



# **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**

**THURSDAY 7 JUNE 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 17.5.2007</b>
3.	<b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>
4.	<b>PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS</b>
5.	<b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>
6.	<b>SITE SELECTION: CIVIC BUILDING</b>
7.	<b>INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGN STANDARD</b>
8.	<b>HERITAGE GRANT APPROVALS: DELEGATED AUTHORITY</b>
9.	<b>ESTABLISHMENT OF SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE WORKING PARTY</b>
10.	<b>COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCE: APPLICATION FOR LOAN FUNDING</b>
11.	<b>LICHFIELD LANES REVITALISATION PROJECT: DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO GENERAL MANAGER CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>
12.	<b>DOG REGISTRATION FEES 2007/08</b>
13.	<b>REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 7 MAY 2007</b>
14.	<b>REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 26 APRIL 2007</b>
15.	<b>REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 4 MAY 2007</b>
16.	<b>REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 9 MAY 2007</b>

**We're on the Web!**

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

7. 6. 2007

- 2 -

<b>ITEM NO</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
17.	REPORT OF THE LYTTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 18 APRIL 2007
18.	REPORT OF THE LYTTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 7 MAY 2007
19.	REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 26 APRIL 2007
20.	REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 2 MAY 2007
21.	REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 8 MAY 2007
22.	REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 2 MAY 2007
23.	REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 1 MAY 2007
24.	NOTICES OF MOTION
25.	QUESTIONS
26.	RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

7. 6. 2007

- 3 -

**1. APOLOGIES**

Councillor Pat Harrow.

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 17.5.2007**

Attached.

**3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**

**5. CORRESPONDENCE**

**6. SITE SELECTION: CIVIC BUILDING**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Corporate Services, DDI 941-8540
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	General Manager Corporate Services
<b>Author:</b>	Roy Baker

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is for the Council to consider amending its brief/requirements criteria for the selection of a site for the new civic building to enable Vbase to explore further site possibilities.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. At the seminar on the new civic building site selection on 3 April 2007, Vbase raised a number of issues with the current sites under consideration. They also suggested that before making any final decision regarding the Orion/Centennial site, that the Council consider the possibility of extending the site selection area. Discussion also occurred over the possibility of a common site for the new civic building and bus exchange proposal.
3. Vbase has written to the Council (copy attached) suggesting:
  - (i) Widening the search area, shifting the western boundary from the Avon River to Rolleston Avenue. The other site search boundaries of Kilmore, St Asaph and Madras Streets would be maintained.
  - (ii) Undertake a ROI process for the new site search area.
  - (iii) Retain the part Orion, Avon and Tuam options pending the outcome of (ii) above.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. Extending the search area will result in a delay in final site selection and hence may expose the project to cost escalation. Vbase is of the opinion that through reviewing the design brief, there are likely cost savings. This, together with running a number of activities in parallel and saving time will minimise any increase. This is considered a reasonable approach, and one that will minimise any cost implications associated with extending the site decision timeframe.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

5. When the Council sought Registrations of Interest (ROI) last year, it did so on the basis that the preferred site for the new civic building was within a defined area. If Councillors agree to widen the area, it will be necessary to seek registrations of interest in respect of sites in that area. The owners of sites within both the previously defined area and the new area will be encouraged to either re-submit earlier proposals or submit new ones.
6. In June 2006 the Council agreed upon a preferred corporate structure for the ownership and development of the site chosen for the new civic building. In the course of the ROI process, proposals may be submitted that suggest a different structure, maybe comprising a joint venture or a design/build arrangement. Councillors should be prepared to reconsider their earlier resolution on the matter.
7. By adopting the ROI process, the Council is fulfilling its statutory obligation to seek the views of people who have an interest in providing a site for the new building. All those wishing to respond must be given a reasonable, and equal, opportunity to present their proposals.

**6 Cont'd**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Request Vbase to:
  - (i) Extend the site search area for the new civic building by shifting the western boundary from the Avon River to Rolleston Avenue.
  - (ii) Initiate a ROI process for the new site search area, including any new opportunities from within the original area.
  - (iii) Look at the feasibility and synergies of the bus exchange site(s) as part of (ii).
  - (iv) Retain the part Orion, Avon and Tuam options as live options pending the outcome of (i) and (ii) above.
- (b) Request the CEO to review the design brief with Vbase to look at possible savings that can be achieved, without compromising the fundamental requirements.
- (c) Request the CEO to report back in September.

## 7. INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGN STANDARD

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport & Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Mike Gillooly, Consultant Project Manager

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This report introduces the Infrastructure Design Standard (the "IDS") prior to consultation with external stakeholders. It gives a brief history of the project, sets out the processes for external consultation with stakeholders, and also addresses the issues arising out of the new chapter on quality assurance.
2. The IDS has been prepared as to replace the existing "Subdivision Code" used by the Council which is inadequate and obsolete.
3. The IDS creates common standards for Council funded works (ie the Capital Programme) and for works that the Council will acquire from subdivisions (ie vested assets).

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4. The IDS affects anybody involved in the creation or enhancement of infrastructural assets. For Council staff that means our own internal designers, asset managers, and contract auditors. It will also apply to developers and their advisers designing and constructing asset created through subdivision which will pass to Council ownership as a consequence of subdividing.
5. The IDS is a revision of the Christchurch Metropolitan Code of Urban Subdivision (the "Code"), which was written in 1987. Since then the Resource Management Act 1991 has been introduced which moved the control of subdivision from the Local Government Act to the RMA. Importantly, local government in Christchurch underwent major change in 1989 with local government amalgamation. Internal restructuring of the Council in 2000 also had a major impact on how assets were designed, constructed and approved internally as part of the capital works programme. This change gave rise to the concept of the "Total Solutions" model of programme delivery, whereby the Council's project management and engineering design capability was located in one unit and shared across all the asset units of the Council. This revision of the subdivision code builds on that model to the extent that the Standard is equally applicable to assets created through the subdivision process as well as the capital works process. Further to that this revision is intended to apply to the former Banks Peninsula District which to now has been using NZS 4404:1981 as their Code of Urban Subdivision.
6. Consultation with the surveying profession in 2001 showed that the code of practice was still the principal document used in the design of subdivisional works. However, a large number of uncoordinated and informal amendments had started to erode the document's integrity. The code was also seen by many as failing to recognise technological advances in the construction industry. It did not relate to the many Council publications, both planning and engineering related, which were intended to directly impact on land and asset developments. It was due for revision.
7. In April 2005 the terms of reference for the IDS project were rewritten to include provision for a chapter on quality assurance. It had become obvious to the project team that there was a significant gap in the Council's processes as they relate to managing for quality across both the subdivision and capital works programme. The chapter on quality assurance with its emphasis on a systems based approach to quality management is perhaps the most significant change to come out of this review. It will challenge not only the industry but also our own internal managers and staff at the coal face of capital works programme delivery. However the benefits of adopting a systems based approach will result in fewer costs to the organisation by reducing the amount of rework and repair of built assets and will drive certainty and consistency into the contract management process by clarifying procedures and responsibilities, standardising documentation and more clearly defined processes for correcting non-conformances.

7 Cont'd

8. The purpose of the update is therefore to incorporate those structural changes in the way that the Council accepts assets and to update the technical engineering aspects of the Standard to current practice. The opportunity has also been seized to incorporate the application of quality assurance to ensure that Council assets are well designed and constructed and to align the Standard with the Council's various planning and engineering related publications, including the Construction Standard Specifications (CSS).
9. The Standard will fulfil two functions. It details the Council's minimum requirements or expands on requirements laid out in the City Plan, which a development must meet to achieve compliance with a subdivision consent or a capital works project brief. It also sets out processes for designing assets to aid the designer in achieving and demonstrating compliance with those requirements.
10. A team, comprising designers from City Solutions and asset managers from the asset groups, wrote each part of the Standard. Each of the 13 parts can therefore be aligned with the relevant asset group but is particularly related to the type of infrastructure. The parts are summarised below:
  - (a) **Part 1:** Introduction introduces the major changes and includes those definitions specific to the Standard.
  - (b) **Part 2:** General Requirements covers a number of regulatory details and sets out the process from design to acceptance by the Council of land developments. It also sets requirements for documentation.
  - (c) **Part 3:** Urban Design is a new section setting out urban design guidelines and is a **non-mandatory** section.
  - (d) **Part 4:** Quality Assurance is another new part, which sets out the requirements for the application of quality assurance to the construction of all assets. This has incorporated two major shifts: each project will require the implementation of a project quality system, with documentation and certification presented to the Council at both the design and construction stages. The traditional Council role of Clerk of Work-type inspections will be replaced with a structured audit based system.
  - (e) **Part 5:** Geotechnical Requirements sets out the requirement for geotechnical input in land development and what must be considered by the geotechnical engineer. It emphasises the Council's desire to work with the landforms and preserve natural features. It also details issues to be considered under erosion, sediment and dust control.
  - (f) **Part 6:** Stormwater and Land Drainage builds on the Waterways and Wetlands Drainage Guide, which sits behind the Standard as a supporting document. This part provides more prescriptive design and compliance criteria than is found in the *WWDG* but reinforces the change of emphasis to include water quality and ecological protection. It also discusses resource consents.
  - (g) **Part 7:** Wastewater incorporates both an explanation of Christchurch's reticulation system and how the Council's philosophy has changed. It provides the design and compliance criteria for wastewater systems and has been modified to include modern materials. The requirements for private drains have been tied to the New Zealand Building Code and the private pump station specifications have been included as an appendix, recognising that these particular assets fall outside the general subdivision and capital works process.
  - (h) **Part 8:** Water Supply covers the design and compliance criteria of the water reticulation. It references the Water Supply Wells, Pumping Station and Reservoir Design Specification for larger infrastructure and has been updated for modern materials.

## 7 Cont'd

- (i) **Part 9:** Roading sets out both the design and compliance criteria for the street layouts eg classification and the streets themselves eg footpaths, construction depths. It incorporates the fundamental changes due to the National Roads Board specifications for the design and construction of roads being replaced with Austroads specifications.
  - (j) **Part 10:** Utilities covers the Council's compliance requirements for telephone, electricity and gas. It excludes the utility design itself, as this must be to the network operator's requirements.
  - (k) **Part 11:** Parks Streets and Open Spaces is a new section on landscaping and reserves, based on NZS 4404: 2004 *Land development and subdivision engineering*, modified to suit the Christchurch context. It sets criteria for reserves, including layout, facilities, structures and furniture. It also applies to landscaping in legal roads. It includes the establishment of landscape areas.
  - (l) **Part 12:** Lighting sets the Council's requirements in an environment in which private companies can carry out street lighting design and construction. It builds on AS/NZS 1158: 2005 *Lighting for roads and public spaces*.
  - (m) **Part 13:** As-Builts sets the Council's requirements for as-built information on completion of the development.
11. The first draft was published in August 2006. Internal consultation was carried out over a six week period to gain feedback on the technical quality assurance elements of the Standard. Internal stakeholders were identified as follows:
- (a) Asset Managers (including business unit managers, asset planners).
  - (b) Subdivision Officers and associated staff reporting to their process.
  - (c) City Solutions design staff.
  - (d) City Solutions contract supervision staff.
  - (e) Legal Services Manager.
12. The IDS creates minimum standards for works that the Council will take over through the subdivision process. The imposition of a compliance regime on all subdivisions will ensure high quality assets are taken over by Council. The challenge is to create a legal framework whereby the Council can insist on a certification from a professional adviser that the assets transferring have been designed, built and will operate in compliance with the IDS and approved standards, (flow rates, gradients, etc). The Council has experience of poor quality assets being transferred to Council ownership through subdivisions with the cost of remedial work being borne by the ratepayer. The IDS process will reduce these problems and create an enforceable obligation on the developer and its professional advisers.

**Communication Timetable**

13. Project completion is scheduled for 1 October 2007. Key milestones for delivery of the remainder of the project are as follows:
- (a) Commence external consultation: 20 July 2007
  - (b) Consultation finishes: 20 September 2007
  - (c) Final report and adoption by Council: Late November 2007



**7 Cont'd**

**External Consultation Process**

14. It is proposed to actively engage with the industry. In that vein the launch of the standard will be used as a vehicle to communicate recent changes in the organisation to key stakeholders, particularly as it relates to our new design standards, our front end contract documentation, the recent updates to the Contract Standard Specification, the appointment of a new Capital Programme General Manager and the LTCCP as it relates to capital programme delivery.
15. The focus for external consultation will be similar to that carried out internally with the aim being to gain industry feedback on the technical elements of the standard and explain the hierarchy of documents in place to deliver the capital programme. Consultation will also be used to "spread the word" on the Council's new approach to quality assurance. External stakeholders have been grouped in line with needs and demands. Broadly the groups are as follows:
  - (a) Consultant Surveyors and Engineers.
  - (b) Contractors.
  - (c) Professional Bodies (IPENZ, MNZIS etc.).
  - (d) Adjoining local authorities and Environment Canterbury
  - (e) Central Government Agencies (Ministry for the Environment, Ministry of Police).
16. The launch will also be used to outline the consultation process. Over the six weeks of consultation it is proposed to present to various professional bodies, (IPENZ, ACENZ, MNZIS, Contractors Federation and Roothing New Zealand) and invite stakeholders to a series of small focus group workshops. The standard will also be available on the internet with the ability to make on-line submissions.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

17. There is no new expenditure required. This project will continue to be funded out of existing operational budgets. Implementation of the IDS is already accounted for as this replaces existing standards that are part of our standard operating procedures.

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

18. There is no change in expenditure therefore this project aligns with 2006 -16 LTCCP budgets.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

19. The IDS has been reviewed by an external provider and approved for consultation. The review confirmed that the standard is not a document identified under the Local Government Act 2002 as requiring consultation and accordingly there is no need to adopt the special consultative procedure under that Act.

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

20. The review concluded that consultation is desirable to reduce the risk of subsequent formal challenge and to produce a more robust document. The review also confirmed that formal Council approval is essential to ensure that the document is in fact a document having formal status appropriate to be incorporated in conditions of a subdivision consent.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

21. The document is consistent with Activity Management Plans and LTCCP objectives and will assist with achieving the same by providing an holistic expression of Council design standards.

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

22. This project will enable delivery of LTCCP projects in a consistent and transparent manner.

**7 Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

23. The IDS creates and adopts as standard practice a best practice regime which will contribute to performance excellence.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

24. Consultation is not formally required under the LGA 2002 but targeted consultation with external stakeholders is desirable to achieve acceptance and recognition by providers of the Council's own capital works programme and those involved in the construction of assets to be vested through subdivision.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended:

- (a) That the Council approve the IDS for consultation with the targeted stakeholders identified in Appendix I (attached).
- (b) That the results and an analysis of consultation outcomes be reported back to the Council by late November 2007.

**8. HERITAGE GRANT APPROVALS: DELEGATED AUTHORITY**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8177
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Programme Manager, Liveable City
<b>Author:</b>	Neil Carrie, Principal Adviser, Urban Design and Heritage, Strategy and Planning

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to request the Council to grant the Heritage Covenant Officer Subcommittee delegated power to approve individual heritage grants up to a limit of \$250,000.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Council has provided annual budget funding for heritage incentive grants or loans to assist owners of listed heritage properties since 1980. The grants policy for Christchurch and Banks Peninsula was approved under the Heritage Conservation Policy 1998, with further amendments being approved by the Council on 26 September 2002 and 7 December 2006. Since its inception approximately 244 loans and grants have been made. From financial years 2002/03 to 2006/07 Council heritage discretionary funding for grants will have been \$2,885,000. There are a number of grant approvals awaiting completion for which the property owners are expecting heritage grant assistance. It is expected that the funding available this year will be fully allocated. The number of grants provided over the last five years totals one hundred.
3. Large grants, loans or purchases of listed heritage buildings have been approved directly by Council resolution, but the smaller grants within the Council's operational heritage programme have been approved within the terms of officers' delegated financial authority. However, it has recently become apparent that this authority extends only to approval of contracts for the purchase of materials, goods and services, but not for grants themselves. In order for the Council's current practice to continue a resolution by the Council to delegate authority for grant approvals by officers is necessary in order to meet the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002.
4. It is proposed that delegated authority for grant approvals of up to \$250,000 per grant be granted to the Heritage Covenant Officers Subcommittee as an extension to its current delegated powers. Any grants above this value will only be made by way of specific Council resolution.
5. An internal review of heritage grant and operational policies has also recently commenced, which should result in enhanced criteria and more targeted grant funding being reported back to the Council. The delegated authority sought in this report will continue to enable grants to be administered by staff, pending the outcome of the wider piece of work later this year.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

6. Following advice from the Legal Services Unit that officers did not have the requisite financial delegation for approving grants, pending heritage grant approvals and payments have been suspended, with the result that the Council risks not meeting its targets for supporting heritage renewal and maintenance. While these could continue to be met by having each proposed grant reported to the Council for approval the provision of a reasonable delegation will assist the Council in continuing to support heritage protection within current practice.

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

7. The recommendation is to ensure compliance and consistency of process, rather than any changes to LTCCP budgets.

**8 Cont'd**

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

8. The Council's ability to delegate authority to approve Heritage grants is provided for in clause 32 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002. The Council could delegate this power to approve grants to an officer/officers of a subcommittee.

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

9. The Legal Services Unit has provided a legal opinion as to whether the Local Government Act 2002 requires the Council to provide delegated authority for grant approvals by officers, and whether that delegation had been approved previously by the Council.
10. After reviewing historical Council reports and policies, the legal opinion advised that it did not appear that the Council had ever given a delegation of the authority to approve heritage grants. The legal opinion also considered that a separate delegation by the Council was required for grant approvals, and staff could not rely on the financial delegation in relation to contracts as providing the power to approve heritage grants. Delegated authority has already been given to the Heritage Officer Subcommittee to enter into the contracts/conservation covenants that follow from the approval of a heritage grant.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

11. The Council's commitment to active involvement in heritage protection is integral to the LTCCP. The continued operation of the Heritage Grants Policy supports this commitment.

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

12. N/A

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

13. Ongoing funding of heritage restoration and refurbishment is consistent with the direction of the Central City Revitalisation Strategy, and the City Plan.

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

14. Yes

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

15. N/A

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Heritage Covenant Officer Subcommittee be delegated power to approve individual heritage grants to owners of heritage buildings, places or objects listed in the City Plan or the Banks Peninsula District Plan of up to \$250,000, on such terms and conditions as provided by the Council's Heritage Grant Policies.

8 Cont'd

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

16. The Council has made provision for financial assistance to owners of listed heritage buildings for annual grants for many years, in recognition of the additional costs of conservation and maintenance associated with heritage buildings. In the cases of loans, of large grants, or expenditure from the Heritage Building Purchase fund, these have been approved by resolution of the Council. The smaller heritage grants from the annual Heritage Emergency, Heritage Maintenance and Heritage Retention funds have been approved by officers using the current delegated financial authority for officers. Delegated Council financial authority for officers, however, only provides for approval for contracts for the purchase of materials, works and services and a separate delegated authority is required with respect to approving heritage or other grants.
17. There is a heritage grants project review currently being undertaken by the Strategy and Planning Group in relation to grants policy (including fiscal policy). The recommended delegation for individual grant approvals to the Heritage Covenant Officer Subcommittee is to be regarded as an interim measure, subject to the outcome of the comprehensive grant policy review, with future recommendations for further consideration by the Council.
18. The heritage discretionary grants programme is subject to a consistent, documented set of conservation and operational policies which have been formally resolved by the Council. These apply to all grant applications for heritage buildings, places and objects listed in Part 10 Appendix 1 of the Christchurch City Plan and Schedules IV and V of the Banks Peninsula District Plan. Grants are provided only in relation to works which contribute positively to the conservation and maintenance of the heritage item. Consideration is given to the relative heritage significance of the item, the risk if the works are not carried out, and the potential that the works contribute to the long term retention and protection of the heritage item. The quantum of any approved grant is a proportion of the cost of the conservation and maintenance works, with heritage items of the most significance being provided with a relatively higher proportion of funding. Council policy has set the amount of any grant at a maximum of 50% of the conservation and maintenance works. The Council also has a set of policies providing for heritage conservation covenants, which are a requirement for all heritage grants of \$5,000 or more. These conservation covenants provide for the ongoing protection of the heritage item and are registered in the majority of cases against the land title. The operation of the conservation covenant programme is by delegated authority to the Heritage Covenant officer Subcommittee.

## 9. ESTABLISHMENT OF SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE WORKING PARTY

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	Strategy and Planning General Manager, DDI 941-8177
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Strategy Support Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Tony Moore, Principal Adviser Sustainability

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to establish a working party to assist with the development of the Council's Sustainability Policy and Climate Change Strategy.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. This report seeks to action the following 22 February 2007 Council resolution.

*That staff be requested to report back to the Council on the proposal to appoint a Council working party to address Councillor input into the Christchurch City Council's sustainability policy and climate change strategy initiatives.*

3. As part of the Council's adopted Strategy Map, the Council has already committed to a Sustainability Policy. The intention of the policy is to embed sustainability into all areas of the Council by having an over-arching policy to be given effect through the various Council strategies, plans and actions and against which future Council actions can be tested and evaluated. The establishment of the working party will provide a framework to complete this policy obligation.
4. In contrast, there is no commitment in the Council's Strategy Map to addressing Climate Change, though the Council has previously (22 August 2003) resolved:
  - *That the Council acknowledge that climate change is occurring and adopt a precautionary approach when planning for future activities and works.*
  - *The Council when developing new policies and projects, take into account the effects of climate change where this is appropriate. Policies that initiate or support activities that counter the causes and effects of those changes, are to be preferred.*
  - *That the Council's response to climate change combine the limitation and adaptation approaches.*
5. Although existing and draft strategies may respond to the impacts of climate change, directly or indirectly, there is currently no formal framework to do this within. Similarly the Council has not established nor sought a mandate from the community to actively address Climate Change across the city. A formally adopted Climate Change Strategy would overcome this. Officers support the development of a Climate Change Strategy given:
  - the public concern (70% of New Zealanders consider it to be the most pressing environmental issue in a recent Lincoln University Study);
  - the clear direction from central government for New Zealand to become carbon neutral and for the public sector to lead by example;
  - the apparent urgency for a response to the issue (current understanding would suggest that we have less than 20 years to avoid passing potentially catastrophic tipping points);
  - Christchurch is one of the most vulnerable communities in relation to the impacts of climate change in New Zealand (susceptible to the impacts of drought, flood and sea level rise);
  - Climate change requires an all of Council and community-wide response; and
  - It is also likely that the Sustainability Policy will signal climate change as a priority issue for the Council to address.

If the Council adopts the recommendation of this report it is proposed that the Strategy Map be updated to include Climate Change as a strategy under the Healthy Environment Programme.

6. To formally establish a Sustainability Working Party, the Council will also need to approve of Terms Of Reference (TOR) for that group and appoint representatives. Accordingly, a draft TOR for the Council to consider is also attached (Attachment 1).

**9 Cont'd**

7. As stated in the Draft TOR the primary goals of this group are:
  - To recommend a Proposed Sustainability Policy and implementation plan to the Council by October 2007.
  - To recommend a Proposed Climate Change Strategy by September 2008.
8. The establishment of a Working Party to address these issues should be considered in two phases: the development of the policy and strategy, and an ongoing role in supporting their respective implementation. As the latter roles will only emerge from the work done during the development phase, this report focuses on establishing a working party to develop and ultimately present both the policy and strategy to the Council for adoption.
9. It is envisaged that in addition to the inclusion of Councillors on the working party, that the working party be able to appoint, on an as required basis, industry and stakeholder representatives to the working party, and to conduct consultation with stakeholders and the community. The role of the working party will be to scope, develop, test and ultimately recommend back to the Council a Sustainability Policy, and Climate Change Strategy for adoption.
10. While the Sustainability Policy is within current resource planning, the development of a Climate Change Strategy will have budgetary and resourcing issues for the Strategy and Planning Group. It is anticipated that a budget of \$40,000 is required to prepare the strategy; being \$20,000 in 2007/08 and \$20,000 in 2008/09, and that funding be approved through the consideration and option of the proposed 2007/08 Annual Plan. Any future implementation funding will be considered as part of the 2009/19 LTCCP. Officers recommend that the Council approve the establishment of the Sustainability and Climate Change Working Party, the adoption of the Terms of Reference (attached) and appoint representatives to this group.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

10. The establishment of the working party and the addition of the Climate Change Strategy has identified additional costs of \$40,000 not currently budgeted within Strategy and Planning. Funding of this amount spread over the 2007/08–2008/09 financial years will need to be approved.

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

11. Funding for the development of a Sustainability Policy is contained within the LTCCP budget. Funds for the development of a Climate Change Strategy will require additional funding.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

12. The Council is not legally required to have a Sustainability Policy or a Strategy on Climate Change.

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

13. The development of a Sustainability Policy will help the Council meet its legal requirements under the Local Government Act 2002 in terms of taking a “sustainable development approach” (Part 2, Section 14) and in considering present and future, social, environmental and economic wellbeing etc (Part 2, Section 10).
14. There is a legal requirement to consider the impacts of Climate Change contained in the Resource Management (Energy and Climate Change) Amendment Act 2004 and indirectly by requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 and the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002.

**9 Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

15. Outcomes from both the Policy and Strategy may influence Council activities and level of service.

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

16. Not applicable.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

17. The working party will help to develop a Sustainability Policy and Climate Change Strategy which will be aligned with the Council's Strategic Directions and integrated with existing and draft strategies.

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

18. Yes, the recommendations align with for example Sustainable Energy Strategy, Water Supply and Surface Water Strategies, Waste Management Plan and Urban Development Strategy.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

19. Consultation will be undertaken as part of the policy/strategy development process.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended:

- (a) That the Council approve the establishment of a Sustainability and Climate Change Working Party and that Councillors (to be named) be appointed to it.
- (b) That the Terms of Reference for the Working Party (as attached) be approved.
- (c) That the Council's Strategy Map be amended to recognise the addition of the Climate Change Strategy, within the Healthy Environment Programme.
- (d) That additional funding of \$20,000 in 2007/08, and \$20,000 in 2008/09 financial years to develop the Climate Change Strategy be included in the Omnibus Report for final approval during the Annual Plan process.



**10. COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCE: APPLICATION FOR LOAN FUNDING**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Public Affairs, DDI 941-8637
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Events Development Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Jo Naish, Events Development Manager

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to consider an application for funding from the Council's Conference and Similar Events Bridging Loan Fund.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****Conference and Similar Events Bridging Loan Fund**

2. The Council has set up the Conference and Similar Events Bridging Loan Fund to assist organisations with funding for up-front costs incurred when hosting significant conferences, symposiums and similar events. The loans are interest free for the period up to the end of the conference and are repaid upon receipt of income from registrations and other income as this comes in.
3. The purpose of the loan fund is to give support to organisers of such events by providing cashflow to secure venues, brochure and website development and other up-front costs. It is focussed on significant national and international events which involve some economic benefit to the city by way of visitors staying in city accommodation and spending money in the city.

**BACKGROUND****23<sup>rd</sup> Commonwealth Agricultural Conference, 14-17 November 2008 - Loan Request \$8,000**

4. Delegates meet every second year to discuss agriculture in the world. A representative from each 'Royal' Show is invited from each Commonwealth country. This group was formed to make sure they help each other and last met in New Zealand in 1970. Decision makers and politicians are also involved and there is a strong likelihood that Princess Anne will be attending in 2008.
5. The Royal Agricultural Society of the Commonwealth and the Royal Agricultural Society of New Zealand, both non-profit organisations, are applying for funds to cover initial establishment and marketing expenses until registrations and any sponsorship funds are received. Normally, the Royal Agricultural Society seed fund the conference from profits made from the previous fund. They were promised 50% of funding to be covered by the Canadian Government in the 2006 year and as they have not yet been paid these funds, they request another form of seed funding.
6. The conference will take place from Friday 14 November until Monday 17 November 2008. It will be a major part of New Zealand Cup and Show Week, and delegates will be encouraged to come and stay longer to enjoy the week's activities.
7. It is expected to attract 200–250 delegates and 50 accompanying partners. Of the total number of delegates, 30 are expected to come from Canterbury, 100 from the rest of New Zealand, 60 from Australia and 70 from other countries.
8. The conference is held every two years, and in 2004 the conference was held in Australia, attracting 199 delegates (the most the conference has attracted over the past six years).

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

9. The loan is provided interest free and is repaid by way of first call on income from registrations. The level and timing of repayment will be by negotiation with the organisers and in such a fashion that minimises the risk to the Council yet still enables the organisers to maintain adequate cash flow. The conference organiser has agreed to repay the proposed loan of \$8,000 at the end of the conference, 19 November 2008.

**10 Cont'd**

10. The Conference and Similar Events Bridging Loan Fund Account has a current balance of \$510,000. At present there is one loan still outstanding for NZ Grain & Seed Trade for \$95,000. Therefore the balance left is \$415,000.
11. A detailed budget has been submitted for the conference which shows a budget of \$168,910 based on an analysis estimating attendance by 150 registrants. This is not an unrealistic expectation based on previous conferences and other international conferences of this type. Members of the Royal NZ Agricultural Society have already been over to Australia to promote the conference and are expecting strong attendance at this early stage. There is however, always a risk that the expected number of registrations will not be realised and income will not be sufficient to reach this breakeven point. It is unlikely this will happen given the established nature of the conference and that a member of the Royal family will most probably be attending. If it was the case, the conference is backed by the Royal Agricultural Society and who act as informal underwriters.
12. Of lower possibility yet potentially more significant risk is the scenario of the event not going ahead at all. In this case the Council loan will still need to be repaid in full upon the decision to cancel the conference. However, the Royal Agricultural Society will have already have some outgoings up to the point where such a decision would be made and in this case there will be little or no income from registrations as these will all have to be refunded. For the majority of cases where this may be arise the conference has taken out insurance.

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

13. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

14. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

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

15. Yes – Events Strategy and Visitor Strategy.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

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

16. Yes - Events Strategy and Visitor Strategy.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

17. NA.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council advance the Royal Agricultural Society a conference loan of \$8,000 for hosting the 23rd Commonwealth Agricultural Conference.

## 11. LICHFIELD LANES REVITALISATION PROJECT: DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO GENERAL MANAGER CAPITAL PROGRAMME

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager - Capital Programme, DDI 941-6401
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Capital Programme Manager CaP – City Environment
<b>Authors:</b>	Robert O'Connor, Solicitor, Legal Services Unit & Dave Pinkney, Project Manager, Capital Programme Team Transport

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to obtain the Council's agreement to delegate authority to the General Manager - Capital Programme to negotiate and agree the terms of the financial arrangement with Business Building Systems Limited ("BBS") necessary as the result of certain street works forming part of the Lichfield Lanes revitalisation project being necessarily constructed on private land owned by that company.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. On 7 September 2006 the Council approved Central City Lanes Plans, including the implementation of the first stage of the proposed street upgrade on Poplar and Ash Streets (known locally at Lichfield lanes). Consequently, the Capital Programme Group is presently, through a contractor, undertaking street works to improve the streetscape and create a piazza at the intersection of Poplar and Ash Streets in the heart of the Lichfield lanes area. Part of the piazza to be created by the Council's street works is situated on legal road and part on private property owned by BBS as indicated on the plan attached to this report.
3. To facilitate the project BBS has granted to the Council a registered legal easement over the Certificate of Title to its property granting the Council and the public legal rights of access over **part** of BBS's property to form the piazza. However, BBS has indicated that for legal reasons relating to its obligations under the Deed of Lease between it and the tenant of its adjacent building that it is unable to grant a similar easement over the whole of BBS's property required to form the piazza. Thus a balance area not subject to the easement in favour of the Council remains. This balance area is marked on the plan attached to this report ("the balance area").
4. The design of the piazza and the associated street works was undertaken on the basis that the whole of the area required to form the piazza, including the balance area, would be available for those works. It was originally envisaged that BBS would agree to the whole area being made subject to the easement in favour of the Council. However as negotiations progressed it became clear that BBS could not agree to that.
5. It is an important principle that the Council should not spend public money improving private land, unless public access to that land can be secured such as by way of easement. Capital Programme Group staff are of the view that notwithstanding the inability to gain easement rights over the entire area of the BBS property affected that the formation of the piazza and the associate works should proceed as originally contemplated. The reasons for this relate to the need to retain the integrity of the original concept plan approved by the Council and the community. There are also issues of convenience and consistency in that it would obviously be more convenient for the Council's contractor to complete the works over the balance land at the same time as completing the remainder of the works. In addition such would lead to a consistency of works and finish on the ground.
6. As a result it was agreed to accept BBS's proposal to grant an easement over a lesser area and to negotiate with BBS a payment arrangement under which BBS would agree to reimburse the Council for the costs of the works to be completed to the balance area. Effectively under this arrangement there will in fact be no Council improvement of private land as the cost of the works to the BBS land will be paid for by BBS. The estimated cost of these works is \$25,000 plus GST.

**11 Cont'd**

7. Matters presently stand at the point where Capital Programme Group staff need to agree on the financial arrangements with BBS as to the payment of this sum to the Council. Preliminary discussions would indicate that BBS are likely to agree to an arrangement under which they will pay that sum to the Council by equal instalments over a period of three years. To enable the General Manager – Capital Programme to conclude those discussions and agree a payment arrangement with BBS it is necessary to obtain a specific delegation to that effect from the Council.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. Essentially, the proposed financial arrangement with BBS will be neutral in a budgetary sense, but there will be a financial implication in that recovery of the monies proposed to be spent by the Council in street works on BBS's private property will be delayed over, it is expected, a period of three years.

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

9. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

10. The proposal to negotiate and enter into a financial arrangement with BBS concerning certain street works proposed to be constructed on that company's property as part of the Lichfield Lanes revitalisation project does not fall within an existing staff delegation. To enable the terms of that arrangement to be negotiated and agreed by staff it is necessary for the Council to grant staff delegated authority to staff to that effect.

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

11. Yes. The Legal Services Unit has advised of the need for an express delegated authority to staff and has assisted with the preparation of this report.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

12. Yes.

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

13. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

14. Yes.

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

15. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

16. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council grant to the General Manager – Capital Programme delegated authority to negotiate and agree on terms and conditions acceptable to him the terms of any financial arrangement with Business Building Systems Limited necessary as the result of certain street works forming part of the Lichfield Lanes revitalisation project being necessarily constructed on private land owned by that company.

**12. DOG REGISTRATION FEES 2007/08**

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

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to obtain Council approval to maintain dog registration and related fees at the same level as approved by the Council for the 2006/07 year. These fees will cover the cost of dog and stock control and enforcement.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Dog Control Act 1996 requires that:
  - 2.1. All dogs of greater age than three months be registered by 1 July each year with the authority in whose district the dog is ordinarily kept and, in the case of a young dog reaching registerable age after 1 July, before it attains the age of three months.
  - 2.2. The fees for dog registration set by an authority be publicly notified in a newspaper circulated within its district at least once in the month prior to the commencement of the registration year.
3. At the Council meeting on 11 May 2006 the Council resolved to adopt Option 1 as outlined in the 2006/07 Dog Registration Fees report.
4. Option 1 in the 2006/07 Dog Registration Fees report recommended that: "The Council adopt Option 1 with all dog owners having an increase in dog registration fees for the period 2006/07 of \$5.00 per dog from 1 July 2006." (refer Appendix 2 attached).
5. The increase in last year's fees was primarily to cover the cost of animal control enforcement, including the additional process of micro-chipping dogs. The 2006/07 report provides background information in relation to previous Council decisions that impact on dog registration fees along with general dog and stock control legislative and policy issues that effect fees. The background information provided in the 2006/07 report includes:
  - The Christchurch City Council Dog Registration Policy
  - Responsible Dog Owner Status
  - Neutering and spaying concession fee
  - Council continues to apply the 8% funding contribution
  - Legislation requirements for micro-chipping of dogs
  - Working dogs as defined by the Dog Control Act 1996
  - Dangerous Dog Registration fee
  - Stock Control funded through rates
6. It is recommended that the Council adopt the fee structure as attached (refer Appendix 1 attached), for the 2007/08 dog registration year, that represents no change from the 2006/07 registration fee schedule.

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

7. Section 35b of the Dog Control Act 1996 imposes a levy on territorial authorities in each financial year to fund the costs of maintaining the National Dog Database. The amount of \$32,888 was budgeted for the 2006/07 expenditure budget period. This fee will be the same for the 2007/08 period.

**12 Cont'd**

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

8. As the wording of the 2006/07 report sought approval to increase fees by \$5.00 for only one year, a further Council resolution is required approving the registration fee structure at the same level for the 2007/08 year and beyond.
9. Historically, dog registration fees remain relatively static. Prior to the 2006/07 increase, it was the period of 2002/03 when the Council last approved an increase in dog registration fees.
10. Section 37(1) of the Dog Control Act 1996 provides that dog control fees payable to a territorial authority shall be those reasonable fees prescribed by resolution of that authority for the registration and control of dogs under the Dog Control Act.
11. Section 37(6) of the Dog Control Act 1996 provides that the fees for dog registration set by an authority be publicly notified in a newspaper circulated within its district at least once in the month prior to the commencement of the registration year.

**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?**

12. The recommendations align with the LTCCP level of service in that the fees collected allow the delivery of the animal control services within the timeframe stipulated in the LTCCP.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

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

13. Not applicable.

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

14. Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

15. Not applicable on the basis that the report recommends no change to the registration fee structure from last year

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Adopt the fee structure as attached (refer Appendix 1 attached), for the 2007/08 dog registration year, which represents no change from the 2006/07 registration fee schedule.
- (b) Resolve to maintain the same level of fees beyond 2007/08, subject to a report in future year/s seeking an increase in fees.

**13. REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD:  
MEETING OF 7 MAY 2007**

Attached.

**14. REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD:  
MEETING OF 26 APRIL 2007**

Attached.

**15. REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD:  
MEETING OF 4 MAY 2007**

Attached.

**16. REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD:  
MEETING OF 9 MAY 2007**

Attached.

**17. REPORT OF THE LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD:  
MEETING OF 18 APRIL 2007**

Attached.

**18. REPORT OF THE LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD:  
MEETING OF 7 MAY 2007**

Attached.

**19. REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD:  
MEETING OF 26 APRIL 2007**

Attached.

**20. REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD:  
MEETING OF 2 MAY 2007**

Attached.

**21. REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD:  
MEETING OF 8 MAY 2007**

Attached.

**22. REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD:  
MEETING OF 2 MAY 2007**

Attached.

**23. REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD:  
MEETING OF 1 MAY 2007**

Attached.

7. 6. 2007

- 24 -

24. NOTICES OF MOTION

25. QUESTIONS

26. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.