



Christchurch City Council

SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD

AGENDA

FRIDAY 5 JUNE 2009

AT 8.00AM

AT BECKENHAM SERVICE CENTRE

**IN THE BOARDROOM,
66 COLOMBO STREET, CHRISTCHURCH**

Community Board: Phil Clearwater (Chairperson), Oscar Alpers, Barry Corbett, Chris Mene, Karolin Potter, Tim Scandrett and Sue Wells.

Community Board Adviser

Jenny Hughey
Telephone: 941-5108
Email: jenny.hughey@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

	PAGE NO	CLAUSE	
PART B	3	1.	APOLOGIES
PART C	3	2.	CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 19 MAY 2009
PART B	3	3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT - Representatives of Selwyn Street
PART B	3	4.	PETITIONS
PART B	3	5.	NOTICE OF MOTION
PART B	3	6.	CORRESPONDENCE
PART B	3	7.	BRIEFINGS

We're on the Web!

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

	PAGE NO	CLAUSE	
PART A	4	8.	POLICY OF VEHICLE ENTRANCES AND FOOTPATH REVIEW
PART C	17	9.	APPLICATION TO SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD YOUTH ACHIEVEMENT SCHEME – CARL TWIDEL AND PHILLIP GOW
PART C	19	10.	KEEP NEW ZEALAND BEAUTIFUL
PART C	20	11.	FRAMING OF A FACSIMILE OF THE TREATY OF WAITANGI DOCUMENTS
PART B	22	12.	COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISERS' UPDATE
PART B	22	13.	ELECTED MEMBERS INFORMATION EXCHANGE
PART B	22	14.	MEMBERS QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 19 MAY 2009

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting (both Public and Public Excluded) of Tuesday 19 May 2009 are **circulated separately**.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes (both Public and Public Excluded) of the Board's meeting of 19 May 2009 be **confirmed**.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

Ella Wright-Stow, Sue-Anna Heath and Andrea Rollo representing Selwyn Street residents will bring to the attention of the Board issues such as footpaths and gardens in their street.

4. PETITIONS

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

The following Notice of Motion is submitted by Phil Clearwater.

"That the Board views the development of a Port Hills Master Plan as a priority for the future co-ordinated management of the area and requests a Council staff report on the following matters in relation to the Port Hills tracks and recreational areas:

- development of a Port Hills Master Plan which would include development of an overall concept plan which would tie the aquatic and grazing strategies, cover recreational and environment sustainability factors and develop objectives and policies for managing the Port Hills.
- explore the possibility of making the whole area a scenic or recreation reserve.
- policies and objectives for maintenance of the tracks including the level of maintenance, closing the tracks temporarily, work to prevent erosion and gathering of information from the various user groups.
- safety aspects of public use including access to the tracks at various times with particular consideration of closing night access.
- general signage improvements.
- relevant traffic matters.
- develop a comprehensive local plan of the tracks which would include improving signage and emphasising the smaller walking tracks.
- engage with the community and consult interest groups.
- any other relevant matters".

6. CORRESPONDENCE

7. BRIEFINGS

Nil.



8. POLICY OF VEHICLE ENTRANCES AND FOOTPATH REVIEW

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment Group, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Asset Planning & Network Manager
Author:	Weng Kei Chen, Asset Policy Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's recommendation to the Council on options to consider in relation to the review of the existing policy of vehicle entrances and footpaths.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council resolved at its 13 March 2008 meeting:

15. REPORT OF THE RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 4 FEBRUARY 2008

(1) Notice of Motion

It was resolved on the motion of the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Wells, that the Council undertake a review of the existing policy of vehicle entrances and footpaths.

3. The current Council's Policy "That the Council will maintain vehicle entrances on roads with an adjacent footpath" was adopted in 25 May 2001.

The reasons for the current policy are:

- (a) Vehicle crossings adjacent to footpaths is recognised as an integral part of the footpath system and thus registered as a footpath asset.
 - (b) Vehicle crossings where there is no footpath is directly attributable to the property owner rather than to the public good.
4. The Council's Traffic Bylaws 2008 Part 4 Vehicle crossing and Section 335 of Local Government 1974 Act requires owners of properties to form vehicle crossings.
 5. A previous review of the policy was carried out in 2004 and the Council at its meeting of 23 September 2004 resolved "that the current policy be confirmed". The reports of May 2001 and September 2004 are attached. **(Attachment 1)**.
 6. The issues relating to the maintenance and resurfacing of vehicle entrances, not adjacent to footpaths was raised by Riccarton/Wigram and Fendalton/Waimariri Community Boards in 2007. The key issue being "Where there is a footpath on only one side of the road the current level of service is to only resurface driveways on the footpath side of the road. The driveways on the opposite side of the road do not get resurfaced."
 7. A Council seminar on the policy was held on the 28 September 2007. The views of elected representatives on the current policy were mixed and staff did stress that any increased level of service would require additional funding. The Council requested staff to review the policy and in particular look at a potential change of level of service that applies to the flat urban part of the city only.

8 Cont'd

OPTIONS

8. The policy review has considered three potential options:
 - (i) Status quo with the current policy reconfirmed.
 - (ii) The status quo remains for the Hills and rural areas, with a change of level of service for the urban flat areas of the city.
 - (iii) Change in the level of service throughout the City Council Area.
9. In determining the implications to a change in the level of service options the following issues have been brought to elected members' attention.
10. Status quo with the Policy reconfirmed.
 - (a) The Council will continue to receive complaints from property owners when footway resurfacing works are undertaken on a particular road or street and their driveways are not included.
 - (b) The budgets included in the draft LTCCP (Long Term Council Community Plan) support the status quo option.
11. Status quo remains for hills and rural areas, with a change in level of service for the urban flat areas of the city.
 - (a) As part of the review external consultants MWH were commissioned to report on the cost implications of changing the level of service associated with the footpath re-surfacing program. In the review the footpath resurfacing programme 2008/09, excluding the rural area, (**Attachment 2**) was used to estimate the additional funding required to resurface driveways on the opposite side to where there are no footpaths. An estimated cost of \$250,000 was attributed to resurfacing of these vehicle crossings.
 - (b) In the urban flat area of the city there are a number of property accesses across waterways supported by existing structures e.g. pipes, culverts, or bridges that will require some maintenance works or their replacements prior to resurfacing. It is estimated that \$50,000 per annum will be required to upgrade these structures prior resurfacing works, this figure is an estimate only and could significantly increase once a detailed asset register has been compiled.
 - (c) An increase in the maintenance budget of \$100,000 will be required.
 - (d) Work will be required to clearly define the level of service to be adopted on a street/road basis.
 - (e) The option provides for differing level of service within the Councils area, some property owners are likely to complain that this unfair.
12. Change in the level of service throughout the Council area.
 - (a) A change in the level of service that includes resurfacing of all vehicle entrances on legal roads means there would be a need to increase the current Resurfacing budget. The current Resurfacing budget to resurface approximately 90 kilometres of footpath annually is \$4.45 million and this would need to be increased by \$400,000 per annum.
 - (b) Across the City area there are property accesses supported by retaining structures on roads. It is estimated that \$150,000 per annum will be required to upgrade these structures prior to surfacing the accesses on road. Again this is a high-level estimate only and could significantly increase once the details of the assets are known.

8 Cont'd

- (c) For any change to the existing policy there will also be a need to review the current footpath operational repairs and maintenance budget of \$1.45 million per annum. Currently it is estimated that \$500,000 of the \$1.45 million is attributed to maintaining the vehicle crossings that formed the footpath network.
 - (d) The maintenance budget needs to be increased by \$300,000 per annum.
 - (e) Level of service is common across the Councils area.
13. Currently the stand alone vehicle entrances i.e. without footpath adjacent to them are not considered to be the Council's infrastructural assets to maintain and hence, are not included in the Council's asset register. Any change of policy will require these "new" assets to be identified. Depreciation allowances for these assets will need to be included for any increase to the current level of service.
 14. Any change of level service without any increase in funding will lead to a decreased level of service increasing the current footway resurfacing cycle from its existing 23 years cycle.
 15. It must be noted that if a change of policy was agreed there will be significant change to the management of this section of the Council's asset. The safe use of the entrances over waterways and supports to driveways would become the Council's responsibility. The management of these additional assets will be complex in particular the responsibility of structural integrity of timber bridges across waterways, 'dry rock 'walls supporting driveways on legal roads. There would be a need to review staff resources to manage these structures appropriately.
 16. The responsibility of maintaining vehicle entrances on legal roads has always been a contentious issue and it is for this reason that the Council formally adopted the current practice as policy in 2001.
 17. Any change of policy will potentially generate additional requests to maintain vehicle entrances from residents residing on roads that have no footpaths.
 18. In the consultant's review it included a survey of five other Councils' policies and the findings were:
 - (a) Waimakariri, North Shore and Wellington Councils have similar policies as Christchurch's existing policy;
 - (b) Napier has a policy to maintain driveways on legal roads for visual appearance;
 - (c) Auckland City Council is replacing asphaltic concrete footpaths with exposed aggregate concrete and will be replacing the old driveways to achieve uniformity.
 19. It must be noted that any change of the present policy will require changes to both Operation and Capital Works budget for Footpath Resurfacing. Without appropriate budgets staff will not be able to deliver the change of level of service required.

8 Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

20. Summary of Additional Cost Implications

	Annual (\$000K)			
	Footpath resurfacing Capital Maintenance budget.	Maintenance of structures, culverts, etc.	Footpath operational, repairs and maintenance.	Total
Option 1 Status Quo	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Option 2 Status quo for Hills and rural areas, change in level of service for urban flat area.	\$250	\$50	\$100	\$400
Option 3 Change in level of service Throughout Council area.	\$400	\$150	\$300	\$850

There is currently no allowance in the Draft 2009/19 LTCCP to change the policy on private driveway resurfacing.

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

21. The recommendations of the report could have an impact on the 2009/19 LTCCP budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

22. Sections 316, 317, and 319 of the Local Government Act 1974 confer a number of powers over roads on the Council. Specifically, section 316 (1) vests local roads in the Council, while section 317 (1) provides that all roads in the district are under the control of the Council (excluding State Highways). Section 319 gives the Council power to do certain things in respect of roads (eg constructing and repairing roads etc). Section 319 (a) of the Local Government Act 1974 confers a power on the council *"to construct, upgrade and repair all roads with such materials and in such manner as the council thinks fit."* The section only confers a power to construct, upgrade and repair any road, rather than an express duty to do so.
23. These sections need to be read in light of the common law. The Courts have held that proceedings cannot be brought against a local authority for failure to maintain and repair a road even though a statute gives the Council the power to repair it. This is known as the "non-feasance rule." The rule is subject to a number of technical qualifications. But it has a long history in New Zealand and other jurisdictions. In the last few years the non-feasance rule has been the subject of criticism. It has now been rejected in Australia. In England, the rule has been abolished since 1961 and a positive repair obligation has been placed on highway authorities. However, in the opinion of the Legal Services Unit, the rule is still good law in New Zealand until a court says otherwise or the rule is changed by statute.
24. The opposite of the non-feasance rule is the misfeasance rule. Once the Council decides to reconstruct or repair a road, then it is obliged to exercise reasonable care in the performance of its self-imposed task.

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

25. Yes. The current policy that the Council will maintain vehicle entrances on roads with a footpath complies with the Local Government Act 1974 and is consistent with the non-feasance and misfeasance rules. The Council has a power to maintain and repair footpaths and vehicle entrance ways but it is not under a duty to do so. If the Council exercises its power to maintain footpaths and vehicle entrance ways it must do so with reasonable care and skill.

8 Cont'd

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

26. This review is to consider a potential change to the of level of service.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

27. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

28. If any significant changes are to be made to the existing Policy this will effectively initiate a change in level of service and therefore appropriate consultation will be part of a future LTCCP review or Annual Plan update.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board recommend that the Council:

(a) Consider the options outlined in the report.

Either:

(b) Decide which option should be adopted, requesting changes to be made to appropriate budgets for the 2009/19 LTCCP.

or

(c) Identify the preferred long term policy and request staff to undertake detailed analysis of the preferred option so that it can be adopted for the 2012/22 LTCCP.

CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

5.6.2009

11. POLICY OF VEHICLE ENTRANCES AND FOOTPATH REVIEW

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Asset Planning & Network Manager
Author:	Weng Kei Chen, Asset Policy Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is in response to the Council’s resolution passed at the meeting of 13 March 2008 *“that the Council undertake a review of the existing policy of vehicle entrances and footpaths”*.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The current Council policy “That the Council will maintain vehicle entrances on roads with a footpath” was adopted on 25 May 2001. The reasons for the policy are:
 - (a) Vehicle crossing adjacent to footpaths is recognised as an integral part of the footpath system and thus registered as a footpath asset.
 - (b) Vehicle crossing where there is no footpath is directly attributable to the property owner rather than to the public good.
3. The Council’s Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 Part 4 Vehicle Crossing and Section 335 of the Local Government Act 1974 requires owners of properties to form vehicle crossings.
4. A review of the policy was carried out in 2004 and the Council at its meeting of 23 September 2004 resolved *“that the current policy be confirmed”*. The reports of May 2001 and September 2004 are **attached**.
5. The maintenance and resurfacing of vehicle entrances, not adjacent to footpaths, was raised by the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board as well as the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board in 2007. A seminar on the policy was carried out on 28 September 2007. The views of elected representatives on the policy matters were mixed and staff did stress that any increased level of service would require additional funding.
6. As part of this review external consultant Montgomery Watson Harza (MWH) was commissioned to report on the cost implications of changing the level of service associated with the footpath re-surfacing programme. “Where there is a footpath on only one side of the road the current level of service is to only resurface driveways on the footpath side of the road. The driveways on the opposite side of the road do not get resurfaced.”
7. In this review the footpath resurfacing programme 2008/09 excluding the rural area was used to estimate the additional funding required to resurface driveways on the opposite side where there are no footpaths. An estimated cost of \$250,000 was attributed to resurfacing of these vehicle crossings. No cost estimates were made for pipes, culverts, bridges and retaining walls replacements. The 2008/09 programme has no footpath resurfacing work programmed along the frontages of properties adjacent to waterways or in the older hill areas where long vehicle entrances are frequently encountered on legal roads.
8. There are a number of property accesses across waterways and the existing structures e.g. pipes, culverts, or bridges that will require some maintenance works or their replacements prior to resurfacing and likewise for hill properties’ accesses with retaining structures within the road reserve. It is estimated that at least \$150,000 per annum will be required for upgrading these structures.
9. If there is a change to the existing policy that includes resurfacing of all vehicle entrances on legal roads there will be a need to increase the current resurfacing budget. The current resurfacing budget to resurface approximately 90km of footpath annually is \$4.45M and this would need to be increased by \$400,000 per annum.

10. For any change to the existing policy there will also be a need to review the current footpath operational maintenance budget of \$1.45M p.a. Currently it is estimated that \$500,000 of the \$1.45M is attributed to maintaining the vehicle crossings that formed the footpath network. If there is a change of policy to include resurfacing vehicle entrances as stated in paragraph 9 an increase of \$300,000 p.a. will be required for the maintenance budget. Currently these stand alone vehicle entrances i.e. without footpath adjacent to them are not considered to be the Council's infrastructural assets to maintain and hence are not included in the Council's asset register. Any change of policy will require these "new " assets to be identified. Depreciation cost for these assets will need to be included for any increase to the current level of service.
11. The change of service level without any increase in funding will lead to a decreased level of service increasing the current resurfacing cycle from 23 years to approximately 26 years and this option is not supported by staff.
12. The current policy has satisfied the majority of the city residents. However, from time to time staff do receive some complaints from residents, but by and large the majority of them reluctantly accept the staff's explanation of the policy.
13. It must be noted that if the change of policy was agreed there will be a significant change to the management of this section of the Council's asset. The safe use of the entrances over waterways and supports to driveways will become the Council's responsibility. The management of these new assets will be complex, in particular the responsibility of structural integrity of timber bridges across waterways, 'dry rock 'walls supporting driveways on legal roads. There will also be a need to review staff resources to manage these structures.
14. The responsibility of maintaining vehicle entrances on legal roads has always been a contentious issue and it is for this reason that the Council formally adopted its practice as policy in 2001.
15. Any change of policy will potentially generate additional requests to maintain vehicle entrances from residents residing on roads that have no footpath.
16. In the consultant's review it included a survey of five other councils' policies and the findings were:
 - (a) Waimakariri, North Shore and Wellington Councils have similar policies as Christchurch's existing policies.
 - (b) Napier has a policy to maintain driveways on legal roads for visual appearance.
 - (c) Auckland City Council is replacing asphaltic concrete footpaths with exposed aggregate concrete and will be replacing the old driveways to achieve uniformity.
17. It must be noted that any change of the present policy will require changes to both Operation and Capital Works budget for footpath resurfacing. Without appropriate budgets staff will not be able to deliver the change of level of service required.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

18. If the Council is to increase the current level of service to include resurfacing of all vehicle entrances on legal roads there will be a need to increase the annual capital budget for footpath resurfacing of \$4.45M by \$400,000 and the footpath maintenance of \$1.45M by \$300,000 and provide for additional depreciation costs of \$200,000.

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

19. The projected increased costs for the change of the current footpath resurfacing policy to include resurfacing of all vehicle entrances on legal roads have been included in the aspiration list in the LTCCP process.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

20. The Council received the following legal opinion in 1975:

"The Council has no legal obligation to maintain the surface of the access track any more that it has an obligation to maintain any other part of the public highway."

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

21. Yes.

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

22. This review is to consider the change of level of service.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

23. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council confirm the existing Footpath Policy.

Attachment 1

ATTACHMENT TO CLAUSE 11 COUNCIL 19.12.2008

5. RESURFACING OF VEHICLE ENTRANCES

Officer responsible Transport and City Streets Manager	Author Weng-Kai Chen, Asset Policy Engineer, DDI 941-8655
--	---

The purpose of this report is to present information on the issues, options and additional costs of maintaining vehicle entrances as requested by the Sustainable Transport and Utilities Committee at its March 2004 meeting.

BACKGROUND

In March 2004 the Committee considered a report advising of the request from the Fendalton/Waimairi and Riccarton/Wigram Community Boards that the Committee review the current policy/practice on the maintenance of vehicle entrances.

The report advised the Committee of the recommendations passed at recent meetings of the two Community Boards and the receipt of a petition from residents in Harkness Place to the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board in November 2003.

The report noted that this policy had been considered by the Council in May 2001 and attached a copy of the report considered by the Committee at that time. In addition it updated the costs that had been included in that report in respect to the additional budget provision required for implementing the change in the policy to reseal all vehicle entranceways and noted that these were now estimated at \$285,000 per annum for resurfacing and \$55,000 for maintenance, total \$340,000.

The Committee decided to review the current policy on the maintenance of vehicle entrances and requested that a report on the issues, options and additional costs be presented to the Committee by July 2004.

ISSUES

There are many different situations where vehicle crossings are not maintained by the Council. The common reason is that the benefit of the crossing is directly attributable to the property owner rather than to the general public. A footpath provides a public benefit so where a footpath exists the Council maintains the footpath, which in most cases includes the vehicle crossing. Situations where the Council does not maintain the crossing are as follows:

1. Private ROW's and driveways in hill suburbs, where no footpath exists or from the back of the footpath if one does exist. Note that in the hill situation the actual road boundary can be many metres back from the edge of the road and if a footpath exists then it is normally immediately behind the kerb.
2. Hill side driveways supported by retaining walls.
3. Properties along waterways where the vehicle crossing includes a bridge or structure.
4. Industrial properties, where no footpath exists.
5. Rural properties.
6. Residential areas, excluding hill areas (Living H), where there is no footpath, eg Harkness Place.

In the above situations the property owners have the advantage of being able to decide on the type of material used in the construction, that is, they can choose to use the same material as they have on their own property.

In looking at the policy the following issues come to mind:

- The maintenance of property owner installed materials. The maintenance is clearly the responsibility of the property owner, but with changes in owners, and trenching by others, this responsibility does get questioned.

- There is an inconsistency in that in situations where there is a footpath and it is not adjacent to the boundary then the section of driveway from the back of the path to the boundary is maintained by the Council when it could be considered a private benefit.

There are approximately 200 streets in residential areas with footpaths on one side, ie number 6 above where crossings are not maintained by the Council.

OPTIONS AND COSTS

A number of options exist:

1. Council to maintain all vehicle crossings from the kerb to the boundary including structures.
Estimated additional cost - \$340,000 pa plus structures maintenance.
2. Council to maintain only those crossings covered by 6 above and excluding owner installed materials.
Estimated additional cost - \$13,000 pa (\$5,000 maintenance, \$8,000 renewal).
3. Retain existing policy.
Additional cost - nil.

CONCLUSION

There are a number of situations where the Council does not maintain vehicle crossings because the benefit is solely to the property owner and it would seem unfair for ratepayers in general to fund this private benefit. For the majority of these situations, especially hill driveways with supporting structures, it is clearly accepted that the property owner is responsible for the maintenance. There are a number, though, such as the Harkness Place situation, where it is not so well understood by property owners.

In reviewing, the policy officers are of the view that in general it operates satisfactorily, is fair and equitable and consistent with private/public good balance.

Committee

Recommendation: That current policy be reconfirmed.

6. FOOTPATH RESURFACING AND MOTOR VEHICLE ACCESSWAY MAINTENANCE

Officer responsible City Streets Manager	Author Weng-Kei Chen, Asset Policy Engineer DD: 371-1655
Corporate Plan Output: Footpath Resurfacing	

The purpose of this report is to advise the Council on the present practice regarding the footpath resurfacing programme and the likely financial implications if the Council were to extend this to include all vehicle crossings on legal roads. This report is provided as requested following a presentation by Mr Ross, of the Mt Pleasant Residents' Association, to the City Services Committee in March 2001 on maintenance of vehicle entrances on streets without footpaths.

VEHICLE CROSSINGS AND THEIR MAINTENANCE

The Local Government Act and the Council's Public Places and Signs Bylaw 1992 require property owners to provide vehicle crossings across any footpath on any road, or any water channel on or adjoining any road by means of a crossing properly constructed. Vehicle crossing also includes crossings to all private right-of-ways or private roads. The issue of maintaining that part of the vehicle crossing on legal road has frequently arisen and legal opinion has indicated that "the Council has no legal obligation to maintain the surface of the access track any more than it has an obligation to maintain any other part of the public highway". The opinion was obtained in 1975 to assist the Council to make decisions not to maintain accessways to properties at the foot of St Andrews Hill Road and Rapaki Road (opposite Montgomery Terrace). These two accessways are substantially on legal roads. As recent as 1998 the residents using these accessways raised the maintenance issue with the Council again and these complaints were also subjected to investigation by the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman in both cases did not find any deficiencies or weaknesses in the Council's decisions in 1975.

In difficult hillside developments the construction of vehicle crossings often requires the construction of retaining walls on legal roads and permission is usually granted with owners entering into a Deed of Licence with the Council. One of the standard conditions is to identify that the owner "is responsible for the maintenance of retaining walls, vehicle crossings and any associated structures installed on legal road". The condition is consistent with the Council's maintenance on road. The Council's policy does permit property owners some flexibility in the installation of pavement materials on vehicle crossings where there is no formal footpath. There are also occasions where residents request the Council to maintain bridges or culverts over waterways on legal roads. These requests are declined for the reason that they don't serve the general public.

CURRENT PRACTICE FOR FOOTPATH RESURFACING

The current practice for footpath resurfacing is to resurface the footpath and area adjacent to the infrastructure which includes vehicle crossings. This practice is to enable a consistent level of service for users of footpaths and recognises that adjacent vehicle crossings are an integral part of the footpath system. The existence of vehicle crossings also provide the users with convenient access and exit to destinations. The table below provides the level of expenditure in recent years.

	<i>Expenditure</i>	<i>Length Sealed</i>	<i>Unit Rate/km</i>
1998/99	\$1,762 m	94.4 km	\$18,670
1999/00	\$2,043 m	92.5 km	\$22,090*
2000/01	\$2,450 m	93.7 km	\$26,147*

*Note the cost increase is due to historical low cost in tendering; increase costs of bitumen and labour; and installation of additional timber battens.

The upgrading cost of vehicle crossings adjacent to footpath amount to 18% of the total cost of the resurfacing programme.

ROADS WITH ONE SIDE FOOTPATH

The City Plan requires subdividers to provide footpath facilities and also linkage to existing or future pedestrian infrastructure. In new subdivisions only one footpath is required for roads in the Living Hill zone or for roads that serve less than 25 dwelling lots. In Living Zones this requirement is consistent with the Council's past practices and also implies that the majority of the existing hillside roads do have only one footpath. The Council has some single footpath roads that serve more than 25 dwelling lots and the Unit has occasional requests to construct additional footpath facilities. The funding for this additional footpath is mostly obtained from Boards' discretionary funding. It is estimated that 100 km of the urban network has one footpath only.

24.5.2001

FUNDING IMPLICATIONS

For the Council to extend its service level to include resurfacing vehicle entrances on roads without a footpath it would need to increase the funding for the footpath resurfacing programme by \$220,000. In addition footpath maintenance expenditure would need to be increased by \$50,000 p.a. In summary \$270,000 is required to increase the level of service.

Recommendation: That the current Council footpath maintenance and resurfacing practice be retained.

Attachment 2

FOOTPATH RESURFACING 2008/09						
Footpath on one side of road only						
RAMM Rd Id	Street	From	To	Side	RAMM Length	Evaluation of Structures
NORTHERN						
361	Brockhall Ln	Kedleston	End	North	200	no structures
362	Brockham St	Veitches	Glenmore	East	374	no structures
1195	Huntingdon Pl	Berkshire	End	North	200	no structures
1760	Oconnor Pl	Roydvale	End	North	270	no structures
2310	Strathean Ave	Withells	Avonhead	North	300	no structures
2370	Tavistock Pl	Apsley Dr	End	North	110	no structures
2640	Wiltshire Mews	Berkshire	End	West	120	no structures
EASTERN						
762	Drayton Dr	Mt Pleasant Rd	Assisi St	Right	560	yes - retaining walls
789	Dyers Rd	Runa Rd	Maces Rd	Right	930	no structures
953	Glendeverve Tce	Glenstrae Rd	End	Right	300	yes - retaining walls
964	Glenstrae Rd	Finish 2008			300	yes - structures
1162	Holland St	Dunaman St	Toriesse St	Left	160	no structures
1470	Laxton Pl	Drayton Dr	End	Left	90	no structures
2780	Main Rd (access)			Right	500	no structures
3121	Marine Pde (Cul de Sac)	Caspian St	End	Right	79	no structures
1677	Mt Pleasant Rd	Billys Track	Soleres Ave	Left	670	yes - retaining walls
2021	Revolution Dr	Clifton Tce	End	Right	1120	yes - retaining walls
2261	St Andrews Hill Rd	Main Rd	Te Awakura Tce	Right	250	yes - retaining walls
1847	Sunnervale Dr	Evans Pass Rd	End	Right	310	yes - pipes
3049	Waitikiri Dr	Alpine View L	Landfill Ave	Left	160	no structures
SOUTHERN						
2332	Sunvale Tce	Bowenvale Ave	End	Right	200	no structures
2594	Westfield Ave	Runnymede St	End	Left	260	no structures
Total length of road with footpath on one side only					7,463	metres
Assume typical street frontage 20m wide, and one entry per property					373	vehicle entrances
Standard vehicle crossing is 3.8m wide by 4.5m deep					16	typical vehicle crossing area
Total area of additional vehicle crossings to overlay with AC					5,968	square metres
Resurface vehicle crossings (including repairs)					40	\$ per square metre
Cost to resurface vehicle crossings					TOTAL	\$238,720
Structural Extras						
Waterways, pipe for entrance, 4.6m long + headwalls					\$3,000	each
Waterways, culvert/bridge for entrance, 4.6m wide + headwalls					\$12,000	each
Retaining Walls (assume 650 m ²)					\$20,000	each

9. APPLICATION TO SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD YOUTH ACHIEVEMENT SCHEME – CARL TWIDLE AND PHILLIP GOW

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Michael Aitken
Officer responsible:	Recreation & Sports Unit Manager, John Filsell
Author:	Delia Walker, Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Community Board approval for funding two applicants from the 2008/2009 Spreydon/Heathcote Youth Achievement Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Funding is being sought by 17 year old Carl Twidle, who lives in Hoon Hay and 18 year old Phillip Gow, who lives in Cashmere. Carl and Phillip and both members of the 14th Christchurch Boys Brigade Group and have been selected to attend the Boys Brigade National Leadership Development Course Stage One, to be held in Blenheim from 5 -12 July 2009.

BACKGROUND

3. The Boys Brigade National Leadership Development Course Stage One, to be held in Blenheim from 5 -12 July 2009, is held to enable young men to develop as leaders of the future. The week will challenge individuals and equip them with leadership skills to be able to utilise throughout all aspects of their lives. Specifically the skills will be brought back to their own Boys Brigade group to utilise as leaders of their group and help run the Boys Brigade programmes.
4. Carl and Phillip have been selected by Paul Beaumont, Captain of the 14th Christchurch Boys Brigade to attend the leadership course.
5. Carl and Phillip are looking forward to the course and both work part time jobs, enabling them to contribute to the costs of attending the course.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6. This is the first time the applicants have applied for funding.
7. Carl and Phillip need to raise \$540 to pay for the course costs as well as pay for transport costs to and from the course. They both are requesting \$250 support from the Spreydon/ Heathcote Community Board Youth Achievement Scheme.
8. Carl and Phillip both have raised enough to cover their transport costs and have received support from various sources including the Beckenham Methodist Church. Carl has also received support from Te Ngahere Trust and the Boys Brigade.
9. There is currently a balance of \$400 in the Spreydon/ Heathcote Youth Achievement Scheme Fund.

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

10. Yes, Democracy and Governance section pages 113 and 115.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. There are no legal issues to be considered.

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

12. Not applicable.

9 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

13. Yes. Democracy and Governance section, pages 113 and 115. Community Board objectives 5 and 9.

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

14. Yes. As mentioned above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

15. Application aligns with the Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

16. Yes. Application aligns with the Youth Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

17. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board allocate \$200 each from the 2008/2009 Youth Achievement Scheme to Carl Twidle and Phillip Gow towards costs to attend the Boys Brigade National Leadership Development Course Stage One, to be held in Blenheim 5-12 July 2009.

CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be supported.

10. KEEP NEW ZEALAND BEAUTIFUL CONFERENCE 2009 – BOARD MEMBER ATTENDANCE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Jenny Hughey, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Board to consider appointing a Board member to attend the Keep New Zealand Beautiful Conference 2009 and Annual General Meeting in Rotorua from Friday 25 to Sunday 27 September 2009.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Board's representative on the Keep Christchurch Beautiful Committee is Karolin Potter.
3. The Committee is a voluntary organisation, which aims to promote a cleaner, more beautiful environment within Christchurch, and to raise the level of awareness of what the individual can do to improve his or her community and reduce litter. Notice of the national conference has been received. Christchurch has a member on the Keep New Zealand Beautiful Board.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. The cost for one member to attend the conference is approximately \$750, which would be met from the Board's 2009/10 operational budget. This covers travel, accommodation and the conference registration.

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

5. Yes.

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

6. There are no legal considerations involved.

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?**

7. Yes, clause 4 above refers.

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

8. Yes, page 61 of the LTCCP, Strategic Direction - Healthy Environment.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

9. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board consider approving the attendance of Karolin Potter to the Keep New Zealand Beautiful Conference and Annual General Meeting in Rotorua from 25 to 27 September 2009.

CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be supported.

11. FRAMING OF A FACSIMILE OF THE TREATY OF WAITANGI DOCUMENTS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Peter Mitchell, DDI 941-8462
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Jenny Hughey, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to consider the matter of the allocation of Spreydon/Heathcote Discretionary Response Funds towards the cost of framing the documents entitled Ngā Whārangī o Te Tiriti, A Facsimile of the Treaty of Waitangi to be hung in the South Christchurch Library, Service Centre and Learning Centre at 66 Colombo Street Christchurch (the South Service Centre) and to request the Board's recommendation of this matter.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At its meeting on 19 May 2009 the Board agreed to the following notice of motion in principle submitted by Board member Karolin Potter: "That the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board in recognition of the increasing diversity of its community and as a first step to having a range of art and craft works representing the many cultures in the Spreydon/Heathcote wards in the Services Centres' public spaces, authorises the framing of a Facsimile Treaty of Waitangi documents from the National Library at a cost of \$1,600 from its Discretionary Response Fund. The Board endorsed the allocation of \$1,600 towards framing of the Treaty of Waitangi documents from its 2008/09 Discretionary Response Fund". This report discusses this proposal and makes recommendations following consideration of the various implications of the proposal.
3. The proposal to frame the documents entitled a Facsimile of the Treaty of Waitangi produced by the National Library arose following the donation to the Board by member Chris Mene of a Tapa cloth. This donation was followed by a decision to display documents related to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in the South Service Centre.
4. The Board endorsed the proposal in recognition of the increasing diversity of its community. The hanging of the tapa cloth and the Treaty of Waitangi documents are seen as a first step towards having a range of art and craft works representing the many cultures in the Spreydon/Heathcote wards on display in the Service Centre building.
5. The documents contained in a Facsimile of the Treaty of Waitangi consist of eight pages of varying sizes being a copy of the Treaty documents signed in eight different locations. The document is a companion to the book Ngā Tohu o Te Tiriti, Making a Mark, published in conjunction with the 1990 Alexander Turnbull Library/ National Library of New Zealand exhibition, Ngā Kupu Kōrero, The People of the Treaty Speak. Reproduced from the film provided by Government Print with the permission of National Archives of New Zealand where the original Treaty of Waitangi is held. The book is a presentation of the Treaty of Waitangi and information on the signatories and witnesses. The framed documents will be displayed in the South Service Centre together with an explanation panel.
6. The Board intends to allocate the \$1,600 from its 2008/09 Discretionary Response Fund. There are sufficient funds available, with \$3,404 in the Fund at the date of this report. The Board has discretion over the allocation of these funds.
7. Inquires reveal that this is a reasonable cost for the framing of the eight Treaty of Waitangi documents with an ultra clear glass and Beech or Matai frames.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. There are adequate funds available in the Board's Discretionary Response Fund being \$3,404 at the date of this report. Two quotes have been obtained for framing of the eight treaty documents. The two quotes are for \$1,676.59 and \$2,017.67 including GST.

11 Cont'd

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

9. Yes, they align with the budget from the Board's 2008/09 Discretionary Response Fund.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

10. Yes, there are none.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Alignment with Strong Communities pages 59 – 61 LTCCP.

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

12. Yes; celebrate and promote Christchurch's identity, cultures and diversity on page 60 of the LTCCP.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Strong Communities, page 59 -60 of the LTCCP.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Yes; celebrate and promote Christchurch's identity, cultures and diversity page 60.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. Not required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board allocate \$1,676.59 from its 2008/09 Discretionary Response Fund towards the framing of a Facsimile of the Treaty of Waitangi documents obtained from the National Library for display in the South Christchurch Library, Service Centre and Learning Centre at 66 Colombo Street Christchurch.

CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be supported.

5.6.2009

- 22 -

12. **COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISERS' UPDATE**
13. **ELECTED MEMBERS INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
14. **MEMBERS QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**