



Christchurch City Council

BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA NO 230

19 APRIL 2006

5.00 PM

IN THE BOARDROOM,
CNR BERESFORD AND UNION STREETS
NEW BRIGHTON

Community Board: Glenda Burt (Chairperson), Carole Evans, Carmen Hammond, Caroline Kellaway, Tina Lomax, Don Rowlands, Gail Sheriff

Community Board Principal Adviser
Clare Sullivan
Telephone: 941-6601
Fax: 941-6604
Email: clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz

Community Secretary
Graham Sutherland
Telephone: 941-6624
Fax: 941-6604
Email: graham.sutherland@ccc.govt.nz

- PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION
- PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION
- PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

- PART C 1. APOLOGIES
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF REPORT
- PART B 3. PETITIONS
- PART B 4. CORRESPONDENCE
 - PART B 4.1 Replacement Pine Tree Planting – South Brighton Domain
 - PART B 4.2 Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutaittrust
- PART B 5. RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS/COMMUNITY GROUPS
- PART B 6. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
- PART C 7. ADCOCK PARK DEVELOPMENT
- PART C 8. BROOMFIELD TERRACE CAR PARK DEVELOPMENT
- PART C 9. ROTHESAY ROAD CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN
- PART B 10. SOUTH NEW BRIGHTON PARK - BASKETBALL COURT UPGRADE
- PART A 11. ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2006/07
- PART B 12. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE
 - PART B 12.1 Committee and Working Party Membership
 - PART B 12.2 Notice of Upcoming Board Reports
 - PART B 12.3 2005/06 Project, Discretionary and Youth Development Funds Update
 - PART B 12.4 Transport & City Streets Quarterly Update to 31 March 2006

We're on the Web!

www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/



19. 4. 2006

- 2 -

- PART B 13. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ADVISER'S UPDATE**
- PART B 14. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS 2.16**
- PART B 15. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS 4.1**
- PART B 16. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF REPORT

The report of the ordinary meeting of the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board held on Wednesday 5 April 2006 has been circulated to Board members.

3. PETITIONS

4. CORRESPONDENCE

4.1 REPLACEMENT PINE TREE PLANTING – SOUTH NEW BRIGHTON DOMAIN

The attached letter was received from the South New Brighton Residents' Association regarding pine tree planting in South Brighton.

4.2 AVON-HEATHCOTE ESTUARY IHUTAI TRUST

The attached letter was received from the Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust thanking the Board for its support.

5. RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS/COMMUNITY GROUPS

Time is allocated at Board meetings for Residents' Association/Community Group representatives to address the Board on local matters. Each group is being invited to do this in rotation.

The attendees for this meeting will be confirmed.

6. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**7. ADCOCK PARK DEVELOPMENT**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Greenspace Manager
Author:	Kim Swarbrick

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1 The purpose of this report is:

- (a) To seek Community Board approval to proceed with the amended concept plan for Adcock Park.
- (b) To approve the name change to Arthur Adcock Memorial Reserve.
- (c) To approve that the memorial tree and plaque to Arthur Adcock remain in their existing location.
- (d) To seek Community Board contribution of \$4,000 to complete the shared boundary fence with Parklands School.
- (e) To seek Community Board approval for the removal of four identified trees.

(Refer attachments)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**Adcock Park Development Plan**

2. The vision for Adcock Park by Council staff is to cherish and maintain the unique natural sand dune character that this environment has to offer. There are no naturally contoured parks elsewhere in the Burwood/Pegasus Ward. There are however many flat grassed parks for recreation opportunities already existing in the Burwood/Pegasus ward. Council officers would consider it a shame to have Adcock Park levelled out.

Funding has been allocated in the current financial year to carry out additional landscape enhancement at Adcock Park. Public information leaflets were posted on an on-site notice-board and distributed to approximately 120 local residential households in April 2005 inviting feedback on the proposal. A total of 23 submissions were received, with 22 supporting the proposed concept plan and one opposing it.

3. In recognition of feedback received, the Greenspace Unit proposes to undertake the following work and minor alterations to the original plan.

- Extending footpath planting beyond the row of bollards along Bottle Lake Drive to reduce mowing maintenance around bollards.
- Leaving the sand dune along Bottle Lake Drive as a grassed area instead of proposed planting, on top, in order to allow for better views into the reserve.
- Not planting large trees within the right of way access on Linkwater Way and grassing one side of it.
- Re-contouring the mound to provide outdoor classroom opportunities.
- Section of school fence to be replaced with see through fence and lockable gate, increasing visibility into park from the school.

- Opening up mounds on pathway at Northern end of Bottle Lake Drive.
 - Lower vegetation species along North East boundary to maintain existing neighbours view into park.
 - Realignment of the proposed pathway to meet Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) safety audit recommendations.
 - Removal of designated trees identified in the tree survey and safety audit.
4. The one submission opposed to the plan had concerns about visibility into the reserve over the sand dune from the road frontage along Bottle Lake Drive. Three other respondents happy with the overall plan also made mention of the sand dune heights. Only one of those was specific to the Bottle Lake Drive sand dune. In response a safety audit has been carried out in relation to sand dune height in terms of visibility, impacts, and safer park issues. The outcome of this was that current mound contours do not compromise safety of park users and any further alterations to the mounds and ground contours is unnecessary. The safety audit did advise pathway realignment closer to the apex of the natural contours. Minor changes have been implemented to the landscape plan to accommodate this recommendation. A further recommendation of the safety audit was for a tree survey to be completed which is addressed later in this report.

Re-naming of Adcock Park

5. The Burwood/Pegasus Community Board on June 2005 requested a name change for Adcock Park. The Park was originally named after Arthur Adcock who was a long serving councillor of the Waimairi District Council. The Community Board feels that changing the name to Arthur Adcock Memorial Reserve would better reflect the person it was named after and acknowledge his contribution to parks. Arthur Adcock's descendants have been consulted and are happy for the renaming to proceed, on the condition, that a memorial plaque be installed to distinguish the relevance of the name. Council Officers have discussed this with immediate family and are happy to oblige with a rock and plaque to be installed at the pathway junction.

Relocation of Memorial Tree

6. The Burwood/Pegasus Community Board on June 2005 requested that the Arthur Adcock Memorial tree be considered for relocation to the Arthur Adcock Memorial Reserve. The tree and its plaque are currently located at the West side of the Parklands Community Centre, Queenspark Drive. The move would be subject to the adoption of the name change being accepted and would need to be implemented in the 2006/07 planting season. An arborist from the Greenspace Unit has assessed the memorial tree (2m tall Totara) in its existing site. The tree is in good condition with good soil and surroundings. City arborist recommendation is that whilst it may be viable to relocate the tree, there is always some risk when transplanting trees particularly to a new site as in this case. Relocation has been discussed with the family and they would prefer the tree to stay in its present position.

Community Partnership – Adjacent School Fencing

7. Parklands School shares a 43m long boundary with Adcock Park. Adjacent to this boundary is a natural contour which with minor landscaping could lend itself to be an amphitheatre or outdoor classroom. The school principal has informed the Board of Trustees and they are keen to see this area developed and accompanied by a see-through fence and gated entry from the school. A see-through fence being imperative to reduce undesirable behaviour in that corner by making informal surveillance possible. As the cost of a pool-type fence is substantially higher than a standard fence the school are seeking financial assistance with the fence. Currently a 43m see-through pool type fence from Strat Co at 1200mm with a lockable gate would cost \$12,000.

The additional cost to Christchurch City Council can be justified on the basis of the improved visibility and security which will benefit both the park and the school. Park users will provide casual observation and surveillance for the school outside normal hours and vice versa when the school is operating. In this instance it would be beneficial for Council to provide additional council contribution towards the cost of a see-through fence. The cost of \$8,000 being sought from the fencing budget 2005/06 with the remaining \$4,000 being requested from the Community Board.

Removal of Trees

8. A tree survey of Adcock Park was implemented at the recommendation of the safety audit (refer attached). There are three trees (two poplar and one cypress) identified within Adcock Park recommended to be removed immediately due to damage, poor stock and/or disease resulting in health and safety issues. A further four (pine) trees identified need to be considered for removal in the near future as they are identified as a potential problem or inhibit access on site. It is these four pine trees that Community Board approval is sort for their removal. Whilst the four trees do not currently pose a health and safety threat they are likely to become problematic in the future. Another 16 wattle (*Acacia* spp.) have been identified for removal due to their poor condition and restriction for site access and replanting. Remaining on site would then be two groups of pines and cypress identified for maintenance, including the removal of poor stock, plus all the new trees and shrubs proposed in the landscape plan.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Funding for the Adcock Park development has been allocated in the 2005/06 capital works programme. The current estimate for the work is \$28,000.
10. Funding for ongoing maintenance, pruning and minor works, is provided for within the existing Greenspace operational maintenance budget.
11. All work will be carried out by a Council approved contractor with the appropriate health and safety and work site management controls in place.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board approve the following:

1. To undertake minor changes to the original Adcock Park Development Plan in recognition of residents feedback.
2. To change the name of Adcock Park to Arthur Adcock Memorial Reserve.
3. That the Arthur Adcock Memorial Tree and accompanying plaque remain in the current location.
4. That the remaining cost of the adjacent school fence (\$4,000) be met by Community Board Discretionary funding.
5. The removal of four (pine) trees in conjunction with the trees identified as health safety and general maintenance issues.

BACKGROUND

12. The Adcock Park Development Plan has previously been presented to the Burwood/ Pegasus Community Board in July 1996. In 1996 there were no residential properties around the reserve. Subsequently the area has been developed. Greenspace therefore thought it appropriate to consult the community for feedback before proceeding with development. The major work up to this point has concentrated on establishing grass and some establishment planting.

At the July 1996 meeting of the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board the following resolutions were passed:

- (1) That the final design of the lake be such that the edges slope gently down at a grade no greater 1:6 to ensure that a toddler could walk out of the lake.
- (2) That any Resource/Environmental/Discharge Consents required be obtained before on-site construction commences from the appropriate authority. (The lake formation was part of the stormwater conditions linked to the subdivision consent).
- (3) That all costs associated with this application and resulting development be met by the subdivider.
- (4) That maintenance periods of six months be accepted by the developer for the lake structure and associated head works and planting, before being finally handed over to the Council to maintain.
- (5) That the design take into account the concerns raised by submitters i.e.
 - (a) That uninterrupted views across the lake be retained where the public have access to the lake edge.
 - (b) That large open informal grass areas fronting on the extended Chadbury Street Lamorna Road be incorporated into the final plan.
 - (c) That the final plan show the extension of the school's playing area into the open grass area in the Reserve fronting on to Lamorna Road in the Reserve.
- (6) That Parklands Residents' Association are shown the final plan before implementation.
- (7) That the board makes submissions to the current budget rounds requesting funding from Water Services and the Parks Unit.
- (8) That funding be brought forward to \$10,000 in 1996/97, \$10,000 in 1997/98 and \$5,000 in 1998/99 to enable the project to be completed in a reasonable time frame.

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND

13. The Adcock Park Development Plan and report went before the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board on 16 November 2005. Further to presentation on this date the report was held over for a safety audit to be completed. The safety audit requested a tree survey to be implemented. This too has now been completed and the results of both will be presented to the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board in the form of a seminar before this report is to be re-presented to the Board.

With consideration of the new information some amendments have been made to the original landscape plan.

- (a) All vegetation planting and pathways have been kept clear of the bowling club fence line thus permitting future expansion if the Bowling Club still desire to do so at a later date.
- (b) The Adcock Family have agreed to the renaming of the park and are happy for the Arthur Adcock Memorial tree and plaque to remain in their current position.
- (c) Re-alignment of the pathway as per recommendation from the safety audit.
- (d) Removal of existing trees in a poor or declining state as indicated by the tree survey results.

OPTIONS

14. **Adcock Park Development Plan.**

There are two possible options:

- (a) Do nothing or status quo. This option is not practical as Greenspace sees merit in carrying out suggestions put forward by local residents. This option disregards the community feedback and input.
- (b) Undertake minor changes to the original plan in recognition of residents feedback.

15. **Renaming of Adcock Park**

There are two possible options:

- (a) Do nothing or status quo.
- (b) Change the name to Arthur Adcock Memorial Reserve.

16. **Relocating memorial tree**

There are two possible options:

- (a) Relocate the memorial tree (including plaque) to Adcock park during the 2006/2007 planting season.
- (b) That the memorial tree and accompanying plaque remain in their current position.

17. **Adjacent school fencing**

There are two possible options:

- (a) Do nothing or status quo.
- (b) That the remaining cost of the fence be met by Community Board discretionary funding.

18. **Removal of trees**

There are two possible options:

- (a) Do nothing or status quo. This would ignore advice from the safety audit and prevent part of pathway construction.
- (b) Remove these four trees as identified by tree survey and discussed in the Adcock Park seminar. Plus ongoing maintenance and limbing up of other trees to maintain future health and safety standards.

PREFERRED OPTION

Adcock Park Development Plan

Option (b) is the preferred option. This option provides for the implementation of minor changes in recognition of feedback from the local community.

Renaming of Adcock Park

Option (b) to rename the park Arthur Adcock Memorial Reserve is the preferred option.

Relocating memorial tree

Option (b) to leave the memorial tree and plaque in their current location is the preferred option.

Adjacent school fencing

Option (b) to replace the adjacent section of fence using council contribution from the 2005/06 fencing budget and the remaining cost of the fence met by community board discretionary funding. This option provides increased informal surveillance for both school and park and is deemed beneficial for both areas in reducing vandalism or undesirable behaviour.

Removal of trees

Preferred option is option b to remove four (pine) trees and whilst the equipment is on site to carry out maintenance work on the other identified trees.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES APRIL 2005-09-02

Community consultation has been concluded. 120 public information leaflets were delivered and 23 responses were received. Of the 23 respondents 22 were happy with the plan and suggested minor changes. The requests for changes to be made are as follows:

- (a) **Trees**
The two residencies adjacent to the lane on Linkwater Way requested that no tall trees be planted in the lane. Two respondents comments desired to have more native trees planted whilst two respondents desired more planting of colourful exotic flowering shrubs. one person asked that the conifers in close proximity to the Bowling Club be retained which is in accordance with the plan.
- (b) **Seats**
Two requests were made for some of the seating to be sheltered by planting or a gazebo. One owner said she doesn't want a seat outside her house so this shall be moved along further.
- (c) **Interpretation and Lighting**
There was one request for interpretation panels about the plants and birdlife found in the park. Two requests for lighting along the pathways were received.
- (d) **Sports & Play Equipment**
One request for each of: a flying fox, tennis court, basketball court, and two requests for child's play equipment.
- (e) **Barbeques**
Two residents were interested in having a barbeque installed.
- (f) **'Dog Poo' Bins**
Two respondents asked for the installation of 'dog poo' bins.
- (g) **Pond**
Three comments came from different residents regarding the pond. one was in relation to pollution from the Canadian Geese. The other two were in relation to safety with kindergartens near by.
- (h) **Sand dune heights**
Three of the respondents who were happy with the overall plan made a reference to being concerned about the height of the former dunes which are now mown grassed areas. One respondent expressed strong concerns in regard to the current contours and mound heights.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Mitigate risks to public and property	Landscape planting \$28,000
Cultural	No benefits identified	No costs identified
Environmental	Improved reserve facility for community. Additional native planting will enhance opportunities for bird life.	
Economic	No positive or negative economic impact for the community identified.	

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Primary alignment with community outcome: *"Our City's natural resources, biodiversity, landscapes, and ecosystem integrity are protected and enhanced."*

Also contributes to *"Our City's infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability"*

Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:

No impacts on Council's capacity and responsibilities have been identified.

Effects on Maori:

No effects on Maori identified.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Consistent with the Environmental Policy and specifically: *"Open Spaces and Planting - The Council will manage and maintain the open spaces of the City in ways that enhance amenity, avoid adverse effects and minimise maintenance requirements"*.

"To acknowledge and promote the "Garden City" identity of the City by protecting, maintaining, and extending planting which complements this image".

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:

From 23 submissions received, 22 supported the landscape plan.

Other relevant matters:

8. BROOMFIELD TERRACE CAR PARK DEVELOPMENT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Greenspace Manager
Author:	Kim Swarbrick, Parks & Waterways Area Advocate

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Community Board support for the installation of a car park at Broomfield Terrace (refer attached map).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Broomfield Terrace is a local street that runs between Lake Terrace Road and Kingsford Street. The street is used for access to Shirley Golf Course, Horseshoe Lake Reserve and Burwood Park. The southern end of Broomfield Terrace is extensively used during weekends by commuter parking attending games for various sports codes. At present there is no formal parking nor formal road edges. The current informal parking arrangement creates danger for pedestrians crossing into Burwood Park, plus it is detrimental to the road edge and grass berms. In winter the grass berms become extremely muddy. The implementation of 90 degree parking and traffic calming islands will increase parking space (provision for 39 vehicles) thus diminishing congestion and provide safer entry to Burwood Park sports fields and linkage to Horseshoe Lake walkways.
3. Also due for construction in the 2006/07 financial year is the Horseshoe Lake Dog Park car park as per the Horseshoe Lake Management Plan, adopted in 2002. The dog park site is situated 200m further north of Broomfield Terrace car park. Whilst machinery is on site to construct Broomfield Terrace parking it will be contracted to construct the dog park vehicle entry and parking simultaneously (12 bay vehicle park). This will save costs on re-deploying equipment twice.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

4. There is \$11,974 available in the Greenspace 2005/06 financial year to design the Broomfield Terrace car park and \$250,000 available in the following financial year for construction of both the Broomfield Terrace Car park and Horseshoe Lake Dog Park entranceway.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board approve option (b) as detailed in the report, to accept the Broomfield Terrace Car Park Development Plan. This action fulfils the next step of implementing the Horseshoe Lake Master Plan.

BACKGROUND

5. The Horseshoe Lake Master Plan was adopted in 2002. The Master Plan indicated a new car park to come. The demand for better parking facilities in the vicinity is very evident at weekends. The Greenspace Unit has developed a landscape plan of the proposed car park layout. Implementation of this plan will rationalise and maximise the parking spaces available along Broomfield Terrace.
6. A public information leaflet seeking responses on the plan was distributed to residents and key stakeholder groups in February 2006. Residents were asked to indicate their acceptance/non-acceptance of the plan and were given the option to comment. In total, 70 response forms have been received from 300 consultation packages delivered.
93% accept the proposed plan (65)
6% do not accept the proposed plan (4)
1% did not indicate (1)
7. A number of suggestions and comments were made that have been considered and where appropriate integrated into the design. Some residents raised concerns regarding speeding traffic. The concept includes raised platforms at each end of proposed car park for traffic calming purposes and increased pedestrian safety. The footpath from Kingsford Street and Tompkins Lane are connected by this proposal and installation of two new lampposts will improve night vision. Landscape planting species will be chosen in relevance to the wetland nature of Horseshoe Lake Reserve.
8. All respondents comments regarding traffic or street layout queries have been forwarded on to Transport and City Streets Unit and assessed by an Asset Engineer in terms of streets asset planning. No recommendations have been made by the Asset Engineer for changes to the proposed plan.

A copy of the final plan will be circulated to residents and stakeholder groups prior to the construction date.

OPTIONS

9. There are two possible options:
 - (a) Do nothing or status quo. This option is not practical as Greenspace sees merit in carrying out management plans as agreed in consultation with local residents. This option disregards the community feedback and input.
 - (b) Accept the Broomfield Terrace Car Park Development plan with its minor changes to the original plan in recognition of residents feedback.

PREFERRED OPTION

To adopt option (b) and accept the Broomfield Terrace Car Park Development plan. This will help alleviate short term parking problems and increase pedestrian safety.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Mitigate risks to public and property	Car park installation, landscape concept plan and implementation \$250,000
Cultural	No benefits identified	No costs identified
Environmental	Improved reserve, sports field, entrance way and community parking facility.	
Economic	No positive or negative economic impact for the community identified.	

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Primary alignment with community outcome:

"Our City's natural resources, biodiversity, landscapes, and ecosystem integrity are protected and enhanced."

"Our City's infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability"

"A Safe City – We are safe at home and in the community. Risks from hazards are managed and mitigated"

Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:

No impacts on council's capacity and responsibilities have been identified.

Effects on Maori:

No effects on Maori identified.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Consistent with the Environmental Policy and specifically: *"Open Spaces and Planting - The Council will manage and maintain the open spaces of the City in ways that enhance amenity, avoid adverse effects and minimise maintenance requirements"*.

"To acknowledge and promote the "Garden City" identity of the City by protecting, maintaining, and extending planting which complements this image".

Consistent with Traffic Calming and Traffic Management Policy.

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:

From 70 submissions received, 65 supported the landscape plan.

Other relevant matters:

9. ROTHESAY ROAD CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Greenspace Manager
Author:	Kim Swarbrick, Parks and Waterways Advocate

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board on the development plan for Rothesay Road Corridor design work (refer attached).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Bottle Lake Forest Park Management Plan was consulted on and approved in 1999. Included in this management plan was a landscape proposal plan for the Rothesay Recreation Corridor. The corridor, bounded to the west by Queenspark Drive, and to the east by Bower Avenue, is approximately 900m in length and 100m in width. The area is described in the management plan as providing an ecological corridor, close to the forest edge and adjacent residential properties, consisting of native plantings (coastal forest and bush) with dune and swampy hollow habitat creation. Currently the area is underdeveloped and needs a lot of tidying up to become a presentable access way or transition zone between residential area and regional park.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

3. The Greenspace Unit has \$40,000 available this year to finalise landscape plans and begin landscape work for the Rothesay Recreation Corridor, Bottle Lake Forest Park. Due to the limited funding and the expansive area involved, implementation of the plan will need to be staged over the next ten years.
4. The Greenspace Unit proposes to complete the remaining components of the development plan in the following 10 financial years. **It is important to note that funds programmed in future years are subject to Council confirming budget expenditure for that particular year.** The following table below shows details of the cost estimates for each of the Areas (ABC) for the construction of the Rothesay Road Corridor.

	AREA			TOTAL
	A	B	C	
PRELIMINARY & GENERAL	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 4,500.00
CARPARKS	\$ 92,170.00	\$ 24,445.00	\$ 7,759.00	\$124,374.00
POST & CABLE FENCE	\$ 5,109.00	\$ 7,860.00	\$ 8,842.50	\$ 21,811.50
FOOTPATHS & CYCLEWAYS	\$ 29,835.00	\$128,440.00	\$ 54,340.00	\$212,615.00
ENTRANCE	\$ 20,451.20	\$ 8,000.00	N/A	\$ 28,451.20
PLAYGROUND	\$ 10,800.00	N/A	N/A	\$ 10,800.00
SEATS & TABLES	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	N/A	\$ 4,000.00
GARDENS	\$ 26,775.00	\$172,520.00	\$ 42,625.00	\$241,920.00
LAWNS	\$ 3,930.00	\$ 19,250.00	\$ 7,250.00	\$ 30,430.00
FOOTBRIDGE	N/A	N/A	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
SUB TOTAL	\$193,070.20	\$363,515.00	\$127,316.50	\$683,901.70
PLUS CONTINGENCY	\$222,030.73	\$418,042.25	\$146,413.98	\$786,486.96
PLUS G.S.T	\$249,784.57	\$470,297.53	\$164,715.72	\$884,797.82

The area has been divided into three regions for costing. They are as follows:

- (a) Bower Ave entrance to main car park, playground to the start of the residential sections.
- (b) From residential sections along to Queenspark Drive, including car park.
- (c) Queenspark Drive back to Tumara park entrance (existing stone walls plus the footbridge).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board approve option (b) detailed in the report to accept the Rothesay Road Corridor Development Plan. The Greenspace Unit can then implement the landscape plan to create an attractive buffer zone between residential housing and regional park area.

BACKGROUND

5. Board members will recall that the concept plan for the redevelopment of Rothesay Road Corridor was delivered for public consultation in October 2004. The design was in keeping with the Bottle Lake Forest Management Plan (1999) and investigated the development of a coastal ecological and amenity corridor that rehabilitates the vegetation and habitat sequence of the coastal margin: to provide a continuous wetland habitat and nesting corridor for birds travelling from the Avon-Heathcote Estuary to Brooklands Lagoon.
6. As a result of consultation feedback the landscape plan was reviewed in June 2005. A number of suggestions and comments were made that have been considered and where appropriate integrated into the design. At this time it was decided to omit the proposed use of Kanuka both for its fire risk and the difficulty in getting it to grow at this site. Some of the planting beds were addressed for re-modification to ensure the maximum buffer and screening of the plantation from neighbours. The 30m wide firebreak was assessed for its efficiency. There was also a preference for the perimeter track to have more curves and meander in and out of the plantings. At this point the landscape plan was re-commissioned for adjustment.
7. On completion of the revised landscape plan it was placed on display in December 2005 for public comment. Two on-site notice boards were sited at the end of Bower Avenue and Bottle Lake Forest car park respectively. Additionally a letter box drop of 300 information packages were delivered to Rothesay Recreation Corridor local residents. As a result of the second consultation there has been no negative feedback received. All respondents were supportive of the project and of the changes made to the initial plan.

OPTIONS

8. There are two possible options:
 - (a) Do nothing or status quo. This option is not practical as the landscaping is currently underdeveloped and looks unfinished. Greenspace sees merit in carrying out the suggestions put forward by local residents through the consultation process.
 - (b) Accept the Rothesay Road Corridor Development plan with its revised amendments resulting from consultation feedback.

PREFERRED OPTION

9. To adopt option (b) and accept the Rothesay Road Corridor Development plan. This will allow Greenspace Unit to: develop the residential buffer zone, maintain the fire break effectively, and create more inviting entrance ways for members of public to access Bottle Lake Forest Park for recreation purposes.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Mitigate risks to public and property	Landscape planting, car parks, footpath and cycleway, seats and tables. \$884,792 over 10 financial years
Cultural	No benefits identified	No costs identified
Environmental	Improved reserve facility for community. Additional native planting will enhance opportunities for bird life. Enhancement of recreation facilities.	
Economic	No positive or negative economic impact for the community identified.	
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome: <i>“Our City’s natural resources, biodiversity, landscapes, and ecosystem integrity are protected and enhanced.”</i> Also contributes to <i>“Our City’s infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability”</i></p> <p>Impact on Council’s capacity and responsibilities: No impacts on council’s capacity and responsibilities have been identified.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: No effects on Maori identified.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Consistent with the Environmental Policy and specifically: <i>“Open Spaces and Planting - The Council will manage and maintain the open spaces of the City in ways that enhance amenity, avoid adverse effects and minimise maintenance requirements”.</i> <i>“To acknowledge and promote the “Garden City” identity of the City by protecting, maintaining, and extending planting which complements this image”.</i></p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Parklands Residents association and local residents in support of proposed plan.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

10. SOUTH NEW BRIGHTON PARK - BASKETBALL COURT UPGRADE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Greenspace Manager
Author:	Kim Swarbrick, Parks and Waterways Advocate

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to confirm Board support for extending and upgrading the South New Brighton Park basketball half-court to a full sized outdoor basketball court (refer attached plan).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The South New Brighton, Southshore Community and Recreation Sports and Arts Needs Analysis Report was completed in 2005 by Sarah Wylie. Two of the outcomes identified by the study were the need for a full sized basketball facility in the South Brighton Area, plus an upgrade of the existing half court facility which is in a state of disrepair. Following the report two workshops were facilitated by the Burwood/Pegasus Community Recreation Advisor at St Lukes Community Hall. The outcome of the workshops' was that two thirds of participants agreed a full outdoor court was required. Basketball is a very popular sport with youth in this area.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

3. The Greenspace Unit has \$22,400 funding available in the 2005/06 financial year for installation of a Burwood/Pegasus half court. Greenspace staff have carried out a feasibility study of all Burwood Pegasus parks and have agreed that best use of this funding would be to upgrade and extend the existing South New Brighton half basketball court to a full court thus meeting the needs and requests of the community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board approve option (b) to accept the proposal of upgrading and extending the South New Brighton Park basketball half-court to a full sized outdoor court.

BACKGROUND

4. As the request has come from survey results highlighted in the South New Brighton, Southshore Community and Recreation Sports and Arts Needs Analysis Report, 2005, consultation has not been undertaken by Greenspace staff on this project. Public participation consultation for the project was carried out by the Community Recreation Advisor.
5. A number of suggestions and comments were made by public participants at the two workshops. These, along with the researchers recommendations, have been considered and where appropriate integrated into the design.
6. Basketball is an existing facility in the park and is sited well away from any residential dwellings. Extending and upgrading the current facility will have little change of impact on the surrounding environment.

OPTIONS

7. There are two possible options:
 - (a) Do nothing or status quo. This option is not practical as Greenspace sees merit in meeting outcomes identified by the Recreation Needs Analysis Study. This option disregards the community feedback and input.
 - (b) Accept the proposal for installation of a full sized outdoor basketball court.

PREFERRED OPTION

8. To adopt option (b) and implement construction of a full outdoor basketball court. Thus providing the community with the facility they have requested. According to the feasibility study carried out by Greenspace Unit staff this option is also the best proposal for allocation of funding.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Mitigate risks to public and property.	\$22,400 for installation.
Cultural	No benefits identified.	No costs identified.
Environmental	Improved reserve facility for community recreation.	
Economic	No positive or negative economic impact for the community identified.	
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome: <i>"A Healthy City" We live long, healthy and happy lives.</i> Also contributes to <i>"A City for Recreation, Fun and Creativity" We value leisure time and recognise that the arts, sports and other recreational activities contribute to our economy, identity, health, and well-being.</i></p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: No impacts on council's capacity and responsibilities have been identified.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: No effects on Maori identified.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Consistent with the Environmental Policy: <i>"Open Spaces and Planting - The Council will manage and maintain the open spaces of the City in ways that enhance amenity, avoid adverse effects and minimise maintenance requirements".</i> <i>"To acknowledge and promote the "Garden City" identity of the City by protecting, maintaining, and extending planting which complements this image".</i> <i>"Plus, promoting a City for Recreation, Fun and Creativity.</i></p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Needs Analysis survey results indicated a request for this project to go ahead.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

11. ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2006/07

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
Officer responsible:	Secretariat Manager
Author:	Max Robertson, Council Secretary

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - (a) enable the Council to make a decision at a May 2006 meeting to send to the Remuneration Authority regarding remuneration to be paid to elected members (except the Mayor) for the 2006/07 financial year; and
 - (b) permit Community Boards to indicate to the Council their preferred option for the allocation of the 2006/07 remuneration pool amongst the elected members of the Christchurch City Council and the eight Christchurch community boards.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Remuneration Authority has advised that the remuneration pool for the elected members of the Christchurch City Council and its eight community boards has been fixed at \$1,529,250 for the 2006/07 financial year and that the Mayor's gross salary has been fixed at \$151,330. In the case of the Mayor this figure represents the gross amount to be debited against the pool - the Mayor's net salary will be adjusted to reflect the fact that he has full private use of a car provided by the Council.
3. This represents an increase of \$59,306 in the 2005/06 pool of \$1,469,944.
4. Based on the rules and principles set by the Remuneration Authority the Council is now required to decide how it proposes to allocate the pool amongst its elected members for the 2006/07 financial year and, once agreed, to submit its proposal to the Remuneration Authority for approval. It should be emphasised that the Remuneration Authority expects the pool to be fully allocated, and it is thus incumbent on the Council to revise the current salaries to reflect the full amount of the pool.
5. The Council's proposal must be approved by the Remuneration Authority before any amended salaries proposed by the Council can be implemented.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. The principal statutory provisions which apply in this instance are the Seventh Schedule of the Local Government Act 2002, and the Remuneration Authority Act 1977. Once this Council's 2006/07 remuneration proposal (or any variation thereof) has been approved by the Remuneration Authority, it will be gazetted via the Local Government Elected Members' Determination 2006.
7. Once the allocation of the increased pool has been decided by the Council and approved by the Remuneration Authority, it will be necessary to reflect the resulting expenditure in the nine different budget provisions for this item (Councillors and eight community boards).
8. There are some substantial budgetary and rating implications associated with some of the options postulated in this report, ie:

Option	Additional Expenditure	Resulting Rate Increase
1	\$66,856	+0.036%
2	\$73,880	+0.040%
3	\$71,356	+0.038%
4	\$81,356.76	+0.044%
5	\$382,180.38	+0.204%
6	\$461,508.68	+0.247%
7	\$156,205	+0.084%
8	\$156,205	+0.084%

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Community Board decide:

- (a) Which salary option it wishes to recommend to the Council.
- (b) Whether or not it wishes to also recommend any changes to the present allowances and expenses in respect of mileage allowances, and the communications allowance.

BACKGROUND ON ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2006/07

9. The Remuneration Authority is responsible for setting the salaries of elected local government representatives (clause 6 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 refers).
10. A brief summary of the remuneration framework and the rules and principles which the Remuneration Authority works under is attached as Appendix A.
11. The Remuneration Authority revises remuneration pools annually, and each council is thus required to review its levels of remuneration prior to the start of each financial year, based on the new pool. Therefore, this report has been submitted to allow the Council to consider the allocation of the increased pool for the 2006/07 financial year. The salaries proposed will thus apply from 1 July 2006.
12. The Authority has now released the Christchurch City indicative pool for 2006/07, which amounts to:

Total pool	\$1,529,250
less Mayor's gross salary	\$151,330

Net pool available for Deputy Mayor, 12 Councillors, eight community board chairs and 32 community board members	\$1,377,920

13. This represents a total increase of **\$59,306** in this Council's remuneration pool.
14. Although included within the pool, the Mayor's salary is independently set by the Remuneration Authority.
15. It should also be noted that 50% of the total remuneration paid to community board chairs and elected (not Councillor appointments) community board members is paid outside the pool.
16. The pool is fixed by the Remuneration Authority relative to other councils and has regard to population, expenditure and assets. The merging of Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula does not produce a remuneration pool equal to the sum of the two separate pools.
17. Although the Mayor's salary is set by the Remuneration Authority, it is included within the pool. Where a Mayor has partial or full private use of a car provided by the Council (as is the case in Christchurch), the Mayor's gross salary is reduced by an amount which reflects both the extent of private use and the value of the car supplied.

DISCUSSION**Decisions to be Made**

18. In preparing its proposal the Council is required to make the following decisions:
 - To decide whether the remuneration pool should be allocated on a salary only basis, or whether it should be a mix of salary and meeting fees.
 - To agree appropriate levels/rates for the different positions/roles on the Council and its community boards and, using that information, develop an option for the allocation of the money within the remuneration pool.

Basis of Remuneration

19. Although it is possible for the Council to recommend the payment of a mixture of salary and meeting fees to Councillors, community board members must be paid on a salary only basis, without meeting fees.

Distribution Options

20. The allocation of the increased pool was discussed with Councillors and community board members at a seminar held on Thursday 16 March 2006. Three possible options for the allocation of the 2006/07 pool were presented at the seminar. Although the members present at the seminar did not indicate a preference for any of the three options presented, staff were requested to prepare some further options which:

- Provided for the chairs and members of the Banks Peninsula community boards to receive a salary equivalent to 80% of the salaries payable to the chairs and members of the metropolitan community boards.
- Assumed that 75% (rather than the present 50%) of the salaries payable to the chairs and members of community boards can be paid outside the remuneration pool (this option being based on oral advice from two elected members that the Remuneration Authority had recently indicated that it might be possible for 75% of the community board salaries to be paid outside the pool, if the Council were to submit such a remuneration proposal).

21. In response to an earlier enquiry, the Chairman of the Remuneration Authority advised in May 2005 that:

"Any increase in the pool arising from combining the two councils is unlikely to, in itself, be sufficient to meet the salary of a new councillor (at existing Christchurch rates) plus the salaries currently payable to the Banks Peninsula community boards. It may be necessary therefore for the Authority to consider, for example, allowing the funding of the two community boards to be met entirely from outside the pool. All this will require some detailed discussions with your council in due course."

22. The Chairman of the Remuneration Authority has since orally confirmed that, in recognition of Christchurch's unique situation with the recent dissolution of Banks Peninsula District, the Authority is prepared to consider making "special arrangements" on a transitional basis for 2006/07, including the possibility of a greater proportion than 50% of the community board remuneration being paid outside the pool, or, alternatively adjusting the pool to reflect the additional payments resulting from the inclusion of Banks Peninsula.

23. The Chairman has indicated that any such "special arrangement" would be for 2006/07 and would not be permanent. Given that any such proposal for an increased amount of community board remuneration to come outside the pool is for one year only and that in 2007/08 (assuming minimal change in the pool figure) the elected members will be facing the same situation as now with having to operate within the 50/50 split, the question needs to be asked why members reach an arrangement for 2006/07 which needs to be reviewed again for 2007/08. Members could decide now to reach a decision for 2006/07 based on the 50/50 split which means the formula arrived at will have long term stability and any difficulty in arriving at that formula will be for this year only.

24. Staff were also requested to confirm the amount of the total pool figure. Staff retained Mr John Mackey from Deloitte to review the setting of the pool figure. Following a comprehensive review, Mr Mackey has advised that the Remuneration Authority's calculation of the indicative remuneration pool for Christchurch City for the year ending 30 June 2007 appears to substantially comply with the legislation, and is materially correct.

Principles Applicable to this Remuneration Review

25. Given that the Council is required to make a recommendation to the Remuneration Authority as to how the pool is to be divided it is considered appropriate that before considering options elected members consider the principles which should guide them in their deliberations on this topic.

26. It is considered that the following principles could be taken into account.

Principle: Remuneration for any elected position should be such as to attract people to hold office within the Council's governance structure so that remuneration should not limit the diversity of representation for councillor and community board positions.

Principle: Members with similar responsibilities should receive similar remuneration.

Principle: A differential rate of remuneration between the same class of elected member within the Council (e.g. councillor, community board chair or community board member) should exist only where it can be justified by reference to relevant differences.

Principle: Remuneration should be set at a level that acknowledges the impact that performing the role of an elected member has on personal lives and careers.

Principle: Remuneration should not be reduced part way through a three year electoral term, when that risk was not known to a candidate at the preceding election unless there are circumstances outside the Council's control.

Councillor Remuneration

27. At its meeting on 5 May 2005 the Council resolved to have a differential for the Deputy Mayor in recognition of her high workload and additional responsibilities.

28. At its meeting on 8 December 2005 the Council resolved that the Banks Peninsula Ward Councillor be remunerated at the same rate as the other Councillors on the basis that that Councillor has city wide responsibilities as well as the other Councillors.

29. The options below assume that the Council will not be changing its May and December 2005 resolutions in respect of these two positions.

Community Board Remuneration

30. At its meeting on 2 December 2004 the Council adopted a proposed remuneration structure which provided for the payment of salaries of \$32,500 and \$20,000 for community board chairs and members, respectively. Following representations to the Remuneration Authority, the Authority increased these salaries to the amounts shown below:

Position	2004 Salaries Proposed by CCC	2004 Salaries Fixed by Remuneration Authority
Community Board Chairs	\$32,500	\$35,000
Community Board Members	\$20,000	\$22,000

31. At the time, the Remuneration Authority advised that in approving these increases, it had been mindful of the following factors:

1. *The need to equitably distribute the pool following the reduction in the number of councillors.*
2. *The consequential increase in representational activities for community boards.*
3. *The role of the community boards as established by government policy and the Local Government Commission's determination regarding the Christchurch City representation review.*
4. *Representations made to the Remuneration Authority by community board members.*

32. The Authority also went on to say that Christchurch is seen as a model for how the two arms of local representation can work effectively at the macro and micro levels, and that the adjustments made by the Authority were not major, but established a slightly more rational relativity.

33. An issue that arose at the seminar on 16 March 2006 was that of a differential between "City board members and chairs" and "Peninsula board members and chairs." At present City board members are paid \$22,450 per annum while Peninsula board members receive \$6,273 per annum. The figures for community board chairs are \$35,850 and \$11,412, respectively. These are relativities of 28% and 32% respectively.
34. Community boards have their respective roles set by the Local Government Act 2002 and the other legislation administered by the Council.
35. S. 52 of the Act provides that the role of a community board is to:
- (a) *represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of its community; and*
 - (b) *consider and report on all matters referred to it by the territorial authority, or any matter of interest or concern to the community board; and*
 - (c) *maintain an overview of services provided by the territorial authority within the community; and*
 - (d) *prepare an annual submission to the territorial authority for expenditure within the community; and*
 - (e) *communicate with community organisations and special interest groups within the community; and*
 - (f) *undertake any other responsibilities that are delegated to it by the territorial authority.*
36. That provision applies equally to all eight community boards. In addition the Council has given the same level of delegations to all eight boards. The Council's expectation of the workload of community boards as far as their delegated authorities is the same.

Land Area and Representation Ratios within each Community

37. At the seminar on Thursday 16 March 2006, I was asked to provide information relating to the land area of each community, and the number of residents represented by each community board member. The following table sets out this information:

Community	Land Area in Hectares	No of Members (including both elected and appointed members)	Population 2001 Census	No of Residents per member
Akaroa/Wairewa	94,320	6	3,027	505
Burwood/Pegasus	4,540	7	52,944	7,563
Fendalton/Waimairi	10,610	7	51,210	7,316
Hagley/Ferrymead	5,800	7	52,515	7,502
Lyttelton/Mount Herbert	21,480	6	5,397	900
Riccarton/Wigram	9,800	7	54,939	7,848
Shirley/Papanui	9,660	7	53,304	7,615
Spreydon/Heathcote	4,490	7	51,306	7,329

38. Certainly while there are population differences between the Boards the question needs to be asked whether the democratic responsibilities and the Local Government Act responsibilities of a Peninsula Board member are any less because they represent fewer people. Apart from having a greater number of people to represent a City board member does not have any additional governance responsibilities to a Peninsula board member.
39. The question also needs to be asked whether the responsibilities associated with the role of democratic representation is dependent on the number of constituents represented? If Christchurch is truly one city, the starting point surely would be equality of remuneration, except where a differential can be rationally justified. All Board members, regardless of the size of the population served by the Board need to have members fully engaged in their role and able to commit time to that role. Complex and contentious issues for a community board can arise from an area with a small population just as easily as an area with a large population. That can be more so where the small population area is developing and geographically is more challenging to administer.

40. Regarding a perception there may be that a larger population results in a higher workload thereby justifying a higher level of remuneration it must be borne in mind that at the present time the Council does not have any empirical data as to the workloads of elected members so that the "workload factor" should not be taken into account when the Council is setting remuneration. It has not been established with any certainty that having a greater population than another community board means the workload of a member of a board with a larger population is greater. In the absence of reliable data there is no rationale for a differential rate of payment for this reason.
41. Another factor to be borne in mind in setting remuneration is the geographical area of the community board areas. As can be seen from the table above the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert community is twice as large as the biggest City community while Akaroa/Wairewa is nine times larger. The travelling time for a Board member on the Peninsula in serving their constituents is greater than in a built up urban area. The ability to claim mileage is available equally to all Board members but should not recognition be given to the time physically spent travelling in addition to being present at meetings and engaging in Board business?

Auckland and Dunedin situations

42. Auckland City and Dunedin City have both urban and island/rural areas, and it is considered appropriate to look at the remuneration systems used by those two Councils.
43. In Auckland City, there are extremely small differences between the salaries paid to the chairs and members of the eight Isthmus community boards, compared with the salaries paid to the chairs and members of the two Hauraki Gulf community boards, despite the significant differences in their respective land area and population, as the following table discloses:

Position	Number of Positions	Current Salary
Isthmus Chairs	8	\$19,197
Isthmus Members	34	\$9,411
Waiheke Island Chair	1	\$18,070
Waiheke Island Members	4	\$8,690
Great Barrier Island Chair	1	\$18,070
Great Barrier Island Members	4	\$8,690

44. There are eight Isthmus community boards, and two Hauraki Gulf community boards, with the following land area and population:

Board/s	Land Area	Population
Isthmus	658 square km (total)	401,000 (total)
Waiheke Island	22 square km	7,000
Great Barrier Island	285 square km	1,100

45. The Chairman of the Remuneration Authority has orally advised that the small differentials which apply in the case of the Auckland City community boards are partly attributable to the fact that members of the two Hauraki Gulf community boards are required to spend considerable time travelling by ferry to attend meetings etc.
46. A similar situation applies in Dunedin City, where identical salaries are paid to the chairs, deputy chairs and members of all six Dunedin community boards, despite the substantial disparities in their land area and population, as the following table discloses:

Board	Land Area	Population	Number of Board Members	Salaries Applicable
Chalmers	78 square km	5,400	6	Chair \$17,303 Deputy Chair \$12,214 Member \$8,142
Mosgiel/Taieri	677 square km	15,100	6	
Waikouaiti Coast	515 square km	3,270	6	
Otago Peninsula	121 square km	4,230	6	
Saddle Hill	40 square km	5,130	6	
Strath Taieri	1,836 square km	650	6	

Remuneration Options

47. Eight options are attached to this report, comprising:

- Option 1, which envisages a range of reductions for the positions of Deputy Mayor, Councillors, the chairs and members of metropolitan community boards and increases for the chairs and members of the Banks Peninsula boards.
- Option 2, which is based on the same percentage allocations of the pool as in 2005/06, with the same salaries being paid for the chairmen and members of all community boards.
- Option 3, which assumes that 50% of the pool is allocated to Councillors, and 27% to community board members, with the ratio between metropolitan and Banks Peninsula community board positions maintained near their present levels.
- Option 4, which is based on the assumption that the chairs and members of the Banks Peninsula community boards will be paid 80% of the salaries applicable in the case of the metropolitan boards (with 50% of the applicable salaries being paid outside the pool, as at present).
- Option 5 - this assumes the same relativities between all positions as shown in Option 3, and has been prepared on the basis that 75% of all community board salaries are paid outside the pool.
- Option 6 - this assumes that 75% of community board salaries are paid outside the pool, with the Banks Peninsula chairs and members being paid 80% of the metropolitan board salaries, with the salaries for the Deputy Mayor and Councillors being adjusted so that the pool is fully allocated.
- Option 7 - this assumes the continuation of the present (2005/06 salaries and 2006/07) but with more than 50% of the community board salaries being paid outside the pool.
- Option 8 - this assumes reductions of \$2,000 for Councillors, \$1,500 for metropolitan community board chairs and \$1,000 for metropolitan community board members, with the total amount resulting from these reductions being distributed to the chairs and members of the Banks Peninsula community boards, and with more than 58% of the Banks Peninsula community board salaries being paid outside the pool.

Elected Member Allowances and Expenses

48. As part of its amended remuneration proposal, the Council is also required to seek the Remuneration Authority's approval for any amendments to the Schedule of Elected Member Allowances and Expenses previously approved by the Authority. The schedule attached as Appendix B is similar to the schedule previously approved by the Authority for 2005/06, with the following amendments:

- It provides for the payment of mileage allowance at a flat rate of 70 cents per kilometre for all qualifying travel, and clarifies the type of travel which qualifies for payment of mileage allowance.
- It proposes an increase in the communications allowance from \$120 to \$150 per month.

Mileage Allowance

49. In September 2005, the Inland Revenue Department came out with new rules on mileage reimbursements for employees. Elected members are not, however, considered employees, but rather as "self employed" persons under the withholding tax regime. The IRD has indicated that it is reviewing mileage rates for self employed persons.

19. 4. 2006

- 26 -

50. In the meantime, self employed persons may use the mileage rates published by the IRD, but only up to a maximum of 5,000 kilometres per year. If this is exceeded, the self employed person has the option of either using the specified rates up to 5,000 kilometres or, alternatively, claiming actual running expenses, apportioned for the percentage of business use. The mileage rates published by the IRD are:

Banded rate

1 to 3,000 kms	62 cents per km
3,001 kms and over	19 cents for each km over 3,000 (limited to 5,000 kms)

Flat rate

Any distance	28 cents per km (limited to 5,000 kms)
--------------	--

51. It has been noted that these rates could disadvantage the Banks Peninsula Councillor and Banks Peninsula Community Board members, who are required to travel greater distances than their urban counterparts to attend Council meetings and other related events.
52. Subject to the approval of the Remuneration Authority, it would be possible for the Council to amend its expenses policy to provide for the payment of up to 70 cents per kilometre for all qualifying travel incurred by elected members in any one year (ie the 70 cent rate would be paid for all travel, and would not be reduced after the member/s concerned had travelled 3,000 kilometres in any one year, or stopped completely after the member/s had travelled 5,000 kilometres in any one year). In this instance, the term "qualifying travel" refers to travel associated with attendance at the meetings or events set out in the Schedule of Elected Member Allowances set out in Appendix B to this report. Before the Local Government Act 2002 came into force, members could only claim for attendance at formally convened council, committee or subcommittee meetings, which they were required to attend. However, subject to the approval of the Remuneration Authority, mileage allowance can now be paid for attendance at a wider range of meetings or events, and the list of meetings or events set out in Appendix B has therefore been expanded to recognise this.
53. A number of other councils (eg ECan) pay their members at the rate of 70 cents per kilometre, with no limit, in recognition of the long distances their members are required to travel on the local authority's business.
54. The revised schedule of elected member allowances and expenses attached has therefore been amended to:
- Provide for the payment of a flat rate of 70 cents per kilometre for all qualifying travel.
 - Clarify the type of travel which qualifies for payment of the allowance of 70 cents per kilometre.

Communications Allowance

55. At present, a flat communications allowance of \$120 per month is payable to the Deputy Mayor, Councillors and community board chairs as a contribution towards:
- Home telephone line rental
 - Monthly cellphone base rental charge
 - Council related toll calls made from home telephone line
 - Call charges for Council related calls made from cellphone
56. It has been suggested that there is justification for an increase in the standard allowance of \$120, to reflect (inter alia) the high number of Council related cellphone calls made by elected members, and the fact that at least two Councillors have wireless cards for their laptops, enabling them to stay in touch while on the move. It has also been pointed out that every phone call from Akaroa to the city is a toll call.
57. In these circumstances, there appears to be ample justification for the communications allowance to be increased from \$120 to \$150 per month. If the payment of this allowance continues to be limited to the deputy mayor, councillors and the chairs of the eight community boards, such an increase would result in the following additional expenditure:

Total annual payments at \$150 a month	\$37,800
Present annual payments at \$130 a month	\$30,240
Additional expenditure	\$7,560 per annum

58. At the recent seminar, some community board members gave their opinion that payment of the communications allowance should be extended to include all community board members, rather than being limited to community board chairs. The following schedule sets out the additional expenditure which would result if this suggestion were to be adopted:

Amount of Monthly Allowance	Annual Expenditure if Limited to Deputy Mayor, Councillors and Community Board Chairs (21 positions)	Annual Expenditure if Extended to Include all Community Board Members (53 positions)
\$120	\$30,240	\$76,320
\$150	\$37,800	\$95,400

59. Any increase in communications allowance from \$120 to \$150 per month, and any increase to include community board members, is currently unbudgeted.

Unanimity of the Council's Decision

60. In submitting its proposal the Council is required to notify the Remuneration Authority of:
- (i) details of any dissent at Council, and
 - (ii) details of any dissent from its community boards.
61. A community board also has the ability to express any opposing views it might have on the Council's final proposal direct to the Remuneration Authority.
62. If the Council's recommendations are unanimous and reasonable it is unlikely that the Commission will withhold its approval. It does, however, have the power to amend any proposal if the level of dissatisfaction is high or if the proposal is considered unreasonable.

CONCLUSION

63. It is essential that each board reaches a decision as early as possible on its preferred remuneration option, and on any recommended alterations to the present allowances and expenses policy, so that the boards' views can be taken into account by the Council when it reaches a final decision on its preferred remuneration option at its meeting on Thursday 11 May 2006.
64. The new salaries and expenses approved by the Remuneration Authority will apply from 1 July 2006.

12. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE

12.1 COMMITTEE AND WORKING PARTY MEMBERSHIP

For members' information a list of all Board Committees and Working Parties is attached.

12.2 NOTICE OF UPCOMING BOARD REPORTS

- South New Brighton/Southshore Consultation Project
- Rothesay Road - Partial Road Stopping
- Thomson Park Safety Audit
- Horseshoe Lake Dog Park
- Parklands Car Park

12.3 2005/06 PROJECT, DISCRETIONARY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUNDS UPDATE

The attached schedule shows the allocations in the Board's Project, Discretionary and Youth Development Funds, to 31 March 2006.

12.4 TRANSPORT AND CITY STREETS QUARTERLY UPDATE TO 31 MARCH 2006

A memorandum from the Manager, Transport and City Streets (circulated separately) details the status and progress on capital works in the Burwood/Pegasus area.

13. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ADVISER'S UPDATE

Verbal update from the Community Engagement Adviser.

14. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS 2.16

15. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS 4.1

Members may at any ordinary meeting put a question to the Chairperson concerning any matter relevant to the role or function of the Community Board concerning any matter that does not appear on the order paper. All questions are subject to Standing Orders 4.1.1 to 4.1.5.

16. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Board members will have an opportunity to provide updates on community activities and/or Council issues.