



## Christchurch City Council

# BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA NO 256

WEDNESDAY 6 JUNE 2007

5.30 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](mailto:clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz)

**Acting Community Secretary**

Leanne Smith

Telephone: 941-6624

Fax: 941-6604

Email: [leanne.smith@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:leanne.smith@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 REPORTS
- PART B 3. PETITIONS
- PART B 4. CORRESPONDENCE
- PART B 5. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
- PART A 6. ROAD LEGALISATION - BROOKER AVENUE AND KINGSBRIDGE DRIVE
- PART C 7. APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE TO BYLAWS REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
- PART C 8. SURPLUS 2006/07 DISCRETIONARY FUNDS - ALLOCATION PROPOSALS
- PART A 9. NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGE 27 RESIDENTIAL DENSITY IN NEW BRIGHTON
- PART B 10. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE
- PART B 11. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS 2.16
- PART B 12. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS 4.1
- PART B 13. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

**We're on the Web!**

[www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/](http://www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/)



6. 6. 2007

- 2 -

**1. APOLOGIES**

**2. CONFIRMATION OF REPORT**

The report of the ordinary meeting (both open and public excluded) of the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board held on Wednesday 16 May 2007 have been circulated to Board members.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the report of the ordinary meeting (both open and public excluded) held on Wednesday 16 May 2007 be confirmed.

**3. PETITIONS**

**4. CORRESPONDENCE**

**BEXLEY WETLAND STOPBANK**

The **attached** email correspondence was received from the Bexley Residents' Association regarding the removal of the Bexley Wetland stopbank.

**5. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**6. ROAD LEGALISATION - BROOKER AVENUE AND KINGSBRIDGE DRIVE**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Weng Kei Chen, Asset Policy Engineer

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. That the Board recommend to the Council that it:
  - (a) declare existing section of land area 4m<sup>2</sup> being Lot 23, DP 77872 as road pursuant to Section 52 of the Public Works Act 1981; and
  - (b) dedicate the existing road reserve defined as Lot 110, DP 71216 as road pursuant to Section 111 of the Reserves Act 1977.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. A subdivision consent was granted to Enterprise Homes Ltd to develop Stage 1 on land contained in Lot 1, DP 29195 (**Attachment 1**).
3. The residential sections will be served by extending the existing Brooker Avenue and Kingsbridge Drive.
4. The extension of these roads include two sections of land owned by the Council for road purposes, being:
  - (a) Lot 23, DP 77872 at the end of Brooker Avenue (**Attachment 2**).
  - (b) Lot 110, DP 71216 at the end of Kingsbridge Drive (**Attachment 3**).
5. The two sections are required to be vested as legal road prior to individual Certificates of Title being issued to the residential lots.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

6. The declaration and dedication of road processes is funded by Enterprise Homes Ltd and is a condition of the Resource Consent issued on 20 March 2006.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

7. Not funded by the Council.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

8. The completion of the subdivision requires the two sections of land owned by the Council to be legalised as road.
9. The section as defined as Lot 23, DP 77872 is freehold and will required the Council's resolution pursuant to Section 52 of the Public Works Act 1981 to declare it as a road.
10. The section as defined in Lot 110, DP 71216 is road reserve and will require the Council's resolution pursuant to Section 3 of the Reserves Act 1977 to dedicate it as a road.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

11. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

12. LTCCP page 152 "Streets and Transport Objectives" - To provide public street frontages to properties.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

13. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

14. Yes, this action is consistent with the objectives of the City Plan.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

15. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

16. Not required.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Board recommend to the Council that it:

- (a) declare existing section of land area 4m<sup>2</sup> being Lot 23, DP 77872 as road pursuant to Section 52 of the Public Works Act 1981; and
- (b) dedicate the existing road reserve defined as Lot 110, DP 71216 as road pursuant to Section 111 of the Reserves Act 1977.

**BACKGROUND**

17. The Resource Consent granted to Enterprise Homes Ltd consisted of 49 residential sections and access to the roading network is by way of the extension of existing Brooker Avenue and Kingsbridge Drive.
18. The extension of these two roads includes the two sections of land owned by the Council for road purposes.
19. The two sections of land were transferred to the Council as the result of previous developments.
20. The transfer of land to Council in subdivision is a common tool used by the Council to control subdivisional roading patterns and reticulation of utilities.
21. The road formation for the subdivision is substantially completed.
22. The declaration and dedication of Council's land for road is required to enable the individual land titles to be issued for the 49 sections on completion of the subdivision.

**7. APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE TO BYLAWS REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8177
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Programme Manager Strong Communities
<b>Author:</b>	Terence Moody, Principal Adviser (Environmental Health)

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is for the Board to nominate a representative to a subcommittee to provide Board members views in to the review of bylaws.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. A seminar was held on 13 March 2007 of Councillors and Board members to provide information on the required reviews of bylaws under the LGA 2002 and the process that must be undertaken to comply with the Act. Section 158 of the LGA 2002 requires bylaws to be reviewed within five years of 1 July 2003 if they were made prior to the Act coming into force, or if made under the LGA 2002 within five years of the date they were made. Reviews must be carried out in accordance with Section 155 which requires that the Council is satisfied that a bylaw is necessary, and the perceived problems cannot be dealt with in any other manner. At least 24 bylaws are required to be reviewed prior to the end of June 2008 and timetables for these reviews have been set.
3. On 10 May 2007 a Council meeting decision was made to form a subcommittee.<sup>1</sup> The subcommittee will provide a single conduit for communication with Boards about the reviews and highlight specific reviews likely to be of high interest. The subcommittee will gather feedback in a timely and efficient fashion and enable a fast turnaround of initial comments on the reviews prior to the formal consideration by the Council required under the Act. The options analysis for each review will be sent to the subcommittee prior to the matter going on to the Council. It will be necessary to ensure a prescribed turnaround time for responses back to the initiating units to meet timetables for the reviews. The terms of reference for this subcommittee is *to provide a process by which the views of Boards can be collected and considered and to communicate these views to the Council as part of the consideration of options in the reviews of bylaws*. The process is not intended to promote totally new bylaws but to consider the review requirements of the Act. Should the process identify objectives that may need to be considered by totally new bylaws these will be noted and addressed once the review of existing bylaws is completed.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. The input of Boards will be conducted through normal Board processes. The joint committee approach should reduce the potential for duplication and delay, and assist Council in meeting its statutory deadline. There are no extraordinary financial implications from the proposed process.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

5. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6. The Council has the power under the LGA 2002 to appoint or discharge committees and subcommittees (clause 30). The Council can also delegate powers to subcommittees in accordance with clause 32, Schedule 7 of the LGA 2002 for the purposes of efficiency and effectiveness in the conduct of the Council's business. In this case, there is no need to delegate any powers to the subcommittee as its primary purpose concerns gathering and distributing information to and from the Boards in respect of the bylaw reviews. The Council has delegate the power to appoint the Board members of the subcommittee to each Board.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

7. Yes.

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to council meeting minutes on this decision.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

8. The report is consistent with the Democracy and Governance Activity Management Plan in the LTCCP in that the recommendations contribute to ensuring that there is suitable community input to the Council's decision making. See Our Community Plan 2006-2016 Volume 1 Page 111.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

9. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

10. No specific strategies involved.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

11. Compliance with Strategic Directions to promote participation in democratic processes by making it easy for people to understand and take part in Council decision-making processes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

12. An initial seminar was held on 13 March 2007 with Boards and copies were distributed to all Board members. The proposed structure was reported to Council on 10 May 2007 and adopted.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board nominate a member as its representative on the Bylaw Reviews Subcommittee to collectively ensure that the views of the Boards are incorporated as part of the review process required for all bylaws under the Local Government Act 2002.

**BACKGROUND (THE BYLAW REVIEW PROCESS)**

14. A seminar was held on 13 March 2007 of Councillors and Board members to provide information on the required reviews of bylaws under the LGA 2002 and the process that must be undertaken to comply with the Act. Where Board members were unable to attend copies of the material presented and the notes of the meeting were distributed for their information. Section 158 of the LGA 2002 requires bylaws to be reviewed within five years of 1 July 2003 if they were made prior to the Act coming into force, or if made under the LGA 2002 within five years of the date they were made. Reviews must be carried out in accordance with Section 155 which requires that the Council is satisfied that a bylaw is necessary, and the perceived problems cannot be dealt with in any other manner.
15. If it is determined that a bylaw is the most appropriate way of dealing with the problem the Council must decide that the bylaw is the most appropriate form and does not give rise to any implications under the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (NZBORA). This means the Council must be able to show that the bylaw provision being considered serves an important and significant objective, there is a rational connection between the provision and objective and it does not interfere with any right or freedom protected by the NZBORA.
16. The Code of Good Regulatory Practice requires that consideration be given to:
  - Efficiency - by adopting only regulations for which the costs to society are justified by the benefits.
  - Effectiveness - to ensure it can be complied with and enforced at the lowest possible cost.
  - Transparency - by defining the nature and extent of the problem and evaluating the need for action.
  - Clarity - in making things as simple as possible, to use plain language where possible, and keeping discretion to a minimum.
  - Regulation should be fair and treat those affected equitably.
17. Section 145 of the LGA 2002 provides the general bylaw-making power for territorial authorities for the following purposes:
  - (a) Protecting the public from nuisance.
  - (b) Protecting, promoting, and maintaining public health and safety.
  - (c) Minimising the potential for offensive behaviour in public places.
18. Sections 146 and 147 provide specific bylaw-making powers to regulate:
  - On-site wastewater disposal systems.
  - Waste management.
  - Trade wastes.
  - Solid wastes.
  - Keeping of animals, bees, and poultry.
  - Trading in public places.
  - Water races.
  - Water supply.
  - Wastewater, drainage and sanitation.
  - Land drainage.
  - Cemeteries.
  - Reserves or Recreation grounds.
  - Prevention of the spread of fires involving vegetation subject to provisions of the Forest and Rural Act 1977.

For liquor control purposes the Council is empowered to prohibit or regulate the consumption of liquor, bringing of liquor, or possession of liquor in a public place.

19. There remain some provisions which enable territorial authorities to make bylaws which are contained in the Local Government Act 1974, which largely relate to the use of roads and traffic matters. These tend to be more specific in nature than the purposes set out in the LGA 2002. Some of the bylaws due for review may fall within the LGA 1974 provisions.



## 6. 6. 2007

- 9 -

20. The table below sets out the bylaws that must be reviewed by June 2008.

CC Public Places and Signs Bylaw 2003	BP District Refuse Bylaw 2002
CC Dog Control Bylaw 1997	BP Trade Wastes Bylaw 2000
CC Refuse Bylaw 1995	BP Wastewater Drainage Bylaw 2000
CC Bylaw No. 118 (1981) Parks and Reserves	BP Water Supply Bylaw 1998
CC Traffic and Parking Bylaw 1991	BP Amusement Devices and Shooting Galleries 1996
CC Water Related Services Bylaw 2001	BP Nuisances 1996
CC Bylaw No. 110 (1980) Cemeteries	BP Public Swimming Pools 1996
CC Bylaw No. 103 (1979) Public Swimming Pools	BP Gin Trap Bylaw 1991 No. 1
CC Bylaw No. 120 (1982) Estuary and Foreshore	BP Cemetery Bylaw 1996
BP Licences for Vehicle Stands on Streets 1996	BP Marine Facilities Control Bylaw 2002
BP Parks and Reserves 1996	BP Traffic and Parking Bylaw 1998
BP Mobile or Travelling Shops, and Hawkers and Itinerant Traders 1996	BP Stock Control Bylaw 1994 No. 1

21. A number of Units are involved in the reviews and some bylaws will be considered jointly by more than one Unit. A programme has been developed for consideration of the bylaws and the process must be adhered to whether a bylaw is to have minor or substantive changes, remain unchanged or be revoked. The full process of review requires consultation with the Executive Team, the Council and Boards, and progression through public consultation, submissions and a hearings panel. A minimum of five or six months is commonly required to complete a review. The table above shows that 24 bylaws must be reviewed in the next 12 months although some reviews will be able to be combined and some bylaws will possibly be able to be revoked on the grounds that their objectives are covered by other legislation. The Council must consider the need for Board input, and the time that may be involved in this additional consultation, with the relatively tight timetable legally required to complete the bylaw reviews.
22. The seminar concluded that a small subcommittee of Board members and Councillors formed to undertake an initial consideration of the reviews could be the most efficient, effective and timely method of obtaining Board input. The subcommittee could provide a single conduit for communication with the Boards about the reviews and highlight specific reviews likely to be of high interest. It is expected that the subcommittee could gather feedback in a timely and efficient fashion and enable a fast turnaround of initial comments on the reviews prior to commencement of the formal consultation process required under the Act. The proposal was that the options analysis for each review would be sent to all Board members for comments back through the Board's representative to the subcommittee prior to the matter going on to the Council. It would be necessary to ensure a prescribed turnaround time for responses back to the initiating Units to meet timetables for the reviews. The process is not intended to be used to promote totally new bylaws. These can be raised and considered at any time, but this process is limited to considering the review requirements of the Act. If through the process possible new bylaws are identified for consideration these will be noted and addressed once the review of existing bylaws is completed. It must be noted that the Boards can have another opportunity to provide feedback through the special consultative procedure.
23. Council Decision - On 10 May 2007 the following decisions were made at the Council meeting:
- Resolve to appoint a Subcommittee to consider initial reviews of the Council's bylaws and provide feedback to the appropriate Units on the views of the Boards, prior to the matters being formally considered by the Council.
  - Resolve that the Subcommittee comprise one representative from each of the eight Boards and two Councillors.
  - Appoint two Councillors to be members of the subcommittee.
  - Delegate the power to appoint one Board member of the Subcommittee to each Board.

**8. SURPLUS 2006/07 DISCRETIONARY FUNDS - ALLOCATION PROPOSALS**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Democracy Services Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Clare Sullivan, Community Board Principal Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is for the Board to consider the allocation of its remaining 2006/07 Discretionary funds.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The funding available to the Board for the 2006/07 financial year was \$390,000.
3. Unspent Project and Discretionary funds cannot be carried over into the next financial year and, therefore, any unspent funds need to be reallocated and spent before 30 June 2007.
4. Proposals for the allocation of the remaining 2006/07 Discretionary funding are detailed below.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5. As at 1 May 2007, from an original allocation of \$23,202, there was a current Discretionary fund balance of \$1,163 available for allocation up to 30 June 2007. Together with \$1,050 remaining in the Youth Development Fund for allocation and the return of unspent funds from Project funding there was a total of \$5,213 for reallocation.
6. On 16 May 2007 the Board approved the allocation of \$2,435 to the Pier Lighting event. This left a balance of \$2,778 for reallocation.
7. Unspent Project and Discretionary funds cannot be carried over into the next financial year and, therefore, any unspent funds need to be reallocated and spent before 30 June 2007.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

8. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

9. Unspent funds cannot be carried over into the next financial year.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

10. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS****Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

11. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES****Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

12. Yes they support the Board's objectives which align with Council strategies and the Community Outcomes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

13. Not required.

**PROPOSALS FOR 2006/07 ALLOCATION**

14. The following projects have been identified as suitable proposals for allocation of the remaining funds:

- (a) New Brighton and Districts Historical Society (\$880)

A request has been received from the New Brighton and Districts Historical Society who have been unsuccessful in seeking additional funding for rental purposes for a shortfall of until the 30 June 2007 of \$1760 (\$220 per week for eight weeks). The Community Response fund has supported half of this and they remain in need of a further \$880. The Board supported the Society in its 2007/08 project funding allocation with \$8,000.

- (b) Board Newsletter (\$1,700)

The Board funded four newsletters in the 2006/07 financial year. At the end of the previous financial year we asked for the accounts for the fourth newsletter for 2005/06 to be sent in order to be paid out of the 2005/06 year. However, this did not occur and the payment was taken from the 2006/07 money. It is therefore proposed that the remaining sum be allocated to fund the final newsletter for the 2006/07 year.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Board:

1. Approve the \$1,500 remaining in the Community Response Fund be returned and allocated to the Discretionary fund for reallocation to other projects.
2. Approve the \$1,500 remaining in the Junior Neighbourhood Support fund be returned and allocated to the Discretionary fund for reallocation to other projects.
3. Consider the project proposals for allocation from its remaining 2006/07 Discretionary funds as it considers appropriate.

## 9. NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGE 27 RESIDENTIAL DENSITY IN NEW BRIGHTON

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Environmental Policy and Approvals Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Jonathan Clease, Senior Planner

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek a Council resolution on whether or not to proceed with public notification of proposed Plan Change 27 relating to residential density in New Brighton.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. In March 2006 the Council initiated a review of the City Plan provisions for New Brighton to investigate the potential for, and possible impacts of, an increase in building height and residential density. The study area encompassed much of the New Brighton Mall area, the foreshore adjacent to the pier, and the Living 3 zoned land from Rawhiti Domain in the north to Shackleton Street in the south.
3. Consultants were engaged to assist with this review, with the consultant team lead by Boffa Miskell Ltd. A number of technical reports were commissioned to look at a range of potential environmental effects that might result from an increase in building scale and residential density in the study area. The technical reports addressed:
  - The visual/landscape implications of a range of building heights and bulk.
  - Potential shading effects.
  - Potential wind tunnel effects.
  - Transport implications from increasing the number of households.
  - Geotechnical and natural hazard issues.
  - Infrastructure capacity eg water, sewer, electricity, stormwater etc.
  - Capacity of community facilities eg primary school, library, parks.
  - The potential market demand and associated economic implications.
  - Social effects.
4. Consultation with the community was undertaken during the study, including:
  - A public meeting and presentation to the community to outline the intended study process on 21 March 2006.
  - Two public open days to present the findings of the technical reports and gain community feedback on 29 and 30 June 2006.
  - Provision of background information and technical reports on the Christchurch City Council website and at the New Brighton Library throughout a public feedback process that ran from the end of June until 22 September 2006. A total of 351 submissions from individuals and seven submissions from community and business groups were received directly by the Council, with a further 475 submissions received on a form initiated by the New Brighton Residents' Association.
5. Based on the findings of the various technical reports and feedback from the community, a package of broad Plan Change recommendations and an interim Section 32 report was presented to a Council seminar on 31 October 2006. Following the October seminar and associated feedback from Councillors, further analysis was carried out on the plan change package and the specific proposed text changes to the Plan were drafted. This further analysis, updated Section 32 report, and proposed Plan Change text was presented to a second Council seminar on 17 April 2007 and the Board on 18 April 2007. Since the April seminar the Section 32 report (circulated separately to Board members) and Plan Change text (**attached**) has been finalised, with this text including detailed design and appearance assessment matters that were not available at the April seminar.

6. The proposed package of changes to the City Plan include:
- Retention of the existing Living 3 zoning in the southern and northern portions of the study area (but amending the current 11 metre development standard height limit to 14 metres as a critical standard).
  - Change in zoning of the Living 3 land north and south of the Mall, to Living 4C with a 20 metre building height limit.
  - Change in zoning of the Business 2 land on the foreshore to Open Space 2, with associated amendments to the Open Space 2 zone rules to provide for a low scale of building development (bulk and location) and an appropriate range of activities consistent with a public use/recreation focus.
  - Retention of the existing Business 2P zoning to the south of the Mall (8 metre building height limit if used for residential activity).
  - Retention of the existing Business 2 zoning in the western part of the Mall area (20 metre building height limit).
  - Retention of the Business 2 zoning for the Business 2 land in the eastern part of the Mall but with a change in the zone provisions to provide a 30 metre building height limit.
  - Provision of a new rule requiring design and appearance controls (including wind assessment for buildings over 20 metres) on all development over 11 metres in height or providing three or more residential units in both the Living and Business zones.
  - Provision of a new rule requiring compliance with shadowing protection provisions for all new buildings on the northern side of the Mall.
7. Section 32 of the Resource Management Act requires Council to be satisfied that any proposed plan change is a more efficient and effective means of achieving the Plan's objectives and policies than the current provisions. The Section 32 report concludes that this is the case for the proposed amendments to the City Plan. Should Council resolve to publicly notify the proposed plan change then those changes will be available for the community to make submissions on, with submitters then able to present their submission at a public hearing, with the hearings panel then obliged to make a recommendation to the Council on whether or not the plan change should be accepted, amended, or rejected.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. There are no direct financial considerations beyond staff time covered by existing Unit budgets.

#### **Do the recommendations of this report align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

9. The costs of public notification are able to be covered by existing Unit budgets.

#### **LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

#### **Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

10. Section 32 of the Resource Management Act requires Council to undertake an analysis of the costs and benefits of any potential plan change so that Council can be satisfied that the proposed plan change is a more efficient and effective method for achieving the Plan's objectives and policies than the current provisions. The RMA requires all proposed Plan Changes to be publicly notified so that interested parties can make submissions on the proposed changes.

#### **ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

11. Supports the LTCCP City Plan measure that 10 variations or plan changes be prepared and notified annually.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

12. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

13. The Section 32 report demonstrates that the proposed plan change more effectively and efficiently meets the objectives and policies of the City Plan than the current provisions.

The proposed plan change is also in alignment with the recently adopted Urban Development Strategy that has as one of its key tenets the management of urban growth through intensification of the existing urban area, with such intensification best located adjacent to district centres.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

14. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

15. Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Section 32 and the Resource Management Act. It is noted that public notification of the proposed Plan Change will enable the community to have their say via submissions and a public hearing.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Board recommends to Council:

- (a) Adopt the assessment under Section 32 of the Resource Management Act.
- (b) Publicly notify Plan Change 27 to the City Plan.

**10. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE**

**10.1 OUTSTANDING REPORTS**

**10.2 CSR UPDATE (FEBRUARY - APRIL 2007)**

**Attached.**

**10.3 2006/07 PROJECT, DISCRETIONARY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUNDS UPDATE**

**Attached.**

**11. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS 2.16**

**12. 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.

**13. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

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