tram service. At present there are areas of the central city that are not well served by current bus routes, which could be connected to the wider bus services by a reinstated free shuttle service - in particular I am familiar with the area between the Botanic Gardens and the central city area - no doubt there are other pockets that would benefit from the shuttle and its ability to circulate around multiple foci in the central city. Note that I believe that the service should again be free of charge for passengers, even though as a current city ratepayer I am aware that I would be helping to pay for it! It might be possible for some of the more commercial enterprises on the shuttle route to be required to provide financial support, in addition to ratepayer funding.

Regards,

Chris Doudney

[REDACTED]

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) David Last Name: (required) Robb

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

im okay with this to get Christchurch back on its feet following the earthquake however long term rate increases should be aligned to inflation.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Put the Wheels to Wings project on hold and only proceed with traffic lights at Harewood-Breens-Gardiners Rd as well as outside Harewood Primary School.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Ken **Last Name:** (required) May

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

While I'm not actually resident within the Christchurch City boundaries, as a retired airman, and a person who has worked within the Christchurch City boundaries for many years, I am a strong supporter of this initiative, and believe the Air Force Museum of New Zealand is a very important asset to the City.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Steven **Last Name:** (required) Holmes

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Gerald **Last Name:** (required) Pringle

Feedback

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

Support the RNZAF Museum please

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I was at the airfeild when the Herc landed. I was so proud to see the amount of people (ratepayers) who came and waited for the Herc to land. We all waited so patiently - and it was a happy and courteous gathering.

Christchurch citizens paid their respects to the RNZAF and this aircraft.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Pat **Last Name:** (required) Maunsell

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

This is a highlight attraction for visitors to ChCh - if possible an increase in allocation would pay dividends in attracting visitors to ChCh.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Anne **Last Name:** (required) Plank

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) George David **Last Name:** (required) Jensen

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

Fair

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

This is a first rate and excellent facility admired and appreciated by a large cross section of the public, and visitors.

The expansion proposed will enhance the facility immeasurably and be a great asset to the city.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26



Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Tom Last Name: (required) Turnbull

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

total no brainer, our heritage at Wigram Air Base

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Julien **Last Name:** (required) Gutknecht

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

No issues provided the money is well spent with value for money a top priority

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

CCC should aggressively pursue low-cost interventions to speed up the delivery of the remaining Major Cycleway programme, as was carried out on Ferry Road between Fitzgerald Ave and High St Asaph St, and on Rolleston Ave. Quick wins should be sought on long-delayed cycleway projects - an example being to seal (even temporarily) the route under the Woolston SH74 roundabout from the Ferry Rd bus stop to Gould Crescent, and the desire line between Radley Park that links up to the Heathcote expressway.

CCC should also continue to investigate low-cost interventions to create more bus lanes - an example being a signs and paint approach at peak hours on Ferry Rd between Woolston and Wilsons Rd in lieu of underutilised car parking.

Spending on road renewals should take a 'build back better' approach and draw on the CCC urban tree cover strategy. There is little value on resealing the full 18m width of suburban roads (examples being Hardwicke St and Wiggins St in Sumner), and this presents a missed opportunity to increase the liveability of the city.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

No issues

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

No issues

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

No issues

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

The cathedral project has been mothballed by the church, further strain on ratepayers is not justified.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

1.2.4

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

A long-term view is better

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

no comment

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

Provides a more graduated approach, however of the opinion that large disposers should pay more and small disposers less per m3 than proposed

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Library, playgrounds

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

Road renewals

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

less road renewals

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

It is important that CCC take a long-term view on this as it will inevitably be required. It should be used to fund critical infrastructure upgrades where sea level rise will be an issue, and can be held in reserve indefinitely

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

How is this ratepayer's problem? I would be keener to pay entry to the attraction than subsidise

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

There is little value in this, and it will cost a lot to operate. Micromobility has boomed since pre-earthquake and a city centre shuttle is no longer justified. There are public buses that connect key activity centres, people can take these if they desire. There is also the tram that although primarily a tourist attraction, offers an attractive annual subscription and already covers a similar route that a shuttle would cover. There are countless better uses for \$200K than this proposed study.

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

rezone them and sell them for housing where practicable (i.e. wakefield avenue)

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Donald **Last Name:** (required) Morgan

Feedback

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

Cycle lanes

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

Building the \$32m Harewood Rd cycleway

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

[REDACTED]

From: Don Morgan [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 13 March 2025 12:15 pm
To: CCC Plan
Subject: Consultation enquiry

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Greetings,

I got a note in the mail regarding the Harewood Rd cycleway. This gave an address where I could give a submission.

Got to a council website where it was apparent the council does not want any submissions as there was no obvious place to make one.

Anyway I do not want the council to proceed with the \$32m cycleway on Harewood Rd.

The proposed traffic lights are a better idea.

Regards

Don Morgan

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Sarah Kate **Last Name:** (required) Millar

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

Think it needs to be more in line with inflation that this. Still too high

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Yes support the cycle path work to Harewood road

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

Keep investing in parks and rec. Key to wellbeing and physical activity levels

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Brent **Last Name:** (required) Smith

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26



Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Terry Last Name: (required) Turkington

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Pete **Last Name:** (required) Belt

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

Kia ora. This is a worthwhile investment for Christchurch to support an initiative where we preserve a huge part of our history. The Hercules and Orion have played a major part nationally, internationally, and locally to you in many civil defence and search and rescue operations. It will also be another attraction for tourist. Please, seriously consider the grant to ensure the preservation as well as future education is supported.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Colin **Last Name:** (required) Creighton

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Bronwen **Last Name:** (required) Howes

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I want the Harewood Rd cycle way on hold and only put in traffic lights at the Harewood-Breens-Gardiners Roads as well as outside Harewood Primary School.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Mark **Last Name:** (required) Williams

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I would like the Harewood Road cycle way put on hold and only put traffic lights at Harewood-Breens -Gardiners as well as outside Harewood Primary School

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Sandra **Last Name:** (required) Franks

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

This is far too much money to be spent, there are greater things that Christchurch need first. I would like this to be put on hold. But think it is a good idea to put traffic lights at Harewood-Breens-Gadiners Roads. Very dangerous. Also with the amount of traffic on Harewood Road each morning, merging from two lanes into one at Crofton Road this is just a waiting game for more accidents. The amount of near misses I have seen early morning is mind blowing. Lights would break and slow down traffic. ditch the cycle way moving forward

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

sell them off

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Julian **Last Name:** (required) Allom

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I less was spent on pointless cycleways the council will not need to increase the rates!

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

Cancel the Harewood Road cycleway and install lights at the Harewood/Breens intersection!

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

No

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

no

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

no

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

No

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

no

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

no

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

No

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

It's called the trams.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

No

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Julie **Last Name:** (required) Carter

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I would like the Harewood Road cycleway/Wheels to Wings to be put on hold, or cancelled permanently.

This is a major expense (that will likely only blow out to cost more) and it is opposed by a significant percentage of those who live in the area and will be most affected by it.

I would like the traffic lights proposed for the Harewood-Breens-Gardiners roads intersection to proceed. This intersection creates a large amount of risk for users.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Julie **Last Name:** (required) Jones

Feedback

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

no to the cycle way on Harewood Rd.

Do the lights only at Breens rd.

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Dave **Last Name:** (required) Hamilton

Feedback

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 13/03/2025

First Name: (required) Erin **Last Name:** (required) Andrew

Feedback

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

i say no to the Harewood Road cycleway as its a total waste of money . I live on Harewood Road and i see the cyclist that use this toad and it's precious little . Primary School children do not have to use it to go to school as the school zones dont cross over the road except for Harewood school and you are already putting traffic lights at that point . People working at the airport - the majority dont bike and while never bike . The very few adults that bike down here dont follow the road rules that i was taught , they dont look behind them when passing parked cars . So once again a big NO NO NO to Harewood cycleway

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 14/03/2025

First Name: (required) Kerry **Last Name:** (required) Loper

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

poor, Council should get back too basics and stop unnecessary spending,the council should stop treating the rate payers as a cash cow

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

stop unnecessary spending on papanui cycleway it is unaffordable and the price keeps going up stick too the basics,Council is doing too much ,stop all the speed humps being installed council is not the police,that's their job too stop speeding

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

no comment

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

no comment

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

scale spending down we can't fund everything

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

No

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

get back too basics learn too live with cars until we have a decent public transportation system,by encouraging more people too live closer together you are encouraging more cars yet there is no room for them?

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

1.2.4

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

stop spending on cycleways ,stop being anticar,stop installing speed humps,disregard the council department for speed humps they do not represent the majority of ratepayers

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

no comment

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 2: Two-tiered volume rate

1.2.7

Why do you prefer this option?

works

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

water,sewer,te kaha

1.2.9

Tell us about the services you could manage without.

libraries,the court theater,excess parking officers,

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

library,no speed humps ,no cycle ways

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

no comment

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

Yes

1.3.3

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

good for tourism

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

good for city

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

sell unused property and land I think 1 example is bishopdale mall?

Anything else?

1.3.7

Any further comments?

please make sure majority rules because as we have had in previous issues ratepayers say one thing then Council does what they want anyway without listening too us ratepayers

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 14/03/2025

First Name: (required) Charles **Last Name:** (required) Shaw

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I am happy with the proposed average rates increase.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I am happy with the proposed staged approach to delivering the Wheels to Wings major cycle route and with the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road Public Transport project to 2029/30

1.1.4

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our parks and reserves?

More attention needs to be paid to spending on parks and reserves outside the city area. The toilets at Stanbury Reserve, Wainui (where I have a holiday home), are in a substandard state and need upgrading. A boarded up and abandoned changing shed at Wainui beach is unsafe and needs urgent attention, that is, repair or demolition. The Wainui tennis courts are not up to scratch and need an upgrade.

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

The slipway breakwater at Wainui which was badly damaged in storms requires rebuilding.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

public transport, swimming pools, libraries

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 14/03/2025

First Name: (required) Winsome **Last Name:** (required) Bryce

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

Not easy on a fixed income but better than predicted.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

The planned Harewood Road cycleway is a cost that needs to be trimmed back. Lights at the Breens Road intersection are definitely required but nothing else.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

The "white elephant" in the square is a sorry sight but should be the responsibility of the Anglican Church not the city. They need to sell some of their property and use the funds if they want the Cathedral to be fully repaired.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

User pays.

Trade waste

1.2.6

What do you think of our proposal to change how we charge for trade waste? Which option do you prefer:

Option 1: Three-tiered volume rate (the Council's preferred option)

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

Rubbish removal - the current bin system works well.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know

Missed the city loop bus after the earthquakes. A similar service would be a great asset for both locals and visitors.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes

Our Draft Annual Plan 2025/26

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 14/03/2025

First Name: (required) David **Last Name:** (required) Palmer

Feedback

Proposed average rates increase

1.1.1

What do you think of our proposed average rates increase of 7.58% across all ratepayers (which is lower than the 8.48% signalled in the Long Term Plan 2024–34) and an average residential rates increase of 7.40%?

I think rates should be kept at 8.48%, and the difference between the proposed rate and the planned rate directed to paying down debt. The decision to use the projected surplus to reduce rates is short-sighted, and will result in more hefty rates increases in the future. I think it is important for council to maintain a balanced budget, and it is financially irresponsible of councillors to not work toward that.

Proposed spending

1.1.2

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our transport network, including the staged approach to delivering Papanui ki Waiwhetū Wheels to Wings major cycle route, or the proposal to defer the Lincoln Road (Curletts to Wrights) Public Transport project from 2026/28 to 2029/30?

I fully support completing Wheels to Wings cycleway. The northwest of Christchurch is poorly served by cycling infrastructure, and the cycleway is desperately needed along Harewood Road. Constant delays to the programme by elected members have resulted in central government funding being pulled, leaving ratepayers to bear the cost of this upgrade. The decision to upgrade the intersection at Breens/Harewood to lights will now cost ratepayers more than if we had just got on and done the work back when central government funding was available. Councillors that claim to be concerned about rates increases should be more aware of how blocking works in their area will cost ratepayers more in the longrun, as has happened here.

I would like to see budget brought forward to commence the larger parts of Wheels to Wings, particularly around the Bishopdale roundabout west to Nunweek Park. Tens of thousands of people work out at the airport and they need a safer way to access that area. Harewood Road also urgently needs a redesign to make it safer and more efficient for car drivers, by removing the unnecessary second lane and adding a cyclelane. The road itself is falling apart as it is long overdue for renewal, due to the pointless delays to W2W by elected members.

1.1.3

Do you have any comments about our proposed spending on our three waters network?

I support adopting a rating for renewal approach so that we can modernise our water infrastructure.

1.1.5

Do you have any other comments about spending on our capital programme in general, for example our facilities?

Facility maintenance should not be cut. Keeping our facilities in good condition so they never feel shabby or run-down is an important part of making them attractive places for people to use.

Christ Church Cathedral targeted rate

1.2.1

Should we pause the collection of the targeted rate for the Christ Church Cathedral reinstatement for the remaining three years we were due to collect it, and factor the saving into our proposed rates increase of 7.58%?

Yes

1.2.2

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I think it makes sense to pause this targeted rate and return it to ratepayers. Alternatively, I would also support continuing to collect it, but directing it toward improving Cathedral Square. The uneven white pavers of Cathedral Square make it feel like a broken place to be. Cathedral Square should be redesigned with more greenspace and a more attractive landscape design. We can begin this work now, even if the cathedral rebuild is on hold.

Rating for renewals

1.2.3

Should we increase our rating for renewals by a further \$2 million a year (\$12 million in total over six years) in order to keep our borrowing costs lower over time? This would result in an additional rates increase of 0.25% in 2025/26 but will generate \$2.6 million of overall rates savings over the next six years, and \$21.3 million over 30 years.

Yes

1.2.4

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I strongly support this idea. Rating for renewals future proofs our city and will help to mitigate dramatic or unexpected cost escalations in the future.

Fees and charges

1.2.5

Do you have any comments on our proposed changes to fees and charges?

The Vacant Land Differential must be applied to the Seagull Pit on Armagh Street. Is it unbelievable that Philip Carter has managed to argue the abandoned hole full of seagulls is still technically a building and therefore does not accrue this targeted differential. When tools to receive revenue from major landholders are available,

the city council must use them, even if they are threatened with legal action. Not doing so amounts to a ratepayer subsidy for Mr Carter's failure to build anything of value on that site.

Council should consider switching to land value rating, instead of the current capital value rating. Fairly applied land value rating would put the highest tax burden onto the property barons who can best afford it, while providing a huge amount of rates relief to the homeownership middle class in the city. Switching back to land value rating should be a priority for any elected member serious about reducing rates for the majority.

Reducing rates

1.2.8

Tell us about the services you value the most and would not want reduced.

rubbish collection
 transport safety
 libraries
 parks and facility maintenance
 recreation facilities

In particular, the "third space" services like libraries and recreation facilities are absolutely critical to a thriving city. My wife found the Baby Times sessions at the library incredibly important for her mental health when she first became a mum. Our librarians are an absolute treasure and an asset to this city. They are the last people we should be penalising with reductions in staff or working hours.

To be extremely clear about this: reducing opening hours at these facilities are service cuts, and are not a productive way to reduce rates.

1.2.10

Tell us about the services where there could be an opportunity for savings.

I believe the framing of this question is incorrect. The question should not be "what can we cut" but "how can we increase revenue."

Free parking should not exist in the central city. Except for mobility permit holders, people bringing their private vehicle into the city, and expecting to store it there for many hours, should also expect to pay a fee for doing so. Currently, the city council provides quite a lot of free on-street parking in the central city. Some upfront investment into this area will pay dividends in the future. With usage data, the council could adopt a floating fee model for parking, where the cost of parking your car increases based on the amount of demand for car parking. As an example, parking overnight might only cost \$1, but parking for half an hour on Colombo Street at midday might cost \$12. The price of parking should be adjustable, such that demand can never exceed supply. In this way, a lot of revenue can be captured, and we gain the added benefit of reducing congestion in the central city.

Increasing enforcement for illegal parking, ideally through technological means, would also help. Vehicle presence detectors could be installed to create automated alerts for overstaying cars, or cars that have not paid. I see a lot of illegal parking, where people park in loading bays, footpaths, taxi stops or disability spaces in order to not pay for parking. I have reported many of these, and in most cases a ticket was issued. Increase the cost of a parking ticket to an eye-watering amount, and send out more parking enforcement wardens.

However there are probably things that can also be done to save money, without reducing services:

The city council should bring some things related to transport in-house. For example, green road paint costs \$100 per metre. NZTA approves three colours for this purpose, but the city council only uses Australian-standard Apple Green. If Jade Green was added to the permitted colour list, it would create the opportunity to use whichever one is cheaper. Council should also consider mixing paint itself, rather than relying on procurement by contractors, which creates the opportunity for contractors to rot the council. Changes to road marking can also be made, for example, do we need to use green paint, when white paint might work just as well? I believe council can do more to reduce costs in our transport network.

There was recent debate on the Antigua Street cycleway, with some members claiming they wanted to save some money on it, but then not actually proposing any changes to the approved design to do so. Here are my suggestions:

1. remove the speed bumps at either end of Antigua Street. They are unpopular, and having three speed bumps on this short stretch of road feels excessive. Removing these could save thousands. The safety platform at the pedestrian crossing should obviously be retained.
2. Adopt patterned concrete for the pattern treatment areas, rather than going to the expense of laying paving bricks.
3. Use a chip-seal surface for the road, rather than asphalt. Asphalt is really only needed for the cycleway and footpath.
4. Remove the green lines down the sides of the cycleways. Cyclists do not need green lines to tell them they are on a cycleway; they can tell this from the design of the space. Painted white bicycle icons every 50m would be more than sufficient.

I was disappointed to see elected members grandstanding on the cost of this project, while none of them actually made any serious suggestions about how to trim cost from the approved (and really quite excellent) design.

Currently, road surface renewals happen almost like clockwork across the city. In my view, many of the roads that receive surface renewals don't really need it. But in many cases these streets do also need broader redesigns to enhance safety. It would be ideal if the surface renewal programme was pulled back to only when necessary, and combined with a community feedback process. In this model, when a road surface is identified as needing renewal, the transport team should ask the community board to consult the local community on what things they'd like to see changed on the road. Any minor to medium-scale changes (such as curb buildouts, paint layout changes and pedestrian refuges) could then be programmed for work alongside the renewals. Similarly, any required three waters work or underground cable work could be coordinated at the same time. This would reduce waste in the renewal programme by aligning renewal to safety enhancements, and allow us to more quickly enhance the streets of our city.

The proposal to move the Halswell Kart Club is frankly laughable considering how few noise complaints the facility actually receives. At a recent forum, the mayor said \$4m was available to move the club, but they thought they needed as much as \$11m to actually move. I think this money would be better spent on buying a fleet of electric carts for the track. This could surely be done for less than \$4m, it would totally remove the reverse sensitivity concerns from noise, and it would allow the club to continue operating in-situ. I have used electric carts at an indoor track on Blenheim Road and they are a lot of fun, I'd say they're actually a lot more fun than internal combustion carts.

Climate Resilience Fund Policy

1.2.11

Do you have any feedback on the draft Climate Resilience Fund Policy, specifically how the Fund will work, what the Fund can be used for and how long it will be held in reserve before being used?

I strongly support the climate resilience fund as a way to ensure our city can adapt in the face of climate change. We are likely to see dramatic shifts as a result of this in the coming decades, so contingency planning needs to be done now.

The fund must be ringfenced only to adaptation programmes, with the "emergency" contingency escape-hatch if it is ever needed. I am concerned that if the scope is increased to include all at-risk assets, the fund will be squandered.

I support a 30-year term for the fund. It is likely we will have to begin adaptation work before this, however, given that the purpose of the fund is to spread the responsibility for this intergenerationally, 30 years is an appropriate horizon.

Air Force Museum Grant

1.3.2

Should we proceed with our proposal to grant the Air Force Museum \$5 million towards an extension of its site?

No

1.3.3

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I really like the Air Force Museum, but this cost cannot be justified. This \$5m could be used to embark on the next stage of Wheels to Wings, for example. The Air Force museum is operated by the Air Force, and so they should be the ones paying for their own facilities. This is yet another example of councillors claiming they are concerned about rates, and then spending ratepayer money on "nice-to-haves" with impunity.

Our priority must be on updating our aging water infrastructure and improving safety on our transport network.

Central city shuttle service

1.3.4

Should we allocate up to \$200,000 for a scoping study for a central city shuttle service?

Yes

1.3.5

Comments

[If you're not sure, or have more to add, let us know](#)

I support investigating this, but I question whether it needs to cost \$200k. For that amount of money, a couple of mini-buses and a driver could be paid to do a 15-minute loop of the city in both directions, to see how the proposal might work. Given that this scoping study is a purely desk-based initiative, I doubt it would need to cost \$200k. If the plan is to hire a consulting firm, I think this task should instead be done in-house by dedicated staff, working alongside ECan. ECan is better positioned to provide a public transport service, and would benefit from economies of scale. The city council is poorly prepared to deliver a PT solution like this, so I think council's role here should be developing a business case and lobbying/working with ECan to have them implement it.

Potential disposal of properties

1.3.6

The Council has a small number of properties which are no longer being used for the purpose for which they were originally acquired. Do you have any feedback to help us decide the future or next steps for these properties?

Parks and reserves must not be disposed of when they are providing amenity to residents. In other cases, I support selling unused property, as long as care is taken to ensure houses will not be built on unsuitable land.

If the council is interested in considering asset sales, the assets I suggest they start with are:

Tarras Airport Land

Christchurch Airport should be directed to sell the land it has accrued near Queenstown and return the balance to council as a dividend. It is ridiculous that the Christchurch International Airport owns land so far away from Christchurch. Now that the Tarras airport project is properly dead with no hopes of revival, the land should be sold.

Lichfield Street Carparking Building

There is no serious benefit I can think of to the council owning an enormous carparking building in the city. This should be sold. The council is under no obligation to provide carparking facilities like this, and carparking in the central city represents appallingly poor use-of-space.

Te Kaha Stadium

Te Kaha will never return enough revenue to offset the significant ongoing operation cost that is currently borne by taxpayers. The council has served its purpose in stumping up the capital to build the stadium, and now that has happened, it is appropriate for it to be sold. The council should cut its losses and sell the stadium now, while it is still new, so that other private providers can bear the cost of operation. For example, the council has budgeted \$1.5m for the foreseeable future just to grow turf for the stadium. This cost should not be borne by ratepayers at all, but rather the users of the stadium, be it rugby teams or concerts. If ownership is transferred to a private operator, ratepayers would be insulated from these costs. A sale could probably net the council \$400m in capital, which could pay off the bulk of the debt accrued in building it. If the stadium proves to not be financially viable in private hands, it could be bought back by the council later, potentially for significantly less, representing a financial win for ratepayers.

Christchurch Airport Shares

The council should sell its shares in the airport down to the minimum 51% required to remain in control of it as a city asset. Selling shares does not mean that we have to lose control or ownership over the airport, but it does mean we can gain a significant chunk of capital at no material cost to ratepayers. We would still retain our strategic asset, that being ownership and control of the airport.

In all cases, asset sales must not be used to temporarily offset rates; that would be unbelievably short-sighted mismanagement of ratepayer funds. Any large chunks of capital acquired through asset sales must be directed to paying down debt, to insulate ratepayers from future changes in interest rates.

Future feedback

1.3.8

For future feedback about our services and issues impacting Christchurch residents, do you consent to us holding your email address and the demographic information that you have provided?

We comply with the Privacy Act 2020. If you say yes, we will use the information for the sole purpose of contacting you about future feedback about our services and other issues impacting Christchurch residents.

Yes