



Submission

Dunedin City Council
2021-31 Long Term Plan

Connecting People & Advancing Business

www.otagochamber.co.nz

INTRODUCTION

1. The Otago Chamber of Commerce welcomes the opportunity to provide a submission on the proposed Dunedin City Council's 2021-31 Long Term Plan. The Chamber has consistently worked to ensure the business community has a voice in council matters, and long term plans are an essential part of this.
2. We provide constructive comments on the positive initiatives and what changes we would like to see in the final Long Term Plan document. These are based on a range of research, member surveys, and our observations and expectations from our member base. We also provide some recommendations to the Council for amendments to this draft LTP to meet the Council's vision.
3. The Chamber would welcome the opportunity to discuss this submission with the Council.

ABOUT THE CHAMBER

4. The Chamber is a membership based service organisation that has been the home and voice of business in the Otago region¹ since 1861. It offers business and business people a range of services and advocacy, as we are dedicated to promoting and actively encouraging business growth and opportunity throughout the Otago region.
5. Comprised of over 950 members, the Chamber actively provides information, advocacy and support for business, connecting members through networking events and functions, and developing capability and skills through our training workshops and programmes.
6. We also advocate and offer a voice for business concerns and submit on behalf of members on local and national government policy. Representation occurs on behalf of a broad cross-section of business demographics including size, location and industry type, with the full range from small businesses through to large employers and stakeholders in the region.

SUMMARY

7. We are pleased to make a submission on behalf of our members, including those in the Dunedin City area. Overall, the Chamber supports the Council's purpose for "*our great small city*" to have offer its' citizens a great quality of life and the intention to ensure it continues to be an attractive and interesting place to live and visit, with a continuing focus on promoting growth and opportunities over the next 10 years.
8. Recognising in the plan that Dunedin has moved from a low to higher growth city is timely, given the changes seen over recent years and projections for the future. As a city we need to start looking forwards and celebrating what makes our place special. Dunedin has much to offer and the future for the city is bright. We need to recognise

¹ There are two chambers operating within the Queenstown Lakes District Council area ie. Queenstown Chamber of Commerce and Ignite Wanaka.

and value our heritage whilst embracing the opportunities offered by the new world. A world in which people can work almost anywhere, where working hours are more fluid and working from home is an option for many. Dunedin offers real value as a lifestyle destination and many are now starting to make this choice.

9. We are aware that infrastructure in the city needs a significant investment. It is therefore appropriate this plan focusses on improving what we already have whilst supporting continued growth. We believe that growth needs to be sustainable both in the environmental and in the economic sense, so planning for this is important. However we would have liked to see a more aspirational plan, with a clear vision for the future which recognises and grows the city's potential as a lifestyle destination of choice.

10. The Chamber welcomes:

- a. The focus on investing in the city and keeping services running.
- b. Support for businesses in the city promoting growth and attracting employees to live and work in the area. Proposed initiatives spread across the city, including South Dunedin, Mosgiel, the Peninsula and local communities recognising the importance of nurturing and sustaining these local communities.
- c. Priority being given to asset and infrastructure maintenance and development to ensure investment for the long-term future, including the investment in the transport network and parking improvements.
- d. We agree with the need to plan for our growing population to address a lack of housing options, this will help enhance the economic development of the city, including filling the increasing number of jobs on offer.

11. We would like to see the following reflected in the final LTP document:

- a. An ongoing commitment to finding efficiencies in current spending.
- b. Collaboration, innovation and partnerships with the business community.
- c. Intent to minimise administrative 'red tape' and keep costs down, particularly in light of those impacted due to COVID-19.
- d. Provision of central city carparks - this is a significant issue that is not covered in the plan. The impact for businesses cannot be underestimated.
- e. Improved recycling options in the city centre, given the mix of commercial and residential with little or no recycling options available. Further discussions would be required to find solutions.

12. The Chamber would also like to see:

- a. Further discussions happen in the business community to fully understand the implications of the financial strategy and rating system, with the potential to review other financial solutions.
- b. Businesses within the city being given the opportunity have a role in providing the labour, skills and expertise to undertake work in council priority areas and other projects, whether that be in a one-off or ongoing regular basis.
- c. How the Council plans to do things differently to create growth opportunities. The Chamber is concerned the current draft plan does not describe how this will happen. What projects / services is the Council going to stop, merge or redesign?

- d. Brave decisions to ensure value and sustainability for commercial ratepayers, and residential ratepayers, as many business owners operate the business of out of their own homes. Do it once and do it right is a common theme for Chamber members.

FEEDBACK ON PROPOSALS

13. The Chamber has the following feedback on the proposed projects and options as detailed in *The Future of Us* consultation document. Members were surveyed to get their feedback on the range of options.

14. Note, member comments are highlighted in italics below.

Issue	Feedback
Financial strategy	<p>58% do not support the Council's financial strategy which will allow the Council to borrow up to \$880M to cover the costs of infrastructure improvements over the next 10 years.</p> <p>Whilst it is absolutely critical to spend on infrastructure and invest in the future, and some debt funding might be appropriate, the size of debt is of concern.</p>
Rates	<p>The majority do not support the proposed rates increases.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Given that we are still in uncharted waters with COVID, rate increases of this magnitude are not appropriate.</i> - <i>Rate increase plus debt increases are too high. Spending needs to be contained to better balance available financial resources. High rate increases plus shifting spend on to future generations through increasing debt.</i> - <i>As a business owner I cannot lift my margins by 9%. Likewise wages do not increase by 9%. We all must work with-in our own budgets and so should the council. Adding cycleways at \$m or other expenditure that has no benefit overall to the city and just an unnecessary cost that increase costs for all rate payers.</i>
Kerbside recycling	<p>54% support for Option 1, 31% Option 2 and 15% do not support either option.</p> <p>Perhaps there could be alternative options considered, such as Option 2 plus an optional weekly food waste. Whilst food waste is important, some households already compost, so this could be a service residents can opt for and pay for this service.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The more we can focus the responsibility at the source the better. Everyone needs to be their bit.</i> - <i>A new red bin will replace our commercial wheelie bin, so no change for us as long as Council service is not more expensive. I don't see garden or food waste working however well-intentioned the proposal might be.</i> - <i>No room for need for 4 bins. People can pay a private company for the extra if they want it</i> - <i>Food waste bins are dreadful. Also 4 bins too many for lots of properties to store. Good to have a red general waste bin to remove</i>

	<p><i>the black bags that get attached by seagulls leaving an unhygienic mess in the streets</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Rubbish is dropped all over the city, partially because the council has removed public rubbish bins to force people to pay for the councils rubbish collection costs. Uniform charge for rubbish collection so no financial incentive not to use it.</i> - <i>Option 1 is good with the added a BIG green lid for garden and red for general waste, but i feel strongly against seeing the blue bins filled with smelly alcohol bottles in every street. It frankly is an embarrassment to this town to showcase the current alcohol culture and make everyone see it and smell it.</i>
<p>City centre recycling</p>	<p>There is nothing in the plan about kerbside recycling in the city centre. Currently rubbish bags are collected daily in the city centre – would this be replaced by a red rubbish bin?</p> <p>Also, there is a mix of commercial and residential in the city centre, and currently no, or little recycling available in some areas. The Chamber supports further discussions on recycling options in the city centre as 77% of members would like to see it available.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>It is crazy not to have it, given what is generated in our business - we take it home to our personal bins</i> - <i>Need more hubs for recycling collection i.e. Cardboard and Glass which currently often ends up in general waste</i> - <i>Since cardboard collection removed, we have not used the 'cardboard recycling' since - too dangerous for our staff to be carrying cardboard across 2 busy streets several blocks away</i> - <i>But with reservations as glass and recycling rubbish could become a target for alcohol affected people</i> - <i>Everything should go into bigger city bins that can take a whole building load.</i>
<p>Harbour arterial improvements</p>	<p>80% support for the proposal to complete the harbour arterial route so traffic has an alternative route which bypasses the central city.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>A diversion for heavy traffic should always be available in any modern city.</i> - <i>Provided trucks are required to use it and Strathallan street traffic flows are improved.</i> - <i>I don't disagree that having heavy traffic running through Dunedin is an issue. The two way street system was introduced some time ago to counter the effect of a major highway literally going through the centre of the city. This is always going to be an issue, narrowing these roads with cycle ways, removing much needed parking has only made the issues worse. The roads you are suggesting as a by-pass are already busy roads.</i> - <i>With the hospital coming we will have to have something like this.</i> - <i>There are also other issues with more traffic flowing through the city. Health and Safety for students crossing the one way system. Tunnels under the road would help the flow of traffic as well. It works in other cities.</i> - <i>It is not clear how the increase in volumes would be handled- already congested at peak times.</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Depends on the one way system in both directions and number of lanes.</i> - <i>Sheep trucks going through the main street is not a great site or smell</i> - <i>All this does is shift congestion from the inner city to the arterial. Traffic congestion in the proposed arterial route is already severe with major backups and delays at peak times this proposal compounds it.</i>
<p>Central city parking improvements</p>	<p>There is support for city parking improvements. However, it is evenly split between “Electronic signs showing where and how many parks are available across the city” and “Expanding paid parking areas in the central city area”.</p> <p>Whilst we understand the intent may be to encourage people to use alternate forms of transport in the future, the alternatives are currently a long way off substituting for the convenience of car travel.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>None of the above. There simply needs to be more parking opportunities available. The more conveniently accessible is the CBD, the more the business hub will retain its vitality and vigour. This is especially so with regard to folk from outside Dunedin who chose (or who might chose) to spend their dollars here</i> - <i>Believe the benefit may be too little to warrant the cost</i> - <i>Parking around university is a joke, pay and display and lack of parking spaces make it impossible for most to find parks</i> - <i>I think on-site hospital parking is essential.</i> - <i>There is nowhere near enough parking in the city. It is a major issue. Electric cars will still need to park somewhere.</i> - <i>More parks are needed. Technology is sufficiently available to not require further funding from council</i> - <i>More parking required for workers</i> - <i>None of these options will improve the current position.</i> - <i>The problem is lack of parking and the above options do not address this</i> - <i>Electronic signs showing there are no parks in the city seems a waste of time. The lack of parking is the issue, the city has been in a quiet patch with Covid but without forethought the centre of Dunedin could die without more parking. The same with technology the issue is simply lack of parking!!!</i> - <i>Build a parking building</i> - <i>The problem is the council, by its actions has removed parks from the centre city. This appears to be aimed at removal of cars from the city. This is unrealistic in a city this size and density. Build more car parks, improve street parking, and stop using financial penalties to try to drive cars out of the centre city. They will only succeed in driving PEOPLE from the centre city.</i> - <i>As a business who operates out of the CBD, when I have to go into the CBD, it is hard to get parking and it really is a dis-incentive to have a business in Dunedin</i> - <i>We should have extra high rise parking in town if we want to have a main street area vibrant</i> - <i>Council has lagged in its planning and provision for car parking. What they propose does not address the chronic lack of carparks. Provision for a multi-storey carpark should have been mandatory as</i>

	<p><i>part of the Hospital build. We have a likely parking crisis that Council has failed to address when it had the time to do so.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Sadly the council has removed many car parks across the city. I support cycle lanes but there needs to be a balance. A large carpark building on the site which the Cadbury social club was on would be great.</i> - <i>Car parking at a hospital is super important. Other cities have excellent parking for patients to be dropped off and for those visiting patients at the hospital. Our parking is diabolical at best.</i> - <i>technology won't increase the availability and number of parks</i> - <i>Parking should be incorporated into new building designs eg. new hospital and ACC building. There also needs to be more short term parking available in the City Centre</i>
<p>Park and ride facilities</p>	<p>The proposal is to provide parking so people can leave their cars and take an express bus into the city to reduce traffic congestions in the city, particularly at peak times. The responses to this proposal were mixed.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Parking will add additional costs to both the user and the rate payer (maintenance of buses + parking facilities). Who will use these facilities? What are the numbers? Is there enough support for this move?</i> - <i>I can't see Burnside working middle of nowhere.</i> - <i>Park and ride will suit some folk; those not on a tight time-table. It is inevitably going to be a ponderous way to travel, compared to the speed and convenience offered by the use of a car</i> - <i>Dunedin's congestion is not just from the south, an effective park and ride system would require car parings both at north and south of the city. In any case, the council should first work on facilitating a working public transport system that actually works for the city. In my opinion, public transport is virtually non-existing and I have to rely on my car. In other cities I did not even need one.</i> - <i>Council would have been best to upgrade and provide for short haul commuter trains from Mosgiel and Burnside that would have removed card from the road and reduced the pollution from the buses and the congestion that exists at the mess that is the bus hub.</i> - <i>Completely unnecessary for a 15min commute</i> - <i>Only following a successful trial. Mosgiel folk will need to use to justify a park and ride. Otherwise it becomes an expensive option and the funds could be better used. A fast transit time is essential.</i> - <i>Electric 8 person golf carts or similar in the city centre. Free taxi service with 0800 number. It works really well in Ljubljana in the pedestrian only area. And would be a great offer to our older population who rely on the bus hub but then have to walk a long way to go to appointments in central city.</i>
<p>Princes bus lane</p>	<p>69% are not in support this proposal of a separate bus lane along Princes Street, from South Road to Manse Street and then to Moray Place.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The main street lacks the space for such a provision and it further restricts through traffic with the corresponding impact on an already fragile retail sector.</i> - <i>Would it improve travel time for bus users?</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>This will make car travel in Princess Street impossible and I do a lot of business in Princess Street. It is hard enough to get car parking in this area and the Dowling Street Park will soon disappear.</i> - <i>Will just add to the appearance of a slow congested city which is already happening with inadequate traffic light facing</i> - <i>Too congested already - road too narrow to juggle cars/buses/cyclists</i>
<p>Central cycle and pedestrian improvements</p>	<p>The members were evenly split between “yes” and “no” for these initiatives. Whilst many strongly support the harbourside cycle lanes and the benefits these offer the city, less are in favour of extending the inner city cycle lanes due to design issues.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Option A – do it once and do it right</i> - <i>As long as traffic flow modelling is done first, and alternative vehicular routes freed up. It is critical that vehicle access to the new hospital precinct is kept at an optimal level (for staff, for visitors of patients, and for services)</i> - <i>Yes to the cycle way. No to the barnes dances, they create more congestion at peak hours than is necessary. Particularly at Frederick/George/Pitt/London Street in the mornings.</i> - <i>A poor use of rate payer money</i> - <i>There are too many cycleways and hardly ever see anyone using them.</i> - <i>Based on the previous work done on the one way system, which has caused many problems for pedestrians, rubbish collection, morning traffic and accidents caused by the concrete laid on the road, it’s an absolute no from me. In other places I would have said yes.</i> - <i>Ensure clear divisions between road users and cycle users please.</i> - <i>Cycle ways are in the wrong places, they need to build more for recreation, than in the centre of town disrupting traffic flows</i>
<p>Central City bike hubs – parking and facilities</p>	<p>While members did tick the locations of hubs listed where bikes can be stored, repaired and charged, the majority do not support, or are unsure of the proposals. It suggests that further consultation would be required to ascertain the demand for such services and whether the Council should be involved in the provision of these services. From a business perspective, these kinds of services could be provided by the private sector.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Not if it’s rate payer funded! If there is demand for such a service it can be a business if not it shouldn’t be done</i> - <i>Has anyone looked into the uptake? Doubt this will be supported</i> - <i>If the cycle lanes are anything to go by the lack of people using these would mean this was simply money spent for a small minority. Spend our money more wisely.</i> - <i>Bike hubs could also have bikes available to use, so that people can make last minute decisions to use bikes.</i> - <i>Note there is a lot of e-bike thefts happening in Wellington and Auckland, so if they are going to do this then there needs to be very good security for these facilities. We cannot seem to be able provide that even for the Bus hub if what I read in the ODT is correct.</i>

Performing arts venue	<p>There was not significant support for developing a new venue at this time. The consensus is the priority should be about investing in the essential infrastructure and maintenance.</p> <p>There are existing venues that should be being better utilised and private sector could take the lead in this area.</p>
Housing	<p>Whilst we didn't ask our members about community housing, we did get feedback that housing is a significant issue for the city.</p> <p>The Chamber supports any initiatives that make it easier for developers to build new accommodation or repurpose existing buildings. We also support changes to the Second Generation Dunedin City Plan to provide for more housing and intentions to extend services into areas that will be developed for housing.</p> <p>Members were asked two questions about housing development and a variety of answers were received – as set out in Appendix 1.</p>
Comments on other issues	<p>Not enough on commercial/business development. How will we keep current businesses and attract new ones?</p> <p>What are the plans for upgrading Princes St – currently this area looks unloved and unkempt. With some of our top hotels being located in this area it should be redeveloped into a vibrant and attractive part of the city.</p> <p>Stop talking and just do it. City needs to have all these acted upon and physically within next 1-3 years, or the region will stop financially growing and cause major sector issues with over priced homes, lack of wage parity, shortage of workers and higher costs once the hospital starts being built. Do it now don't take 5-10 years it's too late as we've spent last 40 years sitting back- the power of the moment is now and the moment of power and what a difference it will make to everyone's life</p>

CONCLUSION

15. The Chamber supports the Council's commitment to moving from a low to a higher growth city. We recognise that a strong infrastructure is important to support sustainable growth and that well considered new initiatives can bring multiple benefits to the city in the long term. We encourage the Council to be visionary and recognise all that the city can offer now and into the future.

16. This submission is submitted on the basis that it provides feedback and the opportunity to further engage with the council on a number of issues. We are committed to joining and working with the Council to achieve our shared objective of attracting and encouraging the development of business opportunities in Dunedin City.

17. Thank you again for the opportunity to submit. The Chamber would welcome the opportunity to discuss this submission with the Council.

Yours sincerely,

Nicky Aldridge

Acting Chief Executive Officer

APPENDIX 1 – Feedback on housing development

(Note: responses are listed in order as received and there is some repetition)

What could the Council be doing to make it easier for future housing development?

Enable areas for tiny homes to be located.

Rezoning industrial land and maybe time that Princess St is rezoned to residential to avoid empty retail shops.

Get rid of bureaucratic red tape and expenses and free up land and rules. Stop using land facilitation as a money-making scheme and provide an efficient and cost-effective service like normal business have too.

Sort out the speed in which permits are given and slowing down the process of building.

Releasing more land for development.

Identifying areas where infill could work without damaging the environment and neighbourhood. Ensuring the infrastructure required is developed before any building takes place

The rental market is unaffordable and there is a need for more social housing for renters

Streamlined consenting process

Reduce your prices for development, less bureaucracy would be a good start

Encouraging high-rise options in the centre city

Focus on improvement of student housing and densification of student population to allow for residential non student housing

Utilising city properties that are run down and ensuring they are renovated to a liveable standard. Looking at the wastage in areas and developing these areas.

Make it easier to get consent

Different departments could actually work with each other. I attending a meeting on the 2GP and several questions were answered with "that's another department". Ridiculous.

Allow more multi-level buildings in suburbs and central city.

1: think better about rubbish collection logistics, make the current system work first before adding more complexity. 2 start thinking about investing money on more effective bus routes and more buses, add council owned bikes and scooters to the mix and stop thinking about real estate solutions a bus lane for one bus every 1/2 hour is not the way. A car park on one side if the city is a narrow minded view. The city centre has already been crippled by the current provisions. Educate more people on recycling and composting, and get a true plastic recycling production line instead of destroying Brighton's environment with a new rubbish dump

Allowing residential owners to decide the size of the section. For example, I have land I cannot use (300 square metres) that is okay to build on in other areas but not mine. Why even have the rule? I appreciate we can't do case by case - too time consuming, but if there is access, and amenities available, why can't we? There are plenty of 65-100m square house plans available. This strategy we free up so much land for building on. Why should Developers have the opportunities and not individual home/land owners?

Ditch the proposed hugely excessive increases in development contributions

Sort out the short comings in the infrastructure, start who are preparing spend their own money to get subdivisions underway. The council's role is not to provide the housing but free up the land for development without the constant roadblocks

Faster easier consents. Allow sections to be subdivided to 350sm for small housing as our kids can't afford the average house now and mum and dad will have to help them where possible i.e Free section. Filling Landlords pockets for residential homes (Not students or U23s) is backward thinking. Create easier first home packages i.e initial rates relief for first home buyers with low compliance costs for them (Not the developers).

Reduce red tape.

Look at rezoning a section / sections of the wharf and commercial waterfront areas, incentivising modern and attractive apartment complexes with a mix of park and other communal spaces, weekend and evening focused businesses (food, entertainment, active pursuits)

Make land available, ease planning rules and reduce consent costs.

Encourage people to learn more building skills or sponsorship to study construction & builder courses.

Better resource consent and inspection processes.

Release more land. It is a supply issue. The New District plan is too restrictive and fly's in the face of reality.

Finding more land suitable for housing

More rezoning and loosen rules for repurposing of old buildings

Employ helpful people in the building consent area

Be socially selective as to where subdivisions are allowed. A lot of streets could not handle the increased loads of new residents and their vehicles. Have seen the outcome of this practice in Auckland in Papatoetoe and it created a mess with cars double parked on streets as residents had no additional space allowed in the sub divided original sections

Get the infrastructure in place for the next 50 years. We are lagging behind.

Improve traffic flow and parking into the city so it doesn't scare people to go and live outside of Dunedin Centre.

Building materials costs feel like buying gold. Allow more flexibility in the building codes and lower what you charge keeping owners from making small improvements to their homes.

Increase density

Open up land and place infrastructure in place and that will then generate development- same as what Christchurch did by building nearly 1,000 homes in just 3 years.

Partnering with developers to fast track infrastructure into new areas and set an ambitious target to make x amount of land available within x number of years, then fund it (national and local government).

Can you please suggest what parts of the city should be open for development?

Princess St, South Dunedin main street. WE need an area to build inner city apartments.

Clean up South Dunedin.

Not thought about it

Majority of inner suburbs

NOT the peninsula; is there more potential in Fairfield and out around the coastal townships; the hills around the back of Highcliff Road and Tomahawk - without encroaching into slippy sand hills

Waterfront

I suggest ripping out the town belt and filling it with state housing might be a good start.

Not specifically just make it easier if someone has a good idea

The first thing that needs to be sorted is the infrastructure. Until that is in place opening up more of the city is pointless. Mosgiel is very popular. However as I say the infrastructure needs significant improvement. We live a 5 minute drive from the centre of Mosgiel and are not serviced with water or wastewater. We have to collect rainwater or buy water, and we have a septic tank.

Macandrew Bay. St Clair. Caversham. Carlton Hill. Wakari. NEV.

South Dunedin

Waverley, Musselburgh, Tomahawk

No idea

Waikari Rd, Dalziel Rd

The harbour basin,

Sections over 850sq with a current dwelling allowing a smaller house. Parts of the peninsula where the landscape is not changed

Hilly areas of poor farmland should be the first residential option. Cheap flat good farmland should not. Central area should be available for high density including high rise, even at the cost of shading and loss of some views.

All except areas with heritage or recreational values.

North East valley, Taieri plains, Upper Half Way Bush, St Clair heights.

All of it.

New areas need developing for entry level housing and rental but allowing existing suburbs to be mass occupied will create many anti-social issues given the general age of the Dunedin populace

We have a housing shortage. Council should be encouraging development across the city. More action less bureaucracy is required

There are several pockets of land on the outskirts of various suburbs which are ripe for subdivision. Offering incentives to those land owners and taking them through the process if they need guidance.

Expand outside of city centre, not inside city centre

Feel South Dunedin and the harbour basing strip are holding the city down. Remove the ridiculous dog racing! Develop the beach front line. Remove all those factories and big footprint businesses from there. Make South Dunedin the new Soho.

Brockville top of hill across towards Abbotsford and back of Fairfield- could place nearly 4,000 homes in there.

Taieri Plain