



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

THURSDAY 5 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.

- | ITEM NO | DESCRIPTION |
|---------|---|
| 1. | APOLOGIES |
| 2. | CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 29.3.2007 |
| 3. | DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT |
| 4. | PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS |
| 5. | CORRESPONDENCE |
| 6. | GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY:
REPORT FROM JOINT HEARINGS PANEL |
| 7. | SUBMISSION TO TRANSIT NZ DRAFT 2007/08 LAND TRANSPORT PROGRAMME AND
10 YEAR FINANCIAL PLAN |
| 8. | ICON FESTIVAL AND EVENT FUNDING 2007-2010 |
| 9. | ANNUAL PLAN/AMENDED LTCCP PROCESS 2007/08 |
| 10. | REVIEW OF THE LICENSED WASTE HANDLING FACILITIES BYLAW 2005 |
| 11. | REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 7 MARCH 2007 |
| 12. | REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD |
| 13. | REPORT OF THE LYTTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 21 FEBRUARY 2007 |
| 14. | REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 7 MARCH 2007 |
| 15. | REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 6 MARCH 2007 |
| 16. | NOTICES OF MOTION |
| 17. | QUESTIONS |
| 18. | RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC |

We're on the Web!

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

5. 4. 2007

- 2 -

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 29.3.2007**
Attached.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

4. **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**

5. **CORRESPONDENCE**

**6. GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY:
REPORT FROM JOINT HEARINGS PANEL**

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This is a report from the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) Joint Hearings Panel, which sets out the recommendations of the panel on changes to the document.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Hearing

2. The hearing of submissions commenced on 26 February 2007 at Our City and continued until 8 March 2007. During those days 90 submitters presented their oral submissions to the panel. The hearings panel comprised representatives from each of the UDS partner Councils: Bob Parker (Independent Chair), Councillors Helen Broughton, Pat Harrow, Sue Wells (Christchurch City Council), Richard Budd, Alec Neill, Elizabeth Cunningham (Environment Canterbury), Annette Foster, Debra Hassan, Malcolm Lyall (Selwyn District Council), Kath Adams, Kevin Felstead and Dan Gordon (Waimakariri District Council).

Partner Council Process

3. Each of the partner Councils will receive a report to consider and adopt these changes, prior to the full strategy being updated and brought back to each strategy partner for final adoption. Should any of the participating Councils disagree with any of the suggested changes to the document, a round of partner negotiations will be required before the final strategy can be adopted. The final Strategy will be brought to the Council in mid-April for adoption.

Joint Hearings Panel Recommendations

4. Table 1 below sets out the most significant recommendations from the Panel and the attached documents (separately circulated) contain:
 - The full recommendations from the Joint Hearings Panel; and
 - The tracked changes document which identifies all of the small text and grammatical changes recommended by the panel. The vast majority of these changes are for clarification of text, actions or reassignment of lead agency responsibility in the actions tables.
5. The fundamental intent and direction of the draft Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy remains unaltered following the Joint Hearings Panel Deliberations.

Table 1: Significant changes recommended by the UDS Joint Hearings Panel

	Issue	Resolution
1.	Population and household projections	The data provided by Statistics New Zealand's 2006 census is the foundation on which to base the Urban Development Strategy. Monitoring of ongoing development and growth will occur throughout implementation and if there are significant changes that need to be made they can be made at the 3-yearly UDS review.
2.	Protection of special amenity, character and historic areas in the central city and other intensification areas.	Action 6 is deleted and an additional key approach is inserted in section 6.10.3 using words from the draft change to the Regional Policy Statement. "Identify significant amenity, character, cultural, natural, historic or heritage features and values and show how they are to be protected."

5. 4. 2007

- 4 -

6 Cont'd

	Issue	Resolution
3.	Rail and transport corridors	In section 6.26.4 delete action 7 Upon the review and implement the Public Passenger Transport Strategy for the Greater Christchurch area. Revise action 11 "Set up a transport group within the Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee (UDSIC) to coordinate transport planning and funding including opportunities for park and ride, public passenger transport, commuter rail, cycle and walk ways."
4.	Urban Design	Add key approach to section 6.9.3 "Promote and encourage comprehensive development and redevelopment to achieve good urban design outcomes."
5.	Growth outside the urban development study area	The UDS addresses growth demand only from within the strategy area and does not seek to concentrate in that area growth that would otherwise occur adjacent to the UDS area. In the areas adjacent to the UDS local district plan provisions continue to apply. At the Strategy review in 2009, the settlement pattern adjacent to this area will be assessed. There is also scope for these issues to be considered as part of the review of the Regional Policy Statement.
6.	Regional and national assets	In section 3.6, Encourage Prosperous Economies add the following regional and national assets that will be protected: Christchurch International Airport, Lyttelton Port, Burnham Military Base, West Melton Training Area, and Agricultural Research Centres and Farm
7.	Tangata Whenua	As part the UDISC a seat will be established for Tangata whenua. Additionally conversations will continue with local runaka to implement local initiatives and the goals of the UDS.
8.	Versatile soils	Add a key approach to section 3.6 Growth Management Assumptions, Manage Growth Versatile soils should be protected where practical. The Strategy accepts that in circumstances where there are reverse sensitivity issues such protection may no longer be appropriate.
9.	Rural Residential in Christchurch City	Add a fifth action to section 6.25.4 At the first Strategy review look at opportunities for rural residential to be provided for within CCC boundaries.
10.	Open space in intensification areas	Add a new growth issue in section 6.5.2 Retention of open space appropriate to intensification. Add a new approach in section 6.5.3 Design and provide appropriate open space in intensification areas.
11.	Waste Minimisation	Add new action 1: All partner councils consult with their communities on the goal of Zero Waste reduction targets in their waste management plans. Delete action 5 All partner councils establish effective waste minimisation strategies to reduce the waste disposed at the regional landfill at Kate Valley.

6 Cont'd

	Issue	Resolution
12.	Maps	It was agreed there would be an indicative map included within the strategy that would clarify greenfield areas, key transport corridors, and potential intensification areas. Additional maps illustrating sections of the draft UDS will be developed by staff for review.
13.	Regional Policy Statement (RPS) Chapter 12A	<p>The RPS Chapter 12A Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern is being developed and written to implement the Urban Development Strategy.</p> <p>The Change will sit with the existing generic policies of the Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>The following text to be added to the key action table in Section 6.</p> <p>It will provide specific guidance on where growth and intensification will occur. Other mechanisms may be considered where the location or timing of urban growth areas cannot be as precisely determined, however the strategy partners will collectively work towards the identification of growth boundaries as a preferred management mechanism.</p> <p>The Change will determine the overall extent of Greater Christchurch through the setting of Metropolitan Urban Limits working towards specific, rather than indicative lines on the map;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenfield growth areas - where Council processes have established a clear boundary these will be included in the RPS change, otherwise indicative boundaries will be used; • Rural residential – a list of criteria for assessing the location, extent and form will be included; and • Intensification areas - the central city within the four avenues as a priority area and will be shown as a clear boundary along with the existing L3 and L4 zones and some L2 zones from within the Christchurch City Plan. Activity centres will be shown as indicative. A two-year programme of work will establish these more specifically for inclusion in the full the RPS review in 2009.

Council Process from here

6. For greenfield areas that are not already zoned the Council needs to undertake further work to identify urban limits, environmental constraints, infrastructure needs, community facilities and community aspirations to confirm the key requirements for these growth areas.
7. For intensification areas, during the next two years the Council will undertake citywide investigations to identify significant values including amenity, character, cultural, natural, heritage and historic values. This will include recognition of existing protection mechanisms such as SAMs. These investigations will also include housing affordability, land aggregation potential, housing stock, community acceptability and aspirations.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. There are no legal considerations for this stage in the UDS process. There are financial considerations regarding the recommendations from the hearings panel, although these will be considered through future LTCCP and Annual Plan processes. 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 through the annual plan process.

6 Cont'd

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

9. 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 alignment of activity management plans and capital programme proceed there will be a need to realign/review timeframe for delivery of particular projects through reviews of the Council LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. There are no legal considerations for this stage in the UDS process, although the implementation of the UDS will involve plan changes through the RMA and investment decisions via the LTCCP. Both processes have the opportunity for submissions and legal challenge.

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

11. There are no legal implications.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. 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 alignment 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?

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

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. Not applicable.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

15. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. Consultation on the draft Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy was undertaken during November and December 2006.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council adopt the recommendations of the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Hearings Panel to amend the draft Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy.

7. SUBMISSION TO TRANSIT NZ DRAFT 2007/08 LAND TRANSPORT PROGRAMME AND 10 YEAR FINANCIAL PLAN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8117
Officer responsible:	Portfolio Manager – Liveable Cities
Author:	Stuart Woods

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present, seek comment on and recommend adoption of a Council submission to the Transit NZ draft 2007/08 Land Transport Programme and 10 Year Financial Plan on which Transit NZ are currently consulting, and to approve attendance at a subsequent hearing of submissions. This consultation is an annual requirement under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 as part of Transit's land transport programme formulation. The due date of the submissions is 30 March 2005, although approval has been received from Transit to provide a ratified submission following on from this meeting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Under legislation, each year Transit New Zealand is required to consult on its forward work programme. This year's consultation document outlines Transit's proposed Land Transport Programme for the 2007/08 financial year, provides broad-brush information on the remaining four years of the Government's committed five year programme of works (established last year), and a ten year financial plan (outlining overall expenditure in the generic work categories on which its budget is based). The overall expenditure proposed for the 2007/08 year is \$1.38B, which may be compared to the \$1.19B for the current 2006/07 year (a 16% increase). However, the document indicates that the forecast level of activity will be broadly the same in the two years, with the increase absorbed by cost escalations.
3. Transit's approach in its consultation document has been to seek feedback on the coming year's activities, and to provide an update on the remainder of the committed five year programme. Specifically, Transit is seeking feedback on:
 - the regional transport issues listed;
 - the proposed maintenance activity level;
 - the programmed and new works;
 - Transit's contribution to meeting the Land Transport Management Act (LTMA) objectives (a mandatory requirement); and
 - the usefulness of the consultation document.
4. The consultation document is very similar in presentation and detail to the final 10 Year State Highway Plan and Forecast for last year, rather than the style of the consultation material in past years which contained significantly more information. A copy of the draft Canterbury State Highway Land Transport Programme is attached. In the consultation material, there is only limited information on projects provided for the 2007/08 year, some additional information on the large projects (valued at over \$4M) out to year 4 and no information about any projects beyond year 4. The Government has signalled it intends to move to a six-year funding cycle with a major update every three years, in order to align with the Local Government planning process cycle (LTCCP's). The first major updates and alignment will be due in 2009. This should ultimately produce a State Highway forecast where there is never less than three years of funding certainty.
5. The level of detail provided in the consultation document is poor, and makes any detailed analysis of the proposed programme difficult. Thus, it is similarly difficult to provide considered and specific submissions. Nevertheless, the Council still has an important opportunity through this mechanism to seek to influence and contribute to the finalisation of this year's Transit Land Transport Programme and Financial Plan. It is important therefore to compile the Council's views into a submission to respond to Transit's draft proposals.

7 Cont'd

6. The key matters identified by staff as important on which to express views are:
- That the consultation material is inadequate in terms of information and detail (or reference thereto) to make a full and detailed submission and contribution to Transit's mandatory consultation process.
 - That the lack of information about future years programmes (years 5-10 for large projects and years 2-3 for all other projects) is unacceptable in terms of seeking to align Council and Transit projects for integrated and collaborative delivery. For example, with the silence on years 5-10 in the programme, and relying upon last year's State Highway Plan, can the Council choose to presume that the Northern Arterial Rural construction date is now at latest in year 9?
 - That the recognition of the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) in the consultation material list of regional issues for Canterbury is encouraging. However, once the UDS is adopted in the near future, Transit will need to go on and ensure that its overall programme is integrated with the UDS (this would not be able to be determined in the current consultation material), it delivers its commitments in a timely and collaborative manner, and provides transparent programming information so that the partner organisations can co-ordinate delivery of improvements across the UDS area.
 - That transport planning in Christchurch should be based on our philosophy that **prevention is better than cure**. Therefore the urgent demands in Auckland and Wellington should not unnecessarily detract from our ability to continue with good planning and implementation. The ongoing low level of activity and delivery of transport system improvements in Christchurch is creating an infrastructure deficit (or lag) in the State Highway system, which the remainder of the Christchurch transport system is having to unnecessarily cope with. In addition, the ongoing use of Regional Funds (R-Funds) rather than allocating National Funds (N-Funds) to Christchurch improvements has been reflected in previous Council submissions, and the same views of dissatisfaction can be expressed.
 - That cycling and walking improvement projects again are allocated a very small part of the overall expenditure, at around 0.2%, and are allocated in a priority 6 (the lowest) grouping of projects in terms of priority call on funding. They should be raised to priority 4 to be alongside minor safety works (and above the large projects – priority 5, which are all major roading projects with one exception), to provide sufficient focus to better meet the objectives of the LTMA.
 - That the proposal to construct the TDM project (bus priority corridor measures) in 2007/08 is strongly endorsed.
 - That the proposal to begin design of the Southern Motorway in 2007/08 and for construction to begin within four years is strongly endorsed, with the requirement of full collaboration and partnership between the Council and Transit being the hallmark of the project.
 - That the introduction of only two new small and medium projects in Canterbury (Lyttelton Tunnel Deluge System and the Johns/Main North Intersection upgrade) for the coming year is too few for addressing the many State Highway issues in the Christchurch and Canterbury region.
 - That the proposal for eight strategic studies in Canterbury, including Christchurch Northern Links, Halswell Road and the Southern Motorway extension (beyond Halswell Junction Road), is endorsed with encouragement for prompt completion and action thereafter.
8. A copy of the proposed City Council submission is attached for discussion, amendment if necessary, and adoption.

7 Cont'd

9. In the consultation material, Transit has asked whether the Council wishes to take an opportunity to present its submission to a hearing panel. Officers believe that this is a key mechanism to promote and optimise the chances of success to address our issues. Therefore officers intend to accept the opportunity, and are recommending that the presentation be delegated to the General Manager Strategy and Planning and the Portfolio Manager – Liveable City. Should Councillors wish to participate or indeed lead the presentation, then the recommendation (b) below should be modified and Councillors nominated to also participate. Information to date regarding these hearings is that they will be regionally-held and will occur on 18 April in Christchurch. Following release of the confirmed forecast around the turn of the new financial year, all submitters will be informed of the decisions, along with reasons, made by the Transit Board.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. There are no financial implications to the Council directly related to this submission.

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

11. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. The Council has no legal obligation to provide a submission on the Transit draft Land Transport Programme and Financial Plan, nor are any legal commitments made through the submission.

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

13. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

14. Making the submission aligns to working with partner agencies to meet community outcomes related to transport.

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

15. The recommendation to adopt and promote the submission may influence Transit to improve its activities to support levels of service related to the transport system operation.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

16. The views expressed in the submission are aligned with the Council's transport strategies, the draft Urban Development Strategy, and Council budgets.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

17. Yes

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. None required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Adopt the attached submission, subject to any agreed amendments, for forwarding to Transit New Zealand as its views on the Transit NZ draft 2006/07-2015/16 10-Year State Highway Forecast.
- (b) Grant approval for the General Manager Strategy and Planning and the Portfolio Manager – Liveable City to present the Council's submission to the regional hearings.

8. ICON FESTIVAL AND EVENT FUNDING 2007-2010

General Manager responsible:	Acting General Manager Public Affairs, 941-8637
Officer responsible:	Events Development Manager
Author:	Jo Naish

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To consider two Icon Event Funding applications and decide on funding allocations for Icon Events for 2007/08 and the following two years
2. To reconsider the label of 'Icon' Event funding criteria.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. The Events Strategy aims to develop two 'Icon' level events for Christchurch by 2010. It is important to remember that events take time to develop and two Icon events are not required immediately this financial year. If so, we may close off future opportunities.
4. Goals in the Events Strategy directly linking to Icon Events are:

Goal 1: Events attract visitors and strengthen the distinctive identities and lifestyle qualities of Christchurch.

Objective 1.1.
Support the development of two events to an Icon 'level' which reflect the character of Christchurch and Banks Peninsula lifestyles and will attract significant visitor numbers.
5. This strategic direction will enable two events over the next three years to attract visitors to Christchurch in the off or shoulder season, supporting the 'Four Seasons BeThere.co.nz campaign' and provide a substantial economic return to the city via the events. It requires that the Council provides two events with enough support and focus to really succeed.

FUNDING**Funding Label**

6. The Events Strategy aims to reallocate funding within the Events and Festivals budget to develop two 'icon' events. Following the 20 March Council seminar, the Council asked staff to reassess the name of the 'funding level' considered in this report. The current name 'icon' is purely a label to describe particular funding criteria. However, it causes confusion. An event described as 'iconic' to Christchurch may be an event which receives only a small amount of funding from the Council, like the Coast to Coast. Classical Sparks may be an iconic event to Christchurch residents. However, when considered for funding, we would assess it under the Metropolitan Community Funding level. The challenge is to find a more specific name.
7. Based on the criteria (outlined below) it is proposed to change the name to 'economic'.
8. The Events Strategy Funding Framework lists the Icon (or 'economic') criteria as:
 - Unique to Christchurch
 - Economic Driver - \$10m plus in direct expenditure to the local economy
 - Has significant international and national media profile
 - Attracts at least 10,000 visitor days to the city
 - Strong marketing support of the event by CCT
 - Reinforce the city's visitor marketing brand identity
 - Annual event
 - Aim for one per shoulder or off shoulder season and link to the Four Seasons BeThere.co.nz Campaign
9. For the purpose of this report this level of funding will continue to be addressed as 'icon' until a decision is made based on the recommendation to change the label at the end of this report.

8 Cont'd

THE APPLICANTS

10. Only two events applied for Icon event funding this year.

New Zealand Cup and Show Week

11. This event is an established festival, project managed by the Council. The Council will handle all New Zealand Cup and Show Brand marketing. The 2006 New Zealand Cup and Show Week contributed \$27m economic impact to the city. \$21m of new money came into the city as direct expenditure from outside Canterbury. When looking at the criteria analysis the festival delivers on all criteria. A total funding package is suggested at \$360,000 with various allocations to events.

Fashion Events

12. During the Council seminar on Tuesday 20 March, the Council provided direction on fashion event funding. It was confirmed that it was important to fund fashion events as part of the festival. Although the Canterbury Collections is an established event and a good opening event for the week, the Council expressed concerns about how the existing fashion event is performing. As a consequence, the Council asked staff to look at other ways to develop the fashion experience and promote Christchurch through fashion during the week.
12. After consideration, the following changes (shown in bold) have been made to the NZ Cup and Show Week event funding allocations.

Event	Initial Recommended Funding	Funding Recommendation following Seminar
Royal NZ Show	\$100,000	\$100,000
Canterbury Collections (to launch the event – possibly held at Addington)	\$70,000 + marketing support	\$50,000
A central city fashion show and small salon and street shows	\$30,000 + marketing support	\$50,000
'Binding' Festival events in the city – think music 'zones'	\$70,000	\$70,000
Local marketing and signage	\$70,000	\$70,000
Addington Racing Events	\$10,000	\$10,000
Riccarton Racing Events	\$10,000	\$10,000
Southern Amp Concert	Receives \$35,000 from old seed funding budget	
		Totals \$360,000

13. An additional **\$200,000** of the BeThere.co.nz funding to promote Christchurch nationally will go towards promoting New Zealand Cup and Show nationally under the BeThere.co.nz banner. This funding was confirmed at the Annual Plan seminar and will be adopted shortly as part of the draft annual plan.

The Christchurch Arts Festival (run by the Arts Festival Trust)

14. The Festival is biannual and Christchurch will see significant development of the event in 2007. 'Festival Square' will be held in Cathedral Square and will host many of the events and hospitality. The Arts Festival Trust's objectives aim for the event to become 'iconic' to Christchurch, a key event for the winter season, and is accessible to the community while remaining attractive to the art initiated.

8 Cont'd

15. The event is requesting **\$300,000** per annum to run the Arts Festival and a Cabaret Festival on the off year. The Cabaret Festival (which began last year) could be held in Cathedral Square or at the Art Gallery as in 2006. It would be the only Cabaret Festival in New Zealand and run on the back of the very successful Cabaret Festival run in Adelaide the month before.
16. Attachment 1 shows an analysis of the two events based on the criteria. The Christchurch Arts Festival does not fulfil the economic impact and visitor days criteria. It is also debateable how 'unique' the event is to Christchurch as it is not a national event – Wellington is the national International Arts Festival.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

17. The allocated budget for Events and Festivals in the 2007/09 Annual Plan is \$1.67m. Icon Event funding will come out of this budget as well as other contracted events and in-house events which will be considered in the next funding round.

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

18. Yes

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

19. Contracts for each event receiving funding will be developed for one to three years depending on the event. As part of the contract, event organisers will be legally obliged to use NZ Cup and Show Week branding when marketing their own events.

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

20. Yes

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

21. Yes

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

22. Yes

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

23. The Events Strategy and the Visitor Strategy

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

24. Yes – see Goals and objectives above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

25. Consultation was taken during the Events Strategy to look at possible icon events. New Zealand Cup and Show Week was nominated as a potential 'icon' event in the strategy.
26. Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism, the Canterbury Development Corporation and the Art Gallery Director were also consulted on the suitability of the two proposals as 'icon' events.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Fund New Zealand Cup and Show Week as an 'icon' event from existing Events and Festivals budgets to the amount of \$360,000 annually for the next three years.
- (b) Change the name 'icon' funding level to 'economic' funding level when communicating funding decisions.

8 Cont'd

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

Current Situation

27. The Christchurch City Council has been seen as a leader in events within New Zealand and as a consequence, Christchurch has a very established calendar of metropolitan community events and festivals. However as other Australasian regions and cities gear up their events proposition and marketing dollars to attract visitors, Christchurch's events product has continued to deliver mostly to residents. Our largest, most popular and established events such as Classical Sparks (25 years old), Festival of Flowers (18 years old), The World Buskers Festival (14 years old) and New Zealand Cup and Show Week (100 years old in parts), help create an identity for the city and deliver well on community outcomes. The challenge now is to develop some of these events into world class events which will help change the perception of Christchurch through media leveraging and attract visitors and future residents.
28. The Christchurch Arts Festival's proposal shows the event has a good future as a possible winter 'icon' event in three years time. The Cabaret Festival and new 'Festival Square' would need to be proven before a move into the 'icon' level could be made. It will be considered again in the following funding round in May as a 'Major' event.

9. ANNUAL PLAN/AMENDED LTCCP PROCESS 2007/08

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Kevin Roche

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of the report is to advise the Council in respect to the processing of submissions on the Draft Annual Plan for 2007/08 and Draft Amendments to the Long-Term Council Community Plan 2006/16.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At the meeting on 23 March 2007 the Council agreed to adopt the above for public consultation with submissions closing on 11 May 2007.
3. As a consequence of the change in the timetable for the Draft Annual Plan and Amended Long-Term Council Community Plan the period available between receipt of submissions and the hearing and consideration of these has been considerably reduced.
4. It is proposed therefore that rather than have officers produce individual one-on-one comments on each submission as undertaken in previous years, an overall omnibus report providing a generic response to the issues raised by submitters be prepared instead to assist Councillors in the consideration of submissions.
5. Members will recall that this intention was previously advised to them at a recent briefing by senior staff. It should be noted that given the time constraints arising from the later amended timetable for 2007 the provision of individual officer comments on submissions would not now be possible.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6. There are no direct financial implications.

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

7. Covered by existing Unit budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. The Local Government Act 2002 places responsibility on the Council for informed decision making and the provision of an overall report by staff on the issues raised by submitters in respect to the Annual Plan and amended LTCCP (including the draft Development Contributions Policy) is consistent with this principle.

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

9. Yes

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

10. Page 112 of the LTCCP, level of service under democracy and governance.

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

11. As above.

9 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

12. Not applicable.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

13. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Council note that the submission process for 2007 for the Draft Annual Plan and Amended LTCCP will not involve one-on-one officer comments (as occurred in the 2006/16 LTCCP process), but that an overall report on the issues raised by submitters will be provided instead by staff.

10. REVIEW OF THE LICENSED WASTE HANDLING FACILITIES BYLAW 2005

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Manager Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Zefanja Potgieter, Senior Planner

PURPOSE

1. The purpose of this report is to consider proposed amendments to the Christchurch City Licensed Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw 2005 in order to update the bylaw to remove reference to waste levies, and to make the bylaw applicable also to the Banks Peninsula area.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Waste handling facilities (also called refuse stations) in the Christchurch City area operate under the Licensed Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw 2005. No such provisions exist for Banks Peninsula.
3. The purpose of the Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw 2005 is to licence all waste handling facilities and through the provisions of the licence regulate waste sorting to achieve a level playing field regarding diversion of recoverable materials from the waste stream. In addition operators are required to collect specified waste data to be passed on to the Council. It has not yet been necessary to implement the provisions regulating the sorting of waste. The requirement for collecting and passing on waste data to the Council works well and assists in planning for waste minimisation. It is advisable that the same rules apply also to Banks Peninsula. References to waste minimisation levies which are contained in the bylaw as it was passed in 2005 will be deleted in line with the High Court decision of March 2006.
4. The bylaw is an important tool in monitoring diversion of waste away from disposal in accordance with the Council's Solid & Hazardous Waste Management Plan 2006. It is also proposed to change the bylaw so it does not refer to the 2003 Waste Management Plan targets but rather to whatever waste management plan targets have been approved by the Council from time to time after a special consultative procedure for the waste management plan.
5. The proposed review process is as follows:
 - (a) The Council resolves that a bylaw is the most appropriate way to address the issue of managing waste handling facilities, and that there are no inconsistencies with the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act (See recommendations below);
 - (b) The Council approves the statement of proposal and summary of information and publicises it for public submissions, and appoints a hearings panel to hear submissions (See recommendations below);
 - (c) A special consultative procedure will run from 4 April to 9 May 2007.
 - (d) Hearing of submissions to take place late in May 2007; and
 - (e) The Council to receive a report from the Hearings Panel in July 2007 to consider the recommendations of the panel regarding the review of the bylaw.

Attachment A is the draft Statement of Proposal including the proposed draft bylaw, and Attachment B is the Summary of Information.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. Section 146 of the Local Government Act 2002 provides a specific bylaw making power in respect of the regulating of waste management. Part XXXI of the Local Government Act 1974 is also still in force and applies to waste management issues and specifically provides for the power to make a bylaw under Section 542.

10 Cont'd

7. Section 155 of the Local Government Act 2002 ("the Act") requires the Council to determine whether the making of a bylaw (including the review of an existing bylaw) is "the most appropriate way to address the perceived problem". The problem in this particular instance is to achieve optimal recovery and/or diversion of material at waste sorting facilities and collect specified waste data.
8. Section 77 of the Act requires the Council, in the course of a decision making process on new objectives, to seek to identify and assess all reasonably practicable options for the achievement of the objectives. In August 2004 the Council determined that the following options existed:
 - (a) Do nothing ie allow refuse stations to continue sorting and consolidating waste without regulation or controls. This was deemed unacceptable by the Council in 2004, and the Bylaw has since proved to work well, however it does not apply to Banks Peninsula.
 - (b) Seek voluntary cooperation. This was deemed impractical by the Council in 2004, and the Bylaw has since proved to work well;
 - (c) Make a bylaw requiring refuse stations to obtain a licence in order to operate, with the licence conditions requiring appropriate sorting of refuse and reporting of specified waste data. This option was recommended in 2004. Under Section 538 of the Local Government Act 1974 councils have the duty to encourage efficient and effective waste management. It is considered that this option meets that duty more effectively than either of the other options. It is therefore proposed that the draft 2007 bylaw be authorised for special consultative procedure purposes.
9. After considering these options the Council in August 2004 resolved that, as is required in terms of Section 155 of the Local Government Act 2002, a bylaw was the most appropriate way to address the issues of (1) regulating waste sorting at all waste handling facilities, and (2) collecting waste minimisation levies (which was terminated by the Council as from 31 March 2006 after a High Court judgement).
10. The regulatory framework for councils has not changed since 2004, and it therefore follows that the need for retaining the bylaw still exists and that a similar resolution should be adopted in this instance where the aim is to update the bylaw and include the Banks Peninsula area.
11. There are no provisions in the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 which have a bearing on the draft Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw 2007 and therefore there are no inconsistencies between the draft bylaw and the statute.
12. The Local Government Act 2002 also requires the Council to determine the form of the Summary of Information and to determine the appropriate manner for distributing that summary. Section 89(c) requires that it be distributed as widely "as reasonably practicable....having regard to the matter to which the proposal relates". In this case as the bylaw only concerns waste handling facilities operators and relevant waste industry organisations it is considered appropriate to distribute the summary of information to those persons and organisations.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

13. When the waste minimisation levy provision of the bylaw was declared ultra vires by the High Court in March 2006 it meant a loss of more than \$2 million per year for which adjustments had to be made in the 2006/07 budget. This current bylaw review process will not cause any further financial changes.

Summary

14. The report seeks to set in motion the process to review the Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw 2005 by approving the Statement of Proposal and Summary of Information for public consultation as set out in the report.

10 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council resolves:

- (a) It has determined pursuant to Section 155 of the Local Government Act 2002, that a bylaw is the most appropriate way to address the issue of regulating waste sorting at all waste handling facilities and the collection of specified waste data.
- (b) There are no inconsistencies between the draft Licensed Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw 2007 and the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990.
- (c) The attached Statement of Proposal and Summary of Information for the Draft Christchurch City Licensed Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw 2007 be publicly notified and be distributed to the current waste handling facilities operators and related waste industry organisations, in compliance with the Local Government Act 2002 special consultative procedure.
- (d) A hearings panel of three members be appointed to consider all submissions, and to report to the July 2007 meeting of the Council.

**11. REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 7 MARCH 2007**

Attached.

12. REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD

Attached.

**13. REPORT OF THE LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 21 FEBRUARY 2007**

Attached.

**14. REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 7 MARCH 2007**

Attached.

**15. REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD:
MEETING OF 6 MARCH 2007**

Attached.

16. NOTICES OF MOTION

(a) FUNDING FOR GARDEN CITY IMAGE

To consider the following motion, notice of which has been given by Councillors Gail Sheriff and Pat Harrow pursuant to Standing Order 2.16.1:

- "1. That the Council agree to a figure of \$100,000 pa to address the garden city image in Christchurch.*
- 2. That the funds be provided from the civic and community component of the Capital Endowment Fund allocations commencing in the year 2007/08.*
- 3. That the Environmental Portfolio Group oversee the funds.*
- 4. That the Council note that this will not have any rate impact as it will be using existing funding provisions."*

17. QUESTIONS

18. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.