

**Christchurch Civic Trust submission May 2006
CCC Development Contributions Policy (LTCCP 2006 –16)**

The Civic Trust would generally support the premise that those who create the additional demand for infrastructure should contribute towards the real cost of it. This proposal looks to spread the cost towards Developers which will ultimately be passed on to the purchasers of property.

It is acknowledged that financial / reserve contributions have been around for a while. In the past how the money was to be spent was all a little too vague. The new regime has positive targets although some more detail could be forthcoming. The Council will still pick up the bulk of the cost of infrastructure and this is fair as development represents capture of rate payers.

To date the Council have not issued their remissions and reduction policy. The policy developed by the ESU in 2000/2001 was a fairly robust and covered a wide array of factors. It was well understood and had a positive effect on conservation and sustainability in terms of heritage and ecology.

It is clear that the proposed policy without remission will be no kerb to urban sprawl. Concentration of development where infrastructure is in tact and has capacity must have a differential to greenfield sites.

The Council's own worked examples show that a new residential lot in Halswell will attract a DV of \$26,082 (up from \$13,323) where as a central city apartment will attract a DV of \$23,450 (no direct comparison was made available). Clearly there is no incentive for a Developer to contemplate residential development in central Christchurch. There should be a remission for the central city if there is an expectation that this is where growth is desirable.

The Civic Trust would also strongly urge that a remission be given for the retention of heritage buildings as is the current policy.

It would also appear that if this is policy based on demand for infrastructure there are at least two broad areas in residential development where this would not be fairly applied.

If additional bedrooms are added to a house this is a tax on infrastructure. Similarly if a small house is demolished and a much larger house built there is a greater demand created. To give a HUE credit in both these cases is generous but unfair in the context of the growth model underlying this policy.