



# **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**

**THURSDAY 26 APRIL 2007**

**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.

<b>ITEM NO</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
1.	<b>APOLOGIES</b>
2.	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 19.4.2007</b>
3.	<b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>
4.	<b>PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS</b>
5.	<b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>
6.	<b>ITEM 7 FROM THE MINUTES OF 29 MARCH 2007 COUNCIL MEETING - HUSSEY ROAD UPGRADE REVIEW</b>
7.	<b>CHRISTCHURCH CITY HOLDINGS LIMITED: STATEMENT OF INTENT</b>
8.	<b>SUBSIDIARY STATEMENTS OF INTENT FOR 2007/2008</b>
9.	<b>ADOPTION OF REPORT ON DOG CONTROL POLICY AND PRACTICES</b>
10.	<b>PLAN CHANGE 13 TO THE CITY PLAN</b>
11.	<b>ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE</b>
12.	<b>ADOPTION OF THE GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</b>
13.	<b>ELECTED MEMBERS' EXPENSES AND ALLOWANCES</b>
14.	<b>ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2007/08: RECOMMENDATION TO INCOMING COUNCIL</b>
15.	<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT RATES INQUIRY - COUNCIL SUBMISSION</b>
16.	<b>NOTICES OF MOTION</b>
17.	<b>QUESTIONS</b>
18.	<b>RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC</b>

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 19.4.2007**  
Attached.
3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
4. **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**
5. **CORRESPONDENCE**
6. **ITEM 7 FROM THE MINUTES OF 29 MARCH 2007 COUNCIL MEETING - HUSSEY ROAD UPGRADE REVIEW**

The minutes of the 29 March 2007 Council meeting were not adopted at the Council meeting of 5 April 2007 in respect to this item which was carried forward to be confirmed at a subsequent meeting.

The relevant section of the minutes of the Council meeting of 29 March 2007 as considered at the Council meeting of 5 April 2007 were:

**"7. HUSSEY ROAD UPGRADE REVIEW**

*It was **resolved**:*

- (a) *That the information be received.*
- (b) *That staff be requested to report back on the possible substitution/reprioritisation of other programmed roading projects in other parts of the city, to allow early implementation of all the safety improvement works proposed for Hussey Road and the Gardiners Road/ Hussey Road intersection."*

The content of the above resolution has been discussed by Council staff and it is not intended to suggest any amendments to the wording. This item is therefore submitted to today's Council meeting for formal confirmation or amendment.

It should be noted that a report on this item will be submitted back to the Council at which time clear confirmation of the Council's intention on this matter can be obtained.

**7. CHRISTCHURCH CITY HOLDINGS LIMITED: STATEMENT OF INTENT**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Peter Mitchell
<b>Author:</b>	Peter Mitchell

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to afford the Council the opportunity to make comment on the draft Statement of Intent for Christchurch City Holdings Limited for the year ending 30 June 2008.
2. The Local Government Act 2002 requires that Christchurch City Holdings Limited deliver to the Council as its shareholder a draft statement of intent on or before 1 March each year. That requirement has been met.
3. Christchurch City Holding Limited is required to consider any comments on the attached draft statement of intent that may be made to it by 30 April 2007 by the Council, and Christchurch City Holdings Limited must then deliver the completed statement of intent to the Council by 30 June 2007.
4. The CEO of Christchurch City Holdings Limited will be at the meeting to answer questions.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

5. The Council had before it the attached draft statement of intent from CCHL for the year ending 30 June 2008 at its meeting on 1 March 2007.
6. At that meeting the Council did not consider whether or not it wished to make any comments on the attached draft statement of intent. The Council did, at that meeting, resolve to request CCHL to increase the dividend and to report back to the Council prior to the Council's adoption of the Draft Annual Plan.
7. CCHL subsequently considered the Council's request and at its meeting on 23 March 2007 the Council was advised that CCHL had amended its forecast dividend to provide for an increase in future dividends by \$2 million each year. At its 23 March meeting the Council resolved to thank Christchurch City Holdings Limited for delivering the statement of intent that meets the Council's request in increased level of dividends.
8. Although the Council has passed this resolution regarding the dividend, the Council has not yet made the decision on whether or not to make comments on other aspects of the Christchurch City Holdings Limited draft statement of intent. This matter is on the Council agenda for the 26 April meeting as this is the last opportunity for the Council to decide whether or not to make any comments on the draft statement of intent before the required deadline of 30 April 2007.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Consider whether or not it wishes to make any comments on the attached draft statement of intent from Christchurch City Holdings Limited.
- (b) Advise Christchurch City Holdings Limited of the nature of any comments it may have on the draft statement of intent, or that the Council has no comments to make.

**8. SUBSIDIARY STATEMENTS OF INTENT FOR 2007/2008**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Peter Mitchell
<b>Author:</b>	Peter Mitchell

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The Council has received information from the Chief Executive, Christchurch City Holdings Limited regarding draft statements of intent for Christchurch City Holdings Ltd (CCHL) subsidiaries and associated companies:
  - Orion Group Limited
  - Christchurch International Airport Limited
  - Lyttelton Port Company Limited
  - Red Bus Limited
  - City Care Limited
  - Christchurch City Networks Limited
  - Selwyn Plantation Board Limited
2. It has received draft statements of intent for three Council owned subsidiaries:
  - Christchurch City Facilities Limited
  - Jade Stadium Limited
  - Tuam Limited

(Note: Copies of the above have been separately circulated to Councillors and staff.)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

3. With regard to the CCHL subsidiary and associate companies the Council has been asked to provide comment to CCHL which has the statutory role under the Local Government Act 2002 of providing comments, or not as the case may be, to those subsidiary and associate companies by 30 April 2007. So the Council's role with those companies is in the nature of providing informal comment to CCHL, which then would decide what comments are formally provided to the subsidiary and associate companies.
4. With regard to the three Council owned subsidiaries, the Council is in the same position as set out in the preceding report regarding CCHL, whereby the Council itself as the shareholder is entitled to formally make comments on the draft statements of intent for those three companies by 30 April 2007 and those companies must deliver the completed statement of intent to the Council by 30 June 2007.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Receive the draft statements of intent for the CCHL subsidiary and associate companies and the draft statements of intent for the Council owned subsidiaries.
- (b) Decide whether or not to make any informal comment to CCHL regarding the draft statements of intent for the CCHL subsidiary and associate companies.
- (c) Decide whether or not to make any formal comment to the three Council owned subsidiary companies.

**9. ADOPTION OF REPORT ON DOG CONTROL POLICY AND PRACTICES**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Inspections & Enforcement Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Mark Vincent, Animal Control Team Leader

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The Dog Control Act 1996 ("the Act") requires all territorial authorities to report annually. Once the Council has adopted the report, public notice must be given of the report and a copy sent to the Secretary for Local Government. This provision in the Act was introduced by the Dog Control Amendment Act 2003. The Act lists the information required in the report.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Dog Control Act 1996 was amended by the Dog Control Amendment Act 2003 with a focus on increasing public safety. As part of the amendments the Government has introduced the requirement for territorial authorities to report annually with certain information.
3. The annual report requires territorial authorities to provide details in relation to such matters as: dog exercise and leash control; dog prohibited areas; impounded animals; education programmes and initiatives and a range of specific annual statistics including aggressive/dangerous dogs, number of dogs classified as dangerous or menacing dog, the number of registered dogs, number of infringement notices issued, and the number of prosecutions etc.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. There are no direct financial implications in relation to the preparation of the annual report or the recommendation that the Council adopt the report. Any costs involved are covered by existing unit budgets.

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

5. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6. Section 10A of the Dog Control Act requires that a territorial authority must report on Dog Control Policy and Practices
  - (1) In respect of each financial year, report on the administration of:
    - (a) Its Dog Control Policy adopted under section 10; and
    - (b) Its Dog Control Practices
  - (2) The report must include, information relating to:
    - (a) The number of registered dogs
    - (b) The number of probationary and disqualified owners
    - (c) The number of dogs classified as dangerous and the relevant provision under which the classification was made.
    - (d) The number of dogs classified as menacing under section 33A
    - (e) The number of dogs classified as menacing under section 33C
    - (f) The number of infringement notices issued
    - (g) The number of prosecutions taken

**9 Cont'd**

- (3) The territorial authority must give public notice of the report:
- (a) by publishing the report in:
    - (i) One or more daily newspapers circulating in the district
    - (ii) One or more other newspapers that have at least an equivalent circulation in the district to the daily newspapers circulating in that district.
  - (b) by any means that the territorial authority thinks desirable in the circumstances.
- (4) The territorial authority must also, within one month after adopting the report, send a copy of it to the Secretary for Local Government.

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

8. As per above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

9. The annual report and recommendation contained in this report aligns with the LTCCP level of services for animal control as the KPIs detailed in the LTCCP require the initiation and resolution of all dog control complaints within stipulated timeframes, namely:
- Priority 1 complaints (wandering stock and aggressive behaviour by dogs) responded to within two hours.
  - Priority 2 complaints (other complaints about dogs) commenced within 24 hours.
  - Page 147 of the LTCCP, level of service under regulatory services.

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

10. Not applicable.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

11. Not applicable.

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

12. Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

13. There is no requirement for consultation in relation to the preparation of the annual report. There is a statutory requirement (section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996) for the report to be publicly notified once adopted by the Council.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council adopt the attached Christchurch City Council Report on Dog Control Policy and Practice for 2005/06, pursuant to Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996.

**10. PLAN CHANGE 13 TO THE CITY PLAN**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Environmental Policy and Approvals Manager
<b>Author:</b>	David Punselie

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend that the Council give its decision on Plan Change 13 to the City Plan and take the subsequent steps to make the change operative.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. At its meeting on 9 November 2006 the Council resolved to publicly notify Plan Change 13. This change reduces the noise contours associated with the Wigram Airbase to reflect the current aviation activity. It also facilitates future residential development as land will no longer be constrained by the presence of noise contours, and it corrects errors in the current noise contours.
3. A copy of the Plan Change is attached to this report.
4. Public notification of the plan change on 27 January 2007 attracted one submission in support. This submission has been withdrawn in order to expedite the process of making the change operative.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5. There are no financial implications in approving this change to the City Plan.

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

6. There are no financial implications.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

7. Making a decision on a plan change, approving the change and making the change operative are steps required by the Resource Management Act 1991.

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

8. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

9. Aligns with City Plan Activity Management Plan.

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

10. Not applicable.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

11. Aligns with Urban Development Strategy.

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

12. Aligns with Urban Development Strategy.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

13. Consultation carried out under provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991.

**10 Cont'd**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Decide, pursuant to clause 10(1) of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991, to adopt the amendments to the City Plan introduced by Plan Change 13 for the reasons set out in the explanation to the change.
- (b) Approve the change pursuant to clause 17(2) of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991.
- (c) Delegate to the General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services the authority to determine the date on which the provision becomes operative.

## 11. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Strategy & Planning, DDI 941-8177
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Programme Manager Liveable City
<b>Author:</b>	Carolyn Ingles

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend the establishment of the UDS Implementation Committee (UDSIC) as a joint committee of the four partner Councils, and for each Council to then appoint their respective representatives to the Committee.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Urban Development Strategy is in the process of being adopted by the partner Council's. That process will be completed by the 26 April 2007. After that date, the focus will be on implementation. Once each Council has resolved to adopt the strategy, implementation must commence to ensure strategy momentum is not lost. The proposal is to establish a joint committee to oversee strategy implementation (see Attachment 1 for Terms of Reference).

### Committee Purpose and Role

3. The UDS Implementation Committee is being established to:
  - Oversee the implementation of the Strategy, in particular the actions for the next three years.
  - Take responsibility for progressing those actions specifically allocated to the "UDS Implementation Committee" in the Strategy and making sure the implementation does occur. The challenges here should not be under estimated. They often involve a different way of working and not just doing one's own thing.
  - Monitor progress against milestones.
  - Review and adjust the Strategy if circumstances change.
  - Ensure that the statements of intent of council owned companies as well as any other implementation agencies, are aligned to reflect the strategic directions and outcomes of the Strategy.
  - Identify and resolve any consultation inconsistencies between the Strategy and subsequent public consultation processes of the partner councils.
  - Implement actions through partner council policy instruments such as the proposed changes to the Regional Policy Statement, Regional and District Plans, Long Term Council Community Plans LTCCP), Triennial Agreements, the Regional Land Transport Strategy review and partnerships between local government and other bodies such as health and education service providers.
  - Co-ordinate actions across the implementation agencies as needed to avoid inconsistencies. Partner councils should align with the Strategy, unless aspects are re-negotiated and agreed through the UDSIC.

### Key Tasks

4. The Committee will have a range of tasks which include:
  - Updating the UDS Implementation Plan every third year as a basis for detailed growth management through agency plans (preceding LTCCP's being compiled).
  - For the implementation of all actions, developing appropriate methods and processes for community engagement that take into account the principles of collaboration and awareness
  - Understanding of issues as a foundation for agreement, commitment and action.

**11 Cont'd**

- Translate into each action the continuing high levels of community awareness of growth management issues generated from the Strategy. This reflects the importance of community engagement in Strategy implementation. It helps enable the needs of special interest groups, such as elders and disabled, to be taken into account in actions.
- Establish protocols to ensure that implementation of Strategy actions are consistent with the agreed communications Strategy
- Reporting back to the strategy partner Councils on a regular basis

**Constitution of Joint Committee**

5. The UDS proposes a Joint implementation Committee of two elected Members from each of the partner Councils together with the respective Mayor and Regional Chair of the partner Councils, one representative of Tangata Whenua and an Independent Chair (non-elected member), with a total membership of 14. The proposal for the Tangata Whenua representative arose during the hearing of submissions and is the adopted recommendation from the Joint Hearings Panel.
6. It is proposed to be a formal joint committee constituted under Schedule 7 (Clause 30) of the Local Government Act 2002.
7. It is also proposed that the committee have the power to co-op two additional non-voting members from the Strategic Partner Forum when required for specific action-related issues to ensure effective strategy implementation. This membership would be temporary, for the period of time the issue was being considered or addressed.

**Independent Chair**

8. The implementation committee will be acting for the collective good of the partnership and on that basis equality of representation on the committee from the partners is an appropriate arrangement. It is also proposed that the committee be supported by an independent chair.
9. The independent chair proposal supports the equality in representation approach, provides an opportunity for the chair to guide the committee through the collaborative implementation processes and demonstrates to the community the confidence the partner Councils have in working together and in having a non elected person involved to assist with providing guidance and input.
10. The role of the independent chair is outlined in Attachment 2 as are the skills and attributes sought.
11. Action 6.28.4(2) of the draft strategy provides for the appointment of an independent chair by the Implementation Committee, on the recommendation of the Mayors and Regional Chairman.
12. The Mayors and Regional Chair have considered this matter and propose to recommend to the UDS Implementation Committee that Bill Wasley (current UDS Project Leader Governance) be appointed to the position for an initial period of one year as it is considered he meets the requirements for the independent chair role as outlined in the attachment. In addition the appointment allows continuity in respect of project involvement and direction, and utilises some of the experience and knowledge gained as a result of him fulfilling a similar role in respect of SmartGrowth implementation in the Western Bay of Plenty.

**Administering Authority**

13. The Chief Executives have agreed that the administering authority for the UDS will be the Christchurch City Council for the first year of implementation. It is proposed that this be reviewed prior to 1 May 2008.

11 Cont'd

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

14. There are financial implications in establishing the UDSIC. The UDSIC will need to be supported financially and administratively. Funding of the UDSIC and the independent chair will be shared proportionally among the partners. Environment Canterbury and Christchurch City will each contribute 37.5% and Waimakariri and Selwyn District will contribute 12.5%.

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

15. Yes. The UDSIC and the Independent Chair are funded within the budgets established for the Christchurch City 2007/08 Annual Plan.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

16. There are requirements within the Local Government Act 2002 regarding the constitution of joint committees.

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

17. The UDSIC will be a formally constituted joint committee of Environment Canterbury, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council and Christchurch City Council under Schedule 7, clause 30 of the Local Government Act 2002.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

18. NA.

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

19. Yes. The UDS has been a key part of the work programme within the City Development Activity Management Plan.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

20. NA.

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

21. NA.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

22. NA.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended:

- (a) That pursuant to Clause 30, Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, a joint Committee of the Christchurch City Council, Waimakariri District Council, Selwyn District Council and Environment Canterbury be established to implement the UDS and that the Committee have the terms of reference and membership as outlined in Attachment 1.
- (b) That two Councillors be appointed to the UDS Implementation Committee. (The membership arrangements contained in the approved UDS provide for the appointment of the Mayors and Regional Chair to the Committee as of right.)

12. ADOPTION OF THE GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Strategy & Planning, DDI 941-8177
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Programme Manager Liveable City
<b>Author:</b>	Carolyn Ingles

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend the adoption of the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) to the Council.
2. The adoption of the UDS will bring to a conclusion the strategy development phase and is a significant milestone in respect of partner collaboration and partnership for the Greater Christchurch area.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Strategy Development**

3. Development of the strategy has been underway since 2004 and there has been significant community and partner input to strategy development. The community have been engaged in two significant public consultation phases (options consultation where over 3250 submissions were received) and more recently the draft strategy consultation undertaken in November and December 2006 where over 300 submissions were received. Various agencies have also been engaged through Forum membership, targeted consultation and also through the submission and hearing processes. Figure 1 summarises the strategy development process and the associated dates that particular phases of the process occurred.

Figure 1: Strategy Development Process:



12 Cont'd

**Project Governance and Management**

4. The UDS Forum (Governance) and UDS Management Team were established as part of the project in 2004. The Forum has provided governance oversight of strategy development. It is noted that it was not established as a formal committee under the Local Government Act.
5. The Management Team comprised of partner staff (Councils and Transit NZ) and project consultants has provided significant input into developing the strategy.
6. The terms of reference for the UDS Forum include recommending a draft strategy to the partners for adoption. Notwithstanding that the Hearings Panel which was a formally constituted joint committee under the Local Government Act 2002, and has provided directly to partner Council's recommendations on submissions and consequential change to the strategy, there is a need to comply with the original terms of reference established for the Forum.
7. Hence, the Forum at its meeting on 13 April 2007 considered a report recommending the UDS to the partners for adoption. The resolution from the Forum follows. The Forum was briefed on the significant amendments to the strategy at its meeting on 16 March, 2007.

*"That the UDS Forum recommends to the partner Councils and Transit NZ that they adopt the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy dated April 2007."*

**Joint Hearing Panel**

8. The Hearing Panel which was a formal joint committee established under the Local Government Act 2002 has provided recommendations back to each partner Council on all submissions and any consequential amendments to the Strategy.
9. The main changes recommended related to the following matters:
  - Population and household projections
  - Protection of special amenity, character and historic areas in the central city and other intensification areas.
  - Rail and transport corridors
  - Urban Design
  - Growth outside the urban development study area
  - Regional and national assets
  - Tangata Whenua
  - Versatile Soils
  - Rural residential in Christchurch City
  - Open Space in intensification areas
  - Waste Minimisation
  - Maps
  - Regional Policy Statement
10. There were a range of other amendments to the strategy arising from the consideration of submissions and these have been previously considered by the Council. All of these recommended amendments have been confirmed by the partner Councils.

**Draft Strategy**

11. The UDS centres on accommodating and managing growth, achieving quality outcomes and taking a sustainable development approach to managing growth. A copy of the strategy has been separately circulated.
12. The vision is as follows:

*"By the year 2041, Greater Christchurch has a vibrant inner city and suburban centres surrounded by thriving rural communities and towns, connected by efficient and sustainable infrastructure. There is a wealth of public spaces ranging from bustling inner city streets to expansive open spaces and parks, which embrace natural systems, landscapes and heritage."*

12 Cont'd

*Innovative businesses are welcome and can thrive supported by a wide range of attractive facilities and opportunities. Prosperous communities can enjoy a variety of lifestyles in good health and safety, enriched by the diversity of cultures and the beautiful environment of Greater Christchurch..*

*The Greater Christchurch sub-region will have:*

- *Enriched lifestyles;*
- *Enhanced environments;*
- *Prosperous economies;*
- *Managed growth*
- *integrated and collaborative leadership “*

13. The UDS establishes a clear, robust, transparent, accountable, and integrated strategy, policy and process framework for the management of the growth of the Greater Christchurch sub-region over time.
14. Growth in the sub-region involves accommodating out to 2041:
  - 134,000 additional people, a 30% increase
  - 74,800 additional households
  - Significant increases in people aged 65 and over
  - 47,500 additional people in employment, a 21% increase.
15. The strategy is about anchoring a long term collaborative approach to implementation. Whilst there will be issues requiring ongoing partner Council debate and consideration, there will also be matters requiring amendment to the current policy approach which will occur as alignment between other strategies and plans is undertaken in the short term. The strategy actions will also require anchoring in the respective Council LTCCPs.
16. A critical element is agreement to the sub-regional settlement pattern which is to be anchored through the Regional Policy Statement, and supported through a range of district plan changes by the partner territorial Councils. This is a change to the current approach, but is necessary if the UDS is to provide clear direction on managing future growth out to 2041.
17. The strategy actions are generally quite specific and are framed in a manner to provide a level of detail that leaves little doubt as to what is proposed. Again, the focus is on providing a high degree of certainty.
18. The implementation of the UDS will need to take a long term approach to achieve the outcomes desired and formal governance and management arrangements are critical to this. After consideration and adoption of the strategy, it is proposed that Council consider the establishment of the UDS Implementation Committee, which is to be a joint committee, constituted under the Local Government Act, 2002 to overview and drive UDS implementation from a collaboration and partnership perspective.
19. The ongoing collaborative and partnership approaches are fundamental to anchoring the long term commitment to successful implementation.

**Strategy implications for CCC**

20. There are a number of key strategy implications for Christchurch City Council:
  1. 39% of all new housing during the first 20 years of the strategy is in intensification areas in Christchurch City. These targets are ambitious and will require Council to work with developers and the community to encourage a market shift.
  2. The Central City is the first intensification area to be identified. The Central City Revitalisation Strategy Stage II sets out how this will be achieved.

**12 Cont'd**

3. Greenfield growth will continue, particularly in the early years of strategy implementation while Council is working to develop and encourage intensification. Throughout the life of the strategy Greenfield development continues and will provide housing choice within the city. The existing are plans programme will support this component of the strategy.
4. The land use and settlement pattern needs to be supported by the appropriate multi-modal transport network. While there is a significant funding gap between current transport funding and that required to implement the strategy, working on the collaborative basis achieved to date provides a significant foundation for seeking central government fiscal support.
5. The land use and settlement pattern proposed in the UDS will require timely provision of other infrastructure such as wastewater and stormwater. The capital works programme will need to be integrated into the UDS commitments and targets to ensure the timely delivery of such infrastructure; it is envisaged the major realignment of the capital works programme to achieve this will occur in the 2009-2019 LTCCP.

**Top 20 Actions**

21. The following actions have been recommended as the "Top 20" by the Chief Executives and Management Team for an immediate focus for implementation and will be considered by the Implementation Committee at its first meeting;

	<b>Actions</b>
1	Revise Chapter 12A of the Regional Policy Statement.
2	Establish the Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee (UDSIC) with an independent chair to undertake the carrying out of the Strategy, including the creation of a Strategic Partner Forum and undertaking risk management strategy.
3	The Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee (UDSIC) develops and plans for the implementation of a programme of actions to give effect to the Urban Development Strategy.
4	Develop integrated transport and land use programmes and patterns for the development of funded transport projects for the southwest (Christchurch Rolleston Environs Transport Study – CRETS) and northern corridors to enhance strategic transport. This will require the development of funding programme with Central Government.
5	Reflect infrastructure staging and timing to give effect to the preferred long-term sub-regional growth pattern, including staging and timing; within respective Council LTCCPs and ensure all strategy and planning documents are aligned with the adopted the Urban Development Strategy.
6	Prepare and implement district plan changes to reflect the Regional Policy Statement Change 12A. This will include appropriate changes to deliver the sub-regional settlement pattern including activity centres, intensification areas, rural residential provision, and urban activities.
7	Amend the Regional Land Transport Strategy to reflect the adopted Urban Development Strategy, this may include a transport strategy for Greater Christchurch and travel demand management strategy and action plans.
8	Develop a communications strategy to inform Greater Christchurch about the strategy and its implementation.
9	Implement the Central City Revitalisation Strategy by providing directives, information and incentives for achieving the density targets while providing affordable housing and protecting neighbourhood identity.
10	Creation of a Development Corporation to enable and facilitate appropriate and catalyst projects within the city.

## 12 Cont'd

	<b>Actions</b>
11	Develop Business Land Management Strategy within the context of agreed wider economic development strategies that defines the role and function of business areas and centres and includes a staging programme for land release.
12	Establish the capital requirements for key sub-regional infrastructure for the 2009-19 LTCCP period together with possible sources of funding as well as shortfalls.
13	Develop an integrated programme for monitoring demographic, social, economic and environmental change together with development activity across Greater Christchurch that enables effective measurement of the outcomes of strategy implementation.
14	Administrative alignment within all the partner organisations to ensure that all decisions and actions of the Councils are working to achieve the UDS.
15	Carry out study of affordable housing options to look at inclusive zoning, increasing the stock of social housing and partnerships with developers and monitor supply and demand of affordable housing at local and regional levels.
16	Develop an urban design strategy to apply the principles of good urban design reflecting the character and diversity of the communities in the Greater Christchurch.
17	Prepare Outline Development Plans for initial Greenfield and intensification areas together with Structure Plans that support intensification of key Activity Centres. Identify candidate "brownfields" conversion areas.
18	Prepare Integrated Catchment Management Plans to assist with co-ordinated decision-making in relation to surface water management.
19	Develop a community engagement programme to take into account the principles of collaboration and to develop awareness and understanding of issues as a foundation for agreement, commitment and action.
20	Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee is to produce a Strategy Implementation Plan every three years as a basis for detailed growth management through agency plans (preceding the LTCCP) and to review all the actions that will need to be achieved during that period and work with the partners to plan and implement these actions.

22. The remaining actions are to be reviewed and prioritised by the UDS Implementation Committee as part of the first review of the Strategy.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

23. There are financial implications within the strategy. There will be a need to ensure that the UDS commitments and targets are embedded into the 2009-2019 LTCCP to ensure capital and other programme delivery to implement the growth targets and actions identified within the strategy. The top 20 actions which are identified as key to implementing the strategy during the first three years and where the Christchurch City Council is a lead or support agency have been identified and funded within the 2007/08 annual plan.

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

24. The first three years of the UDS implementation programme are budgeted for within the 10-year work programme of the 2006-2016 LTCCP. However as investigations to ensure UDS commitments are integrated into activity management plans and the capital programme progress there will be a need to realign/review timeframes for delivery of particular projects through reviews of the LTCCP.

12 Cont'd

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

25. There are legal considerations with regard to the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The key considerations under the LGA relate to sections 77 to 82 regarding decision making. The key issue in relation to the RMA relates to how far the UDS pre-determines any RMA-related process, such as a change to the Regional Policy Statement or District Plan.

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

26. Legal advice has been received on the strategy development process, consultation process, partner Council resolutions relation to various strategy phases and the strategy document itself. This advice indicates that there are no legal issues with process and the document achieved substantial compliance with the requirements of S77 to 82 of the Local Government Act 2002. On the basis of the legal advice received the strategy document will be amended to more clearly indicate that the UDS sets in place a common policy framework and that specific actions and implementation mechanisms, such as changes to the Regional Policy Statement, District Plans and other documents are each subject to a statutory process.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

27. The implementation of the UDS will impact on current and future capital works programmes, renewals and programme priorities. Future Activity management plans will need to be reviewed to improve integration with the Council's UDS commitments, in particular greater emphasis on intensification and urban redevelopment.

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

28. Yes. The UDS has been a key part of the work programme within the City Development Activity Management Plan.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

29. The UDS land use, settlement and transport pattern will be invaluable inputs into the development of Council strategies. It should also be noted that the UDS anticipates and builds on a number of strategy initiatives which are either in progress or planned within the Council's strategy development programme.

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

30. See above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

31. Consultation has been undertaken on strategy options and on the draft strategy. The legal advice received indicates that the consultation undertaken complies with LGA requirements.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Adopt the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy April 2007.
- (b) Delegate to the General Manager Strategy and Planning the ability to make minor text and grammatical changes and changes recommended by the legal advisors to ensure compliance with the Local Government Act 2002.

**13. ELECTED MEMBERS' EXPENSES AND ALLOWANCES**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Democracy Services Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Kevin Roche, Assistant Council Secretary

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Council's approval of a proposed schedule of elected member expenses and allowances for forwarding to the Remuneration Authority for its approval.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Council is required to submit to the Remuneration Authority by 30 April 2007 a schedule of allowances and expenses proposed to be paid to elected members for the period 1 July 2007 to 30 June 2008 for its approval. The schedule attached as Attachment 1 is in the new format required by the Remuneration Authority and includes some amendments as discussed at the Council seminar on 17 April 2006. Apart from these items (shown in italics in the schedule), it repeats the status quo. Also included for information is a copy of the current schedule for allowances and expenses, Attachment 2.
3. A proposed schedule of elected member allowances and expenses was submitted to the 23 March 2007 Council meeting for approval. This item was deferred, however, to allow the opportunity for further consultation with Councillors on some of the existing procedures for the payment of such expenses and allowances.
4. A seminar to discuss the proposed schedule of expenses and allowances was held on Tuesday 17 April 2007 and the issues raised at this seminar have been incorporated into this report and the proposed schedule for submission to the Remuneration Authority. The recommendations previously made by Community Boards on allowances and expenses were again tabled at this seminar for discussion.
5. Additional items raised at the seminar on 17 April 2007 related to:
  - The provision of JetStream (to be provided on personal telephone lines) and a refund of \$40 per month for JetStream connection for Community Board members.

(Note at present this is currently provided only for the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, Councillors and Community Board Chairs. The consensus of the seminar meeting was that this provision should also be extended to all Community Board members.)

The estimated additional cost of this proposal is \$15,360 per annum.

- Payment of subscriptions/fees for membership of professional institutes/associations which are relevant to the role of an elected member.

It was suggested at the seminar that consideration be given to reimbursing the costs of membership in such professional associations as the Resource Management Law Association (RMLA), New Zealand Planning Institute (NZPI) and Institute of Directors of New Zealand.

Staff will report back on the possible criteria that could apply to this with a view to the matter being considered by the incoming Council.

13 Cont'd

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

6. If the Council adopted the additional allowances in respect to payment of a JetStream refund to Community Board members and reimbursement of membership and professional association fees, then an additional cost of \$15,360 per annum could result. This cost would be met from existing budgets.

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

7. As indicated above the additional costs over existing budgets of \$15,360 would be met from existing budgets.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

8. The principal statutory provision which applies in this instance is the Remuneration Authority Act 1977. Once the Council's proposal has been approved by the Authority it will be gazetted via the Local Government Elected Members Determination 2007.

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

9. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

10. Page 113 of the LTCCP, level of service under Democracy and Governance refers.

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

11. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

12. Not applicable.

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

13. Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

14. This matter has been considered by all Community Boards and their recommendations placed before the Council's meeting of 23 March 2007.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Confirm if it wishes to include in the schedule of elected member expenses and allowances the additional provisions relating to payment of a \$40 refund for JetStream connections to all Community Board members, as detailed in the report and draft schedule.
- (b) Adopt a schedule of elected member expenses, reimbursements and allowances for the period 1 July 2007 to 30 June 2008 for submission to the Remuneration Authority for its approval.

**14. ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2007/08: RECOMMENDATION TO INCOMING COUNCIL**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Acting Democracy Services Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Lisa Goodman

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to submit corrected figures in respect of the elected member salary option to be recommended to the incoming Council after the election.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. On 23 March 2007 the Council resolved, inter alia, to request the incoming Council to consider the possible adoption of a post-election remuneration structure which provides for the payment of the following salaries for the balance of 2007/08:

<i>Mayor</i>	156,590
<i>Deputy Mayor</i>	92,955
<i>Councillors</i>	79,995
<i>Metro Community Board Chairs</i>	28,526
<i>Banks Peninsula Community Board Chairs</i>	28,526
<i>Metro Community Board members</i>	15,291
<i>Banks Peninsula Community Board Members</i>	15,291

3. Unfortunately there was an error in the figures presented to that meeting, which was communicated to Councillors shortly afterwards. The figures for the community board chairs, both metro and Banks Peninsula, should have been **\$31,925**. Confirmation of this revised figure is now sought from the Council.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. All financial implications associated with elected members' remuneration for 2007/08 were outlined in the comprehensive report to the Council meeting of 23 March 2007. This revised figure of \$31,925 for community board chairs will not result in the total salaries exceeding the remuneration pool.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

5. All legal considerations associated with the elected members' remuneration for 2007/08 were outlined in the report to the Council meeting of 23 March 2007.

**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?**

6. Page 113 of the LTCCP refers to remunerating members for governing the city.

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

7. Not relevant.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

8. No consultation is required.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council confirm the salary of \$31,925 for community board chairs as part of the post-election remuneration structure that the Council has requested be given consideration by the incoming Council.

**15. LOCAL GOVERNMENT RATES INQUIRY COUNCIL SUBMISSION**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Corporate Services, Roy Baker DDI 941-8540
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Corporate Finance Manager, Diane Brandish
<b>Author:</b>	Geoff Barnes, Funds & Financial Policy Manager

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to obtain the Council's approval of the submission to the Local Government Rates Inquiry.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Minister for Local Government has set up an independent inquiry into the funding of local government. The Local Government Rates Inquiry is being carried out by a panel of three: David Shand (Chair), Christine Cheyne and Graeme Horsley. The objective of the inquiry is to provide the Government with recommendations on how to improve local government funding, covering both rating and other sources of revenue. Rates are primarily driven by council decisions on expenditure, so the terms of reference also require the Commission to look at what drives local government expenditure, the rating system, and alternative sources of revenue currently available to councils, including new sources of revenue.
3. The terms of reference for the inquiry are attached as Appendix A.
4. The commission has requested specific recommendations on changes requested as well as comment on what works well under the current legislation.
5. The draft submission is attached as Appendix B. Several recommendations are included:
  - (a) That the Commission review the rating tools and legislation for:
    - Targeted rates area of benefit
    - Remove the general rates exemption from non rateable property
    - Amend the legislation to allow a tourism targeted rate
    - Lower the valuation costs through efficiency changes
    - Improve council loan raising processes
  - (b) Benchmarking of councils be established to provide transparency and performance improvement.
  - (c) The Government should transfer more taxation revenue to councils to compensate them for the service benefits to citizens generally beyond that which benefits ratepayers and properties.
6. The submissions have been discussed at two Council seminars and at a workshop held by the Commission to hear the concerns of local councils.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7. There are benefits to this Council if the recommendations are adopted by the Government and implemented. A wider and more focused rating tool kit would give this Council more options for rating. Adopting this submission does not change this Council's rating or Revenue & Financing Policy. It merely seeks more and better options.
8. The Council would benefit from any additional distribution of central government funds to local authorities generally.
9. Benchmarking on a nationally consistent basis may cause some minor compliance costs, however there would be potential gains from knowledge to assist enhanced performance.

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

10. Not applicable as there is no Council activity action requested in this report.

15 Cont'd

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

11. The submission has been reviewed by Legal Services Unit to ensure the recommendations are reasonable. The format of the submission is that of the Commission of Inquiry, not the standard format of Select Committees of Parliament. Where possible specific amendments to legislation have been recommended to assist the Commission.
12. The specific changes to legislation are detailed in the submission under the heading "Summary of Recommendations".

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

13. There are no alignment issues.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

14. The submission does not represent Council policies. The Revenue & Financing Policy as adopted in the 2006-16 LTCCP stands intact.
15. The recommendations in the submission generally add to the tools available. If implemented by the Government, the Council will need to consider their application to our community.
16. There is no need to consult with the community. The public have also been invited to make submissions to the Commission.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council approve the submission.

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

17. The Commission has issued a background paper to explain its inquiry. The submission follows the format of the issues raised as expressed in that background paper. Some headings and explanatory text from that paper is retained in the submission to better explain the context of the Council's submission.
18. The following issues are highlighted by the Inquiry's Terms of Reference and will be the focus of its investigation:
  - the current level of rates and the level of rates increases;
  - the drivers for increased local authority expenditure;
  - the trends in the use of rating tools nationally to fund services;
  - other sources of revenue currently available to local authorities;
  - the sustainability of rates,
  - the Rates Rebate Scheme (and other government assistance packages for families), and local authority rates remission and postponement policies;
  - the impact of rates on land covered by the Te Ture Whenua Maori Act 1993;
  - exemptions from liability for rates, including Crown exemptions; and
  - other revenue-raising mechanisms.
19. Further information about the inquiry can be found on the website [www.ratesinquiry.govt.nz](http://www.ratesinquiry.govt.nz).

26. 4. 2007

- 23 -

16. NOTICES OF MOTION

17. QUESTIONS

18. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.