



## Christchurch City Council

# FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 3 OCTOBER 2007

8.30 AM

IN MEETING ROOM 1  
FENDALTON SERVICE CENTRE  
CORNER JEFFREYS AND CLYDE ROADS

**Community Board:** Mike Wall (Chairman), Val Carter (Deputy Chairperson), Sally Buck, Faimeh Burke, Cheryl Colley, Pat Harrow and Andrew Yoon

**Community Board Adviser**  
Clare Sullivan  
Phone 941 6728 DDI  
Email: [clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz)

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

### INDEX

- PART B 1. APOLOGIES**
- PART C 2. APPLICATION TO THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD'S 2007/08 SCAP FUND - BURNSIDE ELIM CHURCH**
- PART C 3. APPLICATION TO THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD'S 2007/08 SCAP FUND - PRESBYTERIAN SUPPORT**
- PART C 4. HERITAGE AWARDS, THE MERIVALE PRECINCT SOCIETY – APPLICATION FOR FUNDING**
- PART C 5. YALDHURST RURAL RESIDENT'S ASSOCIATION – APPLICATION FOR FUNDING**
- PART C 6. NEIGHBOURHOOD WEEK APPLICATIONS**
- PART A 7. PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 16: PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE TO AMEND RUNWAY END PROTECTION AREAS FOR CROSS-RUNWAY 11/29, CHRISTCHURCH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**
- PART B 8. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
  - 8.1 Current Issues**
  - 8.2 Board Funding Update for 2007/08**
- PART B 9. CHAIRPERSONS' AND BOARD MEMBERS INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- PART B 10. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

**We're on the Web!**

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

1. **APOLOGIES**

Cheryl Colley

2. **APPLICATION TO THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD'S 2007/08 SCAP FUND - BURNSIDE ELIM CHURCH**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8534
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support
<b>Author:</b>	Maryanne Lomax, Community Development Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to provide information in relation to an application for funding from the Burnside Elim Church for \$7,400 from the Board's 2007/08 SCAP fund.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Burnside Elim Church is seeking financial support from the Board towards the cost of running the LINK programme.
3. The main objective of the LINK programme is to assist migrants and students of other ethnicities to be integrated into the New Zealand culture with a particular focus on the Northwest area.
4. The LINK programme includes a morning class once a week that incorporates teaching English (pronunciation, grammar, listening, reading and writing skills) with basic life skills. Some of the skills include learning how to make appointments for different services, such as going to see doctors, dentists and schools, getting a New Zealand Drivers Licence, cooking, and social etiquette.
5. The funding requested will secure the services of two fully qualified tutors and a coordinator to ensure a high standard of service is provided. Having two tutors allows the class to be split into different levels of difficulty. Students pay \$2 per session which contributes to the resources used in the programme.
6. There are currently 26 people regularly attending these classes.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7. The requested funding can be sourced from the Board's 2007/08 SCAP fund. There is currently \$13,654 remaining in this budget.
8. The Board funded \$7,400 towards this programme from the 2006/07 SCAP fund. That funding was for a 12 month period and is due to finish in December 2007.
9. The funding requested in this application will cover the period of January to December 2008.

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

10. This application is seeking funding from the Community Board's 2007/08 SCAP fund which was established as part of the Board's 2007/08 Project Funding and aligns with page 170 LTCCP, regarding Community Board Project funding.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

11. There are no legal issues to be considered.

**2 Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

12. Aligns with page 170 LTCCP, regarding Community Board Project funding.

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

13. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

14. Application aligns with the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy and local Community Board objectives.

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

15. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

16. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

- (a) That the Board allocate \$3,700 to the Burnside Elim Church to fund the LINK programme through to June 2008.
- (b) That the organisation submits an application for this programme to the 2008-09 Strengthening Communities fund for the period of July 2008-June 2009.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

### 3. APPLICATION TO THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD'S 2007/08 SCAP FUND - PRESBYTERIAN SUPPORT

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8534
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support
<b>Author:</b>	Maryanne Lomax, Community Development Adviser

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to provide information in relation to an application for funding from Presbyterian Support - Family Works for \$2,400 from the Board's 2007/08 SCAP fund.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Presbyterian Support - Family Works has made an application for funding to the Board for \$2,400 to continue providing a resiliency programme for Year 6 students at Aorangi Primary School.
3. Aorangi Primary School is a small decile 3, multicultural school in the suburb of Bryndwr. They have a stable roll of around 110 students, which is made up of approximately 27% Maori, 14% Samoan, 12% Afghani refugee, 8% Malaysian and 39% European.
4. This programme focuses on developing and improving social skills, problem solving skills, and communication. It also teaches students to consider the consequences of the choices they make.
5. Year 6 students were chosen for this programme as they are about to transition to intermediate school and will be faced with a more grown up environment where their social skills will be tested. This programme is available to all Year 6 students which removes the stigma that children may otherwise associate with participating in a special learning programme.
6. Since the programme has been running there has been 100% positive feedback from teachers, parents, and the students. Teachers and parents have both noted an improvement in the attitudes of their children.
7. Through feedback received from parents and teachers, the need has been identified to involve the parents and families of the children into the programme so that the learning gained through the programme can be reinforced within the child's daily life. This is also a way to connect families to each other and the wider school community.
8. Aorangi Primary School has a large migrant population and this programme will help families to settle into their new community and culture. Through the relationships developed, families who require additional support can be assisted to access other services.
9. The programme is run by Marcel van der Weerden, the Family and Community Worker at St Stephen's Community Centre. Marcel's main role is to provide counselling to families within the Fendalton/Waimairi area, particularly low income families in the Bryndwr area.

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. The requested funding can be sourced from the Board's 2007/08 SCAP fund. There is currently \$13,654 remaining in this budget.
11. The Board funded \$2,000 towards this programme in 2006/07.

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

12. This application is seeking funding from the Community Board's 2007/08 SCAP fund which was established as part of the Board's 2007/08 Project Funding and aligns with page 170 LTCCP, regarding Community Board Project funding.

**3 Cont'd**

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

13. There are no legal issues to be considered.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

14. Aligns with page 170 LTCCP, regarding Community Board Project funding.

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

15. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

16. Application aligns with the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy and local Community Board objectives.

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

17. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

18. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board approve the application and allocate \$2,400 to Presbyterian Support for the Resiliency Programme at Aorangi Primary School from the Board's 2007/08 SCAP fund.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

## 4. HERITAGE AWARDS, THE MERIVALE PRECINCT SOCIETY – APPLICATION FOR FUNDING

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8986
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support
<b>Author:</b>	Andrea Wild, Community Engagement Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is for the Board to consider an application for funding from the Merivale Precinct Society for their Annual House Awards to be held during October 2007.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Merivale Precinct Society has made an application for funding to the Board for \$4,700 for the Society's Annual House Awards which is to be held in October this year.
3. The awards are held to encourage and raise awareness of well-planned property development, the preservation of heritage and established trees, and to generate good rapport with the commercial businesses throughout the Merivale area. They also aim to enhance community spirit and pride in the Merivale and Fendalton areas.
4. There are three categories in the House Awards. Awards are given for the best New Home, Renovated Home and Commercial Premises in the Merivale area. An award will also be given to the best Renovated Home in Fendalton. This is the first year the awards have been expanded to include the Fendalton area. Nominations are received from members of the public and judging is done by a panel of four, including an Architect who advises on architectural merit of the premises. In addition the Society will have a Best Street award. The awards ceremony is held in Merivale Mall and is open to all to attend.
5. The main Awards are paintings, commissioned by a local artist, depicting the winners' properties.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

6. A total of \$6,000 has been allocated for Heritage Awards by the Board for the period 2007/2008. There are currently no proposals to hold Ward-based Heritage Awards during this financial year. It therefore seems unlikely that this funding will be spent in the financial year 2007/2008. It is therefore suggested that this application, which has as one of its aims the preservation of heritage, be considered for funding from the Heritage Awards monies.
7. The Society requires funding of \$4,700 to hold their Annual House Awards.
8. The total budget for the Annual House Awards is \$5,700. The Society have raised \$1,000 through sponsorship and are requesting \$4,700 from the Board to cover the costs of the awards ceremony, a speaker for the event, food and refreshments at the event, spot prizes, paintings by a local artist for the winners of each category plus plaques.
9. The following table provides a breakdown of the costs involved with the House Awards:

<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>Cost (\$)</b>
Function	1,200
Speaker	400
Framed Paintings	1,800
Plaques	400
Photographs	400
Spot Prizes	500
Major Spot Prize	1,000
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>5,700</b>

10. The Society requested the same amount towards their awards last year and was awarded \$3,500 by the Board. This is the third time that the Merivale Precinct Society has applied to the Board for financial support to run the Annual House Awards.

**4 Cont'd**

11. The Merivale Precinct Society has \$12,000 total accumulated funds. The Chairperson has confirmed that half of this money has already been committed to forthcoming projects, including contributing to the costs of signage and landscaping on the City Council owned Merivale Village Green.

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

12. This application is seeking funding from the Community Board's 2007/08 Heritage Awards fund which was established as part of the Board's 2007/8 Project Funding.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

13. There are no legal issues to be considered.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

14. Aligns with page 170 LTCCP, regarding Community Board Project funding.

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

15. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

16. Application aligns with the *Attractive and Well-designed City* Community Outcome, Council's *Liveable City* Strategy and the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board objective *That residents take pride in living in the Fendalton/Waimairi ward.*

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

17. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

18. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board allocate the Merivale Precinct Society \$3,700 from its 2007/08 Heritage Awards fund towards the Annual House Awards, and for the Board to consider encouraging the Society to seek donations from local businesses towards the refreshments and spot prizes given out at the evening Awards ceremony.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**5. YALDHURST RURAL RESIDENT’S ASSOCIATION – APPLICATION FOR FUNDING**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8986
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support
<b>Author:</b>	Andrea Wild, Community Engagement Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek funding of \$5,000 from the Board’s 2007/08 Discretionary Fund towards the cost of professional services for the Yaldhurst Rural Resident’s Association in a Council Resource Consent hearing.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Association are requiring professional planner and legal services in order to oppose a Resource Consent application by United Campervan Rentals to set up a non-rural activity at 559 Pound Road.
3. 559 Pound Road is within a Rural 5 zone. The City Plan restricts the percentage of any site within a Rural 5 zone which can be used for non-rural activities. United Campervan Rentals are applying for a Resource Consent to breach the rules set out in the City Plan so that their business may operate from this site.
4. The Association has been instructed by its members to oppose the application by United Campervan Rentals, which they regard as an attempt to industrialise the Yaldhurst rural area.
5. The Council’s Planning Team have advised that they will not be supporting the application from United Campervan Rentals and will recommend that Council decline the resource consent application.
6. The hearing will take place on 8, 9 and 10 October and is joint hearing with Environment Canterbury as the proposed development will also have storm water and waste water implications.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7. The Board currently has \$36,652 in its Discretionary Fund.
8. Yaldhurst Rural Residents Association are applying for \$5,000 from the Board.
9. The total cost of the professional services required by the Association is estimated at being between \$4,800 and \$5,800.
10. The following table provides a breakdown of the costs involved:

<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>Cost (\$)</b>
Planner – Technical Assistance	\$3,000 - \$4,000
6 hours of Legal Advice at \$300 per hour	1,800
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$4,800 - \$5,800</b>

11. Yaldhurst Rural Residents Association has \$627 total accumulated funds.

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

12. This application is seeking funding from the Community Board’s 2007/08 Discretionary Fund.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

13. The Council resolution of 16 April 1992 states that Community Boards may make grants to “recognised residents’ groups within their area” to enable them to participate in the resource consent process.



**5 Cont'd**

14. The Planning team are recommending that Council decline the Resource Consent application from United Campervan Rentals.

**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?**

15. Aligns with page 170 LTCCP, regarding Community Board Project funding.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

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

16. Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

17. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Community Board consider the application for funding for \$5,000 from Yaldhurst Rural Residents Association.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

**6. NEIGHBOURHOOD WEEK APPLICATIONS**

Please refer to attached memo and application matrix.

Andrea Wild will be in attendance to answer any questions.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board consider the attached matrix and the funding allocations suggested by staff.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**7. PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 16: PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE TO AMEND RUNWAY END PROTECTION AREAS FOR CROSS-RUNWAY 11/29, CHRISTCHURCH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941 8462
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Environmental Policy and Approvals Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Glenda Dixon, Planner

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. This report describes a private plan change application to Council for a change to the City Plan and the process which must be followed under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The application is to amend Runway End Protection Area provisions and Approach Surface provisions as they relate to the Cross-wind runway (Runway 11/29) at the Christchurch International Airport, to enable increased airfield operational capacity and more efficient and safe use of the airport's combined runway system.
3. The purpose of this report is not to consider the application on its merits. Rather, it is to recommend which of several options under the RMA is to be used in processing the application.
4. The Council has the option of declining this application on the grounds that the City Plan has not been operative for two years, of accepting the application as a private application and publicly notifying it for submission and hearing at the cost of the applicant, or of adopting the change as the Council's own change and accepting the responsibility and costs of processing it. The Council is obliged to consider this request under the due process set out in the RMA.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5. The financial considerations will differ depending on how the Council chooses to handle this application. Should it reject the application it is possible that the applicant would challenge this decision in the Environment Court, which would be a costly process for Council regardless of the outcome. Costs cannot be predicted accurately but could be in the vicinity of \$50,000 for this preliminary step.
6. Should the Council accept and notify the change at the expense of the applicant there will be a no direct costs to Council as the Council's costs would be recovered. However there would be an impost on staff time.
7. Should the Council adopt the change as its own then Council will need to absorb all the costs, likely to run to at least \$50,000.

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

8. The recommendation will have no cost to Council and therefore will not impose on the LTCCP budget.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

9. There is a legal process set out in the RMA which must be followed. It includes initial consideration of what process to follow, then notification, submissions, reporting, hearings, decisions and possible appeals.

7 Cont'd

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

10. The process mentioned above is very familiar to Council and should create no particular risks or liabilities if followed correctly.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

11. Regulatory Services ongoing programme of improvements (pages 145 and 146 of the LTCCP) to enhance the City Plan including plan changes, as part of planning and providing for the sustainable management, development and protection of natural and physical resources of the City, as required by section 5 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Also Economic Development (p117 and 118 of the LTCCP) to promote and manage regional economic development and attract international and domestic visitors to Christchurch.

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

12. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

13. Statement of Intent with CCHL.

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

14. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

15. The applicant has consulted with City Council officers. Under the RM Act consultation with parties affected by a private plan change is not mandatory. In this instance the applicant considered that the requirement under Clause 5 of the First Schedule to, upon public notification, send a copy of the public notice and further information on the plan change to all parties considered to be directly affected by the plan change, would serve as adequate notice of the application.
16. It is anticipated that the applicant will arrange meetings with affected landowners once the application is notified, if requested.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended:

- (a) That the information in the report be received.
- (b) That the Board note that staff will be seeking agreement from the Council to accept the plan change application pursuant to clause 25 of the 1<sup>st</sup> schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991 and publicly notify it accordingly.
- (c) That the Board identify if there are any local issues regarding this private plan change which have not been identified in the report or in the attached section 32 assessment.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

7 Cont'd

**BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

**The application**

17. A copy of the application is attached. "Runway End Protection Areas" (REPAs) are land adjacent to the ends of the airport runway strips which is required to be kept free of obstructions or activities that could interfere with aeronautical navigation. "Strips" in this context are areas of land kept free of all obstacles surrounding the sealed runway surface. The proposed plan change makes provision for the widening of the existing strip for the cross-wind runway and the enlargement (both widening and lengthening) of the existing cross-runway REPAs. The change also introduces "Deferred REPA" provisions that will protect land to be affected by a possible future relocation of this cross-runway to a new alignment 182.5m to the south of its existing centreline.
18. The Christchurch International Airport Ltd (CIAL) have advised that the proposed change will not necessitate any alteration to the projected air noise contours currently shown within the City Plan within this plan period.
19. Please note that the plan change includes copies of aerial photos with existing and proposed trapezoidal shaped REPAs displayed over them, for both ends of the cross-runway. The existing REPA at the City end of the cross-runway is totally within CIAL's Airport Purposes designation, while the enlarged and deferred REPAs at this end of the runway would affect additional land outside of the designation and zoned Rural 5 on the eastern side of Russley Road (SH1). The existing REPA at the far (north-western) end of the cross-runway starts west of Pound Road and covers land outside of CIAL's Airport Purposes designation zoned Rural 5 and to a very small extent Rural 6. The enlarged and deferred REPAs at this far end of the runway would affect extra areas zoned Rural 5 and Rural 6 and a very small part of the CIAL designation.

**Resource Management Act Timeframes**

20. The application was initially received on 12 February 2007. Further information was requested and the revised change was received on 5 July 2007. Additional information was requested in relation to amendments made. The RMA timeframe for requesting this additional information was extended under S37. A second revision of the plan change was received on 7 September 2007. Under the RMA the Council is due to make a decision whether to accept the application or otherwise by 18 October 2007.

**Description of proposal and its relationship to other changes at the Airport**

21. This plan change will facilitate increased use of Cross-runway 11/29, which is anticipated to occur in three stages, as set out below. The plan change of itself only makes planning provision for Stage 1 and elements of stages 2 & 3, with these latter stages requiring additional planning processes.
  - Stage 1  
Within this Plan period, widening of the strip width of the runway from 150m to 300m and widening and lengthening of the REPAs. This will mean the strip width meets ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organisation) requirements for precision approach runways and that under a limited version of SIMOPs (Simultaneous Operations) the cross-runway will be able to accommodate additional flights by mainly turboprop aircraft and smaller jet aircraft at times of peak runway demand.

## 7 Cont'd

- Stage 2:  
Beyond the life of the current City Plan, lengthening of the cross-runway from its current 1741m to 2000m (at the far end of the cross-runway) to facilitate, under a fuller version of SIMOPs, increased takeoff capability for Code D (e.g. B767) and Code E (e.g. B777, B787 and A350) aircraft in northwest wind operational conditions. The current 305m displacement of this REPA from the runway threshold provides space for this lengthening. Runway lengthening will require further LG Act and RM Act processes to close or divert Pound Road and designate additional land for airport (runway) purposes. SIMOPs will also require the lengthening of the main runway at the northern end by 300m which can be accommodated within the existing airport purposes designation. The timing of the lengthening of the main runway is currently uncertain.
- Stage 3:  
Significantly beyond the life of the current City Plan, Runway 11/29 may be reconstructed on a new parallel alignment 182.5m to the south of its existing centreline and having an overall extended length of 3000m. Such a runway alignment would enable the southerly expansion of the airport terminal precinct and more efficient provision of freight areas. This plan change includes a deferred REPA to enable potential protection of the further extent of land which would be necessary for the future southern alignment of the cross-runway but at its current length. A future plan change would be needed to shift the operative REPA and approach slope provisions to the south and in the case of the REPA at the far end of the cross-runway to the west, and remove REPA and approach slope provisions from areas of land where they are no longer needed. Again additional land would need to be designated for airport (runway) purposes.

**Description of Issues**

22. The direct effects of this plan change are additional land use restrictions on those landowners within the enlarged and deferred REPAs. In REPAs (but not the proposed deferred REPAs) any additional building or structure or activities resulting in activities such as mass assembly of people, release of any substance which may impair visibility, production of reflective glare etc is a prohibited activity. In the proposed deferred REPAs these activities will be assessed as restricted discretionary activities. It should be noted that the rurally zoned parts of these areas already have little further subdivision potential because of existing lot sizes and that additional residential or other noise sensitive activities are already prohibited within the 65 dBA Ldn /95 SEL dBA Air Noise Boundary. (This includes all of the land within the north-western REPA ).
23. CIAL has made it clear that this plan change does not request or result in the need for any amendment to the existing City Plan noise contours. The plan change states that any increase in noise generation as a consequence of aircraft movement, either due to growth of airport operations or increased usage of the cross-runway as a consequence of this plan change, will be able to be accommodated within the existing noise contours for this planning period.

**Processing of Private Plan Changes**

24. The processing of private plan changes is set out in Clauses 21 -29 of the 1st Schedule to the RMA. In summary this provides:
- Clause 21 Any person may make an application for a change to an operative district plan. The City Plan is operative.
  - Clause 22 Request to be in writing, with reasons, Assessment of Environmental Effects and assessment under section 32 of the RMA
  - Clause 23 Further information may be required. Council has done this in this case.
  - Clause 24 Council may modify the proposal but only with the consent of the applicant.
  - Clause 25 Council must consider the request, and make a decision to either
    - “accept” it and proceed to public notification, or
    - “adopt” it as if it were its own proposal, and publicly notify it, or
    - treat it as if it were a resource consent or
    - reject it.

7 Cont'd

- Clause 26 Where Council accepts the change it must publicly notify it within four months
  - Clause 27 The applicant may appeal the decision under clause 26
  - Clause 28 Applications may be withdrawn
  - Clause 29 Unless rejected, the application is put through the standard process of public notification, submission, hearing, decision, and appeal (if any).
25. There is a significant difference between “accepting” and “adopting” the application. If the application is accepted, Council retains its independence and is able to consider it impartially at a hearing later in the process, rather like a resource consent process. The entire cost of the process can be charged to the applicant. If it adopts the application Council would be effectively supporting the application as if it had decided to propose the change itself. Council would also be unable to charge the applicant for the costs.
26. There are very narrow grounds in the Act for rejecting an application. The only relevant one in this case is that the City Plan has been operative for less than two years. The Council has a formal policy on this matter, which is attached to this report. In summary, the Council’s policy is to accept such applications and allow them to proceed through the process unless
- The subject matter of the application affects an important strategic or policy issue the Council is currently investigating and may preclude options being considered.
  - The proposal is for rezoning of a significant amount of land for urban growth and would pre-empt options for urban growth, being considered under the Metropolitan Christchurch Urban Development Strategy.
  - The proposal is for rezoning of land for urban growth and the site is within a Priority 1 Area Plan currently under investigation by the Council. As at August 2005 Priority 1 Area Plans include Belfast, Memorial-Russley-Hawthornden, Southwest and Upper Styx-Harewood.
27. The subject areas are not:
- Affected by any strategic or policy issue the Council is currently investigating
  - Being proposed for rezoning under this plan change or land being considered for urban growth under the UDS.
28. While part of the land affected at the City end of the cross-runway is within a Priority 1 Area Plan (Memorial-Russley-Hawthornden), the proposal is not for rezoning and the Area Plan is at an early stage of preparation and is currently on hold. Work is not currently programmed to resume on this area plan before late 2008. It would not be appropriate to reject the plan change in these circumstances and the plan change and its outcome will need to be considered in the Area Plan.

**THE OPTIONS**

29. Council’s options are:
- (i) Reject the application
  - (ii) Accept the application, proceed to publicly notify and decide the application at the expense of the applicant
  - (iii) Council adopt the change as its own and assume the responsibility for putting it through the process outlined in the RMA including all costs.

**THE PREFERRED OPTION**

30. The preferred option is Option b. There is no status quo, i.e. do nothing option. The application must be considered and either accepted, adopted or rejected. There do not appear to be valid reasons for rejecting the plan change.

**7 Cont'd**

31. Existing REPA provisions in the City Plan affect primarily land owned and designated by CIAL as well as the Harewood Golf Course. However the amended REPA provisions in this plan change including Deferred REPAs affect further privately owned land which is not designated for airport purposes. CIAL has chosen not to use the designation process but rather to seek amendments to existing City Plan rules to achieve protection for this land. This plan change along with other planning processes yet to be commenced will facilitate increased usage of Cross-runway 11/29 in the future, which will have an indirect effect on the wider community living within the air noise contours relating to the cross-runway, through a gradual increase in aircraft noise over time.
32. Although the Council holds a majority interest in CIAL through CCHL, it would be inappropriate for Council in its resource management role to express support for the plan change ahead of making a decision on the merits of the plan change through the submission and hearing process. The Council has an adopted City Plan programme and this item is not on it.
33. Therefore the application should be accepted and considered on its merits, following public notification and the receipt of submissions.

**8. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISERS UPDATE**

**8.1 CURRENT ISSUES**

Attached.

**8.2 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

**9. CHAIRPERSONS' AND BOARD MEMBERS INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

**10. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**