



Christchurch City Council

SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

TUESDAY 21 FEBRUARY 2006

AT 5.00 PM

IN THE BOARDROOM,
SOUTH LIBRARY, SERVICE CENTRE AND LEARNING CENTRE,
66 COLOMBO STREET, CHRISTCHURCH

Community Board: Phil Clearwater (Chairperson), Oscar Alpers, Barry Corbett, Paul de Spa, Chris Mene, Sue Wells and Megan Woods.

Community Board Principal Adviser

Lisa Goodman

DDI: 941-5108

Email: lisa.goodman@ccc.govt.nz

Community Secretary

Peter Dow

DDI: 941-5105

Email: peter.dow@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 MEETING REPORT – 7 FEBRUARY 2006
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
- PART B 4. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
- PART B 5. SUBURBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORT INTERCHANGE CRITERIA
- PART A 6. HANSEN PARK – PROPOSAL BY VODAFONE NEW ZEALAND LIMITED TO OBTAIN APPROVAL TO INSTALL AND OPERATE A TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY ON FEE SIMPLE LAND USED FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES
- PART B 7. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE
- REPORT OF MEETING 13 FEBRUARY 2006
- PART B 8. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE
- PART B 9. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

We're on the Web!

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

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 7 FEBRUARY 2006

The report of the meeting of 7 February 2006 has been separately circulated.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the report of the Board meeting of 7 February 2006 as circulated, be confirmed.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 HANSEN PARK – VODAFONE NEW ZEALAND, PROPOSED TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY

Speaking rights on this matter have been granted to:

- Ms Angelika Frank-Alexander on behalf of Christchurch Rudolf Steiner School.
- Mr Ivan Thomson, 287 Centaurus Road.

Clause 6 of this agenda refers.

4. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

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

5. SUBURBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORT INTERCHANGE CRITERIA

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	Don Munro, Transport and City Streets Unit Manager
Author:	Robert Woods, Public Transport Planner, DDI 941-8060

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's feedback on certain proposed criteria to identify locations for the development of three suburban bus interchanges. A further report will then present an analysis of potential locations using these criteria (once approved by the Council) and a request for Community Board comment on a recommendation of the three locations for scheme development, prior to seeking a resolution of such from the Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The development of suburban interchanges are integral to achieving the Council's vision and goals for public transport as set out in its Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy. In this Strategy, the Council has a target for the adoption of a plan identifying locations of interchanges and construction of three interchanges by June 2006.
3. In December 2005 staff conducted a seminar for the Council and Community Boards on the role of interchanges and highlighted the particular functions of them in Christchurch (**Attachment 1**). The seminar outlined the aim of achieving positive community outcomes through transport improvements that encourage increased suburban transfer between services forming the metro network and also between public transport and other modes of travel. This is currently an under-utilised aspect of the system because despite the metro services being largely in place for people to move around the network, there are not the appropriate passenger interchange facilities at key points in the network to encourage transfers. By encouraging people to maximise the flexibility of the system by interchanging between services and modes, they will be able to make better use of the metro system to access a wider range of destinations, rather

5 Cont'd

than be limited to just a single bus trip. This will improve the convenience of the system to present customers whilst also allowing new customers to take advantage of an improved metro system as the overall level of service becomes more aligned with their travel requirements and expectations.

4. The success of suburban interchanges depends upon improvements in a number of key areas. These improvements may be considered the key objectives for the development of the interchanges and comprise:
 - the provision of quality interchange passenger facilities at the right locations
 - appropriate passenger services to facilitate interchange
 - the provision of good access and arrangements for other modes
 - strong ongoing marketing and promotion of the facility once it is up and running.
5. Success in these areas will require the Council to engage with other key stakeholders, such as Environment Canterbury, local businesses and the surrounding local communities.
6. In order to identify a fair and technically robust process for selecting the first three interchange sites, a number of different criteria options were considered. These comprised site selection by:
 - (a) geographical spread.
 - (b) existing passenger demand.
 - (c) existing level of passenger services.
 - (d) surrounding population catchment.
 - (e) importance of the suburban centre in comparison to other centres.
 - (f) status of the centre within the metro network.
 - (g) land availability and complexity of procurement.
 - (h) traffic management implications and impacts on other road users.
 - (i) extent of changes required to the existing metro services and for existing passengers.
 - (j) impacts on neighbouring land owners and uses.
 - (k) project cost.
 - (l) time to complete and time implications with other projects.
7. Having assessed these options it is recommended that criteria (d) to (l) form the criteria for selecting interchange sites as these are the most important aspects to achieving positive outcomes on the aims and objectives of the project. Criteria (d) to (f) cover matters of site significance, (g) to (j) cover matters of project feasibility and criteria (k) and (l) cover issues of project deliverability. Whilst criteria (a) to (c) qualify as equitable in one way or another they would not have any supporting technical rationale to indicate they would be the best opportunities for the Council to take. If however assessments using (d) to (l) result in equal ratings of sites, (a) to (c) could be used to separate them by a second tier assessment.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. Funding for interchanges was first identified through adoption of the Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Statement Stage 1 in December 2003. Budgets for suburban interchanges are currently identified in the Council's current draft LTCCP 2006/16.

5 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON SUBURBAN INTERCHANGES

9. The development of three suburban interchanges by June 2006 is a City Council target of the Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy. It sits amongst a range of other targets for both the City Council and Environment Canterbury, emphasising the importance of ongoing and combined improvements in passenger services and infrastructure to achieve the vision set out in the Strategy.
10. Suburban interchanges aim to encourage people to transfer between different metro services and between metro public transport and other modes. With the availability of an urban network of convenient services and attractive interchanges, people will increasingly be able to move efficiently within it, making public transport a convenient alternative to most private car journeys. Interchange is a concept where customers can hop on and off different routes to reach their destination, as well as to join and leave the system via another mode. This will occur at its most optimal when the services have sufficient coverage and are of an appropriate cost, reliability and frequency to make their use realistic, supported by passenger interchange facilities that provide attractive surroundings of sufficient quality and functionality to make interchanging easy and convenient. The bus exchange is an excellent example of such a facility (albeit on a larger scale).
11. Interchanges and the supporting passenger services must therefore support the needs of people moving efficiently within a network and must also recognise where and how customers choose to join and leave the network (whether it be on foot, by bike or other mode¹) and what other business they may undertake on the way, such as shopping, entertainment, leisure or personal business. Interchanges thus operate on a number of levels, with the locations that will deliver the greatest benefits being those that can most effectively deliver the interchange concept in an area with a high passenger catchment. Criteria are needed to identify the extent to which any given location is likely to perform on these fronts and therefore their priority in terms of achieving the Council's aims and objectives.

AIMS

12. The Council works towards the achievement of a number of Community Outcomes, some of which relate directly to improvements in the transport system. These include "An attractive and well designed city", "A safe city", "A city of people who value and protect the natural environment" and "A prosperous city". Contributions to these Community Outcomes through transport improvements should be recognised as an important aim of the interchanges project. To achieve these outcomes interchanges aim to encourage more trips by public transport and less by private car by encouraging transfer between metro services and also between metro and other modes of arrival and departure from the interchange. In this way better use will be made of the existing road network, improving its efficiency and safety and making higher value road trips such as freight movement faster and more reliable.

OBJECTIVES

13. From these high level aims arise certain specific project objectives. The achievement of these objectives depend largely upon addressing the differences between metro and private transport in terms of time, cost, coverage, safety, image and accessibility (being the main drivers of mode choice). The project objectives are outlined below.

¹ Park 'n' ride is a form of 'interchange' not suited to the urban environment - which is the context for these bus interchanges. P&R is effective generally only on the edge of an urban area and along the line of a major high volume radial corridor such as a motorway, where car journeys can be readily intercepted. Typically, features of P&R include substantial managed free parking areas, low cost high frequency express services direct to the destination, supported by dedicated bus priority facilities. Parking controls in the urban centre, such as time limits, limited availability and price increases are also used to encourage transfer from the car at the P&R station. Park 'n' ride is a separately identified project in the Public Passenger Transport Strategy.

5 Cont'd

14. The first objective is to develop a suitable facility at the right location to encourage people to travel to a defined point in the network (via their chosen mode) where they can then transfer to another mode or service to get to their destination (or to another interchange). This infrastructure can impact upon a persons choice of travel mode by addressing common perceptions of security, image, journey time and accessibility. Feelings of security will be improved through the provision of a comfortable interchange environment, whilst its design and branding will determine its image. The way in which the facility allows the metro services to interact with the passengers (for example all services coming together at one point) also impacts upon journey time, safety and accessibility.
15. Probably as important as providing good infrastructure, is the need to provide the correct services to support the interchange concept. Attention in the areas of time, cost, coverage, image and accessibility will deliver this. Particularly essential are regular local services to get passengers to their interchange, fast and frequent links between interchanges to allow efficient movement within the network, quality buses that are clean with plenty of seats and attractive and accessible bus stops.
16. Recognising that passengers may make their way to and from the interchange using another mode, an objective should include encouragement of these types of journeys by reviewing access arrangements (for example pedestrian crossing facilities and cycle facilities on approach routes) and facilities at the interchange itself like secure cycle parking and secure storage facilities.
17. A final and often under-utilised objective for the project should be to actively inform, educate and promote interchanges before, during and after their development to ensure the maximum number of people are attracted to the facility and services. Only if people within the catchment of the interchange are aware of their options will they make use of them. Research in travel behaviour shows that changes in mode choice occur gradually and over a period of time. It is therefore important to undertake information and promotion work as part of an ongoing marketing campaign so that as people's needs and motivations change, they are regularly reminded of the alternatives available.

OPTIONS

18. A number of criteria were considered as a way to develop a priority list of sites for development. These were as follows:
 - (a) geographical spread.
 - (b) existing passenger demand.
 - (c) existing level of passenger services.
 - (d) surrounding population catchment.
 - (e) importance of the suburban centre in comparison to other centres.
 - (f) status of the centre within the metro network.
 - (g) land availability and complexity of procurement.
 - (h) traffic management implications and impacts on other road users.
 - (i) extent of changes required to the existing metro services and for existing passengers.
 - (j) impacts on neighbouring land owners and uses.
 - (k) project cost.
 - (l) time to complete and time implications with other projects.

5 Cont'd

PREFERRED OPTION

19. Having considered each criteria and the aims and objectives of the project, it is recommended that criteria (d) to (l) form the criteria to prioritise a list of interchange locations. Criteria (d) to (f) cover matters of site significance, (g) to (j) cover matters of project feasibility and criteria (k) and (l) cover issues of project deliverability. This option reflects the significance of a location in the context of achieving high level Council aims and project objectives whilst it also recognises practical matters such as the availability of appropriate land and programming with other works².

Using these criteria will also likely achieve the equity offered by the remaining options which could be employed if necessary to split options rated equally using the proposed criteria.

20. The following table outlines the proposed criteria recommended for use and how these criteria will be measured. Each criteria will receive equal weighting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Notes the aims and objectives of the project.
- (b) Expresses its support for the proposed criteria for the development of a priority list of interchange locations. These being:
- (i) surrounding population catchment.
 - (ii) importance of the suburban centre in comparison to other centres.
 - (iii) status of the centre within the metro network.
 - (iv) land availability and complexity of procurement.
 - (v) traffic management implications and impacts on other road users.
 - (iv) extent of changes required to the existing metro services and for existing passengers.
 - (vii) impacts on neighbouring land owners and uses.
 - (viii) project cost.
 - (ix) time to complete and time implications with other projects.
- (c) Requests that staff report back to the Community Board with the proposed interchange location priority list using these criteria (once they are adopted by Council), prior to a resolution being sought by Council for the development of the first three suburban interchange locations.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

6. HANSEN PARK – PROPOSAL BY VODAFONE NEW ZEALAND LIMITED TO OBTAIN APPROVAL TO INSTALL AND OPERATE A TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY ON FEE SIMPLE LAND USED FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES.

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment
Officer responsible:	Michael Aitken, Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Tony Hallams, Policy and Leasing Officer, DDI 941-8320

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's recommendation to the Council to approve the installation of a telecommunication facility that utilises existing Council owned infrastructure at Hansen Park. The proposal is necessary to enable the applicant to improve mobile phone coverage in the immediate area of Hansen Park, Butler Street, Opawa. A site description of the proposal is **attached**.

² The development of interchanges within LTCCP 2006/16 budgets is an underlying assumption.

6 Cont'd

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant seeks to utilise an existing floodlight pole to locate telecommunication equipment which is owned by the Christchurch City Council and utilised by the Sydenham Rugby Football Club to light the nearby rugby playing field. The Sydenham Rugby Football Club is in support of the application because the Club will benefit by improving the light levels on the rugby playing field.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

3. The Christchurch City Council entered in to a 10 year Agreement with Vodafone New Zealand Limited on 19 September 2001 to licence sites in the Christchurch City Council territorial area for telecommunication purposes. The background to the Agreement is:
 - (a) That the Council is the registered proprietor or administering body of the land.
 - (b) That the Company (Vodafone New Zealand Limited) wishes to have access to and use of various parts of the land to erect, install, and maintain telecommunication facilities.
 - (c) That the parties wish to record the terms and conditions that will apply to telecommunication facilities installed on the land.

After being approached by the applicant, Mr Bill Hughes, Property Consultant Corporate Services, and a member of the Christchurch City Council Staff Cell Site Sub Committee, has indicated to the writer that the Christchurch City Council will consider an application for the Hansen Park site within the provisions of Section 3, Site Identification, of the Agreement.

Because the intended site is not on the roadside, stand alone, a building site, macro or micro site as defined under Sections 3.3 (a) (b) of the Agreement, section 3.3(c) applies, which states.

(C).... Whether the site is available will be at the Council's sole discretion.

Because the fee simple land is used for recreational sporting purposes, the Greenspace Unit has been requested to process the application through the appropriate community board and the Council for consideration. The writer has been requested to report back to the Cell Site Sub Committee after any decision has been made by the Council.

Under Council resolution made on 19 April 2000, it was resolved that "Where a Commissioner is not used, that a Council Hearings Panel make all decisions relating to applications for cell phone towers (including whether or not to notify the application and whether or not to grant consent) under the Resource Management Act 1991 or the Reserves Act 1977."

Whilst it is considered that the proposal is not covered under the above legislation, it is also considered that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board under the Governance Provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, may consider that the proposal and make a recommendation to the Council. It is also considered the Council or a Commissioner may make a decision to approve or otherwise the proposal to use the land at specified point to accommodate a telecommunications facility. If this course of action was followed, and the Council or a Commissioner approved the application, then the applicant would still need to make an application for resource consent within the provisions of the City Plan requirements.

4. The floodlight pole sought to be utilised at Hansen Park sits on land held under the Canterbury Land Registry as fee simple, the proprietor being the Christchurch City Council Act 1977. As such, this proposal will not be subject to the consultation provisions of the Reserves Act 1977.
5. A consultant to the applicant, Connell Wagner, has indicated that the proposed facility is to be located within the Open Space 2 zone, and the visual effects will be no more than minor. A copy of Connell Wagner's report is **attached**.

6 Cont'd

6. In 1996, the Christchurch City Council made an application under the Resource Management Act 1991 to erect four poles totalling 14.5 metres in height for floodlighting a rugby training ground at Hansen Park. The decision on 21 May 1996 by David W. Collins, Hearing Commissioner, conditionally permitted the erection of four poles at the above-mentioned height of 14.5 metres. It is considered the applicant's proposal to locate the telecommunications antennae on top of an existing pole, to be relocated to give an overall height of 15.500 metres, does not comply with the conditions of the resource consent decision, and the proposal, if supported by the Board, will require the applicant gaining resource consent and building consent approvals to enable the antennae and telecommunications equipment to be installed at the new height.
7. The consultant to the applicant, the National Radiation Laboratory, has indicated in the report (refer handout):

"Exposure in publicly accessible areas in and around the site would be low compared with the exposure limits prescribed in NZS 2772.1.1999. The limits in the exposure Standard are set well below the levels at which adverse health effects may occur, so as to provide a safe and healthy working and living environment. On this basis, the proposed mobile phone site would not pose a health hazard to people who live, work or pass close to it".
8. The Sydenham Rugby Football Club has detailed in its letter dated 2 November 2005 (refer **attached**):

"The Sydenham Rugby Football Club has no objections to the proposed Vodafone installation at Hansen Park, St Martins, Christchurch. As discussed the site of the tower to be located 15 metres south west (towards the designated lighted rugby ground). The existing floodlights to be located at the same position on the proposed replacement pole".
9. The applicant intends to pay all costs associated with the installation of the facility and negotiation of a site agreement with the Corporate Support Unit on behalf of the Council, which will include Council officers' time spent preparing reports, attending Council meetings, and preparing legal documentation, together with the fees of outside agencies required.
10. All residences that border Hansen Park have been written to, informing the occupiers of the details of the proposal. The residents have also been informed that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board will consider the proposal at its meeting on 21 February 2006. All known sports clubs and schools that use the park have also been written to as well as known community groups in the area.

BACKGROUND

11. The Christchurch City Council Corporate Support Unit and Greenspace Unit have received an application from Vodafone New Zealand Limited to install and operate a telecommunication facility on fee simple land owned by the Christchurch City Council at Hansen Park, Butler Street, Opawa, Christchurch.
12. Mr David Sisson Greenspace Unit Planner has made an assessment of the proposal and reports as follows:

"I believe this proposal would have a low adverse visual effect on public appreciation of Hansen Park. The proposed pole is 15.5m tall and replaces an existing floodlight pole. It is well screened from trees from all but one nearby house, and even from that house the setting of young trees reduces the intrusion, and it would become less intrusive as those trees grow. It would be a bit more visible in Winter, but it would fit with the existing ring of floodlights and be a logical part of the park. In views from hillside houses it would be an insignificant part of the view across the park. Within the park it would not have any significant effect compared to the present character."
13. The applicant has provided a photographic "mock up" of the intended installation, and this is detailed in the **attachment**.

6 Cont'd

14. All known residences straddling Hansen Park (158) have been written to informing the occupiers of the proposal. Known schools (6) and sports groups (4) using the park have also been written to, as well as the Opawa/St Martins Residents Association. The Greenspace Unit received 39 written responses from letters sent, with some residents consenting to Brent McLeod (DTZ New Zealand Ltd MREINZ) acting on behalf of Vodafone, discussing their concerns.
15. **Attachment 5** lists those people who have entered in to correspondence with the Council or made a written submission raising concerns with the proposal.
16. The underlying strands of concerns raised by residents are as follows:
 - *The potential visual and effects of the proposal.*
17. The potential visual effects have been commented on by Greenspace Unit Planner, David Sissons, (refer to recommendation (b) of this report). It is considered that in the event of the proposal being supported by the Board a condition is set down that Vodafone cover the cost of any plantings to shield the proposed installation from the field of view of nearby residents.
 - *The potential adverse health effects of the proposal*
18. The radio frequency exposure assessment of the proposal has been reported on by the National Radiation Laboratory. The report concludes that the limits in the exposure standard are set well below the levels at which adverse health effects may occur, so as to provide a safe healthy and living environment; and on this basis, the proposal would not pose a health hazard to people who live, work, or pass by close to it.
19. Copies of the National Radiation Laboratory Report dated 2 September 2005 will be circulated at the Board meeting.

There are provisions under Section 13.2 of the Agreement between the Christchurch City Council and Vodafone New Zealand Limited, for termination of the agreement if it is shown by independent evidence from the National Radiation Laboratory that in terms of New Zealand Standard 2772: 1999 the use of a site by the company is or is reasonably likely to cause a health hazard to the members of the public and it is shown that such a health hazard can only be averted by the company ceasing all operations at the site.

The applicant does not seek to undertake any site testing as detailed under Section 4 Site Testing, of the agreement until a decision has been made on the application by the Council.

20. The proposed telecommunication facility will see Vodafone replace an existing 14.500 metre floodlight pole owned by the Christchurch City Council with a new 15.00 metre pole with upper antennae to give an overall height of 15.500 metres. The new 15.00 metre pole will become the property of the Council upon installation. The 14.500 metre pole will remain the property of the Council. The existing floodlights on the 14.500 metre pole will be remounted on the new 15.00 metre pole at their current height. The telecommunication facility panel antenna and masthead amplifiers will be located inside a plastic sleeve mounted on the pole above the floodlights to minimise any visual effect.
21. The telecommunication facility microwave dish will be mounted externally on the pole below the floodlights to provide a clear line of sight connection to another distant telecommunication facility. An equipment cabinet measuring 5m² and 3 metres in height will also be installed adjacent to the new 15 metre pole. Both the new 15 metre pole and equipment cabinet will be painted green to match the existing power box, surrounding bushes and trees. In addition, the Sydenham Rugby Football Club has negotiated with both the Council and Vodafone to have the new 15 metre floodlight pole and existing power box relocated closer to the rugby ground to improve light levels on the nearby rugby playing field. The new location is among existing bushes and therefore has removed the need for any new landscaping around the proposed telecommunication facility.

6 Cont'd

VODAFONE'S PREFERRED OPTION

22. On an existing floodlight pole at Hansen Park, Butler Street, Opawa. The applicant has indicated this is its preferred option because the site meets the following criteria:
 - (a) An existing structure.
 - (b) It will improve mobile phone coverage in and around Hansen Park.
 - (c) The unavailability of other suitable sites.
23. It is important that works are consistent with the Council's policies. Before any tenders are let or work commences on site, discussions will be held with the Parks and Waterways Area Advocate (Spreydon/Heathcote), the Corporate Services Unit and the Greenspace Unit, to ascertain the Council's requirements throughout the installation phase.
24. It is considered that there will be no detrimental long term health and environmental effects as an outcome of the proposal because the applicant has provided a report from the National Radiation Laboratory indicating New Zealand Standard 2772.1 1999 Radio frequency Fields Part 1: Maximum exposure levels 3 kHz- 300GHz will be complied with in terms of the siting and operation of the telecommunications equipment at Hansen Park.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

- (a) That the Board recommend to the Council that it enter in to a site agreement, as per the current protocol document between the Christchurch City Council and Vodafone New Zealand Limited to enable Vodafone to install a telecommunication facility on a relocated floodlight pole on Hansen Park, together with a ground service cabinet subject to the following conditions:
 - (i) That resource and building consents are obtained.
 - (ii) That before work commences on the site, the applicant is responsible for locating any existing services in the reserve, if applicable, and ensuring that these are not damaged by contractors.
 - (iii) That any telecommunications equipment, including the cabinet, is to be painted or coated in a green shade or suitable colour to match the colour of the existing pole.
 - (iv) The telecommunications facility is maintained by the applicant and its contractors in a safe and tidy condition at all times.
 - (v) A bond of \$2,000 is to be paid by the applicant to the Christchurch City Council via the Parks and Waterways Advocate, Beckenham Service Centre, before work commences on the site. This bond, less any expenses incurred by the Council, is to be refunded to the payee upon the completion of the work by the Greenspace Unit Policy and Leasing Administrator.
- (b) That Vodafone New Zealand Limited provide a landscape plan to the Greenspace Unit Manager detailing sufficient plantings to shield the intended installation from the field of view of nearby residents.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

**7. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE
- REPORT OF MEETING 13 FEBRUARY 2006**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services
Officer responsible:	Lisa Goodman, Community Board Principal Adviser
Author:	Peter Dow, Community Secretary, DDI 941-5105

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to submit the outcomes of the Finance & Policy Committee meeting held on 13 February 2006 as follows:

**Report of a meeting of the Finance & Policy Committee
held on Monday 13 February 2006 at 5.00pm
in the Boardroom, Beckenham Service Centre**

PRESENT: Phil Clearwater, Oscar Alpers, Paul de Spa, Chris Mene and Megan Woods

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Barry Corbett and Sue Wells.

2. PROPOSED EARTHQUAKE-PRONE, DANGEROUS AND INSANITARY BUILDINGS POLICY 2006 – BOARD SUBMISSION

At its meeting on 7 February 2006 the Board **agreed** that the Finance & Policy Committee consider the “Christchurch Plans for Safer Buildings” document with a view to preparing a Board submission on the matter.

The Committee considered the contents of the draft policy and the resulting draft submission is **attached** for the Board’s consideration.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the draft Board submission on the Proposed Earthquake-Prone, Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings Policy 2006, be adopted.

3. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND – REVIEW OF PURPOSE AND CRITERIA

Having considered a report detailing proposed guidelines and a suggested timeframe for the implementation of a revised Youth Development Scheme at its meeting on 18 October 2005, the Board **resolved** to:

- (a) Decline the adoption of the proposed guidelines and the implementation and funding criteria for the scheme and maintain the status quo.
- (b) Request that staff provide a set of basic guidelines to meet best practice standards, transparency and accountability in the administration of the Board’s Youth Development Fund.
- (c) Undertake a review at a future seminar meeting of the criteria for its own fund, including repeat applications, standards of excellence, financial need and individuals versus groups.

The Committee considered items (b) and (c) above in detail and in doing so had available various issues previously identified by the Board in April 2005 as requiring consideration along with the current criteria used for the Board’s Youth Development Fund.

Whilst good progress was made, the Committee still requires further time to complete its work including input from appropriate staff and accordingly it is anticipated that a final report will be made back to the Board in March/April 2006.

7 Cont'd

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the information be received.

The meeting concluded at 6.50pm.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and the recommendations therein be adopted.

8. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE

The Community Board Principal Adviser will update the Board on current issues.

9. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS