

2. SUBMISSION TO “OUR COMMUNITY PLAN – 2004-14”

The purpose of today’s discussion is to identify issues on which the Board should build its submission to the Council on the draft Long Term Council Community Plan for 2004/14 (i.e. the 10 year plan).

Members are reminded that at its meeting on 30 March, the Board allocated the Committee the task of preparing an appropriate submission for the Board’s consideration.

Subject to agreement on the issues at today’s meeting it is proposed that staff complete a draft submission which will then be included in the agenda for the 4 May Board meeting. This will enable the submission to be lodged by the due closing date of 6 May.

Submissions are expected to be heard in the first week of June.

1. SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND TO PLAN

The format for the long term plan is different to previous years, and provides a focus not only for 2004/05 but also for the next 10 years.

The “Plan” comprises 3 volumes as follows:

- **Volume 1 – Summary**
 - Summaries of community outcomes, major proposals, and Council activities.
 - Five year capital programme
- **Volume 2 – Details**
 - Community outcomes
 - Council activities and asset management
 - Trading organisations
- **Volume 3 – Finance and Policies**
 - Financial details
 - Financial policies

The associated documents – MCTS, and Waste Management Strategy, are also available for public input.

It will be noted that the new Local Government Act requires Long Term Council Community Plans, to be built around “desired community outcomes”. On this occasion the community outcomes have been developed through a “desk based” exercise i.e. on what consultation and research from previous years had indicated. For the next LTCCP, in 2006 there will be a process involving more in depth consultation with the wider community.

Details of the nine community outcomes, and the key indicators for measuring progress toward achieving the outcomes are listed on pages 23 to 28 of Volume 1. Further detail is also provided on pages 3 to 22 of Volume 2.

It is assumed that the Committee will endorse the 9 outcomes forming the basis for the plan.

Copies of overheads surrounding the presentation of the draft LTCCP to elected members on 7 April are enclosed under **separate cover**. This may assist the Committee’s understanding of the key aspects of the plan.

2. DISCUSSION/“ISSUES”

- a) A copy of last years submission to the 2003/04, and beyond, “Annual Plan” is **attached** to this agenda. There may be items which the Committee considers should be repeated in this year’s submission.

- e.g.
- the rate increase projections?
 - the Uniform Annual General Charge?
 - the Ring Road?
 - undergrounding?
 - Jellie Park (now the support for this)?
(Note: \$5,606,000 has been allocated over the next two financial years. A report is expected to be brought to the Board within a few months dealing with detail for the modifications, and the timing associated with this.)

- decentralisation (in light of the proposal for \$53.7 million to be spent on a new central building)?

b) **Summaries of Major Proposals (pages 29 to 38 Volume 1)**

The Committee may consider the need to comment as to whether any of these are supported/or not supported.

c) **New Operating Initiatives**

While tentative approval has been given to a number of new operating (as distinct from capital) initiatives at this stage through the planning process, these are not easily identifiable from the draft volumes.

The following list has been drawn from other documentation, and the Committee may also wish to express some views on these.

- Central City Litter Collection – an additional \$200,000 p.a.
- Anti Litter Education Campaign - \$50,000 p.a.
- Safer Christchurch - \$100,000

As a result from a recent review, the Crime Prevention Unit has decided there is to be no further funding for Safer Community Council's in their current form. The Council has moved to now take a primary role in leading and co-ordinating safety in Christchurch City. The sum of \$100,000 is provided to that end. It will be noted that the CPU will continue to fund the Council for local crime prevention projects, although this is subject to the provision of a range of information and an agreed governance model to be completed by 31 May 2004.

- Clearwater PGA Event - \$1,050,000 over 3 years as follows:
2004/05 - \$300,000 + \$100,000 underwrite
2005/06 - \$300,000 + \$50,000 underwrite
2006/07 - \$300,000 – no underwrite
- Libraries Opening Hours
from 2004/05 – an additional \$75,000 p.a. to enable the Central Library to be open from 10.00 to 4.00 on Sundays.
From 2005/06 - an additional \$50,000 p.a. to enable Fendalton/Shirley/Papanui/Linwood to be open from 10.00 to 4.00 on Saturdays.
- Urban Renewal – an additional \$200,000 p.a.
- Putrescible Collection and Processing – up to \$1.0 million p.a.
(note: relates to collection from commercial sources only)
- Central City Marketing/Promotion - \$850,000 p.a. for 3 years
(note: to be funded by increased parking charges)

d) **Ten Year Financial Summary (page 6 – Volume 3)**

Are the projected percentage rate increases appropriate?

e) **Rates Setting, etc – Differential Categories Used (page 112 – Volume 3)**

There is some current concern, within the rural community, because of the changes to the definitions. As an outcome from this a number of properties currently rated as rural, are to be changed to residential. This change relates to the **use** of the property.

The Committee may care to consider whether a submission should be prepared based on this change.

f) **Social Support Programmes**

In a previous years submission, the Board suggested that support for the Asian Youth Trust should be provided on a metropolitan basis rather than by the North West Boards. With the Board's recent financial support to the Youth Forever Trust it was noted that this entity also operates on behalf of the wider city community. It could therefore be relevant for the Committee to include this recommendation in the submission.

g) **Capital Endowment Fund (page 137 – Volume 3)**

Although not specifically stated in the documentation, the allocation of the returns from this fund have been amended in this years plan.

The fund was established in 2001 and income from the fund (the earnings of a capital investment of \$75 million) was allocated to the following categories.

- economic development 70%
- civic and community projects 30%

There are a number of criteria applying to the fund, including the allocation to the categories to be reviewed on a three yearly cycle.

This year the Annual Plan Subcommittee, and the Council agreed that the ratios should be altered to 60:40 rather than the 70:30 which had been the case for the previous three years.

Because of earlier commitments to the Museum and central city initiatives no funding has previously been available for “community projects” to date, and the change to 60:40 is being made to release more funding for such projects.

The Capital Endowment Fund has had a history of intense interest following its creation from the earlier electricity company (Southpower) repatriation, and for this reason the Committee may have some views on the change in allocation proposed in the plan.

h) **Financial Information, Revenue and Financial Policies, etc** (i.e. generally the information in Vol. 3)

There may be some aspects within this area that the Committee may wish to comment on.

The matters of rate increases, Capital Endowment Fund, and rural rates have been referred to separately within this agenda.

- *Development Contribution Policy*

It is interesting to note, on page 59 that “no community projects have been identified for development levies at the time of implementing the policy” and that “where such projects are identified they can only be scheduled in the policy document following a positive outcome of the special consultative procedure (SCP)”. There is however noted a commitment of \$44,682,405 (page 64) for growth over the 10 year period.

An examination of the projected costs will show that they comprise provision for libraries and recreation facilities (including Jellie Park, Centennial, a new aquatic centre, and a flat water facility) – ref page 64. The reference to “no major projects” for community halls and facilities is repeated on page 64.

Elsewhere in the LTCCP (pages 52 and 54 of Vol. 2) there is reference to the “functional obsolescence” of some of the Council’s existing community facilities, the “ineffectiveness in meeting current needs”, and the facilities being “expensive to operate”. While there is a proposal to prepare an asset management plan for the existing portfolio, it does seem rather surprising, or inconsistent, that there is no recognition of opportunity through the Development Contributions Policy to cater for replacement of outmoded facilities, or to create new facilities associated with many of the recent growth areas in the city.

The Committee may wish to consider whether a submission based on the above is relevant?

- *Partnerships with the Private Sector Policy (pages 105 to 108)*

In last years submission the Board referred to the option of “land exchange or gifting” being added as a “Type of PPP Participation”. This was acknowledged at the time with a recommendation that the words “Contribution of Land” be added to the list.

Unfortunately this amendment did not appear to have been recognised in the 2003/04 Final Plan, and it does not appear in the draft text on page 106 this year.

This is a matter which could be worthy of submission again?

- *Policy on Determining Significance (pages 123 to 126)*
It will also be noted that, in last years submission, there was a recommendation that the Capital Endowment Fund (in view of the significant repatriation of \$75 million, and the criteria under which the Fund was to be managed) should be separately listed as a "Strategic Asset" (see page 125).

The Committee may consider whether this matter should be raised again?

i) **Project Substitutions**

In previous years the Board has from time to time taken the opportunity to consider options for substitution within the kerb and channel renewal programme. With the recent input into both the review of criteria, and the initial draft kerb and channel programme the Board (through the Committee) may view the current programme as one which now fairly reflects "needs"?

(The 5 year capital programme is set out on pages 66 to 84 of Volume 1.)

j) **YMCA – Bishopdale**

As discussed during the informal meeting with the YMCA, at Bishopdale, on Thursday 15 April consideration could be given to confirming the Board's support for the new facility, and seeking the Council's confirmation of its endorsement in an appropriate and tangible manner.

k) **Vehicle Entranceway Resealing Policy**

Members will recall the deliberations over the Harkness Place experience when vehicle entranceways on only one side of the cul-de-sac were resealed.

The Board's submission could include a repeat of the Board's support for the residents, by seeking amendment to the existing policy and hence funding provision (even though it is programmed to proceed through the earlier agreed review process).

l) **Out of School Programmes**

It will be recalled that there is a report pending on the extent, or otherwise, of ongoing Council support for out of school/after school programmes, and that a joint Seminar (with Shirley/Papanui) is scheduled for 3.45 pm on Monday 17 May for the presentation of the outcomes from a recent review.

The Board has been consistent in its view that this should be a Central Government responsibility and, more recently, that the (now) provision of Ministry of Social Development funding should enable the Council to reduce its overall financial commitment to these programmes.

A suitable clause reiterating the Board's view would seem appropriate for inclusion in the draft submission.

3. **DRAFT SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2004 (PART 2 – ACTION PLAN)**

In summary this plan centres on the long term solid waste goal for zero residual wastes in Christchurch. The action plan considers a number of changes required to achieve zero residual waste, and develops an indicative timeline, and budget, for these changes to occur.

The plan proposes, among other things, to:-

- increase the range of materials able to be recycled at the kerbside
- encourage home composting and composting in schools
- establish a fund that community groups and schools can apply to for financial support to reduce waste
- lower the fee for separated green waste at the transfer station to half of the tipping fee for rubbish
- build an enclosed compost plant for processing organic waste from business such as restaurants and food manufacturers
- introduce a bylaw that will require, through a licensing system, all waste generated in Christchurch to be sorted to locally agreed standards
- eventually ban green waste at landfills

The best approach for the Committee may be for each of the sections (6.1 – page 12 to 6.6 page 29) to be considered in turn, and comment made on either the reality of the targets or some of the "issues" / "direct action" noted.

4. METROPOLITAN CHRISTCHURCH TRANSPORT STATEMENT (MCTS)

Again the opportunity is available for comment to be made on this particular document.

5. REVIEW OF SOME EARLIER FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

A number of earlier Board funding allocations seem likely to now become available for reallocation. The details are below:

- **Bus Patronage Initiatives**

This was a 2002/03 allocation, of \$10,000 from the Board's project funds. No fruitful avenues were identified for the use of this funding during the year and the money was carried forward for use in the 2003/04 year. (It is, incidentally, unlikely that any carry forward request would be approved again.)

Staff have discussed this matter with the City Streets Unit, and with the public transport staff at ECan, but no practical options have been identified.

- **Community Celebration Events**

This is a 2003/04 allocation of \$4,000 from the Board's project funds. One particular event (the Burnside Groups Mid-Winter Christmas Event) is not to be held this year and there remains a sum of \$2,500 which could be available for reallocation.

- **Bishopdale Multi-use Facility**

As discussed during the informal briefing for Members on 15 April, the process for the "management" of the proposed YMCA facility at Bishopdale changed somewhat with the YMCA decision to purchase their own land. Of the \$5,000 allocated from the Board's 2003/04 project funding there remains a sum of \$4,000 unspent.

- **Streetscape Projects – Partnerships with Local Business Areas**

(\$10,000 ex 2003/04 project funding, and \$5,000 carried forward from 2002/03).

As mentioned earlier the criteria for approving carry forward requests is more stringent than previously, and would only be likely if partnership arrangements were in hand.

The main contender for this funding was to be the Elmwood Shopping Precinct, following the Board's resolution of 26 November 2002 (and confirmed on 30 March 2004). At the time of reporting a formal approach to the representative of the businesses has been made, although a response has yet been received.

Summary of funding now available for possible reallocation:

	\$
- Bus Patronage Initiatives	10,000
- Community Celebration Events	2,500
- Bishopdale Multi-use Facility	4,000
- Streetscape Projects	*15,000
	<hr/>
	\$31,500

(* contingent on positive response from the Elmwood Village businesses within the next month.)

Options for Reallocation

- In the spirit of assisting the YMCA with developing its concept for Bishopdale the option for providing a grant could be considered?
- The matter of the Board funding one or more 40km/hour school speed zones has been referred to from time to time? (cost will be available at the meeting.)
- Pitcairn Reserve – upgrade of planting and general utility use.
- Edgar Macintosh Park – shade sail for swimming pool (\$7,000)
This has already been agreed to, for funding ex 2004/05 discretionary funding. The opportunity for an earlier commitment could be considered?
- Waimairi School – grant toward path resealing on link to railway cycleway (\$3,000). As above, this has already been agreed to, for funding ex 2004/05 discretionary funding. The opportunity for an earlier grant to be made could be considered?