



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

THURSDAY 30 MARCH 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 23.3.2006
3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
4.	PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS
5.	CORRESPONDENCE
6.	MAYOR'S REPORT
7.	150TH ANNIVERSARY OF CITY STATUS FOR CHRISTCHURCH
8.	KATE VALLEY LANDFILL: SUPPORT FOR CHANGE IN CONSENT CONDITION RELATING TO VEHICLE TRIPS
9.	PROTOCOL FOR SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT
10.	APPOINTMENT OF REPLACEMENT MEMBER OF CANTERBURY MUSEUM TRUST BOARD
11.	APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES ON RICcarton BUSH TRUST
12.	SUMMIT ROAD PROTECTION AUTHORITY
13.	REVALUATION OF BANKS PENINSULA WARD OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
14.	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO COUNCIL FEES AND CHARGES
15.	REPORT OF THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL/BANKS PENINSULA DISTRICT COUNCIL TRANSITIONAL JOINT COMMITTEE - MEETING OF 21 FEBRUARY 2006
16.	REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD - MEETING OF 1 MARCH 2006
17.	REPORT OF THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD - MEETING OF 14 FEBRUARY 2006

We're on the Web!

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

30. 3. 2006

- 2 -

ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION
18.	REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD - MEETING OF 14 FEBRUARY 2006
19.	REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD - MEETING OF 1 MARCH 2006
20.	REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD - MEETING OF 1 MARCH 2006
21.	REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD - MEETING OF 21 FEBRUARY 2006
22.	NOTICES OF MOTION
23.	QUESTIONS
24.	RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

30. 3. 2006

- 3 -

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 23.3.2006

Attached.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

5. CORRESPONDENCE

6. MAYOR'S REPORT

Attached.

7. 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF CITY STATUS FOR CHRISTCHURCH

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Public Affairs, DDI 941-8637
Officer responsible:	Marketing Manager
Author:	Richard Stokes

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - (a) Provide background information to the Council on planned activities to commemorate the 150th Anniversary of the City Status of Christchurch.
 - (b) Present to the Council a proposal for a re-allocation of unspent Festivals and Events funding in the 2005/06 financial year to event activity commemorating the 150th Anniversary of the Anglican Diocese of Christchurch.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

2. No impact on allocated Festival and Events Budgets from the relocation of the budget from Young Inventionz to the Spencer Street Revisited concerts.
3. Existing budgets will cover the support provided by the Council's Events Production and Marketing Services Teams to activity within the theme of 'New Zealand's First City'.
4. A Festivals and Events Core funding agreement would be entered into with the Anglican Diocese of Christchurch and contract monitoring processes implemented.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Receive the information provided on activity to commemorate the 150th Anniversary of City Status for Christchurch.
- (b) Approve the reallocation from within the 2005/06 Festivals and Events funding allocation, of \$20,000 to the Anglican cathedral for staging and marketing of the Spencer Street Revisited concert.

7 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF CITY STATUS FOR CHRISTCHURCH

5. Christchurch became a City by Royal Charter from Queen Victoria on 31 July 1856, making it the first official City of New Zealand.
6. The Royal Charter was given by Queen Victoria to confer the City Status so that Christchurch could be the 'seat' or base for a Bishop. On Christmas Day, 1856, Henry John Chitty Harper was enthroned as the first Bishop of Christchurch.
7. A variety of activities linked to the city's 150th Anniversary and the Anglican Diocese's 150th Anniversary are planned in the period from 30 July through to the end of 2006.
8. It has been proposed that this activity is promoted under a common theme of 'New Zealand's First City'.
9. A copy of the funding proposal from the Anglican Diocese of Christchurch is attached.

THE COUNCIL'S INVOLVEMENT

10. The Council is involved in many activities which will commemorate the 150th Anniversary. These include:
 - An exhibition at Our City – O-Tautahi from October – December
 - A 'Celebrate Christchurch' promotion in the Central Library with different themes on each floor from 14-27 July.
 - Planning is underway for a civic reception on 31 July.
 - Heritage Week, which is core funded by the Council, will have many activities linked to the 150th and other anniversaries which fall this year. These include:
 - 150th anniversary of the Royal Charter for Christchurch as a City
 - Centenary of the 2006 exhibition
 - 150th anniversary of St Andrews at Rangī Ruru
 - 150th anniversary of the Christchurch Club
 - 150th anniversary of Riccarton House
 - 150th anniversary of the foundation stone, Christchurch Polytech
 - 100th anniversary of the first state house in New Zealand
 - 150th anniversary of Cathedral Grammar
 - 150th anniversary of Anglican bishop in Christchurch
 - 50th anniversary of Christchurch branch of NZ Historic Places Trust
 - 100th anniversary of the Great Exhibition
11. There is a distinct link between the heritage theme of this festival and the celebration of 150 years.
 - Uplighting of the Anglican Cathedral - in preparation for the celebrations of the 150th anniversary of the Anglican Diocese of Christchurch, the Council has allocated funding for uplifting of the Cathedral, to be completed in October 2006. The budget for this is \$314,000 in 2005/06 and \$209,000 in 2006/07. The Council Events Production Team will provide operational support to 'launch' the turning on of the lights.
 - The 'New Zealand's First City' theme will be co-ordinated by the Council's Marketing Unit, to collectively promote 150th Anniversary activity through existing channels such as the Be There website and City Scene.

FUNDING FOR THE ANGLICAN DIOCESE OF CHRISTCHURCH 150TH ANNIVERSARY ACTIVITIES

12. The Anglican Diocese of Christchurch presented a proposal to the Creating Strong Communities Portfolio Group on 23 February 2006 for funding for event activity to celebrate the 150th Anniversary of the Anglican Diocese of Christchurch within a celebration of 'New Zealand's First City' (proposal is attached).
13. The main areas of funding request were for:

7 Cont'd

- Contribution to marquee costs for a civic reception/Anglican event.
 - Two Cathedral Concerts themed 'Spencer Street Revisited'. Ray Columbus would be the biggest act with musicians from renowned Christchurch rock 'n' roll bands such as The Downbeats, Johnny and the Revellers, The Detours, The Invaders and The Silhouettes also featuring.
 - James Edward Fitzgerald's 'Seadrift' exhibition. This delightful nautical story of 64 pages (32 pen and wash drawings and 32 hand scripted text pages) was written by James Fitzgerald for John Robert Godley's son Arthur. These items have never been in the public view.
14. Since submission of the proposal to the Portfolio Group, the proposed civic reception/Anglican event in association with TRENZ from 12–18 June has been withdrawn. The focus for a civic event will now be on 30 July.
15. Events seeding of \$10,000 has been granted to the 150th Anniversary of the Anglican Diocese. This will be allocated to the Seadrift Exhibition.
16. Funding for the civic reception will come from existing civic event budgets.
17. It is proposed that \$20,000 funding from the 2005/06 Festivals and Events funding which is unspent due to Young Inventionz not happening this year, be reallocated to the staging and marketing of the Spencer Street Revisited Concerts which will be open to the public. \$15,000 would be allocated to the staging of the concerts and \$5,000 to marketing associated with the events.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**Option 1: To approve the re-allocation of funding**

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Funding reallocated to a free event provides access to the people of Christchurch to event activity	None identified
Cultural	The event adds to the celebration of an important event in the history of our city, therefore contributing to expression of our identity as a city	None identified
Environmental	None identified	None identified
Economic	It provides an event to attract attendees into the central city. There may be some associated expenditure in the central city before or after the event	The \$20,000 is reallocated and not retained

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Primary alignment with community outcomes: A cultural and fun city; A city of inclusive and diverse communities.

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:

Support provided from Events Production and Marketing Services teams will be built into their programme in implementing Festivals and Events activity.

Effects on Maori:

No specific effects.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Fits with Festivals and Events policy, particularly in the provision of event activity accessible to all.

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

The proposal for funding follows discussion with representatives of the Anglican Cathedral who are positive about working with the Council in promoting the City Anniversary in conjunction with the Anglican Diocese Anniversary.

Other relevant matters:

7 Cont'd

Option 2: To decline the re-allocation of funding

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	None identified	None identified
Cultural	None identified	None identified
Environmental	None identified	None identified
Economic	\$20,000 funding un-spent is retained	Potential expenditure in the central city before or after the concerts will not happen
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcomes:</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: No specific effect</p> <p>Effects on Maori: No specific effect</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: It is likely to reduce the level of activity celebrating the Anglican Diocese anniversary</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

8. KATE VALLEY LANDFILL: SUPPORT FOR CHANGE IN CONSENT CONDITION RELATING TO VEHICLE TRIPS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 94-8656
Officer responsible:	City Water and Waste Manager
Author:	Zefanja Potgieter

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to obtain Council support for a change or deletion of an existing resource consent condition regulating the number of vehicle trips to and from Kate Valley landfill.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. There is a difference in opinion between the Hurunui District Council, the consenting authority for this particular consent (RC020069), and Transwaste Canterbury Ltd the holder of the consent, regarding the interpretation of Clause 22 which requires that:

“The total number of vehicle movements to or from the site in any seven day period shall not exceed 1090, of which no more than 600 shall be heavy vehicles. For the purpose of this condition heavy vehicles means a motor vehicle (other than a motor car which is not used, kept or available for the carriage of passengers for hire or reward) in which the gross laden exceeds 3500 kgs but does not include an emergency response vehicle designed solely or principally for that purpose.”

3. The Hurunui District Council interprets this condition as only allowing for 300 heavy vehicle trips to the site and 300 heavy vehicles trips from the site in any seven day period. Transwaste Canterbury Ltd (based on legal advice) interprets this condition as allowing for 600 heavy vehicle trips to the site and 600 heavy vehicles trips from the site in any seven day period with numbers being counted at the site entrance. The Hurunui District Council requested Transwaste to apply for a consent change. Transwaste has taken the opportunity to review its expected future heavy vehicle flows given the 25% increase in waste volume since the original application and the unforeseen need to haul gravel to the site for liner protection work.
4. Transwaste Canterbury Ltd is seeking the change or cancellation of the condition. The period for submissions closes on 7 April 2006.
5. It is important for the City Council as the major territorial authority shareholder and part owner of Kate Valley Landfill to indicate its support for this application. If the application is unsuccessful, Kate Valley Landfill would be compromised in its ability to accept all residual waste from Canterbury local authority areas. The consequences of such an outcome would be contrary to what the CWSC has worked to achieve for ten years.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Indicate its support for the application lodged by Transwaste Canterbury Ltd.
- (b) Strongly express its view that the Canterbury Regional Landfill at Kate Valley must have consents that allow it to accept the residual waste volume from Canterbury communities.

8 Cont'd

BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

6. Attachment A contains the full assessment of environmental effects submitted by Transwaste Canterbury Ltd in support of this consent conditions change. The following points summarise the background and issues involved.
7. *"In March 2004, a decision by the Environment Court granted Transwaste resource consents to establish a modern engineered municipal solid waste landfill within Kate Valley. As part of this decision, a condition of consent requires that:*

'The total number of vehicle movements to or from the site in any seven day period shall not exceed 1090, of which no more than 600 shall be heavy vehicles'.
8. Transwaste's legal advice says that its existing consent allows 600 heavy vehicles to enter the landfill site in any seven day period. The company has been operating on this understanding. The average number of heavy vehicles carrying waste entering the site in all seven day periods since starting operations has been 280, with a maximum of 358 in the peak week before Christmas. The average number of all types of heavy vehicles entering in any seven day period has been 338, with a maximum of 446. (This maximum occurred in December, traditionally the highest waste producing period of the year.) The vehicle numbers have thus complied with the consent as Transwaste's legal advisers understand it.
9. The Hurunui District Council has recently advised Transwaste that it believes that the consent only allows 300 heavy vehicles to enter the landfill site in any seven day period, and requested Transwaste to lodge an application to clarify which interpretation is correct. While heavy vehicles carrying waste are within the Hurunui District Council's view of the limit, overall heavy vehicle numbers are not, for reasons explained below.
10. In response to the Council's request, Transwaste has lodged an application for up to 800 heavy vehicles to enter into the site in any seven day period, or for the condition to be cancelled. Canterbury Waste Services, which managed the consent application process, advises that one of the reasons for the condition originally being imposed by the Commissioners was to limit the ability of Transwaste to accept waste from outside Canterbury. The Environment Court subsequently imposed a much more effective geographical limit to ensure waste cannot be accepted from outside Canterbury, superseding the heavy vehicle limit for this purpose, consequently Transwaste does not accept waste from outside Canterbury.
11. The major part of the application, and the primary cause of the requested change to 800 heavy vehicle entries into the landfill, relates to the need for gravel to be hauled into the site from the nearby Waipara River. Because the consent conditions count all truck trips in seven day periods, it must allow for sufficient heavy vehicle numbers to enter the site when both gravel trucks and normal waste trucks are operating.
12. The gravel is only hauled for short periods of several days to a stockpile in the site. Up to 200 heavy vehicles per seven day period may enter the site hauling gravel, but this may only happen for a few weeks interspersed throughout the year. The gravel trucks only operate on a short 3km stretch of Mt Cass Road, between the Omihi Stream Bridge and the landfill access road. They do not travel on State Highway One.
13. The gravel is used for the liner protection layer in the landfill. It had been expected that sufficient sand suitable for this purpose would be found during site excavation, but that has not been the case to date. Accordingly, no gravel truck numbers were included in the original consent application, but now need to be.
14. Referring to points 8 and 13 above, it can be seen that if the maximum recorded refuse vehicle trips to date of 446 are added to the expected maximum gravel vehicle trips of 200, the consent condition of a 600 maximum would be exceeded. Clearly, given the recent high level of waste growth within Canterbury, it would be imprudent for their current application not to provide a comfortable safety margin should the recent economic and waste growth patterns continue into the future. Thus as detailed in the attached AEE, the application has included for an 800 vehicle 7-day limit.

8 Cont'd

15. Kate Valley Landfill must have consents that allow it to take the waste produced in Canterbury, and carry out normal landfill operations, such as laying liner protection gravel. Transwaste's application is about ensuring that this is the case. A notified hearing is likely to be held in mid 2006.

OPTIONS

16. The Council has the following options:

- (a) Submit in opposition to the consent variation lodged by Transwaste

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To do so would be in direct conflict with Council objective of having a single regional landfill.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would undermine Transwaste trust in its shareholder.

- (b) Support the Transwaste consent variation application by submitting in favour of the application.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Major shareholder is supporting its business 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seen to support more heavy truck movements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensures support of a practical solution that will minimise operational costs and ensures residual waste in Canterbury is properly disposed of. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduces risk of residual waste being disposed of outside of Canterbury. 	

- (c) To not submit on the Transwaste consent variation application.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Major shareholder is silent on a potentially major issue.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Risk that conditions for Transwaste could be imposed that limit trading movements and/or increase operational costs resulting in increased disposal fees.

PREFERRED OPTION

17. Option (b) support the Transwaste application by submitting in favour of the application to ensure that the Regional Landfill at Kate Valley, has consents that allow it to accept the residual waste volumes from Canterbury communities.

9. PROTOCOL FOR SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning Group DDI 941-8177
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Healthy Environment
Author:	Jenny Ridgen, Environmental Scientist

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council adoption of "A Joint Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury Planning and Consents Protocol for Surface Water Management" (the Protocol) between the Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury. The Protocol provides principles and agreed practices for the development of an integrated catchment management approach for Christchurch's surface water. A copy of the Protocol has been provided separately to this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Protocol has been developed to provide an agreed approach on how the two councils will work together to achieve integrated catchment management. The Protocol is intended to be a "living document" and will act as a guide for Council processes as the first Integrated Catchment Management Plan (ICMP), for South West Christchurch, is developed. The Protocol is a non-statutory document.
3. The Proposed Natural Resources Regional Plan (PNRRP) provides policies and rules that promote integrated catchment management and sets out the requirements for ICMPs. This complements the CCC approach to managing Christchurch's waterways by addressing ecological, landscape, recreation, cultural, heritage, and drainage values. This approach has replaced the traditional one, focused primarily on drainage.
4. A public consultation process has been carried out on the draft Protocol and Councillors have been advised of the Protocol at the Joint ECan/CCC meeting on 28 February 2006 and at the CCC Council seminar on 14 March 2006. The draft document has been amended to incorporate feedback from the public and Councillors.
5. In response to concerns raised at the CCC Council seminar one of the objectives has been amended to read as follows:

"Although recognising that there will be transitional arrangements until ICMPs are approved, to ensure that no significant new greenfield zoning¹ is proposed by the CCC without first having a surface water management scheme/plan that is covered by a cost share scheme and/or budget provision, and for which all necessary RMA authorisation has been applied for."

Footnote: "1. This will not apply to areas where the new zoning is expected to result in similar discharges to the previous zoning."

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. The Protocol will commit both Councils to providing resources. Each Council will need to ensure that relevant staff are well informed on the agreed principles and practices set out in the Protocol and that they are able to commit time to its implementation.
 - Environment Canterbury staff will be expected to provide pre-application advice, give clear direction to developers, and work with CCC staff in the development of ICMP's (particularly for the pilot ICMP for South West Christchurch).
 - CCC will need to review planning procedures to better co-ordinate land use planning with catchment planning. To improve surface water quality, CCC will also need to commit to significant upgrading of some waterways, including the installation of new infrastructure. Funding for the pilot ICMP (South West Christchurch) has been anticipated through the LTCCP process. It is recognised that considerable funding will be required for CCC to work methodically towards improving surface water quality across the city and that future LTCCP funding requirements will be better informed as the pilot ICMP progresses.

9 Cont'd

7. In advance of the PNRRP becoming operative, the Protocol encourages interaction and information exchange between the two Councils, and provides detail on where responsibilities lie, and how ICMPs will be developed. This will help to reduce the uncertainty that interim arrangements can bring.
8. The Protocol supports the “no surprises” provision in the Canterbury Local Authorities Triennial Agreement between Councils, by setting out agreed processes for dealing with issues arising from surface water management.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Council agree to formally adopt the Protocol.

9 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON PROTOCOL FOR SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT

9. The CCC currently holds over 100 resource consents, incorporating over 800 conditions, for the operation and maintenance of the city's land drainage system. A change in focus from individual sites, to a catchment-wide approach, is required to improve in surface water quality. The Protocol sets out a number of key principles and agreed practices that provide the basis for this approach.
10. Key principles outlined in the Protocol include:
 - Integrated Land Use Planning – land use planning will consider catchment-wide impacts and incorporate surface water management into planning decision making.
 - Interim Consenting – Environment Canterbury will continue to process applications on a site-by-site basis until an ICMP is in place.
 - Interim Arrangements for Integrating Discharge Permits and Subdivision Consents – in the absence of an ICMP, subdivision consents and discharge permits shall be applied for at the same time and joint hearings held.
 - PNRRP Requirements – implementation of the Protocol shall reflect Rule WQL7 of the PNRRP, but without prejudicing CCC's right to argue its submissions on PNRRP provisions. It is expected that the Protocol will be amended during the life of the PNRRP and will still be used once the PNRRP is operative.
 - Rule WQL7 – this rule concerns the discharge of stormwater within areas covered by an ICMP. CCC will apply for consents under this rule and the two Councils will work together to co-ordinate pre-application advice and, during processing, to ensure that the appropriate scale of assessment is provided.
11. Agreed practices outlined in the Protocol include:
 - Ensuring that actions governed by the Protocol are consistent with the PNRRP.
 - Prioritising catchments within Christchurch for preparation of ICMPs and applications for catchment wide consents.
 - Continuing to process applications for individual discharges until catchment-wide consents are obtained.
 - CCC and ECan focus on catchment-wide management rather than individual non-compliances.
 - Taking sewer overflows into account when preparing ICMPs.
 - Surrendering relevant existing discharge permits once catchment-wide consents have been obtained.
 - Using a pilot area for preparation of an ICMP and catchment-wide consent process.
 - Authorisation by CCC of discharges into the stormwater network system where catchment-wide consents have been obtained.
12. The Protocol has been developed to encompass the area within the Christchurch City boundary. Banks Peninsula areas have not been prioritised in the Protocol. However, extension of the key principles and agreed practices would be readily applicable to the wider Banks Peninsula area.

A LIVING DOCUMENT

13. It is recognised that the Protocol will need to be a living document that can be updated when necessary e.g. when the pilot ICMP (for South West Christchurch) has been prepared. In its current form the Protocol recognises that a number of issues remain outstanding and cannot be confirmed until they have been worked through during the development of the first ICMP.

10. APPOINTMENT OF REPLACEMENT MEMBER OF CANTERBURY MUSEUM TRUST BOARD

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the appointment of a replacement member of the Canterbury Museum Trust Board, to fill a vacancy created by the recent resignation of Councillor Pat Harrow.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Christchurch City Council appoints four members of the Canterbury Museum Trust Board. Prior to Councillor Harrow's resignation, the Council's four representatives comprised:

The Mayor
Helen Broughton
Councillor Graham Condon
Councillor Pat Harrow

3. As a result of Councillor Harrow's resignation, it will be necessary for the Council to appoint another representative in his place. The Council's representative is not required to be an elected member.

REQUIREMENTS OF POSITION ON THE TRUST BOARD

4. The Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993 entitles the Christchurch City Council to appoint four persons to the Canterbury Museum Trust Board.
5. As a guide to appointing organisations, the Trust Board previously provided the following description of the requirements of a position on the Trust Board, so that potential candidates could judge if the position is one with which they would feel comfortable:

Demands of the Role

The Trust Board meets monthly from 11am to 2pm on the first Tuesday of each month. Currently, there is a formal Board meeting every two months, alternating with group visits, which allow members to learn the activities that take place in the Museum, and to be updated on any issues arising. The Museum's 'business' is complex, and these visits are very useful in keeping Trustees fully informed.

In addition, there are subcommittees of the Board. These meet on average every two months, but may need to meet more often if specific issues arise.

Reading and preparation for the meetings ranges from 1-2 hours, and Board members are expected to arrive at meetings with all papers read.

For the Board to function well, it is essential that the Trustees be prepared to meet the above demands, which are not overly arduous. Members may be prevented by competing demands from attending every meeting, but should be at the majority of meetings.

From time to time, there are functions: openings, launches, markings of specific anniversaries and the like. These tend to happen only three or four times per year and, although Trustee attendance is not required, we like to encourage support from Trustees.

Qualities of Trustees

These are listed in no particular order, although the first one is the single most important quality a Trustee needs.

10 Cont'd

- *The understanding that the primary responsibility of a Trustee is to the Museum rather than to the appointing organisation*
- *An understanding of, and commitment to, the role of a Museum in its community*
- *The ability to represent the views of the body the Trustee is representing*
- *A willingness to get to know the business of the Museum*
- *Integrity, respect for confidentiality and good common sense.*

Suggested Competencies

The following is a list of competencies desired around the Board table. The first group of competencies is crucial, and Trustees should be prepared to undergo training if they do not have these competencies at the time of joining the Board.

In the second group, not every Trustee needs to have all of these qualities, but it would be desirable for each Trustee to have a reasonable number of them.

1. *Core competencies*
 - *Financial literacy: ability to interpret financial statements and statistical information, such as balance sheet and profit and loss statements*
 - *Knowledge of legal requirements of Board membership: conflicts of interest, confidentiality and liability issues*
 - *Ability to distinguish between governance and management roles*
 - *Understanding of the principle of collective responsibility: that once a majority decision has been taken by the Board, all Trustees must support that decision*
 - *Ability to work harmoniously in a team, to recognise and value the contributions of other Board members in a diplomatic manner.*

2. *Other competencies*
 - *Ability to see the wide perspective and think strategically*
 - *Organisational and structural awareness*
 - *Critical faculty: ability to probe facts, challenge assumptions, identify drawbacks and advantages of proposals*
 - *Honesty and willingness to be accountable*
 - *Awareness of the obligations placed on the Museum as a statutory body under the Treaty of Waitangi*
 - *Bi-cultural awareness*
 - *Multi-cultural awareness*
 - *Awareness of major external influences on the Museum and environment including political, economic, social and technological issues*
 - *Special knowledge: Awareness of any strategic, cultural or other issues that may impact on the particular operation of the Museum*
 - *Understanding of the community's expectations.*

This is a very satisfying Board to belong to. The work of the Museum is fascinating, and the Director and his team provide excellent support to the Board. The Museum is just moving into an exciting phase of its history, as it embarks upon a major revitalisation project as part of its long-term strategic plan. There will be plenty of challenges and satisfaction over the next Board term.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. The appointment of four representatives is a requirement of the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993. The appointment of a replacement member by the Christchurch City Council will have no financial implications, as Councillors attending Trust Board meetings receive no additional remuneration apart from their normal Councillor's salary.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that another Councillor be appointed to fill the vacancy on the Canterbury Museum Trust Board created by the resignation of Councillor Harrow.

11. APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES ON RICCARTON BUSH TRUST

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the appointment of two further Council representatives on the Riccarton Bush Trust.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Currently (on the basis of a Council resolution at its 10 February and 3 March 2005 meetings), the following persons serve as the Council's representatives on the Trust:

Councillor Pat Harrow

Councillor Bob Shearing

Mr Neville Bennett (Member, Riccarton/Wigram Community Board)

Mr Mike Mora (Member, Riccarton/Wigram Community Board)

3. Under the present provisions of the Riccarton Bush Act 1914, the Council is required to appoint six members of the Trust. Thus, the appointment of two further members is required.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

4. The Riccarton Bush Act 1914 requires the appointment of six Council representatives to the Riccarton Bush Trust. However, there is no requirement that the persons appointed be Councillors.
5. The Trust has previously advised that the number of City Council representatives could be reduced from six to four members in total and it was on this advice that the Council at its February 2005 meeting appointed a representative. As a result of legal advice obtained by the Trust following the February 2005 meeting the Trust has requested the Council to appoint a further two representatives.
6. The Trust intends pursuing an amendment to the Riccarton Bush Act to permit such a reduction in the number of City Council representatives to four. In the meantime, the Trust requests the appointment of two further representatives, to bring the Council's representation up to the full complement of six.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. Where Councillors are appointed to outside organisations, their attendance at meetings is covered by their elected members' salary, and meeting fees do not apply. Should the Council appoint representatives who are not elected members, no meeting fees or other payments can be made to the persons concerned. Thus, the appointment of two further representatives will not result in any additional expenditure.

SUGGESTED APPOINTEES

8. The Trust recommends that the following persons be appointed as the Council's two remaining representatives:
 - Mrs Pam Wilson, Heritage Adviser (Registrations), NZ Historic Places Trust
 - Mr Tony Gemmill, the Trust's Special Projects Officer
9. Previously, the Council's practice was to appoint three of the representatives (one of which was nominated by the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board) with the remaining three representatives being nominated by the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board. Thus, in the past these two vacancies would have been filled by a Councillor and a Community Board member.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council appoint two further representatives on the Riccarton Bush Trust.

12. SUMMIT ROAD PROTECTION AUTHORITY

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of the report is to request the Council to appoint one additional Christchurch City member of the Summit Road Protection Authority, such appointment being required as a result of the recent dissolution of the Banks Peninsula District Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Summit Road Protection Authority is a joint standing committee of the Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council and the Banks Peninsula District Council.
3. Prior to the dissolution of the Banks Peninsula District Council, each of these three councils appointed one member of the Authority. The following members were appointed:

Christchurch City Council	Councillor David Cox
Banks Peninsula District Council	Councillor Jeremy Agar
Selwyn District Council	Councillor Annette Foster

4. In respect of the Summit Road Protection Authority, the Order in Council implementing the Local Government Commission's scheme in respect of Banks Peninsula District provides that:

"The functions exercised by local authorities, under paragraphs (a) to (c) of Section 7 (1) of the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001, are to be exercised as if, for those paragraphs were substituted the following paragraphs):

"(a) two members appointed by the Christchurch City Council; and

(b) one member appointed by the Selwyn District Council" "

5. Jeremy Agar has now been elected as a member of the Lyttelton/Mount Herbert Community Board and it may be appropriate to appoint him as the second Christchurch City member of the Authority, in view of his previous service as a member.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. The appointment of a second member of the Authority will not involve any additional expenditure. The appointment of a second Christchurch City member is required pursuant to the provisions of the Order in Council implementing the Local Government Commission's scheme in respect of Banks Peninsula District, and its inclusion in Christchurch City.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council appoint one further member of the Summit Road Protection Authority.

13. REVALUATION OF BANKS PENINSULA WARD OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Corporate Services, DDI 941-8540
Officer responsible:	Corporate Finance Manager
Author:	Geoff Barnes

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Council of the results of the recent revaluation of Banks Peninsula Ward.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**Reason for the Revaluation**

2. The Banks Peninsula ward of Christchurch City has been revalued to align with the rest of the city, with a valuation date of August 2004. This will allow rates to be set on a common basis from 1 July 2006.
3. This special valuation of this area is a result of the abolition of the Banks Peninsula District Council and its inclusion within Christchurch City. The Rating Valuation Act 1998 requires the Council to have a common valuation roll, that is with the same valuation date. Previously the District Council had a valuation date of 1 July 2003, and therefore the percentage increases are for 13 months. The next revaluation for the city (including the Banks Peninsula Ward) will be 1 August 2007 and will be applied for rating in 2008/09.
4. The revaluation was undertaken by Quotable Value, the valuers for the former Banks Peninsula District Council. The Valuer General has approved the release of the revaluation, and the valuation notices will be posted out to ratepayers and owners on 27 March 2006.

Revaluation Results

5. The comments on valuations have been supplied by Quotable Value:

There was significant market movement in all sectors for the period 1 July 2003 to the 1 August 2004 valuation date. There has also been significant movement from the valuation date to current date, although this is not reflected in the revaluation. The new valuations posted out are, in most cases, well below current 2006 market levels.

Categories	Number of Rating Units	Percentage increase	
		Capital Value	Land Value
Commercial and Industrial	201	29%	69%
Residential	5180	51%	76%
Rural	690	50%	58%
Lifestyle	898	44%	62%
Other	607	20%	66%
Overall	7576	46%	68%

13 Cont'd

6. Result summary:

- There has been an increase in values in all sectors.
- There are 7,576 properties in the Banks Peninsula Ward, of which 5,180 are residential, 898 are rural lifestyle and 647 are rural.
- The percentage increase in the value of residential coastal property is generally greater than the average for other properties, in respect of both land value and capital value.
- The value of commercial retail property in Lyttelton has generally increased significantly more than commercial property in Akaroa.
- Hotels and motels have generally experienced a lower percentage increase in value than other commercial property.
- Properties in the Banks Peninsula Ward are now valued at \$2.59 billion. When this is added to the value of property in the balance of the city of \$46.086 billion, the value of all properties in the enlarged city now amounts to \$48.676 billion.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. The revaluation is required as a result of the recent abolition of Banks Peninsula District. Under the Draft LTCCP, the new rates system for the expanded city will apply to all ratepayers. The increase in total value is in line with that anticipated in the LTCCP, although the impact on individual properties will vary.
8. Some rating units will no longer be rated due to the application of the Valuer General Rules. The owners of these properties, such as boathouses, may have concerns.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the information be received.

13 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON REVALUATION OF BANKS PENINSULA WARD OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

9. The value changes for rate sectors.

Residential

10. The residential market was generally buoyant for Banks Peninsula with an overall increase in residential dwelling values of 51% from 1 July 2003 to 1 August 2004. Subsequent increases in value have occurred since August 2004 to the current date, but these are not reflected in the rating valuations as the effective date of valuation is some 19 months old. The greatest increases in Capital Value have been for residential property with good water views or coastal access.

11. Land values have had the greatest increase for sites with good water views and coastal access. Breakdown of residential dwellings by location:

Sales Group	Average Capital Value	Average % Change (+ / -)	Average land Value	Average % LV change
Lyttelton	\$289,000	+44%	\$118,000	+69%
Lyttelton Bays	\$336,000	+56%	\$159,400	+93%
Peninsula – other bays and settlements	\$252,000	+51%	\$107,000	+94%
Akaroa township	\$436,000	+46%	\$170,000	+55%
LOCAL AUTHORITY TOTAL	\$322,000	+49%	\$185,000	+68%

Rural-Pastoral

12. The Banks Peninsula ward is virtually all pastoral owing to the hilly topography. There has always been a good demand for economic properties on the Peninsula due to its proximity to Christchurch, mild climate, and the beautiful vistas. This demand was present in 2003 and is still present for those properties overlooking Akaroa Harbour or those properties with coastal influence. A number of the coastal properties, especially in the Akaroa Harbour, have an element of X factor. This is a premium paid above normal farm sale prices \$/ha or /stock unit. One property which sold in 2002 for \$3 million, sold in April 2004 for \$5.3 million, which was \$1000/stock unit.

13. Farm values are still on an upward trend though not as dramatic as in 2003 with unprecedented sales of large coastal properties. Currently there does not seem to be the same level of interest from overseas buyers.

Lifestyle

14. Even though Banks Peninsula is a very compact district one can divide the lifestyle properties into five market localities:

- Akaroa Harbour
- Outer Bays (Mainly the eastern bays)
- Little River
- Kaituna
- Lyttelton Harbour

15. The lifestyle market was very buoyant in 2003 and has continued right through 2004 and 2005. There are still large premiums being paid for land with good coastal and harbour views. The lifestyle market in and around Kaituna and Little River, where there is no coastal influence, have had a lower increase in values.

Boatsheds and Dwellings on Foreshore and Road Reserve

16. There are 229 boatsheds on the foreshore and five dwellings on road reserve currently regarded as individual rating units. These been individually rated by the Banks Peninsula District Council.

13 Cont'd

17. The Valuer General's Rules, an extract is attached as Appendix A, does not allow separate identification as a rating unit for each boatshed or dwelling on a road reserve unless there is an equivalent to a legal certificate of title for that occupancy or there is a lease or licence to occupy issued for at least 10 years and noted on the title. The valuers were unable to identify the necessary titles or rights to occupancy therefore the rating units must cease to exist in order for the revaluation to be approved by the Valuer General.
18. As a consequence the 'owners' will not have separate rating units and will, from 1 July 2006, no longer be individually rated. They may be concerned with the rating treatment as they will not have a separate identity on a formal register held by the City Council. There is no legal capacity for the Council to individually rate these improvements.
19. The occupation of the road reserve by the houses requires more investigation.
20. It is believed the boatsheds on the foreshore are not there as a result of Banks Peninsula District Council approvals and as such it will be up to the Crown to resolve the occupancy.

The Revaluation Impact on Rating

21. Rates will continue for the rest of the 2005/06 rating year based on the 2003 values and former BPDC rating system.
22. From 1 July 2006 the Banks Peninsula ward will be fully integrated into the city-wide rating structure. This is detailed in the Draft LTCCP adopted by the Council.
23. The impact of rates on each property will be disclosed to ratepayers as part of the publicly accessible 'Rate Information Database' which shows for each property the new capital values, the rate classification, rate types applied, and the intended rates for 2006/07 as a result of the Draft LTCCP. This will be available from 10 April 2006.
24. The rate impact of moving from the current structure to the city-wide structure will be modelled in the near future and Councillors will be advised of the result. The data is not yet available on the CCC rates system.
25. The resulting rate changes, from the former BPDC rate structure to the City Council rates, for each property, are caused by several factors, including:
 - The change from a uniform charge dominated rate system under BPDC to a capital value dominated system. As a result lower valued properties will pay less, higher valued properties may pay more.
 - The application of rates to rating units such as the land drainage rates and the number of Uniform Annual General Charges.
 - The impact of revaluation changes, being different for each property from the average 46% increase for the ward as a whole. Some properties increase more than others and therefore will attract more rates.
 - Changes to the rateability of land as a result of the application of the valuation rules - 229 boatsheds and five dwellings on either foreshore or road reserve which are currently rated will no longer be rated as they are no longer classed as rating units (under the Valuer General's Rules).
 - Changes to the rateability of land as a result of the application of Council policy:
 - Change in the rating of some rural lifestyle properties from Rural to Residential. This is the same differential rating policy application as faced in the wider city area and will increase the rates for those properties reclassified compared to leaving them as Rural. The BPDC rates system had higher rates for Rural. The reverse applies for the city.
26. Staff are working through the application of rate types to rating units for the Banks Peninsula ward. This migration of rateability of land is dependent on the land attributes and may in some cases necessitate investigation. The changes will be implemented up to 30 June 2006 and where material will be advised to each ratepayer. Should any ratepayer believe the rates have been inappropriately applied they can request a review based on the facts of each case. This is a normal process of a changed rate structure.

14. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO COUNCIL FEES AND CHARGES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Corporate Services, DDI 941-8540
Officer responsible:	Funds & Financial Policy Manager
Author:	Geoff Barnes

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to:
 - The fees and charges to be made by the Council under Section 12 of the Local Government Act 2002; and
 - The draft fees for those requiring a special consultative procedure and release of the statement of proposal for consultation;
 - Grant delegated authority for the appropriate General Manager to review and set some fees.
2. If this report is adopted the fee schedule under the first bullet-point will be adopted and those under the second point will be available for submission by the public and then confirmed by the Council on or before 30 June 2006.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. This is a full list of Council charges. Some fees are recommended to change, some to continue unchanged. In each case the prices have been recommended by relevant business units for consideration by the Council. In the case of dog control fees, the current charges are listed. The report to recommend the charges for 2006/07 has yet to be presented to the Council.
4. The fee changes in this report reflect inflation adjustments, or market prices and align with:
 - Revenue and financing policy considerations; and
 - Service delivery policies or activity management plans as contained in the Draft LTCCP.
5. In the past only the fees which are changed have been formally approved in each year. This has caused uncertainty and it has been difficult to determine the current price list for all service charges.
6. Excluded from this list of fees and charges are:
 - Rates, as they are set by the LTCCP process;
 - Development contributions, as they are set by the Development Contributions Policy within the LTCCP;
 - Financial contributions and resource consent works and services conditions, where they are charges as a result of work done for a subdivision;
 - Rents, commissions and recoveries under a lease, rent agreement, or licence to occupy as these are set by negotiation with the tenant or by Council resolution;
 - Cost recoveries by the Council under contract provisions;
 - Fees, charges and taxes set by other entities, such as the Government, where the Council is a collecting agent. In most cases the Council may retain all or part of the charge; and
 - The specific charge for any cost recovery fee as these are not known until the transaction.
7. The fees and charges apply to the whole city, including Banks Peninsula, and commence, generally, on 1 July 2006, although some fees are noted in Appendix A to commence later.
8. The process for the consideration of fees was reported to the Council on 17 February 2006 as part of the Revenue and Financing Policy consideration. The revenue budgeted for fees is included within the draft LTCCP figures. The Council needs to give effect to the charges by authorising the charge or any amendments. The Council has many charges, and it has been decided that they are individually below a level of significance for specific inclusion in the LTCCP. This year it is proposed that the Council will be asked to approve the fees, both amended and unchanged, by ordinary resolution.

14 Cont'd

9. From a fee setting perspective, there are two types of fees:
 - Charges for goods, services and amenities provided by the Council in reliance on the Council's general power under Section 12 of the Local Government Act 2002, (and Section 150(6) of that Act) where this allows fees to be set by ordinary resolution; and
 - Fees and charges payable for a certificate, authority, approval, permit or consent from or inspection by the Council in respect of a matter provided for in a bylaw or under any statute other than the Local Government Act. These must be prescribed in the bylaw or by using the special consultative procedure under Sections 150(1) and (3) of the Local Government Act. Such fees or charges include those payable under such statutes as the Building Act, Resource Management Act, and the Sale of Liquor Act.
10. For the Section 12 fees, the adopting resolution proposed below concludes the process, the fees are then set.
11. For the fees requiring a special consultative procedure, the following process is proposed:
 - A Statement of Proposal, including the fees schedule and a Summary of Information, needs to be adopted by the Council for release for consultation;
 - Public notice is given that the Statement of Proposal is available for submission;
 - Submissions would be heard by the Council, say at the LTCCP hearings; and
 - The fees schedule (including any changes thereto) is then adopted by the Council in June 2006.
12. In addition to adopting the fees, approval is sought for delegated authority to be granted to the appropriate General Manager to:
 - Set the prices for all retail sales items, as these are impractical to detail and are subject to periodic change;
 - Determine the charge where the charge is for actual cost recovery;
 - Set prices for hire of venues and equipment where not included in the fees schedule;
 - Set prices for recreation programmes and events tailored to the customer needs; and
 - In the case of charges for pools, set prices where the increase is within the inflation adjustment limits, if any, set for each charge.
13. Where the authority is sought under the last bullet-point, it is noted on the attached schedule and the delegation is restricted to that charge type.
14. Where reference is made to actual costs recovered, this includes any normal internally generated costs.
15. In addition, it is recommended that the Council consider granting delegated authority to allow a General Manager to remit any charge where there are reasonable grounds, such as extreme financial hardship.
16. Remission would not be available to a class of customer such as charities. If a case could be mounted for differential pricing to reflect the status of customers then that should be reflected in the price schedule and not actioned by remission. This move would strengthen the accountability to achieve revenue targets by encouraging more timely and market orientated price reviews, knowing that special needs, where appropriate, can be catered for.

14 Cont'd

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

17. This schedule of charges gives effect to the revenue budgeted in the LTCCP. As inflation is built into the revenue budgets the fees need to be adjusted annually to ensure the revenue is achieved. Should a change to this schedule be made by the Council, or following a public submission, it may give rise to a consequential change to the draft LTCCP. The consideration of submissions made in respect of fees and charges should be made at the same time as submissions on the LTCCP are considered.
18. Most of the charges are set under Section 12 of the Local Government Act 2002, the general power clause. Where the charges are set under a Council bylaw or under an Act where the authority to set fees is not specific, a special consultative procedure is required under Section 150.
19. In order to address these issues, it is intended that the time frame and process for adopting the fees follow the special consultative procedure, and this ensures the public have an opportunity to make submissions. These would be heard at the same time as the LTCCP submissions and consequential adjustments to the budgets can be made.
20. The fees and revenue generated have been budgeted for following consideration of the issues under the requirements of the Revenue and Financing Policy as contained in the Draft LTCCP. The Council should make reference to that policy in adopting these fees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

- (a) The schedule of fees listed in Appendix A, set by the Council under Section 12 of the Local Government Act 2002, be adopted.
- (b) The fees, included in Appendix B, the Statement of Proposal, and Summary of Information be approved in draft and that these be released for consultation, including:
 - Statement of Proposal, including Appendix B, the fees schedule
 - Summary of the Statement of proposal
- (c) The Council consider the submissions from the public in relation to Appendix B fees at the same time as the LTCCP submissions and that the fees scheduled together with any changes arising from the submissions, be adopted at a Council meeting in June 2006 (or later).
- (d) Delegated authority be granted to the relevant General Manager to:
 - Set the prices for all retail sales items;
 - Determine the charge where the charge is for actual cost recovery;
 - Set prices for hire of venues and equipment where these are not scheduled;
 - Set prices for recreation programmes and events tailored to the customer needs; and
 - Adjust limits, if any, as noted for each charge in the schedule (Appendix A);
 - Remit any charge, where in the opinion of a General Manager, they consider it is fair to do so.

subject to:

- Where the intention to apply delegated authority is noted on the schedule (Appendix A) (other than for retail prices) the delegation being restricted to that charge type.
- Where reference is made to actual costs recovered, this includes any normal internally generated costs.
- Remission of charges not being granted to a class of applicant (eg charities generally) as this should be taken into account in setting the scale of fees.

14 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO COUNCIL FEES AND CHARGES

21. The Council may set fees and charges for services to the public. The statutory authority is for fee setting is:
 - For most charges, under the general powers of Section 12 of the Local Government Act 2002;
 - For fees under bylaws or empowering Acts such as the Building Act, Resource Management Act, or Section 150 of the Local Government Act 2002.
22. The Council may delegate the authority to set fees or make recovery charges with or without constraints apart from the fees set under the special consultative procedure.
23. This report aims to both set the fees for the next year and put in place a process for fee review under delegated authority for some fees, where practicable, and for those noted on Appendix A.
24. It is proposed that the fees be reviewed at least annually by a single process (with exceptions noted below), and where necessary, adopting them in draft now and making them available for public submissions. It is intended that the fees subject to consultation be confirmed in June 2006 at the same meeting as the LTCCP adoption.
25. It is intended that the total fee schedule be permanently included on the Council web site as a single source of current fee information. In the past only the changes were recorded in the Annual Plan (and LTCCP) and only some fees included in the web pages for some Council activities. This led to inconsistent treatment of fees.
26. Secondly, the fees review has been held at various times for different Council activities. In the future and as far as practicable, there should be consistent review and consideration for fees.
27. Two exceptions to this process are noted:
 1. Dog and animal control fees:

There is a significant review of charges following the proposed micro chipping, the National Dog Database (NDD) and incorporating all the BPDC dogs.

Animal Control/Dogs fees will be adopted separately under the Dog Control Act as part of a separate report to go to the Council in the next 3-4 weeks identifying options for fees and also the recovery of the NDD levy and working dogs in BPDC.
 2. Housing rentals – this will be the subject of a separate report in the near future.
28. Some fees charges and taxes are excluded from this process as they are set by other entities and processes. Where applicable, they are collected by the Council and are included in the revenues of the council as shown in the LTCCP.

Fee Setting

29. The fees as set out in the schedule Appendix A are recommended for adoption by the Council or for those in Appendix B, adopted in draft. Generally they will apply from 1 July 2006. However some apply from later dates as this is the most convenient due to the seasonal use attributes and notice requirements. The level of fees is that recommended by the responsible Unit Manager within the context of the Activity Management Plans and has not been determined by Corporate Finance.
30. The fee changes recommended, range from circumstances where the fee is cancelled, to restructuring the service charge, through to continuing the current charge, to substantial review of the charge in line with the level of the proposed property rate increase.

14 Cont'd

31. In setting fees, the Council must have regard for Revenue and Financing Policy issues:
- The costs to produce the service
 - The direct benefit portion of those costs – this sets the maximum revenue to be targeted
 - Any pricing policy issues such as:
 - customer demand, and how price will influence this
 - price as a barrier to access to the service by the customers
 - the underlying service objective – for example, irrespective of the cost, the Council may have determined that the service should be free to customers etc, or alternatively should be fully user pay
 - Legal or audit guidelines on the maximum charge that is appropriate.
31. The former issues are covered under the Revenue and Finance Policy in the adopted Draft LTCCP.
32. For fees set under section 150, there is a constraint in sub-section 150 (4):
- “The fees prescribed under subsection (1) must not provide for the local authority to recover more than the reasonable costs incurred by the local authority for the matter for which the fee is charged.”*
33. This constraint is summarised in the extract from a recent Audit Office report on local government regulatory services (but relevant to all fees):
- “The pricing structure adopted should be clear, and consistent with the local authority’s strategic objectives for service delivery, its fee structure and its charging policy, and must comply with all the relevant legislation regarding local authority fees”*
- and*
- “Given the monopolistic nature of regulatory functions, controls are needed to prevent unreasonable price charging. The manner for pricing different components should be designed to ensure that the interests of the community and other stakeholders are protected”*
34. In addition 36(4) of the Resource Management Act requires:
- “When fixing charges referred to in this section, a local authority **shall have regard to the following criteria:***
- (a) *the sole purpose of a charge is to recover the reasonable costs incurred by the local authority in respect of the activity to which the charge relates:*
 - (b) *a particular person or persons should only be required to pay a charge-*
 - (i) *to the extent that the benefit of the local authority's actions to which the charge relates is obtained by those persons as distinct from the community of the local authority as a whole; or*
 - (ii) *where the need for the local authority's actions to which the charge relates is occasioned by the actions of those persons; or*
 - (iii) *in a case where the charge is in respect of the local authority's monitoring functions under section 35(2)(a) (which relates to monitoring the state of the whole or part of the environment), to the extent that the monitoring relates to the likely effects on the environment of those persons' activities, or to the extent that the likely benefit to those persons of the monitoring exceeds the likely benefit of the monitoring to the community of the local authority as a whole,-*
and the local authority may fix different charges for different costs it incurs in the performance of its various functions, powers, and duties under this Act-
 - (c) *in relation to different areas or different classes of applicant, consent holder, requiring authority, or heritage protection authority; or*
 - (d) *where any activity undertaken by the persons liable to pay any charge reduces the cost to the local authority of carrying out any of its functions, powers, and duties.”*
35. The attached fee schedule includes these requirements.

14 Cont'd

Delegated Authority to Act

36. For obvious practical reasons this report recommends that the Council grant delegated authority to the appropriate General Manager, to adjust some fees and charges without further reference to the Council. The circumstances of the delegations recommended are limited to:

- set the prices for all retail sales items generally as these are impractical to detail and are subject to periodic and possibly urgent change;
- determine the charge where the charge is for actual cost recovery as the amounts will not be known until the service transaction occurs;
- set prices for hire of venues and equipment where these are not scheduled in Appendix A, or where there is a variation of the standard terms of hire that warrant a variation;
- set prices for recreation programmes and events tailored to the customer needs, say for instance, a school group with special needs requiring a level of response and service materially different from the standard;
- set prices for pools where the increase is within the inflation or other adjustment limits, if any, set for each charge, as noted on the schedule Appendix A;
- generally to remit any charge where in the opinion of a General Manager, it is fair to do so, and following an application in writing,

subject to:

- where this authority is granted, for other than retail prices, it is noted on the attached schedule and the delegation being restricted to that charge type;
- where reference is made to actual costs recovered, this includes any normal internally generated costs;
- remission of charges not being granted to a class of applicant (eg charities generally) as differential pricing to reflect the status of the customer should be taken into account in setting the scale of fees.

37. In all cases where the fee is amended either under delegation or by Council resolution, the fee schedule on the public access internet site shall be updated.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

38. The Council may consider alternative fees to those recommended. Any significant change will impact on the revenue budget in the draft LTCCP. The consequential adjustments and impact on rates revenue should be made under the LTCCP.

39. The Council may reserve more fee setting to itself rather than delegate. The outcome will be more detailed reports and in the case of retail prices, delays impacting on trading levels. There is a practical level of fee setting that balances the community's interests and the ratepayers' interests and the implementation of the Activity Management Plans.

**15. REPORT OF THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL/BANKS PENINSULA DISTRICT COUNCIL
TRANSITIONAL JOINT COMMITTEE - MEETING OF 21 FEBRUARY 2006**

Attached.

**16. REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD -
MEETING OF 1 MARCH 2006**

Attached.

**17. REPORT OF THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD -
MEETING OF 14 FEBRUARY 2006**

Attached.

**18. REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD -
MEETING OF 14 FEBRUARY 2006**

Attached.

**19. REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD -
MEETING OF 1 MARCH 2006**

Attached.

**20. REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD -
MEETING OF 1 MARCH 2006**

Attached.

**21. REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD -
MEETING OF 21 FEBRUARY 2006**

Attached.

22. NOTICES OF MOTION

23. QUESTIONS

24. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.