

**LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

**TUESDAY 17 APRIL 2012
AT 12.30PM**

**IN THE MEETING ROOM,
LIVING SPRINGS CONFERENCE CENTRE,
218 BAMFORDS ROAD, ALLANDALE**

Community Board: Paula Smith (Chairperson), Jeremy Agar (Deputy Chairperson), Ann Jolliffe, Claudia Reid, Adrian Te Patu and Andrew Turner

Community Board Adviser

Liz Carter

Telephone: 941 5682

Fax: (03) 304-7731

Email: liz.carter@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

KARAKIA

- PART C 1. APOLOGIES**
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 3 APRIL 2012**
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
3.1 Mr Tony Airs, Lyttelton Historical Museum Society
- PART B 4. CORRESPONDENCE**
4.1 Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board
- PART B 5. PETITIONS**
- PART B 6. NOTICES OF MOTION**
- PART B 7. MINUTES OF LYTTELTON HARBOUR/WHAKARAUPU ISSUES GROUP –
28 FEBRUARY 2012**
- PART B 8. RESERVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES**
8.1 Allandale Reserve Management Committee – 17 January 2012
8.2 Lyttelton Reserves Management Committee – 27 February 2012
8.3 Lyttelton Reserves Management Committee – 26 March 2012
- PART B 9. LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD STRENGTHENING
COMMUNITIES FUNDING 2012/13 – BOARD BIDS**

17. 4. 2012

- PART C 10. APPLICATION TO LYTTELTON MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD 2011/12
DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND
- PART C 11. REUTER SCENIC RESERVE – ELECTRICITY EASEMENT
- PART A 12. SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT LYTTELTON MASTER PLAN
- PART B 13. BRIEFINGS
- PART B 14. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE
 - 14.1 Board Funding Balances
 - 14.2 March Update on Local Capital Projects
 - 14.3 December 2012 Meeting
- PART B 15. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
- PART B 16. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 3 APRIL 2012**

The minutes of the Board's meeting of 3 April 2012 will be separately circulated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's meeting held on Tuesday 3 April 2012 be confirmed.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

3.1 **MR TONY AIRS, LYTTTELTON HISTORICAL MUSEUM SOCIETY**

Mr Tony Airs, President of the Lyttelton Historical Museum Society wishes to address the Board regarding the Society's five year plan to redevelop the Museum.

4. **CORRESPONDENCE**

4.1 **SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD**

Attached is a letter from the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board requesting that the Board advocate on behalf of its community and declare Lyttelton/Mt Herbert to be a fracking free area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the correspondence be received.

17. 4. 2012

5. **PETITIONS**

6. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

7. **MINUTES OF LYTTELTON HARBOUR/WHAKARAUPU ISSUES GROUP – 28 FEBRUARY 2012**

The minutes of the Lyttelton Harbour/Whakaraupo Issues Group meeting of 28 February 2012 are **attached**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board receive the minutes of the Lyttelton Harbour/Whakaraupo Issues Group meeting held on 28 February 2012.

17. 4. 2012

8. RESERVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES

The minutes of the following Reserves Management Committee meetings are attached:

- 8.1 Allandale Reserve Management Committee – 17 January 2012 (**attached**).
- 8.2 Lyttelton Reserves Management Committee – 27 February 2012 (**attached**)*.
- 8.3 Lyttelton Reserves Management Committee – 26 March 2012 (**attached**).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board receive the minutes of the following Reserve Management Committee meetings:

- Allandale Reserve Management Committee – 17 January 2012
- Lyttelton Reserves Management Committee – 27 February 2012
- Lyttelton Reserves Management Committee – 26 March 2012

* The Interim Whaka Raupo Reserves Management Plan Review referred to in these minutes will be separately circulated to Board members.

9. **LYTTELTON/Mt HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING 2012/13 – BOARD BIDS**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services Group 941.8607
Officer responsible:	Manager Community Support Unit
Author:	Lincoln Papali'i Strategic Initiatives Manager

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board to agree to the projects that will be put forward on behalf of the Board to the Strengthening Communities Fund for 2012/13.
2. The Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board Strengthening Communities Fund decision meeting is scheduled for 17 July 2012.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. **Attached** to this report is a table that outlines potential projects that the Board may wish to put forward for consideration for the 2012/13 Strengthening Communities Fund (Attachment 1). These were discussed by the Board in a workshop earlier in the year. These projects have been agreed as part of Unit work programmes.
4. As a result of the earthquake, it may be that the Boards priorities for projects have altered. This meeting is the opportunity to update these projects.
5. Subsequent to the Board identifying which projects it would like to put forward as applications, staff will assess each project and include these on the decision matrix along with the other applications received for Strengthening Communities Fund.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

6. Yes, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

7. Yes. Community Board funding decisions are made under delegated authority from the Council.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

8. Yes. Strengthening Communities Funding and Community Board Funding, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

9. The funding allocation process carried out by Christchurch community boards is covered in the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

10. Not required

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board give consideration to the projects detailed in Attachment 1 – Projects to Consider 2012/13 and approve a list of projects to be submitted as applications to the 2012/13 Strengthening Communities Fund.

BACKGROUND

STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

11. The Council adopted the Strengthening Communities Strategy on 12 July 2007. The Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme comprises four funding schemes:
 - (a) Strengthening Communities Fund
 - (b) Small Projects Fund
 - (c) Discretionary Response Fund
 - (d) Community Organisations Loan Scheme

12. The following funding outcomes have been used to evaluate and assess applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund:
 - Support, develop and promote the capacity and sustainability of community recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups
 - Increase participation in and awareness of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups, programmes and local events
 - Increase community engagement in local decision making
 - Enhance community and neighbourhood safety
 - Provide community based programmes which enhance basic life skills
 - Reduce or overcome barriers to participation
 - Foster collaborative responses to areas of identified need

13. The following funding priorities have been taken into consideration when assessing applications:
 - Older Adults
 - Children and Youth
 - People with Disabilities
 - Ethnic and Culturally Diverse Groups
 - Disadvantaged and/or Socially Excluded
 - Capacity of Community Organisations
 - Civic Engagement

TIMELINE AND PROCESS

14. Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to make final decisions on the Strengthening Communities Funding for their respective wards. The Board's decisions will be actioned immediately following the decision meeting.

15. All funding approved is for the period of September to August each year, therefore grants will be paid out in early September 2012.

10. APPLICATION TO LYTTTELTON MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD 2011/12 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Unit Manager
Assessment undertaken by:	Philipa Hay, Strengthening Communities Advisor South West

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board to consider three applications for funding from its 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund from:
 - (a) Lyttelton Community House Trust, \$4,000 for Community Meals Project.
 - (b) Lyttelton Harbour Basin Youth Council Inc, \$3,800 for Administration.
 - (c) Project Lyttelton Inc, \$2,427 for Office Equipment and Stationery.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In 2011/12, the total budget available for allocation in the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Discretionary Response Fund is \$12,799. Further funding of \$3,793 has been added to this amount as a result of an under spend from the Metropolitan Small Grants Fund. Another \$9,162 in unspent funds from 2010/2011 has also been added to the current years fund giving an overall total of \$25,754. The Discretionary Response Fund opens each year on 1 July and closes on 30 June the following year, or when all funds are expended.
3. The purpose of the Fund is to assist community groups where the project and funding request falls outside other council funding criteria and/or closing dates. This fund is also for emergency funding for unforeseen situations.
4. At the Council meeting of 22 April 2010, Council resolved to change the criteria and delegations around the local Discretionary Response Fund.
5. The change in criteria limited the items that the local Discretionary Response Fund does not cover to only:
 - (a) Legal challenges or Environment Court challenges against the Council, Council Controlled Organisations or Community Boards decisions;
 - (b) Projects or initiatives that change the scope of a Council project; and
 - (c) Projects or initiatives that will lead to ongoing operational costs to the Council.

Council also made a note that: *"Community Boards can recommend to the Council for consideration grants under (b) and (c)."*
6. Based on this criteria, the applications from Lyttelton Community House Trust, Lyttelton Harbour Basin Youth Council Inc and Project Lyttelton Inc are eligible for funding.
7. Detailed information on the application and staff comments are included in the attached Decision Matrix. (**Attachment 1**).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. There is currently \$21,374 in the Board's 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

9. Yes, see page 184 of the LTCCP regarding community grants schemes including Board funding

10 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. There are no legal considerations.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, page 172 and 176

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

12. Yes, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes, including Board funding.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Refer to the attached Decision Matrix.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board:

- (a) Approve a grant of \$4,000 from its 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund to Lyttelton Community House Trust for Community Meals Project.
- (b) Approve a grant of \$3,800 from its 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund to Lyttelton Harbour Basin Youth Council Inc for Administration.
- (c) Approve a grant of \$1,750 from its 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund to Project Lyttelton Inc for Office Equipment and Stationery.

11. REUTER SCENIC RESERVE – ELECTRICITY EASEMENT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Lewis Burn, Property Consultant

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to obtain the approval of the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board, under the delegated authority of Council, to grant an electrical easement in gross over part of a scenic reserve off Dyers Pass Road in favour of Orion NZ for the purpose of providing power reticulation to an adjoining property by means of an underground cable.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Application has been made to Council by a private property owner (the applicant) for an easement to take a power supply from an existing pole owned by Orion NZ on Council scenic reserve adjacent by way of an under ground cable to his property (**refer Attachment 1**). The easement will need to be in favour of Orion NZ as the network provider, but as the benefit will be to the property owner all costs in creating the easement will lie with the property owner.
3. The preliminary design by the electrical contractor (**refer Attachment 2**) provides for a high voltage underground cable to be laid from the existing pole AH 549 on the existing 11kv overhead line to a proposed ground mounted transformer in the applicants property near the driveway to the new house site. The approximate proposed route of the underground cable is shown highlighted yellow and marked "A" on the attached diagram (Attachment 2). The final route of the easement would be dependant on the actual laid position of the cable and the easement survey plan would follow after the cable has been laid. The overhead line shown red on the diagram is there by authority of Section 22 of the Electricity Act.
4. There is an alternative option available to the applicant which would involve laying a cable from an Orion pole (AH 548) inside his property which carries the same overhead line, under very steep terrain, which would be a very technical, expensive and complex process according to the applicant. The overhead line comes over from Worsleys Hill through their property and crosses the Council's reserve to Governors Bay. The applicant is also mindful that this alternative would involve sacrificing some native planting that they have established.
5. The easement width is to be 1.5m and the length of the corridor is about 95 metres. Orion's standard easement conditions allow Orion or their contractors to enter upon the easement strip and the adjoining land. Once the cable is installed and commissioned there would probably be very little need to access the easement unless there is a fault.
6. The Council's Area Head Ranger has no issue with this application provided the easement granted is subject to the usual conditions.
7. At the time of writing this report negotiations had not been concluded with the applicant over compensation and costs. As time is of the essence the Board is being asked to agree to the principle of granting this easement and to delegate to staff the authority to conclude negotiations with the applicant over but not limited to compensation and costs in creating the easement.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. There are no financial implications of any significance for Council with all costs to create the easement to be met by the applicant.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

9. Not applicable.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. Section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977 provides that the administering body, with the consent of the Minister of Conservation and on such conditions as the Minister thinks fit, may grant rights of way and other easements over any part of the reserve for in this case Section 48(1)(d), an electrical installation or work, as defined in Section 2 of the Electricity Act 1992. Section 48(2) provides that before granting a right of way or an easement under Subsection (1) over any part of a reserve vested in it, the administering body shall give public notice in accordance with Section 119 specifying the right of way or other easement intended to be granted, and shall give full consideration, in accordance with Section 120, to all objections and submissions received in respect of the proposal under that section.
11. Further Section 48(3) states Section 48(2) shall not apply in any case where:
 - (a) The reserve is vested in an administering body and is not likely to be materially altered or permanently damaged; and:
 - (b) The rights of the public in respect of the reserve are not likely to be permanently affected by the establishment and lawful exercise of the right of way or other easement.
12. This application falls within the provisions of Section 48(3) as the rights of the public are not likely to be permanently affected (the services are under ground) and accordingly the Minister of Conservation when approached for consent will be asked to waive the requirement for public notification.
13. The Community Board has the delegated authority of Council as the decision maker to approve the granting of easements pursuant to Section 48(1) of the Reserves Act 1977.

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

14. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

15. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

16. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

17. Refer Clause 12.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board pursuant to section 48(1)(d) of the Reserves Act 1977, approve the granting of an easement in gross in favour of Orion NZ over approximately 143 square metres shown as "A" on Lemacon Plan L6663 (Attachment 1) being part of Section 1 on Survey Office Plan 19626, a Scenic Reserve vested in the Christchurch City Council, in which to lay an underground high voltage electrical cable subject to the following conditions.

- (a) The consent of the Minister of Conservation being obtained.
- (b) The easement terms including compensation payment and costs being negotiated and concluded by the Corporate Support Unit Manager or their nominee.

11 Cont'd

- (c) The easement construction area being maintained by the applicant, and their contractors in a safe and tidy condition at all times.
- (d) All costs associated with the survey and registration of the easement on the Council's title, being paid for by the applicant.
- (e) Any services that are to be placed underground are to be placed within the easement.
- (f) The applicant is to provide the Council, within three months of completion of the work, a surveyed easement plan on which the new easement is shown.
- (g) That the applicant pays a one off compensatory payment for the privilege of having the easement encumbrance placed on the Council's title in accordance with Council policy (27/9/01).
- (h) The Council is to charge the applicant for officers time, and other processing costs (DOC approval fees etc) to process the application for the easement in accordance with Council Policy (12/7/01).
- (i) The applicant is to pay a \$2,000 bond to the Council via the Area Head Ranger Port Hills, domiciled at the Victoria Park Ranger Station, and sign a temporary access licence before any construction work commences on the site. The bond, less any expenses incurred by the Council, will be refunded to the payee upon completion of the development to a standard acceptable to the Greenspace Manager or his nominee.

12. SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT LYTTTELTON MASTER PLAN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Healthy Environment
Author:	Janine Sowerby, Senior Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - (a) Inform the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board and the Council of the community's response to the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan (the Plan);
 - (b) Seek a recommendation from the Board to the Council on whether or not submissions on the Plan should be heard; and
 - (c) Provide an indication of the initial staff response to the submissions and proposed direction for finalising the Plan, in the event the Council decides not to hear the submissions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Plan was approved as a project by the Council in June 2011 to provide a vision, framework and action implementation plan to support the recovery and rebuild of the Lyttelton suburban centre, which was badly damaged in the Canterbury earthquakes.
3. Initial direction for the Plan was obtained via a series of focus groups and public workshops in late May through to early June 2011. The resulting concepts were tested through a series of community feedback presentations in July 2011, which drew 145 submissions, after which the Plan was developed. Having been approved by the Council for public notification in October, the Plan was made available for public consultation, providing the opportunity for formal submissions over a four-week period from mid November 2012. The Plan drew 197 submissions from both individuals and organisations within the community.
4. The 197 submissions were collated and analysed and the overall summary of findings is provided as **Attachment 1**. This shows that considerably more submitters expressed a liking for the draft actions (1808) than a dislike (232). Summaries of the 31 actions and other matters raised by the 67 (34%) submitters who wish to be heard, and staff comments as to how the Plan should be amended in relation to each action are provided in **Attachments 2 and 3**.
5. In general, given the high level of support, staff consider that the draft actions can be retained with some further amendments and consolidation to address the matters raised through submissions. Staff do not consider any additional actions are required.
6. On balance, due to the level of community participation in the preparation of the draft Plan, the support for the draft actions, the need for expediency in finalising the Plan and the opportunity for further engagement in the implementation stage it is recommended that hearings are not held.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. Preparation of the Plan within the Strategy and Planning Group's budget was confirmed through the 2011/12 Annual Plan process. Funding for implementation of the Plan will be considered through the 2012/13 Annual Plan process and Long Term Plan reviews.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

8. Yes, funding for preparation of the Plan has been provided within the Strategy and Planning Group's 2011/12 budget.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. There are no immediate legal considerations, other than having undertaken consultation in accordance with *S.82 Principles of consultation* of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). In summary, these require that, in relation to any decision or other matter:
- (a) Affected persons should have reasonable access to relevant information in a manner and format appropriate to their preferences and needs;
 - (b) Affected persons should be encouraged to present their views;
 - (c) Affected persons should be given clear information concerning the purpose of the consultation and the scope of the decisions to be made following consideration of the views presented;
 - (d) Affected persons who wish to have their views considered should be provided with a reasonable opportunity to do so in a manner and format appropriate to their preferences and needs;
 - (e) The views presented should be received with an open mind and given due consideration;
 - (f) Affected persons who present their views should be provided with information concerning the decision/s and reasons for the decision/s.

The Council is to observe these principles in whatever manner it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

10. Staff have met with officials from the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) and will continue to do so to ensure that the work on the Plan is informed by and consistent with the Recovery Strategy and Recovery Plans. There is no requirement under *S. 19 Development of Recovery Plans* of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 for Recovery Plans for areas outside the CBD to be subject to public hearings.

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

11. Yes, as above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. Yes, completion of the Plan is provided for within Activity Management Plan *1.0 City and Community Long-Term Policy and Planning* updated as at 1 July 2011.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

13. Yes, as above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. The Plan is consistent with relevant strategies, including objectives of the Urban Development Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

15. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. The Council has endeavoured to ensure the Plan encapsulates the community's vision for Lyttelton's rebuild and recovery, by:

12 Cont'd

- (a) Proceeding on a community-specific basis for master plan-related community consultation, taking into consideration the size and nature of each suburban centre.
- (b) Flagging early and often throughout the process that there would be three phases of community consultation.
- (c) Seeking ideas from stakeholders early in the process, including the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board, property and business owners, social and environmental interests and the community generally. Nearly 350 people participated in these focus group and public meetings in early June 2011.
- (d) Presenting the analysis of the ideas received and starting a dialogue to test with the community whether the concepts arising reflected what they had said. At least 300 people attended these community feedback presentations. People could choose to provide feedback via the form provided, or by email or letter. People had three weeks from the presentations ending 21 July 2011 until the deadline for feedback on 12 August 2011. 145 Written submissions were received, all of which informed preparation of the Plan.
- (e) Having ongoing meetings and dialogue with individuals and organisations from the community.
- (f) Having the draft Plan peer reviewed by appropriately qualified local design professionals in late September 2011.
- (g) Having the Plan considered by the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board in October 2011 prior to going to Council.
- (h) Including in this consultation phase, in response to requests by the Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Lyttelton Community Association, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre and Project Lyttelton:
 - (i) A four-week submission period, from 19 November until 19 December 2011;
 - (ii) Publicising details via newspapers, the radio, posters and local networks.
 - (iii) Delivery of:
 - A cover letter explaining the process and consultation details (what, where, when and how), a summary of the Plan (including how to access it) and a submission form to all land owners within Lyttelton south to Cass Bay and Diamond Harbour;
 - A cover letter, the full Plan and a submission form to community groups; and
 - A letter only to the remaining land owners around the harbour.
 Submitters were asked to state which actions they liked, disliked and why; which actions they considered the most important; of those, which actions they considered the most urgent; and any other comments they had about any aspects of the Plan or process. They were also asked, if hearings are held, whether they wish to be heard; and, if they wish to assist with the implementation of any actions, which ones. Written submissions were also accepted via the Council's Have Your Say website, emails and letters.
 - (iv) Hard copies of the summary Plan, full Plan and submission form were made widely available at all Council libraries and service centres and a variety of other locations around the Lyttelton Harbour Basin.
 - (v) Two drop-in display sessions were held at the Naval Point Yacht Club and Lyttelton Club, and arranged to include timeslots of both day and evening, as well as week and weekend, which were neither too early nor too late into the submission period. Council staff were assisted at these sessions by members of the Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Lyttelton Community Association, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre and Project Lyttelton.
 - (vi) Providing community members with a laminated copy of the display panels for use beyond the drop-in sessions.
- (i) Obtaining key tangata whenua values and objectives to consider in the final version of the Plan from Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd (MKT).

17. The Plan drew 197 submissions from both individuals and organisations within the community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Community Board:

- (a) Receive the overall summary of findings in the Summary of Submissions on the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan and the staff comments in relation to each action therein; and
- (b) Recommend to the Council that it resolve not to hear the submissions by the 67 submitters who wish to be heard; and
- (c) Endorse the amendment of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan in accordance with the staff comments in relation to each action before it is presented to Council for adoption at a later date.

THE HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

18. In normal circumstances, Council would consider hearing submissions on a plan of this nature in order to maintain community confidence and encourage ownership of the plan. In considering the question of whether to hold hearings staff have taken into account the following matters:
 - (a) The extent and nature of consultation undertaken to date: As noted in paragraph 14, there has been considerable opportunity for both verbal and written community input into and feedback on the Plan. Time, logistics, budget, management and venues permitting, the community consultation undertaken in Lyttelton was responsive and the most comprehensive of all the master plans progressed to date. With 1808 likes and 232 dislikes of the actions identified to achieve the vision overall, clear majority support for the Plan is evident. The Plan anticipates further community consultation being undertaken during its implementation, to develop the detail around projects, and for actions being implemented by local organisations, either separately or in conjunction with the Council and other partner organisations.
 - (b) The number and proportion of submitters wishing to be heard: Of the 197 submissions received on the Plan, 67 (34%) of submitters wished to be heard if hearings are held, 78 (40%) don't wish to be heard and 52 (26%) didn't say either way.
 - (c) Who wished to be heard: Notable submitters wishing to be heard include Hon. Ruth Dyson MP; Lyttelton Port of Christchurch; New Zealand Transport Agency; Lyttelton Harbour Business Association; Lyttelton Community Association; Project Lyttelton; Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre; Lyttelton Environment Group; Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society; Lyttelton Historical Museum Society; Lyttelton Museum; Harbour Arts Collective; The Loons Theatre Company; Naval Point Club; local design professionals such as Roy Montgomery, Nancy Vance, Peter Rough, Mrs (Liz) Briggs and Ms Jillian Frater; particularly active individuals such as Wendy Everingham, Sarah van der Burch, Trent Hiles and Sue Stubenvoll; and the Diamond Harbour Community Association.
 - (d) The number and nature of actions and submission points on which submitters wish to be heard: All (100%) of the 31 draft actions have been identified by submitters wishing to be heard, about which they have raised 1086 submission points, either in support of or opposition to them (see Attachment 2).
 - (e) The level of support (like/dislike) for the actions on which submitters wish to be heard: Submitters wishing to be heard like all of the actions more than they dislike them, with an overall ratio of 925 (85%) like to 161 (15%) dislike (see Attachment 2). All actions are supported by over 60% of the submitters. The most supported actions – those with a like/dislike ratio of $\geq 90\%:\leq 10\%$, of which there are thirteen – are: E3: Appoint a Lyttelton case manager; E5: Funding options and temporary support; M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement); N1: A new civic square; N2: Pool garden off-season access; N4: Head to Head Walkway; N5: Temporary landscapes; N6: Local landscape and heritage interpretation; N7: Interpretation of Tangata Whenua values; C3: Combined Lyttelton Library and Service Centre redevelopment; C4: New public amenities in the town centre; B1: Development-supportive Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan (Town Centre Zone) amendments; and B4: Identify and assist retention of remaining built heritage. The five least supported actions – which still enjoy a like/dislike ratio of $\geq 60\%:\leq 40\%$ – are: M1: Movement and the waterfront; M4: London Street public realm enhancements and public event opportunities; M5: Parking investigations; N3: Rooftop park between, or on a combined, Lyttelton Library and Service Centre; and C2: Alternative use of a Council property on Canterbury Street.

- (f) The actions on which submitters most frequently wish to be heard: The top five actions on which submitters most frequently wish to be heard are M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement), with a like/dislike ratio of 46:5 (90%:10%); M1: Movement and the waterfront, with a like/dislike ratio of 32:17 (65%:35%); N1: A new civic square, with a like/dislike ratio of 39:4 (91%:9%); E4: Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace, with a like/dislike ratio of 37:5 (88%:12%); and C7: Donald St arts precinct and art in the street, with a like/dislike ratio of 34:6 (85%:15%) (see Attachment 2).
- (g) Local factors that could influence the need to hold hearings: Lyttelton is a community that does not like to be over-managed and seeks active participation in decision-making. The level of community engagement by Lytteltonians was sufficiently high to impress Urbanismplus, the consultants responsible for early development of the Plan, compared to their experiences of community engagement elsewhere and they verbalised this observation on a number of occasions. High public attendance at earlier meetings and presentations has translated into a comparatively high number of submissions. The submissions received reflect the fact that Lyttelton's longer term residents generally better appreciate its historic and current role as a working port than the residents more recently attracted by its niche lifestyle. Progressive expansion of the port and the associated use of Norwich Quay by port-related heavy traffic and exclusion of the public from the inner harbour waterfront have been issues for some time, particularly for the latter part of the community. A number of the submitters have stated in some form that failure to address these port-related issues in the Plan risks failure of the Plan per se. Despite its earthquake recovery focus, local residents have therefore been keen to harness the Plan as a means to progress resolution of these issues sooner rather than later.
- (h) The circumstances which currently justify a more streamlined approach than the hearing of submissions for the Suburban Centres Programme master plans. These include:
- (i) Availability of resources: A Hearings Panel of elected representatives would need to be appointed. For the four draft master plans that have completed their final consultation phase, it is estimated that seven working days would be required for the holding of hearings and deliberation on the submissions, of which at least four days would be required in respect to Lyttelton. This assumes that each submitter would only have 10 minutes to verbally present their submissions, similar to the Annual Plan hearings process. The likely timing for hearings also presents a timetabling difficulty as it clashes with the hearings schedule for the Annual Plan. There would also be implications for Council staff administering the process.
 - (ii) Alignment with the Annual Plan process: In order to progress the implementation of the master plans, the Council needs to confirm its work programme and funding for 2012/13 before the end of June 2012. Failure to include implementation projects within the 2012/13 Annual Plan could cause a 12 month delay, prior to the next opportunity to programme projects in the Long Term Plan review in 2013.
 - (iii) Expediency: Finalising the master plans quickly will provide property owners and the community with more certainty over the context for the rebuild of their centre.

19. On balance, it is recommended that submissions should not be heard because:

- (a) There has been considerable opportunity for both verbal and written community input into and feedback on the Plan, from which clear majority support for the Plan is evident;
- (b) That submissions may not be heard was flagged through the various community engagement meetings by the Council, the Lyttelton Review following the deputation to the Council meeting of 27 October 2011 and the official submission form by the Council. Given the logistical constraints, any hearing of submissions would likely only provide each submitter with 10 minutes to address the main points in their written submissions.
- (c) Further community consultation is anticipated during implementation of the Plan, including with many of the notable submitters with respect to those actions in which they have a particular interest;
- (d) The minority (34%) of submitters who wish to be heard like all of the actions more than they dislike them, with an overall ratio of 925 (85%) like to 161 (15%) dislike and all actions supported by over 75% of the submitters;
- (e) Four of the top five actions that were most frequently identified by these submitters - M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement), N1: A new civic square, E4: Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace and C7: Donald St arts precinct and art in the street – are in the top five actions considered most urgent by the community (with the fifth - M1: Movement and the waterfront – in the top ten actions considered most urgent by the community);

12 Cont'd

- (f) Relevant local factors have been recognised and/or addressed in development of the Plan, or will be through the amendments proposed in Attachment 3 before the Plan is adopted by the Council at a later date. Given the high level of community engagement, the community consultation undertaken in Lyttelton was responsive and the most comprehensive of all the master plans progressed to date. Although not generated by the earthquakes, the Plan recognises that the long-standing port-related issues of particular concern to the community have the potential to be exacerbated by them and addresses them insofar as is possible within its earthquake-recovery scope through draft actions M1 and M2; and
- (g) There are a number of circumstances which justify not hearing submissions, the most significant being that the purpose of the Plan is to facilitate the rebuild and recovery of one of the most severely earthquake-damaged suburban centres in Christchurch and one which also serves other Lyttelton Harbour communities. We are already 19 months on from the start of the series of damaging earthquakes. Funding and implementation of the Plan needs to start as soon as possible, ie through the 2012/13 Annual Plan, to the extent that this is possible.

- 20. Should the Council decide to hear submissions a Hearings Panel will need to be appointed and arrangements made for the hearing including timetabling and circulation of the officer report. Both the hearing format and officer report are likely to be similar to those regarding area plans.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 21. The tables in Attachment 3 summarise the submissions on the draft actions and staff comments as to how the Plan should be amended in relation to each draft action. In general, given the high level of support for the draft actions, staff consider that they can be retained, with some further consolidation and/or refinement to address matters raised through the submissions. Staff do not consider any additional actions are required.

13. BRIEFINGS

14. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISERS UPDATE

14.1 BOARD FUNDING BALANCES

A copy of the Board's funding balances as at 31 March 2012 is **attached** for members' information.

14.2 MARCH UPDATE ON LOCAL CAPITAL PROJECTS

The March update on Local Capital Projects, along with the Stronger Christchurch Infrastructure Team report for the same period, are **attached** for members' information.

14.3 DECEMBER 2012 MEETING

The Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board has adopted a Meeting Schedule for 2012, which includes a meeting date scheduled for Tuesday 18 December. It is proposed that this meeting be brought forward by one week to better align with other Council meetings at that time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Community Board amend its 2012 Meeting Schedule to bring its December meeting forward by one week to be held on Tuesday 11 December 2012 at 12.30pm.

17. 4. 2012

15. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

16. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS