

SUBMISSION to CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLAN 2006 to 16

Submission by

Malcolm Douglass
51A Bowenvale Avenue
Christchurch

(T) 332 5504 (F) 332 5504
douglass.m@clear.net.nz

I wish to be heard in person.

I make this personal submission on the Christchurch City Draft LTCCP 2006-2016 with a background of over 40 years of professional association with local government as a senior officer and as a consultant. In 2005 I had the privilege of organising and editing the proceedings for the Canterbury Regional Jubilee Symposium held 19 November 2005. I have recently written a paper which appeared in the Planning Quarterly, No 160, March 2006 "A Renaissance in Strategic Regional Planning". I have also in the past 2 years undertaken research employed by Victoria University on the implementation of LTCCPs by NZ Local Government. I am a consultant and lecturer on these topics. My submission reflects a fervent desire for metropolitan Christchurch and the Canterbury region to remain a world leader in developing a balanced sustainable rural and urban environment of quality with character.

1. City Council Planning and Collaborative Planning.

I commend the City Council in its planning functions under the several statutes in particular the City Plan under the RMA 1991, the Regional Land Transport Strategy under the LMA2003, the Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Reserve management Plans and this LTCCP under the LGA 2002. These tasks are not easy and they are very demanding on councillors and staff resources. However when done successfully they are a great boon to the community and provide some certainty for the future in these complex areas of city management.

The LTCCP process provides an opportunity to establish and clarify the shared role of so many organisations which in both the public, private and voluntary sectors contribute to the Community Outcomes. I observe around the country that other council LTCCPs reflect the effort made to identify key stake holders and establish a range of lead agencies to implement the Community Outcomes. This has included regional councils, adjacent district councils, health boards, transit, government ministries, government departments, together with commerce, private sector and voluntary community organisations. These many parties have been asked to 'sign up' and agree the Community Outcomes and in some cases have agreed to take a lead role in delivering services, implementing and monitoring programmes to support them.. These Councils then provide their services and support in context and in collaboration with a large number of agencies and organisations.

There are passing references in the Christchurch City's LTCCP to the 'need to work with' a list of list of government agencies and there are a series of statements in the 'Strategic Directions section. (page 51,52, and neighbouring local authorities 55,57) . There are also paragraphs which state there is a 'need to understand the capabilities of voluntary groups' and also 'working with Maori' and 'working with other cultural groups'. However these are hardly agreements but rather Council statement of intent. There is no reference in the LTCCP to the triennial agreements with adjacent local authorities and the Regional Council or any specific agreements with Transit. There are also no statements as to any shared projects included in the 'Council Activities'. In view of the submissions and extent of discussion during the ' Lets Talk It Through' 2005 the LTCCP might have been able to give a more positive recognition of collaborative partnerships with the community and the other agencies involved.

Suggestion that the Council might consider, in the near future, extending the sections dealing with 'community outcomes' and 'council activities' to prepare a protocol which embraces the agreement of public agencies and community organisations that support the Community Outcomes and the collaborative arrangements agreed with them.

2. Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

I support other submissions to the Council seeking greater recognition of the Urban Development Strategy (UDS) and its visions and implications for the future in this LTCCP. There is only a passing reference to the Christchurch Urban Development Strategy. (UDS) in the LTCCP (page 71). But this issue is a major driving force for the future of Christchurch and eastern Canterbury. Delaying any reference or explanation of this fundamental and important programme to the next three year review would be incorrect in logic, policy and effect. This work appears to be included in the 'City Development' activity correctly nesting alongside the 'Central City Revitalisation Strategy' and the 'Greater Christchurch Transport Strategy'. But it is not possible, from the published LTCCP, to identify the terms of reference, the resources or the collaborating parties being applied to this important work. Work which will provide the major long term driver for the future (and future LTCCPs).

Urban development strategies need a focussed, ongoing and highly skilled team to be successful. It cannot be achieved by being treated as a 'hobby job'. They are not a one off project but rather an ongoing strategic planning programme. This obviously has to be undertaken in collaboration between the City adjacent District Councils, the Regional Council, Government and the Community. The Regional Council will have to embrace the results both in the Regional Policy Statement and future Regional Plans. This omission from the LTCCP is regrettable. It would appear that the responsibility for these matters could also be clarified through the useful exercise of the triennial agreements between councils now required by the LGA 2002.

It is suggested that the purpose of the joint Christchurch Urban Development Strategy, the joint agreements supporting it and the resources being applied to this project be included and explained in this LTCCP.

3. Christchurch and Regional Land Transport Strategies (Long Term)

The Greater Christchurch Transport Strategy (in conjunction with the UDS and the RLTS) is essential to give confidence in identifying current needs and future transport projects to enable improved accessibility and a balanced level of service for all modes of travel throughout the greater Christchurch area. This must be for a long term (30-50 year) forecast.. It is understood that a new up to date set of multi modal transport models are being prepared by the City Council as part of the technical work both for the UDS, the RLTS and the immediate traffic management of the existing network.. The four councils have until recently relied heavily on past models and forecasts. The last major comprehensive regional study testing the consequences of alternative growth strategies for Christchurch was undertaken in the 1969-75 period!. Planning confidence, in regional transportation and other major network strategies, relies on political leadership however, for this to be advocated and undertaken with confidence, it requires the support of an ongoing, and not inexpensive, process of major technical planning studies and review.

From a transportation planning view point the current RLTS has value as a forum for consensus which accepts current government attitudes on funding the LTNZs allocation processes and Transit's view on its 10 year programme. It is NOT a strategic study that leads Christchurch and Canterbury to positive, balanced and improved transportation solutions in the long term.. In its present form with only a 10 year horizon, the RLTS will not provide the vision for different and more effective long term (30 to 50 year) solutions to Christchurch's transportation problems. It is understood, but not explained in the LTCCP, that the council is developing its overall transportation review study to test both short (10 year) and long term time frames (30 to 50 years). This would seem essential so as to strengthen the effectiveness of the Regional Land Transport Strategy as a basis for future negotiation with Government.

I support both the Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury in their efforts to put in place such a multi modal transportation study which can test long term (30 to 50 year) options of land use and transport networks. There is no reference to this activity under Streets and Transport on page 150 and it would be appropriate to repeat some of the 'strategic directions' shown on page 54 in that schedule.

I suggest that additions be made as the top line of the schedule on page 150 to read 'What is the Council's Objective?' 'To provide a safe and efficient arterial road system' then in the column 'What is the Council already doing?' add 'Undertaking transport planning investigations of present and future multi modal travel demand, network deficiencies and options for future improvements.'

4. Immediate Arterial Road and Transportation Funding.

The LTCCP includes much information on the ten year funding and operational/capital budgeting. The Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Statement (2004), works within the confidence of programmes prepared under the current pattern of funding. However even with the projects proposed, including the significant capital works for improved level of service and increased demand, the city is still losing ground and there is an increasing gap in the supply on the arterial road network on the one hand and the increasing travel demands on the other. The extent of funding shown in both operating and capital is, nevertheless impressive. The LTCCP average annual figure for capital improvements per annum over the next 10 years (excluding the bus exchange and local street renewals and replacements) appears to be about \$24 million p.a.. It is to be hoped that future LTCCPs might increase this allocation.. For the situation of meeting travel demand to improve the construction of the Northern and Southern motorways are urgently required.

It is interesting to summarise the City's and Transit's (SH) capital improvement investments against demand. The City Plan (1999) shows the City's street network comprised:-

Major Arterials	84 kms	6%
Minor Arterials	237 kms	16%
Collectors	193 kms	13%
Local streets	976 kms	65%

The total then was 1490 kms and is now 1608 kms but the additions are mostly in the local subdivision street system.

The spine of the City system is the 84 kms of intensively trafficked major arterials (averaging traffic of 25,000 vpd) . Interestingly the length of State Highway Arterials administered by Transit adds up to 110 kms (average traffic of 22000 vpd). So the traffic service of the two systems is approximately CCC=2.1 million veh-kms/day and Transit = 2.4 million veh-kms/day. So the twinned systems have nearly equal vehicle loading and travel distance. The city council is proposing capital funding of improvements mostly on the arterial system at about \$24 million per annum. Transit's programme , for the same travel demand, is about 1/3 that of the CCC, for Transits share of the arterial system.

Transit, unfortunately, is already well behind on its arterial route improvements (eg on SH 1 past the airport and elsewhere). In the past the City Council has previously built arterial routes and then handed them to Transit as State Highways (e.g. Brougham St Arterial, Queen Elizabeth Drive/ Burwood Expressway). However Transit has, over many years (since 1967), accepted responsibility for the Northern Motorway and the Southern Motorways. Both routes, (on any reasonable Canterbury RLTS programme) should have been built at least 10 years ago.

At present there is the real prospect they wont be built for another 10 years. Both routes are estimated to cost about \$100 million each. With the upgrade of existing SH roads (say \$10 million p.a.) plus construction of the two new SH routes over say 10 years (say \$ 20 million p.a.) it would seem that at that level of expenditure i.e. a 4 fold increase on present budgets (to about \$30 million p.a.) Transit could be contributing its fair share to the supply of roading in the Christchurch Urban area. In the Council's relationship with Transit the matters I raise underline the need for a collaborative agreement to be reached. Obviously the UDS may assist this, and enable government and Transit agreements before the CCC/LTCCP is reviewed in 3 years time

Blenheim Road deviation . Other aspects of the Council's capital streets and transport programme could of course be questioned and I will mention three projects. I realise that the Blenheim Road deviation (pp 71) is committed, even although it has no benefits to the total travel in Christchurch and will detract from the grid network and alter the urban design and open space character in that locality. It could also prejudice the future urban passenger rail link from the North to the City Centre and Lyttelton. Given the deviation is proceeding this future rail link requires designation and protection of the land for it now.

Lichfield and Tuam. I comment that the political expedient of making Lichfield St two-way would, on balance and in urban planning and design terms, serve no great environmental advantage to the city centre, would be counter productive to city centre accessibility and would also prejudice the distribution of internal traffic in and around the city centre. The one way streets are a blessing to Christchurch and have provided an effective and safe traffic distribution, which are both economic and successful, over the past 35 years. Without the one way streets and the associated parking buildings, the 'flight to the suburbs' from the city centre would have been much greater. They have been shown to work well and have few disadvantages in terms of the land use, residential activity, pedestrian movement, total circulation and pleasance in the city centre. As observed in a comprehensive town planning and traffic report 'Christchurch City Centre 40 years of Change' prepared for the City Council in October 2000

'Christchurch has benefited from Captain Thomas' original town plan and its regular and generous central street grid. Building onto those plans of the 1800s the plans of the 1960s have been equally effective. (i.e. one way streets, city mall, open spaces etc) Traffic accidents, noise and pollution are significantly lower than in the 1960s as a consequence of the success of the one way traffic streets. The four one way pairs are a proven success and must be retained. They are correctly placed, meet the full needs of traffic to/from and within the city centre. The evenly spaced N/S and E/W one way streets should continue to be protected in their present form and at their present locations'

This considered town planning and transportation opinion is unshaken by all the debate.

Bus Exchange The Bus Exchange is not yet committed, although it has mysteriously and without any completed feasibility study or reported technical recommendation, been elevated as a 'significant' and an 'Essential Capital' work (pp 71). As an experienced town planner and transportation planner I suggest this project would be more appropriately seen as part of a comprehensive central city revitalisation and renewal development covering at least 1 hectare in a central city block. It does not seem to sit comfortably as an isolated investment alongside other more urgent improvements and extensions urgently needed for the metropolitan transportation scene. Such loan funds (say \$30 million) would be better spent as an advance on the property purchase for the right of way for the essential Northern and Southern corridors (together with their bus lanes and cycle ways and landscaping) so that Transit could be invited to get on with building these two critical highways earlier. These two corridor routes are vital to the metropolitan area, the city centre and the region's economic development.

The Councils provisions in the LTCCP and the level of funding proposed for operation and capital improvement under streets and transport is to be commended. However the relative contribution of Transit must be increased to enable funding for the improvements necessary to carry its share of the traffic demand.

I suggest

- a) **The Council continue to seek an increased level of funding from Transit for Christchurch SHs and also consider offering to assist Transit, by the use of loan funds, to enable the forward purchase of the Northern and Southern Motorways and so encourage Transit's earlier construction of these two essential transport corridors.**
- b) **the designation to enable the long term rail loop, for passenger transport, at Addington below the proposed Blenheim Road deviation be secured now.**
- c) **the Lichfield Street/St Asaph Street one way pair be left as at present.**

7. Conclusion

I have covered a wide range of matters, sometimes in detail, as I believe the LTCCP submissions are one of the few opportunities to genuinely raise these broader visionary and 'ball park' considerations, directly with councillors.

1. Collaborative Agreements. Regarding collaborative arrangements perhaps the council could address these matters further in the near future and get parties and stake holders 'on board' with protocols and multi party agreements to the Community Outcomes adopted. .

2. Urban Development Strategy. I strongly support the UDS and would observe that a well conceived UDS , well supported with technical facts, sound policies (as are contained in the City Plan with appropriate amendment) would save a host of uncertainty and litigation in the Environment Court in the future. As I observed in my recent article on Strategic Planning

"The Environment Court is not the right place for high level (urban growth) strategies to be forged through deliberations on individual applications In eastern Canterbury the cost of the appeal activities, affecting regional and district plans and including all the parties before the Environment Court has been estimated (conservatively) at about \$100 million over the past 5 year ! Surely a small part of these funds spent creatively on a collaborative strategic planning group developing a good regional plan, is preferable to endless litigation where we still end up having 'no plan'.

3. Transportation Planning and RLTS. Long term transportation planning is closely linked to the UDS, and development of suitable models to make these long term (30-50 years) forecasts is, I believe, in hand. Could this be explained explicitly in the LTCCP.

4. Immediate Arterial Road and Transport Funding. The Councils support for the level of funding proposed for operation and capital improvement under streets and transport is to be commended. However there is a need to lift the Transit SH capital improvement programme to about the same level for the Northern and Southern Motorways. The critical programmes and specific project details will emerge in the months and years ahead. I assure you some of us are watching this with keen interest.

Malcolm Douglass.

MSc(Birm), DipTP, BE(civil), NZPI, IPENZ(Fellow), SOLGM(Life).

5.5.2006.