

REGULATORY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE  
4 JULY 2012



A meeting of the Regulatory and Planning Committee  
was held in the No. 2 Committee Room  
on Wednesday 4 July 2012 at 9.15am.

**PRESENT:** Councillor Sue Wells (Chairperson)  
Councillors Sally Buck, Jimmy Chen, Yani Johanson,  
Glenn Livingstone and Claudia Reid

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillor Peter Beck

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from  
Councillors Helen Broughton, Tim Carter and Jamie Gough

Councillor Glenn Livingstone arrived at 9.20am.

The Committee reports that:

**PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**

**1. WEATHERTIGHT HOMES CLAIMS IN CHRISTCHURCH**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Resource Consents and Building Policy Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Steve McCarthy, Resource Consents & Building Policy Manager

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to provide an update to the Council on the current status of claims in Christchurch under the Weathertight Homes Resolution Service Act and in particular, those claimants who have opted to enter the WHRS (Financial Assistance Package).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Council has previously agree to become a party to the WHRS (FAP) scheme, paying 25 per cent (Government 25 per cent, homeowner 50 per cent) towards the remediation costs. The owners have further access to loan funding and the ability to make further claims against builders, developers or other parties involved in the building of their dwelling (see **Appendix 1**).
3. The scheme became effective on 1 July 2011 and existing claimants were given the opportunity to convert their WHRS claims to the FAP Scheme, provided they met certain eligibility criteria (see **Appendix 2**) and applied by the end of October 2011.
4. Christchurch currently has 85 active claims representing 162 dwellings and units, registered with the WHRS (Weathertight Homes Resolution Service) and two claims in the District Court. Of these 85 WHRS claims, 70 claimants (of the 85) have applied to enter the WHRS (FAP) Scheme.
5. At this stage in the process, Council has the opportunity to consider the applications and decide whether they meet the eligibility criteria and whether Council will agree to contribute, subject to reviewing a repair plan in the future, with associated costs revealed. Of the applications received, 62 have been responded to and 43 accepted as being eligible for the Council

**1 Cont'd**

contribution. Nineteen have been declined (generally because they are Certifier jobs and Council has not been involved) or the Council had not completed all of the inspections and no code compliance certificate was issued.

6. The balance of claims (eight) are more complicated and still under consideration. In some cases they are incomplete applications, they have earthquake damage or the level of Council involvement is limited.
7. In the case of Certifier jobs, the applicant may still be eligible for the Government contribution. In the case of some Council involvement but no Code Compliance Certificate issued, a judgement will be made as to whether the case is best resolved through the FAP scheme or the normal WHRS mediation/adjudication processes.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. The Council has provided \$1 million per annum in its 2010/11 - 2015/16 budgets to meet weathertight homes claims. These figures have been based on Council's previous history of resolving claims under the WHRS Act 2006 and provides for claimants in the WHRS scheme, to opt into the WHRS (FAP) scheme.
9. In 2011/12 we have forecasted that we will pay \$450,000 in resolving claims. None of these payments are under the WHRS (FAP) scheme but we are expecting to pay out three claimants within the first few months of 2012/13. These claimants have already completed works which meet building code standards. The rate of settling these claims is hard to evaluate, with the applicants needing to provide repair plans first and the Council contributing its share of the costs as works progress. All works will also require a Building Consent and this will enable further Council scrutiny to ensure works meet building code requirements.

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

10. This report is for the information of the Council.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

11. Not applicable.

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

12. Not applicable.

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

13. This report is for the information of the Council only.

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

14. This report is for the information of the Council only.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

15. There is no consultation required.

1 Cont'd

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council receive this report.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the staff recommendation be adopted.

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

**Department Building and Housing Statistics**

16. Looking at the WHRS process as a whole – 82 per cent of active claims are located in the three largest Councils, Auckland - Wellington and Christchurch - and account for 89 per cent of known leaky dwellings in NZ. 18.5 per cent of claims lodged with the WHRS have indicated an interest in the FAP scheme.
17. By 30 April 2012, there were 3,655 new and existing claimants who have indicated an interest in the FAP. They represent 1,249 active claims including 1,159 single or two dwelling claims, 31 claims with three to nine units and 59 with 10 or more units. The Department and the Councils have assessed 968 claims with 2,856 properties against the FAP contribution criteria.
  - 400 claims (778 properties) were assessed as qualifying for the Council and Government contribution (50 per cent contribution for repairs).
  - 366 claims (1,402 properties) qualified for the Government contribution only (25 per cent contribution). The most common reasons for the Councils declining to contribute are a private certifier involved (54 per cent), no code of compliance certificate (23 per cent), and the Council not participating (10 per cent).
  - 202 claims (or 676 properties) did not qualify for the contribution. The main reasons for not qualifying include a building consent for repairs being issued before 1 November 2009 (36 per cent), already in civil or Weathertight Homes Tribunal proceedings with TAs (and either not prepared or allowed by TA or other parties to withdraw (27 per cent)), had no eligible WHRS claim (19 per cent), or had already settled with their TA (12 per cent).

In April 2012, the Department answered 83 calls on the new claimant line and, the webpage ([www.leakyhomes.govt.nz](http://www.leakyhomes.govt.nz)) had 971 hits with 73 application forms downloaded.

18. Nationally there are 1806 WHRS Claims representing 4,659 properties.

The Christchurch City Council currently has 85 active WHRS (Weathertight Resolution Service) claims representing 162 properties.

There are 70 FAP (Financial Assistance Package) claims, of which **62 Responded** to, comprising:

- 43 Provisionally Accepted
- 19 Declined.

**2. REVIEW OF THE 2009 TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD (TAB) VENUE POLICY**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Programme Manager Strong Communities
<b>Author:</b>	Siobhan Storey, Senior Policy Analyst

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. This paper reports on a review of the Council's Totalisator Agency Board (TAB) Venue Policy 2009. It proposes that the Council retain the current policy, which places no restrictions on the number or location of stand-alone TAB venues in Christchurch.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Council's current TAB Venue Policy (the Policy) places no restrictions on the number or location of TAB venues in Christchurch. The Policy, which is incorporated with the Gambling Venue Policy, was adopted in 2004 and has remained unchanged since then. The Policy relates only to stand-alone TAB venues, which are owned or leased by the New Zealand Racing Board (NZRB)<sup>1</sup>. It does not apply to TAB facilities located in bars, hotels or clubs.
3. The Council is required under the Racing Act 2003 to review the Policy every three years. In reviewing the Policy, staff have considered the social impacts of gambling and approaches taken by other councils, and sought views from stakeholders and the wider community.
4. No public feedback on TAB venues was received when the Gambling Venues Policy was reviewed and there have been no complaints about TAB venues. Unlike Class 4 gambling, betting at TAB venues is not rapid and repetitive and has a low prevalence of problem gambling. According to the Ministry of Health, 57.63 per cent of all problem gamblers indicate a problem with pokie machines but only 7.15 per cent of all problem gamblers indicate a problem with race or sports betting.<sup>2</sup>
5. Thus there is a potential for harm from gambling at TAB venues but it is small. On balance, staff consider that existing controls are sufficient and the current policy should be retained unchanged.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

6. There are no financial implications associated with the recommendations of this report. However, if the Council decides to amend the Policy, a special consultative procedure will be required. The associated costs include printing and distribution of the statement of proposal and summary of information, the placement of public notices and staff costs in supporting a hearings panel. These costs, including the cost of the review, are budgeted for in the City and Community Long-Term Planning Activity in the LTCCP.

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

7. See above.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

8. Under the Racing Act 2003, each territorial authority (TA) is required to have a policy on TAB venues and to review it every three years. The policy adopted by the Council (and any amended policy) must meet the requirements of section 65D(3) of the Racing Act 2003.

*“(3) The policy must specify whether or not new Board venues may be established in the territorial authority district and, if so, where they may be located.”*

<sup>1</sup> A Board venue is a stand-alone TAB operated by the New Zealand Racing Board. The Racing Act 2003 specifies that a Board venue means the premises that are owned or leased by the New Zealand Racing Board and where the main business carried out at the premises is providing racing betting or sports betting services.

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/preventative-health-wellness/problem-gambling/service-user-data/intervention-client-data#total\\_assisted](http://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/preventative-health-wellness/problem-gambling/service-user-data/intervention-client-data#total_assisted)

**2 Cont'd**

9. In adopting a policy the Council must have regard to the social impact of gambling within the district (see section 65D(2) of the Racing Act). If amendments are to be proposed to a policy the Council should again consider this matter. If a policy is to be amended as a result of the review this must be by way of the special consultative procedure in section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA02) (see section 102).
10. In addition, the Racing Act 2003 includes a requirement for a territorial authority consent if the New Zealand Racing Board proposes to establish a Board venue, and also requires territorial authorities to have Board Venue policies.

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

11. Yes, as above. The social impacts of gambling have been considered in reviewing the policy as required by the legislation.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

12. This report is broadly aligned to the City and Community Long-Term Planning Activity through the provision of advice on key issues that affect the social, cultural, environmental and economic wellbeing of the city.

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

13. See above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

14. There are no strategies that relate specifically to this issue.

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

15. See above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

16. Staff sought stakeholder and community views on the current TAB Venues Policy through the 'Have Your Say' website to assist in undertaking the review. Key stakeholders were advised by email that the review was taking place and were directed to the 'Have Your Say' website. The submission period was from 7 May 2012 to 31 May 2012. Three submissions were received, one from a member of the public, one from Addington Raceway Limited and one from the New Zealand Racing Board. All these submissions were in favour of retaining the current policy unchanged.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council retain the current TAB Venues Policy without amendment.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the staff recommendation be adopted.

## 2 Cont'd

### BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

17. Racing and sports betting is controlled by the Racing Act 2003 (the Act). The Act establishes the New Zealand Racing Board and, similar to the Gambling Act 2003, requires the Racing Board to have harm minimisation procedures in place. As already noted, the Act provides that if the Board proposes to establish a TAB venue,<sup>3</sup> a territorial authority consent is required. Councils must have a policy on TAB venues, which is reviewable every three years.

18. The Council's current TAB Venue Policy places no restrictions on the number or location of TAB venues in Christchurch. The Policy states:

*"The Christchurch City Council will grant a Totalisator Agency Board (TAB) venue consent to the New Zealand Racing Board to establish a Board venue (the Board must meet all other statutory requirements, including the City Plan requirements, in respect of such proposed venue)."*

19. The Policy, which is incorporated with the Gambling Venue Policy, was adopted in 2004, was retained unchanged at the last review in 2006 and has remained unchanged since then. The Policy relates only to stand-alone TAB venues, which are owned or leased by the New Zealand Racing Board (NZRB). It does not apply to TAB facilities located in bars, hotels or clubs.

### Review of the Policy

20. The Gambling Venue and TAB Venue Policy 2009 was reviewed in 2012. However, the focus of the review was on the Gambling Venue Policy rather than on both components of the Policy. Hence this report reviews the TAB Venue Policy 2009.

21. In reviewing the Policy staff have:

- considered the number of TAB venues operating in Christchurch
- considered the social impacts of gambling
- looked at approaches taken by other councils
- sought views from stakeholders and the wider community through the 'Have Your Say' website.

### *Gambling in Christchurch under current policy settings*

22. The current policy has been in place since 2004 and allows for growth in the number of Board venues. In March 2004 there were 10 Board venues in Christchurch; currently there are seven. Thus although the Policy allows for growth, the number of venues has declined. Four TAB Board Venues were closed as a result of the 22 February 2011 earthquake, namely the TAB located at 88 Worcester Boulevard, the New Brighton TAB, the Richmond TAB, and the Edgware TAB. Two new TAB Board Venues have been established since the 22 February 2011 earthquake, namely the Merivale TAB and the Linwood TAB.

### *The effects of gambling*

23. There is limited information on the effects of betting on racing or sports and none specifically related to betting at stand-alone TAB venues. No public feedback on TAB venues was received when the Gambling Venues Policy was reviewed and there have been no complaints about TAB venues.

24. Social benefits accrue to the individual from the fun and entertainment people derive from watching sports and races and placing bets. Money accrued from betting after prize payouts is returned to the racing clubs.

---

<sup>3</sup> A Board venue is a stand-alone TAB operated by the New Zealand Racing Board. The Racing Act 2003 specifies that a Board venue means the premises that are owned or leased by the New Zealand Racing Board and where the main business carried out at the premises is providing racing betting or sports betting services.

## 2 Cont'd

25. The benefits of gambling are offset to a greater or lesser extent by the harms gambling causes either to the individual who has a gambling problem and their family/whānau and associates, or to the wider community through crime and dishonesty occurring related to gambling. However, unlike Class 4 gambling, betting at TAB venues is not rapid and repetitive and has a low prevalence of problem gambling. According to the Ministry of Health, 57.63 per cent of all problem gamblers indicate a problem with pokie machines but only 7.15 per cent of all problem gamblers indicate a problem with race or sports betting.<sup>4</sup>

### **Other Councils' Policies**

26. TAB policies in other main centres are as follows:
- **Wellington:** Wellington City Council's Gambling Venues Policy incorporates their policy on TAB venues. TAB venues may be established anywhere in the Wellington District, subject to the provisions of the Wellington City District Plan and meeting application and fee requirements.
  - **Auckland:** Auckland City Council's Gambling Venues Policy, which was approved by the Council on 25 March 2010, incorporates their policy on TAB venues. Both were sinking lid policies, due to take effect from 1 June 2010. However the Council amended its stance on these policies and notes on its website that from 1 June 2010, Auckland City Council will accept applications for new class 4 and New Zealand Racing Board venues.
  - **Hamilton:** Hamilton City Council's TAB Venues Policy places a cap on the number of TAB venues in the City of not more than one venue per 30,000 population. Venues may only be established within Gambling Permitted Areas and are subject to meeting other conditions around signage and location.
  - **Dunedin:** Dunedin City Council's Gambling and TAB Venues Policy is silent on TAB venues.

### **Stakeholder Views**

27. Key stakeholders were advised that the review was taking place and were directed to the 'Have Your Say' website. The submission period was from 7 May 2012 to 31 May 2012. Three submissions were received, one from a member of the public, one from Addington Raceway Limited and one from the New Zealand Racing Board. All these submissions were in favour of retaining the current policy unchanged.

### **Discussion**

28. On the basis of the information available, there does not appear to be any significant concerns with the number or location of TAB venues in the city. The number of TAB venues has declined since the introduction of the policy in 2004 and no complaints have been received about these venues. While there is a small risk of problem gambling, Ministry of Health research indicates that this is significantly less than the risk associated with Class 4 gambling machines. The few stakeholders that chose to comment on the policy review did not raise any concerns.
29. Thus there is a potential for harm from gambling at TAB venues but it is small. On balance, staff consider that the existing controls are sufficient. If the Council wished to amend the policy to be more restrictive controls could be applied to numbers of venues and/or location as Hamilton has done, or apply a sinking lid policy as with the Gambling Venues Policy.

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/preventative-health-wellness/problem-gambling/service-user-data/intervention-client-data#total\\_assisted](http://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/preventative-health-wellness/problem-gambling/service-user-data/intervention-client-data#total_assisted)

2 Cont'd

**THE OBJECTIVES**

30. The purpose of the Racing Act 2003 is (a) to provide effective governance arrangements for the racing industry; (b) to facilitate betting on galloping, harness, and greyhound races, and other sporting events; and (c) to promote the long-term viability of New Zealand racing. The underlying objective in requiring councils to have a TAB venue policy is to ensure an appropriate balance between enabling sports betting to take place and minimising any adverse effects on local communities.

**THE OPTIONS**

31. Staff have considered two options:

- (a) Maintaining the status quo

Under this option, the Council would continue to grant consent to the New Zealand Racing Board to establish a TAB venue provided the Board meets all other statutory requirements, including City Plan requirements. There would be no specific controls on the number or location of TAB venues in the city.

- (b) Introducing controls on the number and/or location of TAB venues

Controls on the numbers of venues and/or their location could be introduced similar to those in Hamilton's policy. Alternatively, the Policy could be amended to say consents would not be given for new Board venues, effectively a sinking lid like the Council's Class 4 Gambling Venues Policy.

32. On balance, staff consider that the existing controls are sufficient and recommend that the Policy be retained unchanged. As already noted, the risk of problem gambling is low and no concerns have been raised about existing TAB venues or the Council's policy.

**3. STRATEGY AND PLANNING 2012/13 WORK PROGRAMME**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI: 941 8281
<b>Officers responsible:</b>	Programme Managers, Strategy and Planning
<b>Authors:</b>	Brigitte de Ronde, Carolyn Ingles, Alan Bywater, Jenny Ridgen

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to present to the Council, for its recommendation a summary of the Proposed Work Programme for the Council under its activity entitled "City and Community Long Term Policy and Planning (CCLTPP)". One of the Council's levels of service is to annually approve the scope of this work. In addition the Council is also advised of the proposed Work Programme for the District Plan Activity in order for the Council to have an understanding of the current priorities for that activity. There is also a close interaction between the two activities, with the work in the CCLTPP area often generating changes and amendments to the District Plan Activity.
2. Approval of the programme will set the priorities for the Council's policy and planning roles for the next twelve months. However, as has been evident in the past any agreed programme has been subject to change during the year, as matters arise for which the Council seeks policy advice, and or wishes to establish a direction.

3 Cont'd

THE PROGRAMME SUMMARY

3. The proposed CCLTPP programme was presented to Council at a recent workshop, and the slides are attached to this report (**Attachment 1**). The CCLTPP Work Programme is divided into fourteen work streams, and the allocation of funding into each is dependent on the different workstream priorities for any given year. The workstreams are:
  - Cross Programme Planning
  - External submissions and advocacy
  - Environmental Policy
  - Regulatory Policy
  - Regional Planning
  - Social Policy
  - Transport Policy and Advice
  - Central City Development
  - Development Advice and Policy
  - Greenfields and Smaller Centres
  - Urban Development Strategy
  - Urban Regeneration (formerly Strategic Intensification Review or SIR)
  - Monitoring and Research
  - Suburban Centres.
4. In the current year Central City Development, Urban Regeneration (Masterplans), Environmental Policy (Port Hills, Wastewater Strategy, and Stormwater Management Plans (SMPs)), are the dominant workstream areas, though as the breakdown attached demonstrates there is significant work occurring across the entire programme. The nature of the work programme also means that many projects span one or more years, and this is also reflected in the attached schedules.
5. A number of the project areas are significantly influenced by the earthquake or more significantly by the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA). These include the Central City Plan (CCP), where the direction of the CCDU/Blueprint will have potentially a significant impact on the work priority of the CCP and team. Rockfall and landslip policy, planning for the Red Zone, the Judicial Review on the adoption of the Metropolitan Urban limits by the Minister, also have significant impacts on the Council's policy resources.
6. It should be noted that neither Attachment 1 or 2 are a complete list of every project planned for, but represent the key projects underway and in particular those which are likely to require some Council decision making during the next 12 months.
7. In the District Plan Work Programme the focus has been on completing a range of key plan changes, moving more quickly on other plan changes required or prioritised as a result of the earthquakes, and working to address a range of Private Plan Change requests. A full list of current plan changes is shown in **Attachment 2**. The District Planning team has also been focussed on supporting the frequently changing Built Environment Recovery Plan/Programme (BERP) and a lot of work remains to facilitate rezoning work to support changing residential and business needs as a result of the earthquakes. Staff have also been involved in supporting a range of other planning and policy work, including the Central City, Suburban Masterplans, Rockfall planning and Brownfields Regeneration. These processes are ongoing and remain a priority for the team, as are processing issues around NZTA's RoNs programme for the Southern Motorway.
8. **Attachment 3** identifies the plan changes successfully completed in the past 12 months. A key emphasis in the past year and ongoing is in shortening the processing time for plan changes, as well as working hard to resolve those without recourse to lengthy appeal processes.

**3 Cont'd**

9. On an annualised basis the Council funds approximately \$13m into planning and policy advice, and just over \$3 million for District Planning. In recent years the Council added an extraordinary budget to review the City Plan, which as the Council will recall was subsequently diverted to fund the Central City Plan post the February 2011 earthquake. This has been completed. As part of the Draft Annual Plan for 2012/13 the Council has budgeted a further one off figure of \$9.1 million to support a range of transitional projects in the Central City. The funding of this was being confirmed at the time of this report's preparation.

**DISCUSSION WITH THE COMMITTEE**

10. The Work Programme outlined in Attachments 1 and 2 is based on the completion of existing projects, and the identification by Council of new projects. It reflects both current budget and staffing levels and to amend the programme would need to be by way of substitution, rather than simply adding additional projects to the mix. Staff discussed the programme with the Regulatory and Planning Committee. (There is always some uncertainty in the programming depending on matters or issues that might arise during the course of the year and which the Council seeks advice and direction on.)
11. As part of the discussions Councillors raised the following matters:
- A Revitalisation Plan for the Eastern part of the city
  - Demographic Profiles – Projections
  - Learning from Post 'Quake – Preparing for new ones
  - Review Planning processes to accelerate recovery
  - Affordable Housing
  - Development Options for Christchurch City Council land
  - Council Vision and Purpose.
12. The key topic that has received consideration is the concept of a Revitalisation Plan for the East. (Not to be confused with a CERA Recovery Plan). A number of discussions have been held with Councillors, and with groups and individuals with an interest in the "east". Staff are presently preparing a scoping document and it is proposed to present this to the Council for discussion and funding. While the earthquakes have significantly affected residences, businesses and infrastructure in the east, there has also been considerable support rendered to residents by the Council, CERA, NGOs etc. There will be much debate around the adequacy or effectiveness of this, and any work will need to try and both validate this and ensure that future support is as effective as it possibly can be. It is also evident that some of the issues of social deprivation, commercial decline and wider social and economic investment have been issues for sometime, as have concerns with flooding, sea level rise and the possible impact of other natural phenomena. The project may provide an opportunity for the Council and the community to identify broad systemic issues, as well as those created by the earthquake itself.
13. The potential scope of such a project can be very wide ranging, and this, the timing and resourcing needs to be carefully considered. It is proposed therefore that this project be added to the Work Programme for the CCLTPP, that a scoping paper be considered by the Council on the topic, (including funding and other work programme implications). As part of this staff will also need to consider how CERA, in its Recovery Strategy programme, views and understands the priority to do a considerable piece of work on the eastern suburbs.
14. A number of the other topics raised can be incorporated into existing workstreams, or noted as placeholders should current programmes provide some opportunity to review current understanding or practices. The Committee may like to identify priorities amongst the list for consideration should the opportunity arise.
15. One outstanding issue remains the review of the City Plan. Prior to the earthquakes this was to be a major work programme topic. The effect of the 'quake and subsequent work priorities of the Council has meant that no review has been commenced. However much of the work that

**3 Cont'd**

has been undertaken will inform the District Plan Review, and this should assist the review once it commences. Given the current work programme and ongoing demand created as a result of the earthquakes it is considered impractical to commence a formal statutory review of the District Plan. It is therefore recommended that the Council confirm that it will not commence the review until the commencement of the 2014-15 year, a step which can be reflected in the LTP currently being drafted for the Council's consideration this year, and public consulted on in 2013.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

16. The proposed programmes align with the available budgets within these Activities. There are projects that have not been able to be accommodated within these budgets given the priority and timeframes around earthquake recovery related work.

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

17. The recommendations align to the 2009-19 LTCCP budgets and other subsequent funding allocations by the Council.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

18. The proposed work programme has taken account of legislative requirements relevant to each Activity, such as the requirement to process private plan changes (RMA), the proposed review of Community Outcomes (Local Government Act), and the detail of the Work Programme will in respect of recovery issues need to remain consistent with the CERA Recovery Strategy 2012, and any subsequent Recovery Plans adopted by the Minister. In each instance projects within the Work programme will have to have regard to any relevant legislation that may impact on them.

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

19. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

20. The recommendations directly align with the LTCCP and Activity Management Plan levels of service.

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

21. Yes, as outlined above.
22. These programmes are about strategy building, and plan development. They support the Council's Strategic Directions as well as legislative requirements under a variety of laws and regulations. Key Plans such as the LTP (LTCCP), District Plan, CERA Recovery Strategy, Regional Land Transport Strategy, and Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy influence the Work Programme presented.

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

23. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

24. The Work Programme is consistent with the Activity Management Plans for the respective programmes and address agreed levels of service. Individual projects will be consulted on as appropriate during their development. The level of consultation, as demonstrated by past practice will vary depending on the nature and significance of individual projects.

3 Cont'd

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Adopt the 2012-2013 work programme outlined in this report for the District Plan and City and Community Long Term Policy and Planning Activities.
- (b) Staff present to the Council a proposed scoping paper for a Revitalisation Plan for the Eastern part of the city at the August Council meeting for Council's consideration.
- (c) Confirm that the timetable and sequence of the review of the District Plan will be considered as part of the 2013/22 LTP.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

Councillor Wells moved, seconded by Councillor Reid:

It is recommended that the Council:

1.
  - (a) Adopt the 2012-2013 work programme outlined in this report for the District Plan and City and Community Long Term Policy and Planning Activities.
  - (b) Staff present to the Planning Committee a proposed scoping paper for a Revitalisation Plan for the eastern part of the city at the end of August Planning meeting and the implications thereof.
  - (c) Receive from the General Manager Strategy and Planning report bi-monthly on the time, cost, and staff allocation of Strategy and Planning requirements supporting the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) work programme, including any implications on approved Christchurch City Council work programmes.
  - (d) Note the work done by this, or other Committees, may necessitate a review of prioritisation of this work programme by the Planning Committee.
  - (e) Staff present to the Planning Committee as a matter of urgency the scope and implications of a revision of Chapter 8 of the Infrastructure Design Standard.
  - (f) Confirm that the timetable and sequence of the review of the District Plan will be considered as part of the 2013/22 Long Term Plan.
  - (g) Ask the General Manager City Environment to discuss with the Planning Committee the overarching planning framework, and implementation of open space in the City.
2. Extend an invitation, via the Planning Committee to Diane Turner (CERA) to discuss Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority/Christchurch City Council planning issues, including future Red Zone issues at an upcoming Planning Committee meeting.

Councillor Johanson moved, seconded by Councillor Buck the following amendment:

*That the following items of table two be removed from the District Plan review and be included in the current 2012/13 work programme:*

- *Special amenity areas; and*
- *Protected trees.*

When put to the meeting the amendment was declared **lost**.

The motion was then put to the meeting and was declared **carried** unanimously.

**PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**4. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

Margaret Austin and Andrew Read addressed the Committee on issues on starlight and urban lighting. They presented the Committee with a copy of the Aoraki Mackenzie Starlight Working Party's application to the International Dark-Sky Association for a Starlight (Dark-Sky) Reserve for the Aoraki/Mt Cook National Park and adjoining Mackenzie Basin. They requested the Council consider the principal of zero upward waste lighting and that central city lighting standards incorporate full cut-off lighting for both street and outdoor amenity lighting, taking into consideration safety issues.

The Committee requested that these items also be referred to the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA), Christchurch Central Development Unit (CCDU), Stronger Christchurch Infrastructure Rebuild Team (SCIRT), and the Christchurch Agency For Energy (CAfE).

The Committee also requested that staff report back in late August on the Council's lighting policy, the impact of the issues raised in the deputation on planned lighting works, and whether the requests are achievable taking into consideration the port and airport as examples.

The meeting concluded at 10.55am.

**CONSIDERED THIS 26TH DAY OF JULY 2012**

**MAYOR**

## The Financial Assistance Package (FAP) to repair and rebuild your property

Under the FAP you (the qualifying homeowner) share the agreed actual repair cost of repairing your home with the government and your local council, if it approved the original work and is participating in the FAP.

The government and council each pay 25 per cent of the repair cost and you pay the remaining 50 per cent. However, if your council didn't sign off on the building work, or has chosen not to participate in the FAP, you will need to agree to pay 75 per cent of the costs to get payments under the scheme.

To use the FAP, you (the homeowner) must agree not to sue contributing councils and the government, although you can still pursue other liable parties such as builders, developers and manufacturers of defective products.

The FAP offers homeowners the certainty of a financial contribution and helps to get more leaky homes fixed faster.

### The Financial Assistance Package (FAP) to repair and rebuild your property

Under the FAP you (the qualifying homeowner) share the agreed actual repair cost of repairing your home with the government and your local council, if it approved the original work and is participating in the FAP.

The government and council each pay 25 per cent of the repair cost and you pay the remaining 50 per cent. However, if your council didn't sign off on the building work, or has chosen not to participate in the FAP, you will need to agree to pay 75 per cent of the costs to get payments under the scheme.

To use the FAP, you (the homeowner) must agree not to sue contributing councils and the government, although you can still pursue other liable parties such as builders, developers and manufacturers of defective products.

The FAP offers homeowners the certainty of a financial contribution and helps to get more leaky homes fixed faster.


Repair costs are agreed in the Homeowner Agreement and can include:

- the cost of repairs, or full demolition and rebuild if that is recommended in the Full or Concise Assessor's Report

Associated costs including:

- design work
- project management
- building and resource consent fees
- valuation fees needed for obtaining a loan
- alternative accommodation and furniture storage (to a capped maximum)

## Leaky Homes Financial Assistance Package Homeowner Journey



**SCHEDULE 10: CONTRIBUTION CRITERIA****Contribution Criteria: Financial Assistance Package**

To be a *qualifying claimant* under the Weathertight Homes Resolution Services Act 2006 and eligible for a Crown contribution to their *agreed repair costs* for repairing a *dwellinghouse* a homeowner must:

1. have an *eligible claim* as defined in section 10 of the Weathertight Homes Resolution Services Act 2006; and
2. meet the criteria set out in Clause 1 of this notice.

To be eligible for a contribution to their *agreed repair costs* for repairing the *dwellinghouse* from a Participating Territorial Authority the homeowner must also meet the criteria in Clause 2 of this notice.

**Definitions**

In this notice:

*Act* means the Weathertight Homes Resolution Services Act 2006.

*Agreed Repair Plan* means a repair plan agreed in accordance with criterion 1E below.

*Existing claimants* means *claimants* who have lodged a claim under the Act prior to 28 July 2011.

*Financial Assistance Package* means the package of *financial assistance measures* being offered by the Crown and any Participating Territorial Authority to *qualifying claimants*.

*Participating Territorial Authority* means a territorial authority who has agreed to participate in the Financial Assistance Package.

Other terms in italics in this notice are defined in the Weathertight Homes Resolution Services Act 2006.

The headings in this notice are for convenience only and do not affect the interpretation of the clauses of this notice.

**Clause 1: Crown Contribution Criteria**

To qualify for a contribution from the Crown all of the criteria in this clause 1 must be met:

- A. **No prior settlement:** The *dwellinghouse* must not have been the subject of a settled weathertight claim with a Participating Territorial Authority, whether that settlement was reached by agreement, mediation, through adjudication or any other civil proceedings.
- B. **WHRS Mediation and Adjudication:** If the *claimant* has applied for adjudication under the Act (regardless of whether the claimant has commenced mediation or

adjudication) and the relevant Participating Territorial Authority was either named as a party in the application or later joined to the application then:

- (i) the Participating Territorial Authority must agree to the *claimant* receiving a financial contribution under the Financial Assistance Package; and
- (ii) the *claimant* must withdraw from adjudication in accordance with section 67 of the Act.

To avoid doubt, a *claimant* will not be required to withdraw an application for adjudication until all other applicable criteria are met.

- C. **Other civil proceedings:** If the *claimant* has applied for or is involved in any other *civil proceedings* relating to the weathertightness of the *dwellinghouse* where the relevant Participating Territorial Authority is named as a party, or has been joined as a party, the:

- (i) the Participating Territorial Authority must agree to the *claimant* receiving a financial contribution under the Financial Assistance Package; and
- (ii) the *claimant* must discontinue the *civil proceedings* entirely,
- (iii) if the *claimant* has applied for mediation or adjudication under the Act in respect of the same dwellinghouse the *claimant* must also comply with clauses 1B(ii) and 1B(iii).

To avoid doubt, a *claimant* will not be required to discontinue *civil proceedings* until all other applicable criteria are met.

- D. **Assessor's report:** Subject to the criteria in clause 1I, the *claimant* has obtained a *full assessor's report* or a [*concise assessor's report (but only if offered by the Department)*] under the Weathertight Homes Resolution Services Act 2006

- E. **Agreed Repair Plan:** Subject to the criteria in clauses 1H and 1I, a repair plan has been agreed to between the claimant and the Department of Building and Housing.

- F. **Financial means:** Subject to the criteria in clauses 1H and 1I, the *claimant* must demonstrate to the Department's satisfaction that they can pay their share of the cost of the works shown in their *Agreed Repair Plan* (taking into account the amount which will be contributed by the Crown and any Participating Territorial Authority and any contingency amount required by the Department of Building and Housing).

- G. **Existing claimants to decide in 3 months:** *Existing Claimants* who have not yet applied for adjudication under the Act must advise the Department of Building and Housing in writing that they wish to be assessed to determine whether they meet the criteria set out in this notice by no later than 29 October 2011.

- H. **Existing claimants with full assessor's report who have undertaken repairs:** *Claimants* who:

- (i) have an *eligible claim* as at 28 July 2011; and
- (ii) have carried out or physically commenced weathertight repairs to the relevant *dwellinghouse* (whether or not the repairs have been completed) before the date of this notice which the *claimant* wishes to have included in the *agreed repair costs*;
- (iii) have a *full assessor's report* that encompasses all weathertight repairs they wish to include in their claim;
- (iv) had building consent granted for the repairs on or after 1 November 2009, are eligible for a contribution provided that:

- (v) criteria 1E and 1F will only apply to the extent that the repairs have not been completed; and
- (vi) all other applicable criteria are met; and
- (vii) the repairs have been carried out in accordance with all applicable laws and are satisfactory to the Department.

Where this criterion applies the *claimant* will be required to provide evidence of the scope and costs of the *repairs* to the satisfaction of the Department which will be reviewed against the estimate in the full assessor's report. The *agreed repair costs* will be an amount determined by the Department. When considering the scope of repairs carried out the Department will take into consideration the definition of *repair* in the Act and whether any aspects of the repair works constitutes betterment.

**I. Existing claimants without a full assessor's report who have undertaken repairs:** *Claimants* who:

- (i) have an *eligible claim* as at 28 July 2011; and
- (ii) have carried out or physically commenced repairs to the relevant *dwellinghouse* (whether or not the repairs have been completed) before the date of this notice which the *claimant* wishes to have included in the *agreed repair costs*;
- (iii) cannot obtain a full assessor's report;
- (iv) had building consent granted for the repairs on or after 1 November 2009,

may be eligible for a contribution, provided that:

- (v) criterion 1D will not apply; and
- (vi) criteria 1E and 1F will only apply to the extent that the repairs have not been completed; and
- (vii) all other applicable criteria are met; and
- (viii) the repairs have been carried out in accordance with all applicable laws and are satisfactory to the Department.

Where this criterion applies the *claimant* will be required to provide evidence of the scope and costs of the *repairs* to the satisfaction of the Department. The *agreed repair costs* will be an amount determined by the Department. If the evidence of costs provided by the *claimant* is not satisfactory to the Department then the *claimant* will not be eligible for a contribution. When considering the scope of repairs carried out the Department will take into consideration the definition of *repair* in the Act and whether any aspects of the repair works constitutes betterment.

**Clause 2: Participating Territorial Authority Contribution**

Subject to clause 2C, to qualify for a contribution from a Participating Territorial Authority:

- A. the *claimant* must meet all of the criteria set out in clause 1; and
- B. the territorial authority must owe a duty of care to a person in the position of the *claimant* in respect of the damage to which the *full assessor's report* or the *concise assessor's report* (as applicable) relates.
- C. A *claimant* who:
  1. has previously been or is currently involved in any *civil proceedings* relating to the weathertightness of the *dwellinghouse* where the relevant Participating Territorial Authority is named as a party, or has been joined as a party; and

2. discontinues those proceedings before lodging a claim in accordance with the Act, will not qualify for a contribution from the Participating Territorial Authority, unless the Participating Territorial Authority agrees otherwise.

Without limiting clause 2B above, as at the date of this notice:

1. the intended use of the *dwellinghouse* when built will be relevant to whether a Participating Territorial Authority has a duty of care, generally the intended use must have been for residential purposes; and
2. the Participating Territorial Authority may not owe a duty of care to *dwellinghouses* within mixed use developments depending on the proportion of the residential component of the development;
3. a Participating Territorial Authority will not be required to contribute in circumstances where:
  - (a) The *relevant territorial authority* did not inspect the *dwellinghouse* or issue a code compliance certificate or interim code compliance certificate for the *dwellinghouse*.
  - (b) The *relevant territorial authority* issued a code compliance certificate for the *dwellinghouse* because it was required to do so by Department of Building and Housing by a determination under subpart 1 of Part 3 of the Building Act 2004.
  - (c) The *relevant territorial authority* issued a code compliance certificate or interim code compliance certificate for the *dwellinghouse* for non- weathertight aspects of the *dwellinghouse* only.
  - (d) A private certifier carried out all inspections and issued a code compliance certificate, regardless of whether the *relevant territorial authority* holds the private certifier's records.
  - (e) The *relevant territorial authority* issued a code compliance certificate or interim code compliance certificate for the *dwellinghouse* in reliance on a certificate from a private certifier issued under section 56 of the Building Act 1991 in respect of weathertightness related work.
  - (f) The *relevant territorial authority* never inspected the weathertightness related work forming part of the *dwellinghouse*.
  - (g) The *relevant territorial authority* inspected the weathertightness related work and either:
    - (1) issued a notice to fix (under the Building Act 2004);
    - (2) issued a notice to rectify (under the Building Act 1991); or
    - (3) otherwise advised the homeowner of any defects, and a code compliance certificate was never issued.
  - (h) The claim relates to a *dwellinghouse* within a retirement village within the meaning of the Retirement Villages Act 2003, and the owner by or on behalf of whom the claim is made is the retirement village's operator or promoter as defined in that Act.


For the avoidance of doubt the above circumstances are not the only circumstances in which a *claimant* may not receive a contribution from a Participating Territorial Authority.

For further information please contact the Department of Building and Housing on 0800 116 926 or visit [www.dbh.govt.nz](http://www.dbh.govt.nz).

Dated at Wellington this 28 day of July 2011


Katrina Bach, Chief Executive, Department of Building and Housing

## City and Community Long Term Policy and Planning



Service	Amount (\$)	Percent (%)
Environmental Policy	1,000,000	8
Regional Planning	120,000	1
Regulatory Policy	285,000	2
Social and Economic Policy	326,000	3
Monitoring and Research	580,000	5
Cross-Programme Planning	1,000,000	8
Transport Policy and Advice	370,000	3
Development Advice and Policy	790,000	6
Urban Development Strategy	1,200,000	9
Urban Regeneration	2,240,000	18
Greenfields and Smaller Centres	582,000	5
Central City Development	4,300,000	34
<b>Totals</b>	<b>12,793,000</b>	<b>100</b>

## Central City Development Policy




3

## Central City Development Policy

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<b>Current Projects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recovery coordinator funding</li> </ul>	
<b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial planning for Central City Recovery Plan Implementation projects</li> </ul>	

4

## Central City Development Policy




5

## Central City Development Policy

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<b>Current Projects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land Purchase – blocks and lanes</li> </ul>	Central City Recovery supported.
<b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Heritage Grants</li> <li>▪ DCs, Residential and Commercial Incentives</li> <li>▪ Transitional City</li> <li>▪ Creative Arts Support and Grants</li> </ul>	

6

## Environmental Policy




7

## Environmental Policy

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<p><b>Current Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪Port Hills land instability</li> <li>▪Wastewater Strategy</li> <li>▪Stormwater Management Plans – Styx and Avon</li> <li>▪Ecological Data Management</li> <li>▪Healthy Environment Strategies - implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪Following decisions by CERA on Port Hills White Zone land, prepare policy provisions in response to the hazard risk associated with land instability issues on the Port Hills</li> <li>▪Prepare a wastewater strategy for adoption by Council</li> <li>▪Progress a catchment discharge consent in association with CEG staff (Styx). Complete catchment investigations and river modelling (Avon)</li> <li>▪Develop a Business Case for a database which provides a single source of ecological data for Council</li> </ul>
<p><b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪Coastal Study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪Prepare a review of relevant information on the impact on Christchurch's coastline of coastal processes, sea level rise, tsunamis, and changes in elevation following the earthquakes, to inform planning for coastal areas</li> </ul>

8

## Regional Planning




9

## Regional Planning

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<p><b>Current Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land and Water Plan (ECan)</li> <li>▪ Canterbury Water Management Strategy – local Zone Committees</li> <li>▪ ECan Resource Consents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare submissions on ECan's draft Plan, prepare evidence and attend hearings</li> <li>• Provide information and advice to Zone Committees to assist in their preparation of Zone Implementation Plans</li> <li>• Assess impacts of notified ECan resource consent applications, and prepare submissions on applications of high significance to the Council. Primary focus is on discharge consents that could impact on Christchurch water resources.</li> </ul>
<p><b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b></p>	

10

## Regulatory Policy




11

## Regulatory Policy

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<p><b>Current Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪Alcohol bans – Papanui and Merivale</li> <li>▪Brothels Location &amp; Commercial Sexual Services Bylaw</li> <li>▪Maintaining 10 year bylaw programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council decision on permanent alcohol bans and consequent communications completed.</li> <li>• Council decision on bylaw and consequent communications completed</li> <li>• Review 10 year bylaw programme and report to Regulatory and Planning Committee</li> </ul>
<p><b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪Alcohol policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Alcohol Policy developed</li> </ul>

12


## Social and Economic Policy



## Social and Economic Policy

	Key Outcomes 2012/ 2013
<p><b>Current Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TAB Venue Policy Review</li> <li>▪ Support facilities planning (community facilities, libraries, aquatic facilities, metro sports facilities, social housing)</li> <li>▪ Input to Healthy Christchurch and work to embed health and well being consideration in policy and planning work</li> <li>▪ Centres strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TAB policy reviewed as per statutory requirement.</li> <li>▪ Facilities planning process is informed by a range of wider policy and planning considerations.</li> <li>▪ Attend healthy Christchurch Steering Group meeting regularly and participate appropriately in Healthy Christchurch initiatives. Increase staff capacity to consider health implications in policy and planning work. Adopt a health in all policies approach to specific projects within the work programme.</li> <li>▪ A draft centres strategy will have been reported to Council.</li> </ul>


## Monitoring and Research



## Monitoring and Research

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<p><b>Current Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪Quality of life survey</li> <li>▪Biannual residents survey</li> <li>▪Growth model</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Communicate 2012 Quality of Life results to Council</li> <li>•Point of contact and general household surveys carried out to inform LTP levels of service reporting</li> <li>•Business growth model rebuilt. Run model using changing assumptions as required. Improve model automation</li> </ul>
<p><b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪Monitoring and research to a range of policy and planning projects</li> </ul>	


## Cross-Programme Planning



## Cross-Programme Planning

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<p><b>Current Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Activity Management Plans development and review</li> <li>▪ Development Contributions Policy Review</li> <li>▪ Input to Capital Programme development</li> <li>▪ Community Outcomes Monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Activity Management Plans reviewed for strategic fit prior to consideration by the LTP Committee.</li> <li>• Key aspects of the Development Contributions Policy reviewed for inclusion in the Draft LTP</li> <li>• Initial capital programme prioritised against Community Outcomes for consideration and amendment by firstly Executive Team and secondly Council.</li> <li>• Framework for monitoring 2013 Community Outcomes Developed</li> </ul>
<p><b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b></p>	

## Transport Policy and Advice




19

## Transport Policy and Advice

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<b>Current Projects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Christchurch Transport Plan – completion and commence implementation</li> <li>▪ Greater Christchurch Transport Statement</li> <li>▪ Strategic input to RONS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final CTP reported to Council, Implementation plan developed.</li> <li>• Greater Christchurch Transport Statement completed</li> <li>• Milestones will largely be dependent on NZTA timetable.</li> </ul>
<b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b>	

20

## Development Advice and Policy




21

## Development Advice and Policy

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<b>Current Projects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Urban Design Panel</li> <li>▪ Resource Consent Advice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Urban Design Panel meetings and advice to developers</li> <li>▪ Urban Design and Landscape advice provided to EPAU for consent processes as required</li> </ul>
<b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b>	

22

## Urban Development Strategy




23

## Urban Development Strategy

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<p><b>Current Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assisting Crown Law in Judicial review case Independent Fisheries Ltd vs MCER (decision to use s27 powers to bring PC1 into the Regional Policy Statement)</li> <li>Attendance at UDS IMG, UDS IC and CERA AC meetings</li> <li>Continued input to CERA on land use, buildings and infrastructure recovery which includes temporary workers accommodation</li> </ul>	<p>Crt proceedings begin 2 July 2012, unknown when Dec will be released</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>New Rules in DP completed,</p>
<p><b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work requests from CERA (as yet unknown)</li> <li>Getting a picture of business land (industrial and commercial) on to land availability website</li> <li>Joint responses to CERA land use, building and infrastructure recovery programme/s</li> </ul>	

24


## Urban Regeneration



## Urban Regeneration

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<p><b>Current Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Suburban Centres <u>Masterplans</u> (8): Sydenham, Lyttelton, Selwyn St Shops, Linwood Village, Ferry Rd/ Main Rd (Stage 1), Sumner, New Brighton, Edgeware</li> <li>▪ Case Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lyttelton and Sydenham: implement actions adopted for commencement during 2012/13 and establish a monitoring programme to track progress of individual actions Selwyn St Shops, Linwood Village, Ferry Rd/Main Rd (Stage 1) and Sumner: complete master plans and present to Council for adoption. Initiate implementation and monitoring of actions. New Brighton and Edgeware: Develop master plans for adoption by Council.</li> <li>• Support property owners within earthquake damaged suburban centres with their rebuild projects</li> </ul>
<p><b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Implementation of adopted <u>masterplans</u></li> <li>▪ Ferry Rd/ Main Rd (Stage 2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement actions identified for 2012/13 and establish a monitoring programme to track progress of individual actions.</li> <li>• Develop Stage 2 of the Ferry Rd/Main Rd Master Plan and present to Council for adoption</li> </ul>

## Greenfields and Smaller Centres



27

## Greenfields and Smaller Centres

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<b>Current Projects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ South West Area Plan Implementation</li> <li>▪ Belfast Area Plan Implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor progress of implementation of Area Plans and report on this, at least annually, to local Community Boards</li> </ul>
<b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b>	


28

ATTACHMENT 1 TO CLAUSE 3 REGULATORY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE 4.7.2012

CITY AND COMMUNITY LONG TERM POLICY & PLANNING AND DISTRICT PLAN PROJECTS SUPPORTING EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY			
EARTHQUAKE EXTREME	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater Christchurch Transport Statement</li> <li>Port Hills Land Instability</li> <li>Avon River Corridor</li> <li>Central City                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning (part)</li> <li>Heritage Grants</li> <li>Life in Vacant Spaces</li> <li>Arts Grants</li> <li>Transitional City</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suburban Centre Master Plans: Sydenham, Lyttelton, Selwyn St Shops, Linwood Village, Ferry Rd/ Main Rd, Sumner, New Brighton &amp; Edgeware</li> <li>Suburban Centres: Case Management</li> <li>Avon Stormwater Management Plan</li> <li>Wastewater Strategy</li> <li>Central City                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning (part)</li> <li>Residential &amp; Commercial Incentives</li> <li>Land Purchase</li> </ul> </li> <li>Papanui &amp; Merivale Alcohol Bans</li> <li>Brothels Location and Signage</li> <li>Advertising Commercial Sexual Services Bylaw</li> <li>Alcohol Policy</li> <li>Support facilities planning (community facilities, libraries, aquatic facilities, metro sports facilities, social housing)</li> <li>Growth model</li> <li>Christchurch Transport Plan – completion and commence implementation</li> <li>Strategic input to RONS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>South West Area Plan Implementation</li> <li>Belfast Area Plan Implementation</li> <li>Styx Stormwater Management Plan</li> <li>Coastal Study</li> <li>Input into Healthy Christchurch and work to embed health and well being consideration in policy and planning work</li> <li>Activity Management Plans development and review</li> <li>Development Contributions Policy Review</li> <li>Input to Capital Programme development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land and Water Plan</li> <li>Canterbury Water Management Strategy (Zone Committees)</li> <li>Healthy Environment Strategy Implementation</li> <li>Maintaining 10 year bylaw programme</li> <li>Quality of life survey</li> <li>Biennial residents survey</li> <li>Community Outcomes Monitoring</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ODPs residential</li> <li>PC 67- Highfield</li> <li>PC 68- Spreydon lodge</li> <li>72- Highsted Park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ODPs business</li> <li>PC 70 Non Family Accom</li> <li>PC 63 Utilities</li> <li>PC 32 – Waimak flood plain</li> <li>NWRA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC 66 - Templeton</li> </ul>


NON ESSENTIAL: PC 52 Ruspuna, TAB Venue Policy Review, ECan Resource Consents, Ecological Database

## District Plan



Service	Amount (\$)	Percent (%)
Council Plan Changes	2,400,000	75
Private Plan Changes	786,000	25
Totals	3,186,000	100

## Council Plan Changes




3

## Council Plan Changes

		Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<p><b>Current Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Banks Peninsula District Plan</li> <li>➢Ecological Heritage sites</li> <li>➢PC 8 – Financial Contributions</li> <li>•City Plan</li> <li>➢PC 15 – Elderly Persons Housing</li> <li>➢PC 32 – Waimakariri River Stoopbank Floodplain Land use controls</li> <li>➢PC 42 – Bridle Path</li> <li>➢PC 52 – Ruapuna</li> <li>➢PC 56 – B1 and B2 zones – Urban Design</li> <li>➢Northwest Review Area</li> <li>➢Policy planning advice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢PC 17 – Special Purpose Ferrymead</li> <li>➢PC 63 – Utilities Review/ NES Telecommunications</li> <li>➢PC 66 – Templeton Special Rural Zone</li> <li>➢PC 70 – Non Family Accommodation</li> <li>➢Relocation of Carrs Road Karting track and greyhounds track</li> <li>➢District Plan Admin</li> </ul>	<p>BPDP – fully operative</p> <p>Ecological Heritage sites plan change hearings completed</p> <p>City Plan – fully operative</p> <p>PC 52, 63, 66, 56 Decisions released</p> <p>PC 42 and 17 – Notified</p> <p>PC 15 and 70 - Way forward identified</p> <p>NWRA – plan change for business land zoning underway</p> <p>Carrs Rd Kart Track relocation – approval for relocation, consents granted</p>
<p><b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•PC 68 – ODP for CSW 3 (Sparks Road, Spreydon Lodge)</li> <li>•PC 71 – ODP for CN3 (Upper Styx, Harewood)</li> <li>•PC 75 – Giving Effect to chapters 12A and 22 of the RPS</li> </ul>		<p>ODP Hearings completed</p> <p>PC 75 – underway (Councillor workshops completed)</p>

4

## Private Plan Changes



## Private Plan Changes

	Key Outcomes 2012/2013
<p><b>Current Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•PC 22- Court Direction to redraft the plan change to introduce new policy (Decision released). Appeals close mid June 2012.</li> <li>•PC 67 – Highfield</li> <li>•PC 69 – Spreydon Lodge</li> <li>•PC 72 – Highsted Park</li> </ul>	<p>PC 22 – operative</p> <p>PC 67 – Decision released , appeals underway (if any)</p> <p>PC 69 and 72, Hearings completed</p>
<p><b>New Projects (2012/ 2013):</b></p> <p>•Staff have discussed with landowners and their consultants 10 upcoming private plan changes these are: <u>Tait electronics</u> (PC and MUL), <u>Cookie Time</u> (PC and MUL), <u>Land between CB2 and CB6</u> (PC and MUL), <u>Bridgestone site</u>, <u>Prestons Road supermarket</u>, <u>Cashmere Lakes</u>, <u>Scarborough</u>, <u>Worsleys Rd</u>, <u>CB1 rezoning</u>, <u>Calder Stewart CB 7</u>.</p>	<p>Will depend on timing of Requests recieved</p>
<p><b>Potential Substitute Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•There are no substitute projects, new private plan changes are expected at any time</li> </ul>	

ATTACHMENT 2 TO CLAUSE 3 REGULATORY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE 4.7.2012

CITY AND COMMUNITY LONG TERM POLICY & PLANNING AND DISTRICT PLAN PROJECTS SUPPORTING EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY			
EARTHQUAKE EXTREME	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater Christchurch Transport Statement</li> <li>Port Hills Land Instability</li> <li>Avon River Corridor</li> <li>Central City                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning (part)</li> <li>Heritage Grants</li> <li>Life in Vacant Spaces</li> <li>Arts Grants</li> <li>Transitional City</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suburban Centre Master Plans: Sydenham, Lyttelton, Selwyn St Shops, Linwood Village, Ferry Rd/Main Rd, Sumner, New Brighton &amp; Edgeware</li> <li>Suburban Centres: Case Management</li> <li>Avon Stormwater Management Plan</li> <li>Wastewater Strategy</li> <li>Central City                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning (part)</li> <li>Residential &amp; Commercial Incentives</li> <li>Land Purchase</li> </ul> </li> <li>Papanui &amp; Merivale Alcohol Bans</li> <li>Brothels Location and Signage Advertising Commercial Sexual Services Bylaw</li> <li>Alcohol Policy</li> <li>Support facilities planning (community facilities, libraries, aquatic facilities, metro sports facilities, social housing)</li> <li>Growth model</li> <li>Christchurch Transport Plan – completion and commence implementation</li> <li>Strategic input to RONS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>South West Area Plan Implementation</li> <li>Belfast Area Plan Implementation</li> <li>Styx Stormwater Management Plan</li> <li>Coastal Study</li> <li>Input into Healthy Christchurch and work to embed health and well being consideration in policy and planning work</li> <li>Activity Management Plans development and review</li> <li>Development Contributions Policy Review</li> <li>Input to Capital Programme development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land and Water Plan</li> <li>Canterbury Water Management Strategy (Zone Committees)</li> <li>Healthy Environment Strategy Implementation</li> <li>Maintaining 10 year bylaw programme</li> <li>Quality of life survey</li> <li>Biannual residents survey</li> <li>Community Outcomes Monitoring</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ODPs residential</li> <li>PC 67- Highfield</li> <li>PC 69- Spreydon lodge</li> <li>72- Highsted Park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ODPs business</li> <li>PC 70 Non Family Accom</li> <li>PC 63 Utilities</li> <li>PC 32 – Waimak flood plain</li> <li>NWRA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC 66 - Templeton</li> </ul>

NON ESSENTIAL: PC 32 Ruapuna, TAB Venue Policy Review, ECan Resource Consents, Ecological Database

Table 1: DISTRICT PLAN WORK PROGRAMME ACHIEVEMENTS 2011/12

<b>PC (Council led Plan Change) Notifications achieved</b>	PC 66 – Templeton Special Rural zone
<b>PPCs (Private Plan Change) Notifications achieved</b>	PC 67 - Highfield PPC 58 – Wrights Road B4 Zone PPC 54 – Marshs Road B4 Zone
<b>Hearings completed and awaiting Decisions</b>	Variation 8 Banks Peninsula D.P.
<b>Plan Change Decisions released</b>	Banks Peninsula District Plan designations Banks Peninsula District Plan Monitoring Provisions PPC 19 Islington Park PPC 30 Prestons Road PC 32 Waimakariri Floodplain PC 44 Riccarton Bush PPC 54– Marshs Road PPC 58 – Wrights Road PPC 59 – St Martins New World PPC 60 – Fulton Hogan W Halswell
<b>Appeal negotiations progressing or awaiting Court Decision</b>	PPC 19 Islington Park PPC 22 Styx Centre PC 32 Waimakariri River Floodplain
<b>Plan Changes made Operative</b>	Belfast 293 PC 5 Awatea PPC 30 – Prestons PC 53 – Living 3 and 4 Zones PPC 43 – Belfast Park PC 44 – Riccarton Bush PPC 45 Christchurch Golf Resort PC 46 Wigram Air Noise Provisions PPC 47 – Sir James Wattie Drive PC 53 Living 3 and 4 Design and Amenity PPC 59 – St Martin New World PPC 60_ Fulton Hogan PPC 62 Wigram Airfield

**ATTACHMENT 3 TO CLAUSE 3 REGULATORY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE 4.7.2012**

<p><b>Other</b></p>	<p>Input to CERA on Landuse, building and Infrastructure recovery</p> <p>Website on residential land availability live</p> <p>Input to draft scoping paper for Heritage and Culture Recovery Plan (led by the Ministry for Culture and Heritage)</p> <p>Work to support Crown Law in the Independent Fishers Case to vs Minister CERA</p> <p>Burwood Landfill Site – Plan Change under the CER Act to permit permanent storage of earthquake waste.</p> <p>North West Review Area – under peer review with findings from study to come to Committee</p> <p>Ongoing UDS IMG meetings, collaboration and functions</p> <p>Ongoing UDS/CERA Liaison meetings to discuss matters (eg Temporary Housing, Land Availability, Unlocking housing supply)</p> <p>Progressing the relocation of the Carrs Road Karting track and greyhound track.</p>
---------------------	---

Table 2: Plan changes, variations to be included within the District Plan Review

<p><u>Council Led Plan Changes/Variations/Projects</u></p>	<p><u>Banks Peninsula District Plan</u></p>	<p>Protected Tree Review</p> <p>Provision to manage long term growth</p> <p>Temporary Activities</p> <p>List of minor plan changes Change for Dwellings and Family flats</p> <p>Change for objectives and policies - non residential activities Akaroa Heritage Character</p>
	<p><u>Christchurch City District Plan</u></p>	<p>Airport Noise Management Plan</p> <p>CCC/BP District Boundary Adjustment</p> <p>CCC/Selwyn Boundary adjustment needs re-zoning</p> <p>Special Amenity Areas (SAMS) PC 11 – Living Hills zone</p> <p>Site Permeability Standards</p> <p>Estuary Environment</p> <p>B3 Industrial Height rule List of minor plan changes Protected Trees</p> <p>Memorial Avenue Signage</p> <p>Quarry zones</p> <p>Hazardous substances</p> <p>Update heritage schedules</p>