



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

THURSDAY 31 AUGUST 2006

AT 9.30AM

IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES

Council: The Mayor, Garry Moore (Chairperson).
Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, Graham Condon, Barry Corbett, David Cox, Anna Crighton,
Carole Evans, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff, Sue Wells and Norm Withers.

ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION
1.	APOLOGIES
2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 24.8.2006
3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
4.	PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS
5.	CORRESPONDENCE
6.	PUBLIC STREETS ENCLOSURES POLICY AND FEES CHARGED
7.	BIOSOLIDS ISSUES AND OPTIONS
8.	BID FOR 2009 COMMUNITY BOARD CONFERENCE
9.	REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 2 AUGUST 2006
10.	REPORT OF THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 11 JULY 2006
11.	REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 26 JULY 2006
12.	REPORT OF THE LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 19 JULY 2006
13.	REPORT OF THE RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 26 JULY 2006
14.	REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 2 AUGUST 2006
15.	REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 1 AUGUST 2006
16.	NOTICES OF MOTION
17.	QUESTIONS
18.	RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

We're on the Web!

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

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 24.8.2006

Attached.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

(a) REQUEST FOR CHILDREN'S PLAYGROUND: HALSWELL

Members of the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board and residents of the Country Palms subdivision, Halswell, will make submissions seeking the provision of a children's playground in this subdivision. Although there are four playground facilities within a 1 kilometre radius, residents believe they are not suitable for pre-school and school aged children, owing to walking distances and safety concerns for children. The residents have previously been advised that there is no provision within the Council's five year capital programme for a new playground in this neighbourhood. The Board is seeking a reprioritisation of funding within the capital programme to enable a new playground facility to be provided within the subdivision as soon as possible.

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

5. CORRESPONDENCE

6. PUBLIC STREETS ENCLOSURES POLICY AND FEES CHARGED

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Michael Aitken Transport & Greenspace Manager
Author:	Stuart McLeod

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to report to the Council the outcome of the discussions between Mr Chapman, the Council's valuer, and Mr Sellars, the valuer for the Strip bar owners.

BACKGROUND

2. The Council resolved on 17 August 2006 "that further consideration of the staff report and the submissions be deferred to enable Mr Richard Chapman to meet with Mr Gary Sellars for the purpose of discussing their respective valuations, and that a further report on the outcome of these discussions be submitted to the Council within the next fortnight".

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. A copy of Mr Chapman's letter detailing the outcome of their discussions is attached to this report. Mr Sellars is also preparing a letter detailing the outcome of their discussion but this letter is not available at the time of writing this report. His letter will be circulated as soon as it becomes available.
4. It is clear from his letter that Mr Chapman remains of the view that he should not depart from the valuation advice that he has previously tendered to the Council. His advice remains that the Council should retain the current fee charging methodology as set out in the officers' report previously submitted to the Council on 15 September 2005, a copy of which was attached as Schedule One to the Public Streets Enclosures and Fees Subcommittee report.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended:

- (a) That the letter from Mr Richard Chapman be received and the letter from Mr Gary Sellars be considered when it becomes available.
- (b) That both letters be considered in conjunction with the report previously submitted to the 17 August 2006 Council meeting (previous report attached as Schedule A).

7. BIOSOLIDS ISSUES AND OPTIONS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	City Water & Waste Unit Manager
Author:	Diane Shelander, Senior Resource Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This report summarises the examination of issues and options for the future management of biosolids that was conducted from April through June 2006.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Biosolids produced by the Christchurch Wastewater Treatment Plant (CWTP) are currently used as cover material for the Burwood Landfill closure. As such there is a need to identify future uses for biosolids.
3. A consultant was engaged to examine the issues and the options for managing the biosolids from the CWTP. A number of technologies and approaches were examined. The report *Issues and Options for the Future Management of Biosolids* (Attachment 1) identified two approaches, based on a multi-criteria analysis: drying with land application or energy use and land application of dewatered biosolids. The latter option is viewed as sub-optimal given the land area required.
3. A seminar for Councillors was held on 18 July 2006 that summarised the results of the Issues and Options project. At the seminar Councillors concurred in general with the recommendations of the report but requested staff to:
 - Further examine the SlurryCarb technology, and
 - Consult with Ensis regarding biosolids management options.
4. Council staff found that while intriguing, the SlurryCarb process is unproven in commercial use, as no commercial-scale facility is currently operating (Attachment 2). Therefore the technology poses too great a risk to the Council given the time frame in which a biosolids management option must be implemented.
5. Council staff met with Ensis personnel on 7 August to follow up on biosolids management options for the future. There were no new technologies or management approaches that arose that had not already been examined in the *Issues and Options* report.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. Biosolids, if not otherwise beneficially reused, will have to be transported to Kate Valley for disposal. Not only does disposal pose a significant annual cost to the Council, such an approach would ensure that the Council would fail to meet the New Zealand Waste Strategy Target for the beneficial reuse of 95% of the CWTP's biosolids.
7. Indicative capital costings for the preferred biosolids management options were within a \$20 million to \$22 million range. \$22 million is already included in the 2006-20016 Long Term Council Community Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Receive the Issues and Option report.
- (b) Endorse a staff recommendation that drying is the preferred management option.
- (c) Approve a feasibility study for the drying option.

7 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON ISSUES AND OPTIONS FOR BIOSOLIDS

8. Annually the Christchurch Wastewater Treatment Plant (CWTP) produces more than 25,000 tonnes of biosolids (as 20 per cent dry solids). This volume is expected to rise to 30,000 tonnes in 2008. By 2027 the volume is expected to be 36,000 tonnes per annum.
9. In February 2006, the Council considered the results of a public consultation on the future management of the biosolids produced at the CWTP. The Council requested staff to develop the issues and options for fulfilling the proposed directions indicated in the public consultations held in June through September 2005.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS PROJECT

10. In April 2006 a contractor was engaged to study the issues and options for the future management of biosolids. This project was intended to:
 - Identify options for managing biosolids;
 - Issues and costs associated with those options;
 - Take into account the preferences indicated in the public consultations held in 2005;
 - Provide a thorough analysis of technologies for managing biosolids that have been proven in the marketplace, with a particular focus on solutions that are in use in medium and large urban areas;
 - Develop a process or processes that offer the greatest flexibility, to enable the Council to adapt its biosolids management approach to regulations, markets and community perceptions; and
 - Factor into the cost analysis any credits and/or cost savings, such as credits from energy production, green house gas credits or avoided costs with alternatives to landfill.
11. This project was undertaken from April through June this year, and the report *Issues and Options for the Future Management of Biosolids* was produced (Attachment 1).
12. Various technologies and management options were considered as part of this project. Each was evaluated according to a multi-criteria analysis. The report concludes that two potential approaches offer the best solution.
13. In July, a Council seminar was held at which the results of the issues and options project were presented. Staff recommended the endorsement of a drying option, as this option
 - provides the greatest flexibility for managing biosolids
 - is in line with the approach preferred through the public consultation process
 - yields an easier to manage material
 - significantly reduces the volume of biosolids
14. Councillors deferred endorsing the drying option with detailed feasibility study to follow, pending further work in two areas:
 - further examination of SlurryCarb, one of the technologies evaluated in the Issues and Options report
 - consultation with Alan Leckie from Ensis , who had provided comments on biosolids during the Long Term Council Community Plan deliberations.

7 Cont'd

15. An investigation by staff of the SlurryCarb process confirmed the analysis of the technology in the *Issues and Options* report. The technology produces a dried product which can be used as a fuel. The SlurryCarb process is unproven on a commercial scale, as construction for the first commercial SlurryCarb plant will begin shortly in California. That plant will not be operational until 2008. There are proven technologies, already in use on a commercial scale such as the thermal drying facility in New Plymouth, that produce a dried product that can be used as a fuel. A report by staff on the SlurryCarb process is provided as Attachment 2. Staff advise that this technology poses a high risk, as it is unproven, and as such should be ruled out of further consideration.
16. As requested at the Council seminar meeting of 18 July, staff met with Per Nielson with Ensis and Lisa Langer of Forest Research on 7 August to follow up on comments raised by Mr Leckie concerning management of biosolids in the future. There were no technology or management solutions identified in that meeting that had not already been considered in the *Issues and Options* report.

CONCLUSIONS

17. Investigations by staff corroborate the findings of the *Issues and Options* report. Staff advise that of the two approaches recommended in the report, the drying option is preferable to applying dewatered cake to land because:
 - drying produces product with greatest range of beneficial reuse as fuel and as soil amendment;
 - it takes the preference of the public consultation for beneficial energy use into account;
 - a dried product is much easier to handle, store and transport than dewatered cake; and
 - the reduced volume of dried product as compared to dewatered cake means lower disposal cost as a last resort.
18. Further work on the drying option is needed. A detailed feasibility study should be undertaken which includes
 - an analysis of consents needed for thermal drying and for potential fuels markets
 - concept design of the preferred drying solution
 - further development of potential markets for a dried product

Staff advise that this work should be initiated as soon as practicable, to enable a report back to Council in late 2006 or early 2007 on the preferred solution and contract delivery model.

8. BID FOR 2009 COMMUNITY BOARD CONFERENCE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
Officer responsible:	Secretariat Manager
Author:	Anusha Guler

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Council's approval for the Christchurch City Council put in a bid to host the 2009 Community Board Conference in Christchurch.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At a meeting of the Community Board Chairpersons and Staff Forum, held on Friday 23 June 2006, it was suggested that the Christchurch City Council should make an application to Local Government New Zealand to host the Community Board Conference for 2009.
3. A National Community Board Conference is held every two years. The Christchurch City Council hosted the 1997 Community Board Conference.
4. Bids to host the conference are due by 11 September 2006 at the New Zealand Community Board Executive meeting.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

5. It is intended that costs of the conference will be covered by registration fees and various sponsors for events. These costs include a Professional Conference Organiser, venues and the activities in the Conference programme. The Council's Civic and International Relations Team would provide advice of protocol and city activities in the programme. A budget of up to \$14,000 will be required for deposits for venue bookings and engaging a Professional Conference Organiser. It is anticipated based on the conference hosted by Dunedin City Council in 2005 that approximately 200 persons will attend the conference.
6. The Chairs of each of the city Community Boards have said that the Community Boards will allocate \$2,000 from their Discretionary Funds, and the Banks Peninsula Community Boards allocate a \$1,000 each. This will provide funding of \$14,000. In addition the Secretariat Unit will seek approval from the Council to budget for an additional \$15,000 in the 2007/08 Annual Plan in the event of any shortfall arising.
7. There are no legal implications.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council approve Christchurch City Council to put in a bid to host the 2009 Community Board Conference.

**9. REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 2 AUGUST 2006**

Attached.

**10. REPORT OF THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 11 JULY 2006**

Attached.

**11. REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 26 JULY 2006**

Attached.

**12. REPORT OF THE LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 19 JULY 2006**

Attached.

**13. REPORT OF THE RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 26 JULY 2006**

Attached.

**14. REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 2 AUGUST 2006**

Attached.

**15. REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 1 AUGUST 2006**

Attached.

16. NOTICES OF MOTION

17. QUESTIONS

18. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.