

SUBMISSION ON THE DRAFT TRANSITION PLAN

Do you have any views on the powers and provisions that will be needed in the new legislation to support regeneration? (see chapter 3 for more information):

We are strongly of the view that these powers and provisions should be subject to the following limitations:

- Execution of Powers under the Act - should no longer rest with a single Minister but include a minimum of three Ministers from within Cabinet.
- Legal Framework for Land Ownership – The powers currently held by CERA’s Chief Executive to acquire, hold, mortgage, lease, dispose of, amalgamate, subdivide, improve and develop land on behalf of the Crown should NOT continue to be available to the Crown UNLESS they are consistent with and enable the implementation of a vision for the lands as a whole that is agreed and shared with the communities of greater Christchurch. *That is, no actions of the Crown should be allowed to compromise or prevent future uses of the residential red zone lands UNLESS with the agreement of the communities of Greater Christchurch.*
- Access Restrictions – that from April 2016, and *by default*, flatland residential red zone lands will have full and free public access. Any residual health and safety issues that relate to any specific sites within the lands must be clearly identified and contained to justify any access restrictions through a process that involves community consultation. *It is imperative for the wellbeing of communities that there exists a right of free access to the flat land residential red zone lands as soon as practically possible and certainly by April 2016.*
- Community Forum – The Community Forum is not representative, accountable to communities, effective, or allowed to be fully transparent in its deliberations and as such is not an appropriate vehicle for meaningful community participation in decision making processes. *Other vehicles modelled on international best practice must be implemented for meaningfully engaging communities in decision making – without this then the truism acknowledged within the draft plan will not be achievable: “International research shows that, for recovery to be sustainable in the long term, it needs to be ‘owned’ and led by local communities and institutions.”*

Do you think that the proposed new arrangements for the central city will create the ‘step change’ needed to drive business confidence and investment in the central city? (see chapter 5 for more information): No

Why or why not?

The proposed new arrangements in themselves will not drive business confidence and investment in the city:

- UNLESS: They align with a shared vision for the city that is clearly defined, transparent, ‘owned’, reviewed and reaffirmed regularly by the people of Greater Christchurch. To be sustainable and effective the regeneration framework must be well-grounded in an agreed set of guiding principles and visions for the city derived through robust iterative community engagement processes that are continually reviewed, tested and evolved over time (Share-an-Idea was an example of such effective engagement at one point in the process – unfortunately to date the only point).
- UNLESS: Central Christchurch is seen in the context of Greater Christchurch as a whole. By treating the central city as a special case the plan silo’s this off and disconnects it from the recovery of the remainder of the city and leads to non-sustainable recovery. As an analogy –

the small stretch of the Ōtākaro/Avon River within the four Avenues has been singled out for restoration yet unless this is undertaken in the context of the whole catchment – both upstream and downstream - it will prove an expensive and ultimately futile exercise - an unsustainable PR initiative. A holistic, integrated vision for the *whole* city is required for efficacious regeneration of the central city and beyond.

Are there any other changes needed to build confidence and encourage investment in the central city rebuild?:

YES – To be effective it must encompass a multiple bottom line approach not be based on commercial drivers alone. The draft plan acknowledges the need for both commercial acumen AND public good. It is our contention that the latter will not be achieved unless investors consider social, cultural and environmental recovery drivers along with commercial ones, only then will any investment be economically sustainable.

What are your views on the proposal for regular monitoring and public reporting on priority areas in order to hold agencies accountable for addressing recovery issues? (see chapter 8 for more information):

We agree with this approach in principle with the following qualifications:

- Any such reporting needs to be made fully public, transparent, accessible (simple to understand) and without any PR spin – accountability needs to be to the people of Greater Christchurch first and foremost;
- Reported data must be accurate, robust, relevant, unprocessed (un-sanitised) and sufficiently granular to be meaningful – too often wellbeing statistics for example are averaged across the whole city which disguises local pockets with very different profiles: recovery within Greater Christchurch is very locality specific, this must be recognised when collecting data and reporting back;
- Priorities must also, and separately, include measures of cultural and environmental regeneration.
- Reporting back must be regular – at least annually.

In your opinion, is there a better way to report on these recovery issues?:

Yes, they must consider and implement the above qualifications.

Any other comments:

It is our view that the recovery to date has been done **to** communities or at best **for** communities; it is now time for a 'step-change' and start the regeneration **with** and **by** communities. In short, the recovery now needs to be **locally driven**.

The proposed continuance of access restrictions to flat land red zone lands is a good analogy here: for the past 4-5 years we have been locked out of these lands that are on our back door step – an integral part of our communities. These are no-go areas that we venture into under threat of trespass or arrest. Communities have also been locked out of their own recoveries in the same way.

Communities have gradually disengaged with their own recoveries as they have become increasingly disempowered and disillusioned - with very significant impacts on wellbeing at individual, family and community levels. *This is not a result of the earthquakes; it is a result of the agencies' response to*

the earthquakes. It is now time to review how this can be addressed – we can do better than this, we *must* do better than this.

The transitional arrangements must allow for the creation of environments and mechanisms for ideas, innovations and opportunities to flourish, for clarity about decisions and regulatory requirements and for the option to revise, adapt, stage and/or scale future key design elements (eg ‘anchor projects’) according to iterative community feedback on the basis of all the latest information to hand.

We acknowledge that Central Government has invested considerable public monies in the red zoning processes and must be significantly involved in decision making processes with regard to this land.

However we also acknowledge the enormous lifetime investment communities have in these lands and the environments in which they lie. It is time that central government also acknowledged the latter and enabled local people a meaningful, accessible, inclusive and influential say in the future of these lands so that they become once again an integral part of our communities rather than simply part of the Crown estate.

Personal details

These fields are optional.

Name: Evan Smith on behalf of Avon-Ōtākaro Network

Address:

Email: evan.smith@vodafone.co.nz

Resident of: Christchurch City