

2. COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO BOARD SUBMISSION ON DRAFT 2004-14 LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLAN

Officer responsible Community Advocate	Author Tony Gemmill, DDI 941 6701
--	---

The following comments refer to the Board's submission, a copy of which is **attached** to this agenda.

i) INTRODUCTION – SUITABILITY OF DOCUMENT

In his introduction to the debate on the Plan at the Council meeting of 30 June, the Chairman of the Annual Plan Subcommittee acknowledged that there had been a number of submissions regarding the suitability of the document. Cr Jame's address included the following comment:

"Our first LTCCP did receive some criticisms as to its presentation, the lack of ability to contribute to the community outcomes and long term plans. However this is very much a transitional LTCCP and I am confident that, in 2006, a much improved LTCCP both as to presentation and content will be presented."

The Council's Strategic Adviser also commented as follows:

"Agreed. The next LTCCP will look very different. The intention is to write Volume 1 in a way that will be easy to read, with statutory considerations taking second place. Subsequent volumes will ensure the whole document complies with statute."

The intention of this years structure was to provide a summary in Volume 1, more detail in Volume 2 for those who wanted it, and detailed policies in Volume 3. This was explained on page 9 of the first volume, but perhaps not as clearly as it could have been."

ii) COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

More recently the Council's Community Plans Special Committee has evaluated the community outcomes process.

The Committee, and the Council, noted that the 2004/05 process was successful in developing a transitional plan within the timeframe and consultation limitations.

It was however also resolved (on 29 July) that:-

- "• the Council develop creative ways to ensure that the community can engage in the 2006/07 community outcomes process and discuss outcomes/priorities."*
- the process for developing community outcomes ensure elected members are appropriately involved."*
- that the LTCCP process be a mechanism for building ongoing relationships (not simply based around the task of developing community outcomes) to ensure that agencies are involved in identifying and implementing community outcomes."*

iii) RATE INCREASE PROJECTIONS

The Council adopted an overall rate increase of 3.61% for 2004/05 (rather than the 3.59% recommended by the Annual Plan Subcommittee).

Other adjustments have resulted in future projected increases being:- with the draft Plan projections shown for comparison.

Year	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
LTCCP Increase %	3.53	3.06	3.32	6.25	6.30	4.25
Draft Plan Increase %	(3.98)	(3.18)	(3.99)	(6.12)	(6.13)	(4.29)

Increases in rates from 2008/09 to 2010/11 are a reflection of the capital programme. The major drivers of the increase are the Ocean Outfall project (\$50m), the Civic Offices (\$53m), and the increased expenditure on transport/roading.

iv) UNIFORM ANNUAL GENERAL CHARGE

The Revenue and Finance Policy proposed in the draft LTCCP was adopted, except for changing the UAGC from \$105 to \$115.

v) USER CHARGES – MUSEUM AND ART GALLERY

The Council resolved “that a report be completed on the possible introduction of user charges at the Christchurch Art Gallery and the Canterbury Museum for the incoming Council in time for the 2005/06 Annual Plan”.

vi) CLEANLINESS OF STREETS/LITTER

The Council has not lowered the levels of service for street cleaning. The Sustainable Transport and Utilities Committee carried out a review of the levels of service in April 2004 and as a result an increase in the level of service for litter bin emptying and litter pick up has been accepted for the 2004/05 year.

The \$50,000 budgeted for anti-litter education has been deferred until the litter strategy has been adopted by the Council which will provide a co-ordinated way forward in dealing with litter.

vii) SAFER CHRISTCHURCH

This has not been specifically referred to. The Council has though confirmed the \$100,000 allocated toward this programme.

viii) LIBRARIES – OPENING HOURS

The Council resolved *“that the requests from the above (Fendalton/Waimairi and Burwood/Pegasus) Boards for additional funding (\$87,000) to be provided from 2004/05 for the Sunday opening of community libraries be approved, subject to resource consent being obtained, where required.”*

It was also resolved *“that staff report to the appropriate Standing Committee on the possibility of incorporating a café in the Fendalton Community Library”.*

ix) JELLIE PARK AQUALAND

The report to the Board, on the modification of the facility and the timing for the work, is still awaited.

Funding for the upgrade has been confirmed as follows:

Year	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07
Amount \$	1,500,000	4,000,000	690,850

x) DECENTRALISATION

The Facility Assets Manager commented as follows:

The nature/scope and locational attributes required of a new Civic Offices is yet to be determined and this will be through a consultative process which, no doubt, would include input from Community Boards. The costs and benefits of locational attributes of service delivery will need to be evaluated.

Funding for the new Civic Offices is presently allocated as follows:

Year	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09
Amount \$	2,274,970	7,994,970	13,032,500	13,280,000	14,936,980

xi) UNDERGROUNDING

The Council resolved that the requests from Community Boards, Combined Inner City Residents Group and the MOA Neighbourhood Committee and the other submitters for funding for the undergrounding of overhead reticulation be dealt with as follows:

- a) That \$200,000 per annum, inclusive of any Orion contribution, be provided from 2006/07 for undergrounding of overhead reticulation in narrow streets across the city unsuitable for alternative enhancement options.
- b) That the Sustainable Transport and Utilities Committee be requested to develop criteria for the allocation of this funding.
- c) That the remaining requests for additional funding provision for the undergrounding of overhead reticulation be declined.

xii) SOCIAL SUPPORT PROGRAMMES

It has been noted that the matter of central support for the Youth for Christ programmes and services (including the Youth Forever Club) is being considered by the Metropolitan Funding Subcommittee. At the time of drafting of this agenda the extent of any funding approved is unknown.

xiii) OUT OF SCHOOL PROGRAMMES

This matter was not specifically referred to.

It is however noted that the Council has, more recently, dealt with the report on the findings from the evaluation of Out of School Programmes.

In general terms the Council has resolved to continue to support Out of School programmes as an "effective way of meeting the policy goals and supporting children and their families". There is however now a resolution which requires the Council to advocate with Government for secure funding for this purpose.

The Council has also resolved on a number of ways in which the Council can be "more effective in achieving its policy goals of supporting children and families, and contributing to social wellbeing in Christchurch communities".

xiv) CONSULTATION WITH MAORI

This matter has not been specifically referred to in the Council's outcomes. On this basis the draft provision has been confirmed.

xv) YMCA – BISHOPDALE

At the Council's Annual Plan meeting a supplementary report from the Chairperson of the Metropolitan Funding Subcommittee was considered. A copy of this report is **attached** for information.

The Council resolved as follows:

- "1. That the Council provide funding of \$1million for 2004/05 only in the Long Term Council Community Plan to enable the Council to contribute towards a recreation and youth centre in Bishopdale.*
- 2. That the Council request staff to negotiate the provision of funds for the project as an equity investment.*
- 3. That the funds be provided from the Income Equalisation Reserve."*

xvi) VEHICLE ENTRANCEWAY RESEALING POLICY

This matter was not specifically referred to.

The proposed report back to the Sustainable Transport and Utilities Committee has not occurred at the time of drafting of this agenda.

xvii) NEW CAPITAL INITIATIVES

- Botanic Gardens
Funding for this initiative was confirmed.
- Flatwater Facility
The Council resolved as follows:

- "1. That the Council acknowledge that a new flat water facility is needed in or near Christchurch.*

2. *That the Council provide \$200,000 in 2004/05 for feasibility investigations on a preferred site for a flat water facility, not being Lake Isaac or any other site which would pose a risk to airport operations.*
3. *That the following capital funding provision be made for this facility:*

2005/06	\$600,000
2006/07	\$3,000,000
2007/08	\$3,600,000
2008/09	\$3,800,000
4. *That the Council become a partner in this project, through a trust to be formed.*
5. *That the Council formally express its sincere appreciation to Lady Isaac and the present trustees for their efforts to date in promoting this project, and that they be advised that the Council looks forward to working with them in the future to provide a flat water facility on another site."*

By way of further background, the Council's decision was assisted by a risk assessment report which concluded that the Lake Isaac proposal posed too great a risk of an unacceptable level of bird strike hazard at Christchurch International Airport.

- **Putrescibles Processing**

The Council's position from its draft Annual Plan meeting on 18 March 2004 was:

- "1. *That an enclosed compost plant be established from 2004/05 for processing food waste.*
2. *That food waste from **commercial** sources be collected for composting, with costs shared between the waste producer and the Council.*
3. *That a kerbside domestic kitchen food waste collection **not** be proceeded with at this stage, and not allowed for in the current budget.*
4. *That options for reducing both food waste and garden waste to landfill be further developed taking into account social, environmental, cultural and economic factors."*

The outcome from the Council's consideration at the meeting on 30 June was as follows:

- "1. *That the Council confirm its decision to construct an enclosed compost plant for processing commercial food waste with capital funding of \$300,000 in 2004/05 \$3,125,000 in 2005/06 and \$3,125,000 in 2006/07, and associated operating costs.*
2. *That the Council budget an additional \$125,000 in 2004/05 for undertaking an extended home composting and kerbside collection trial as described in the Technical Briefing Paper, Appendix 6.*
3. *That, based on recommendations 1 and 2, and on the submissions to the LTCCP, staff make appropriate changes to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan: Part 2 – Action Plan and bring the final document to the Council meeting on 26 August 2004.*
4. *That staff monitor and report to the Council on the outcomes of the voluntary kerbside collection at North Shore City Council proposed in their 2004/05 LTCCP".*

xviii) CAPITAL ENDOWMENT FUND

The Council resolved that the 70/30 ratio continue for 2004/05, 2005/06 and 2006/07, and be reviewed at that time.

It was also resolved "that the Council hold a seminar with representatives of the Canterbury Economic Development Fund to discuss the criteria for the allocation of funds, having regard also to the comments from the Canterbury Manufacturers Association."

xix) DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTION POLICY

There were a number of submissions received on this particular policy. A number of changes have resulted as an outcome.

xx) PARTNERSHIPS WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The Board's comment here has been referred to the Strategic Adviser for inclusion in the final LTCCP.

xxi) POLICY FOR DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE

The Council did not endorse the recommendation for listing the Capital Endowment Fund as a "strategic asset".

The Director of Strategic Investment commented that "some of the requirements of the policy are that there be clear transparency of reporting on the fund in the annual report and annual plan, and there must be an 80% vote in favour by the Council for any utilisation of the capital. Listing this fund as a significant asset would certainly make it more difficult for a future Council to dispose of the capital of the fund".

xxii) DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE

The Council has increased the "satisfaction" targets for the public's participation in decision making processes, and has agreed on a performance measure of 75% for the satisfaction, by the people of Christchurch, that the Council makes decisions in the best interests of the city.

The Council is looking to further improve its efforts at engaging with the community and expects to have a new consultation strategy completed early in the current financial year.

xxiii) METROPOLITAN CHRISTCHURCH TRANSPORT STATEMENT

It was resolved that no changes be made to the current stage 1 MCTS, with a number of suggested improvements to be addressed with the later work on the stage 2 version.

xxiv) PRESERVATION OF HERITAGE BUILDINGS

The Council resolved as follows:

- "a) That staff report to the Regulatory and Consents Committee on the promotion of a variation to the City Plan providing for the demolition of Group 1 and 2 buildings to be a prohibited activity; and*
- b) That the Council develop a heritage strategy within the next six months."*

xxv) RURAL RATEPAYERS CONCERNS

The Council set aside the implementation of the proposed changes and resolved, instead:

- "1. That those properties which were rated as rural in the 2003/04 rating year be rated as rural for the next 12 months.*
- 2. That a set of criteria be developed against which the "rural" nature of individual properties are measured.*
- 3. That the Council develop policy which clarifies the relationship between land use and rating type, including (but not limited to) the appropriate rating of properties in living zones when their use changes, either by way of resource consent or by permitted development, and considers criteria against which they could be measured".*

In later consideration (at the Council meeting on 1 July) it was resolved to amend the resolution to provide that the following rating units be excluded from those properties affected by the above resolution:

- those which change to "business"; and
- those which are zoned living and where there has been a recent change of use because of a new dwelling building consent.

Staff

Recommendation: That the outcomes from the Council's consideration of the Board's views, be received.