

8. URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

The Board **resolved** to formulate the following comments on the Urban Development Strategy as its first draft (pending attendance at the Spreydon/Heathcote public meeting to be held on 25 May 2005) with a view to the submission being finalised at its 7 June 2005 meeting:

Business as Usual Option

- Redevelopment would be minimal.
- People have freedom of choice; more organic approach taken.
- Houses able to retain their character while still being quite close to the city (currently zoned living 1).
- Uncoordinated approach.
- Disappointed at the way Waimakariri has responded to options put to it in terms of both rural and domestic growth.
- Potentially, there may not be any countryside left around Christchurch, which will impact on everyone.
- Effects on mobility are significant.
- Green belt concept is not in the City Plan.
- A lot of development to the south west (eg Aidansfield) which will impact on Heathcote River; transport issues, etc.

Option A

- Extra emphasis needs to be put on transport, including light rail.
- Need to look at more infrastructure to support expansion and get people into Christchurch city.
- Need to look at expanding options further to encompass Ashburton and Timaru, including Darfield and Amberley to the north.
- In terms of redevelopment, care needs to be taken in terms of Waltham – a lot of bad urban redevelopment has been done in terms of how sections have been subdivided and the consequent impact on residents' quality of life.
- A lot more money needs to be budgeted to protect heritage values and some private properties where there are significant heritage features.
- This option is open to the best transport choices, land use and housing choices.
- Uses the least amount of land available – this is a good thing – the best option in terms of retaining a rural belt.
- Natural Environment – water use – if compared to other options it is the best, but a 35% increase in consumption to what we use now is not tolerable.
- Use of grey water should be an option – the document has to dig deeper to say there are ways to reduce or sustain options in terms of water use.

Option B

- This option is more dispersed geographically.
- As homes become older and sea levels rise owing to global warming, it would make sense to move away from at risk areas in terms of liquefaction.
- Support the creation of community “hubs” within the city – this is a strength of the model.
- Transport and cost of congestion – huge amount of money.
- There is a reference to light rail and it should be noted that the spending of \$2 billion on road widening/maintenance to avoid congestion becomes unacceptable.
- Emphasis on light rail as a public transport solution for option B.
- In terms of a projected increase in new housing in the Diamond Harbour area, while some of the population growth might choose to travel via Lyttelton Harbour/Tunnel, the general increase in traffic volume would certainly impact on Dyers Pass Road.
- In terms of natural environment – in particular the Halswell area, more flooding would occur if the area is expanded any further.

Option C

- In terms of a projected increase in new housing in the Diamond Harbour area, while some of the population growth might choose to travel via Lyttelton Harbour/Tunnel, the general increase in traffic volume would certainly impact on Dyers Pass Road.
- This option takes away fertile soils, no agrarian area – would have to bring produce in from elsewhere in the country – this needs to be protected.
- Biggest problem is with congestion and increased water demand; a lot of development in the south west area and people coming from the Governor's Bay area.
- There would be a loss of identity for the city because it spreads too far afield.

General Comments

- Staff to be congratulated on the format of the document – very user-friendly.
- The strategy has been publicised well with local newspapers.