

7. KEEP CHRISTCHURCH BEAUTIFUL

Officer responsible Director of Policy	Author Terence Moody, DDI 941-8834
--	--

The purpose of this report is to advise of the matter of future funding of the Keep Christchurch Beautiful campaign by the Council and suggest criteria for such funding.

CONTEXT

The Committee received a report in June 2002 seeking funding be granted on a three year basis for the Keep Christchurch Beautiful campaign activities to allow it more certainty in planning its future activities. It was decided that as this was a community organisation that received grant money it should be included within the Community Funds Review process. This process has now been undertaken and the recommendations in relation to Keep Christchurch Beautiful are as follows:

That Keep Christchurch Beautiful funding (currently held in the Policy Directorate budget) is transferred to Major Grants as a line item.

That Keep Christchurch Beautiful funding is reviewed after one year. It is also recommended that such a review will include the Council's employment of the co-ordinator and the appropriateness of continued funding if proper legal status has not been gained.

The report states:

It appears that clarification of the relationships between KCB and the Council is required. That is, if KCB receives grants funds, then a single grant could be made to KCB through an appropriate community funding stream. If, however, the Council is contracting KCB to achieve outputs for the Council, then the Council could consider whether this is being achieved in the most effective way. A combination of these two outcomes is also possible. After discussion with the parties involved, the review has concluded that the Council intends KCB to receive grants funds, and so these should be structured accordingly. Consideration should also be given (in the further review) to the role of the KCB co-ordinator, and whether it is appropriate to ring-fence Council salary funding for the co-ordinator of an external organisation (see recommendation 2.4 - That grant funds are not used to employ Council staff or support Council projects).

The above recommendation acknowledges that KCB may wish to seek legal status (and the Chairperson has indicated that this would be a straightforward matter). It seems appropriate to allow sufficient time for this to occur, and for KCB to have adequate notice of a possible change in its relationship with the Council.¹

It is considered this is appropriate at this time in the development of the relationship with the City Council as it has become apparent that the campaign members are feeling constrained by having to refer matters to officers of the Council for financial approval. In order for an orderly transition to a stand alone community group to occur it is considered that the decision on the matter should be made by the beginning of the 2003/04 year. This is important as currently the co-ordinator is employed on a fixed term contract which finishes on 30 June 2003.

BACKGROUND

It is considered that the history of the relationship be set out in order that the above changes that are suggested can be placed in an appropriate context and that the expectations of the relationship in the future can be clearly stated for monitoring any funding granted.

There has been, in one form or another, a voluntary organisation with its major purpose the reduction of litter and littering behaviour in the city since the late 1960s. Besides the major purpose of these organisations being similar they have all relied largely on voluntary community-based persons to undertake the work in the community. They have also been supported to a greater or lesser degree by local authorities in the area by the provision of both support services and direct finance.

These groupings arose from the concern over what was seen as the growing problem of litter and the formation of the National Anti-Litter Campaign Council by the then Government in 1967. In 1968 the then Chairman of the former City Council's Bylaw, Finance and Departmental Committee (Councillor H P Smith) suggested:

¹ *Community Funding Review Summary Report, March 2003, recommendation 4.13*

The solution lies in getting a sufficiently large number of people to become anti-litter minded to the extent that not only will they take their own litter to some place where it will be properly dealt with in due course, but that they will be active in reminding others to do so.

This led to the formation of the Christchurch Civic Pride Committee which undertook education and publicity, and whose membership was representatives of the following organisations as well as councillors from the local authorities in the Christchurch area.

Women's Division Federated Farmers	Canterbury Federation PTA
National Council of Women	Town Women's Guild
Business and Professional Women's Club	Red Cross Society
Labour Representation Committee	Catholic Women's League
Canterbury Education Board	

The Litter Act 1968 made provision for a number of enforcement approaches to the litter problem and the requirement for public authorities to provide litterbins in public places. It also enabled local authorities to make grants to non-profit organisations whose principal objects include the abatement or prevention of litter.

The provisions of the Litter Act 1979 included the above provisions, and additionally, created the New Zealand Litter Control Council which was supported by Government to undertake educational and public relations activities to reduce littering behaviour and to change attitudes towards littering in New Zealand society. This Act also introduced the ability to appoint both Litter Control Officers and Litter Wardens, to require occupiers of private land to clear litter, and introduced the ability for local authorities to adopt infringement notice provisions. The New Zealand Litter Control Council (and the subsequently renamed Keep New Zealand Beautiful Inc) were originally funded by the Government and latter supported by industry, in particular the packaging industry, and included some representatives of local authorities among other groups. They operated out of Wellington and had a number of full and part-time staff. They introduced a nation wide sampling programme of litter counts at a number of selected sites to determine the effectiveness of local programmes and based on the American model *Keep America Beautiful*.

A 1985 amendment changed the name of the body primarily responsible for the promotion of litter control in New Zealand to Keep New Zealand Beautiful Incorporated. This followed the adaptation, and piloting, of an American "Clean Community" programme that led into the "Beautiful Cities" and "Beautiful Towns" community based programmes. These programmes as introduced had led to significant measurable reductions in littering (as measured by litter counts) in the areas they were operating. The now Keep New Zealand Beautiful Society had produced a manual to be followed in operating both the "Beautiful Cities" and "Beautiful Towns" programmes and had provided training for co-ordinators operating in such areas.

There were changes to the organisation of the Keep New Zealand Beautiful Society in the 1992/93 year. With the reduction in Government funding of the organisation there was a relocation of the office to Auckland and industry, through the Packaging Industry Council Inc, was underwriting the activities of the society. It still operated with a full time co-ordinator who was paid for by the industry members. There were two local authority representatives on the Board of Management.

Later the industry funding was withdrawn, and with little central government input, the Society continued to operate on a limited basis largely funded by the membership fees paid by the various local campaigns. There have been further changes since then and as a lead organisation, for a period at least, its role appeared to have further diminished. In 2001 the Society published a document *Strategic Goals 2001/02*² which included the strategic goals for the 2001/02 period.

From the above it seems that KNZB is attempting to regain its pre-eminence on a national basis as leading the anti litter groupings that are operated through the local campaigns such as Keep Christchurch Beautiful. The Chairperson of Keep Christchurch Beautiful is a member of the Board and through her efforts arranged the national conference of KNZB in Christchurch in 2002.

On a national level some confusion has been caused in recent years by the formation of the Clean Up New Zealand Trust, an apparently well-funded organisation that was formed to undertake the New Zealand *Clean up the World* week. This organisation is operating with the support of the international organisation Clean Up the World Trust that operates out of Sydney, Australia and is supported by a number of national organisations and the United Nations.

² *Strategic Goals 2001/02*, Keep New Zealand Beautiful Society Inc, Manawatu District Council, Fielding, May 2001
Community and Leisure Committee Agenda 5 May 2003

THE KEEP CHRISTCHURCH BEAUTIFUL CAMPAIGN

In 1988 Keep New Zealand Beautiful Inc published the Beautiful Cities Programme³ that set out criteria for implementing such programmes in cities. It was based on work undertaken in the USA by Keep America Beautiful and covered matters formerly undertaken through Clean Community Programmes. Subject to programme sites meeting the criteria these sites would be granted official recognition by Keep New Zealand Beautiful Inc. Continued recognition relied on compliance with the procedures and methods of the programme.

The purpose of the Beautiful Cities Programme was to:

- Change people's attitudes and behaviour towards littering and the handling of solid waste.
- Encourage citizens to participate in beautification projects and to undertake ongoing responsibility for the care and upkeep of these projects.
- Develop in citizens a pride in their home, street, city and country.

It was stated that the programme was *a goal-oriented campaign designed to achieve sustained results through changed attitudes. A simple but systematic planning and evaluation system will ensure that your committee does not lose sight of its key objectives or become bogged down with projects to the detriment of a carefully structured programme.* This was the message contained in the publication.

Around the time of the major nationwide reorganisation of local authorities in 1989 the original programme was upgraded and changed.⁴ This called for a reorganisation of existing Beautiful Cities Programmes and while retaining the previous centralised structure, with four sub-committees remaining, the Community Organisations Committee was to be disbanded and Neighbourhood Committees formed. They then had representation on the central Executive through their chairpersons. It should be noted that KNZB still employed Field Officers who were able to provide advice and training for both the campaign members and co-ordinators at that time. In Christchurch the concept of forming Neighbourhood Committees was not as successful as hoped, although one in the Burwood/Pegasus Ward was extremely involved over a number of years.

At the time when a KCB Committee member was threatening legal action an opinion was sought as to the legal status of the Keep Christchurch Beautiful Campaign. This opinion from Buddle Findlay⁵ clearly states the following:

As the campaign is not an entity in its own right (i.e. not a trust, incorporated society or company) it does not have any legal status. It cannot own property such as intellectual property rights. It cannot be sued or sue in its own name. Obligations of the campaign will be incurred by the various individuals or organisations associated with it depending on the transaction in question and who represented the campaign at that time.

I note the constitution of the Keep New Zealand Beautiful Society (Inc) refers to membership being available to groups provided they are "bodies corporate". The campaign is not a "body corporate" and therefore is not a group member of the Keep New Zealand Beautiful Society (Inc). The City Council can be a government member of the Society but I am not certain whether it has applied for and holds such membership.

The fact that, at this time, the Keep Christchurch Beautiful Campaign does not exist as a legal entity means it must operate within the parameters applied by the Council, as it is that body which is legally responsible. It is understood some members of the campaign have found these restrictions constraining but these are necessary in a legal sense. For example KCB cannot enter into contracts in its own right but must rely on the Council to undertake these. Some clarity as to the legal situation in this regard if KCB became a legal entity but entered into contracts on the basis of receiving money from the Council is needed. There are procedures that must be undertaken before the Council may enter into a contract, and these include opening the contracts to competitive tendering in many cases and requiring the contracting organisation to have a health and safety plan and public liability insurance among other matters. This means that organisations such as KCB cannot operate in such selection processes but must rely on Council officers. The provisions of the Health and Safety in Employment Amendment Act 2002 requires that organisations that utilise the work of volunteers have a general duty of care to provide for their health and safety. If the volunteers perform work that is similar to employment the employer has additional responsibilities for hazard management, provision of protective equipment, information and accident management as if it was an employer/employee

³ Beautiful Cities Programme – A Keep New Zealand Beautiful Programme, Wellington, 1988 Edition

⁴ Beautiful Cities Programme – An Environmental Protection Programme from Keep New Zealand Beautiful Society (Inc.), Wellington, Rev. 09/89

⁵ Jane Montgomery, *ALB Litterbug – Keep Christchurch Beautiful*, Buddle Findlay, Christchurch, 27 February 2002

relationship. The situation in regard to KCB members will need to be assessed in relation to this matter.

CONCLUSIONS

The Keep Christchurch Beautiful Campaign, in its various forms, has provided a useful input into promoting the prevention of litter over the years it has been in existence. The major factor in the successes it has had is through its ability to generate community input into dealing with litter in the community. This was, and still is, the most important reason to continue funding this group from ratepayer funds. Historically the KCB Campaign has undertaken certain educational activities within primary schools, including the provision of booklets on litter and the Schools Environmental Education Programme (SEEP), both of which have some relevance to litter prevention and abatement. It may be useful to examine the idea of involving schools in measuring litter in their school grounds as a project to go along with SEEP. KCB could also look at how litter is to be managed in the EnviroSchools programme and comment on that and if it is good support that programme.

One of the key objectives of the Beautiful Cities Programme is to address the question of how to contain litter at its source. To this end one of the major operations of KCB could be to identify the various basic sources of litter so that these can be targeted and addressed. These seven sources of litter (eight are specified but one, marine litter, is probably not significant in this area) should be examined and measured or prioritise these for Christchurch. KCB could then come up with a plan of action in the community for each of the sources.

The Beautiful Cities Programme clearly intends that people in the community become involved. It is stated that in order to change the attitudes and behaviour of people towards littering and actively involve them in the programme the activity must extend to where people live. The programme must operate within that community supported by those living there. To this end a community survey should be undertaken to set objectives for that community. KCB should then develop projects in the areas in conjunction with residents and local businesses and assist their implementation.

KCB could be involved, as has happened in the past, with both the Clean Up the World and the Seaweed associated "Gigantic Beach Clean Up" but as these are operated by other outside organisations it is considered the local input at the present time should be through the Council itself.

Staff

- Recommendation:**
1. That the recommendations of the Community Funding Review as applicable to Keep Christchurch Beautiful be implemented from 1 July 2003.
 2. That the grant of \$24,000 provided for in the 2003/04 budget for Keep Christchurch Beautiful be transferred to Major Grants as a line item.
 3. That the Council continue to provide funding for a co-ordinator for the 2003/04 year until the first yearly review is completed and decisions be made as to the most appropriate unit to house such a position in the 2003/04 year.
 4. That a Memorandum of Understanding be developed with the Keep Christchurch Beautiful Campaign on the work they will undertake in the 2003/04 year and key indicators for this work. This would enable decisions as to future funding to be made for the 2004/05 year.

Chairman's

- Recommendation:** That the above recommendation be adopted.