Appendix A: Responses to Specific Questions

1. Can Christchurch City Council override, reverse, amend or quash the Community Board's decision?

No

For this matter, the Council has formally delegated decision-making authority to the Community Board. The Board is responsible for considering submissions and other relevant information before making its decision. Decisions made under a formal delegation are not ordinarily overturned simply because a different view may be held elsewhere.

There are some implementation decisions, such as future budget decisions, that sit outside the Community Board's delegation and may require separate Council decisions.

2. Will the staff report be independently peer reviewed to ensure its accuracy and lack of prejudice?

No.

The Council considers the consultation process extensive and robust. Staff analyse all public feedback neutrally. The Community Board evaluates staff advice alongside all public submissions and is not bound to adopt staff recommendations. It will reach its own conclusions.

3. Why did Council withhold the option of selling part or all of the site at the start of consultation, and how does the possibility of sale affect the consultation process?

Option boundaries were not withheld. The initial consultation materials explicitly stated: *"Some land use options for the site could require the sale of land, either partially or wholly, and a Council decision would be needed for this."* Statements made by staff and consultants that "anything is possible" reflected an open option set, not a predetermined decision to sell or develop. No decision[1] has been made regarding future ownership, tenure, or use of any part of the site. The purpose of consultation is to seek feedback on a range of possible future uses.

[1] With exception of retaining the butchery shop.

The Community Board's consideration of the matter on 7 December will consider the feedback received through the consultation process, including views expressed on ownership, retention, disposal of land, and future use options. The Board will make its decision having regard to the feedback and other relevant information before it.

4. If the land were sold for housing, would Council require housing outcomes through conditions or covenants?

The Council retains the ability to apply legal conditions or covenants to sale agreements. If the Community Board specifies defined housing outcomes, appropriate contractual terms will be included. Preferences regarding housing models can be submitted through the consultation process.

5. If the land were sold, would proceeds fund site improvements?

Standard Council practice directs net property sale proceeds to general debt reduction. Ring fencing proceeds for site-specific works requires an explicit Council resolution. Essential maintenance is funded through general portfolio budgets. Major capital works require allocation through the 2027–2037 Long-Term Plan.

6. Has Council consulted a conservation architect or heritage experts regarding the annex and heritage values?

No, not at this stage.

Should the Community Board determine that changes to the annex are required to facilitate its preferred future use for the site, appropriate heritage assessments would be commissioned as required to support future decision making and statutory processes.

7. If tenants are required to relocate, will Council provide alternative accommodation?

No decision has been made requiring tenant relocation.

Should the Community Board support an option that affects existing tenants, the Council would engage with affected tenants as part of implementation planning.

The Toy Library and L'Op Shop could remain within retained rooms. The Council would also work with the Community Arts Council to assist with alternative accommodation if required.

8. Has Council commissioned internal or independent heritage reports regarding the significance of the site?

Heritage values have been considered; however, no specialist reports have been commissioned at this time.

The key decision currently before the Community Board concerns the future use of the site.

Further specialist reports would be commissioned if required to implement the Community Board's eventual decision.

9. Why was Ngāi Tahu allocated a full page without equivalent reference to European cultural values?

The dedicated content outlining mana whenua cultural and historical values reflects the Council's commitment to working with mana whenua and recognising Māori cultural wellbeing and heritage interests.

It is also reasonable to recognise that the site is located within a historic area and that European, French, British, industrial, and local heritage values contribute to the identity and character of Akaroa. On that basis I find that your concern regarding contextual completeness is valid. While the primary purpose of the consultation is to determine the future use of the site, heritage values remain relevant considerations because they help inform community expectations, place identity, and future development opportunities.

Notwithstanding that finding, the consultation process has enabled community members to raise these matters[2]. Feedback relating to heritage values now forms part of the information available to decision makers and can be considered by the Community Board when determining the future use of the site.

The concern is therefore a reasonable comment on the completeness of contextual information presented in the consultation material. It does not, however, demonstrate a failure of the consultation process.

[2] Feedback on heritage values has been sighted as part of reviewing this complaint.

10. Does the Butchery building have a current Code Compliance Certificate and is it compliant with health and safety requirements?

Yes.

The building has a current Code Compliance Certificate and remains occupied and operational.

The Council continues to meet its obligations as landlord and has undertaken maintenance within available budgets, with priority given to safety, compliance, weather-tightness, and operational matters.

The Council recently received a draft independent condition assessment, which found the building to be generally in fair condition for its age. The assessment identified several maintenance and renewal requirements, including some specific health and safety improvements, but did not conclude that the building is unsafe or unfit for occupation. Once the final report is received, it will form the basis of future Long Term Plan bids.

Additional maintenance work had already been authorised, including roof repairs, replacement roofing, guttering repairs, and other building improvements intended to address recurring issues and improve the ongoing condition of the asset.