



# CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

THURSDAY 30 JUNE 2005

AT 9.30AM

IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES

**Council:** The Mayor, Garry Moore (Chairperson).  
Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, Graham Condon, Barry Corbett, David Cox,  
Anna Crighton, Carole Evans, Pat Harrow, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff, Sue Wells and Norm Withers.

PAGE NO	DESCRIPTION
1	APOLOGIES
3	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
-	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
-	PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS
-	CORRESPONDENCE
-	CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL ANNUAL PLAN 2006
11	LITTER STRATEGY
21	CITY PLAN DEVELOPMENT RULES IN LIVING 1A ZONE
29	EXTENSIONS TO GENERAL CARRIAGEWAY MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS
30	APPOINTMENT OF PRINCIPAL RURAL FIRE OFFICER
31	2005 LOCAL GOVERNMENT NEW ZEALAND CONFERENCE
35	REPORT OF MISUSE OF MOTOR VEHICLES SUBCOMMITTEE
39	REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD
33	STAFF ORGANISATION VALUES LAUNCH
-	NOTICES OF MOTION
-	QUESTIONS
45	RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

30. 6. 2005

- 2 -

**1. APOLOGIES**

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

(a) **ANNUAL PLAN COUNCIL MEETINGS OF 7, 8, 9, 10 AND 13 JUNE 2005**

Attached.

(b) **COUNCIL MEETING OF 23 JUNE 2005**

Attached.

**3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**

**5. CORRESPONDENCE**

**6. CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL ANNUAL PLAN 2006**

(Report by General Manager Corporate Services to be separately circulated.)

## 7. LITTER STRATEGY

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Marketing Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Richard Stokes, Marketing Manager, Public Affairs Group, DDI 941-8587

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to report back from the Litter Project Steering Team on actions proposed to achieve the goal of:

*“Christchurch is New Zealand’s cleanest city, with citizens who are responsible for their own litter and do not tolerate others littering.”*

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The litter strategy proposes a co-ordinated response to addressing concerns over the level of litter in Christchurch.
3. Littering (the reduction of) is all about taking personal responsibility. This strategy focuses on the Council’s role in creating an environment that encourages residents, workers and visitors to demonstrate pride in the city by taking personal responsibility for not littering streets, parks and public places. Councils are in a unique position to undertake a key role in controlling and managing litter. They have diverse responsibilities and therefore many opportunities to influence the reduction of litter. Currently most Councils treat the symptoms of littering and try to use downstream solutions rather than finding ‘source reduction’ solutions. The actions recommended in this report have been developed to include source reduction solutions which will improve environmental outcomes while achieving maximum benefit from ratepayer funding.
4. The starting point for this project was to undertake extensive secondary research, nationally and internationally, to identify successful litter reduction strategies and programmes. The research confirmed that in the face of the fast pace and ‘throw-away mentality’ of modern society, dated approaches to litter management through legislation, regulation and reactive cleanups are costly and largely ineffective downstream solutions. Particularly, fines for littering require costly and extensive enforcement to be effective. Resulting behavioural impact depends upon continual promotion of disincentives (fines) and under current New Zealand legislation unless the offender is caught in the act, it is very difficult, although not impossible, to take further action.
5. Research has identified a number of successful anti-litter campaigns. These campaigns had a major focus on effective communication of personal responsibility to not litter and were supported by other measures around education, ‘hot spots’ cleaning, community involvement, providing infrastructure for litter disposal (especially cigarette butt disposal) and enforcement.
6. A social marketing trial has been completed of two communication campaigns (one based on an American model, one Australian) that have been successful in leading an integrated litter reduction campaign and which could be adapted to Christchurch’s situation. The objective of the trial was to identify an effective communication of personal responsibility that can be supported with other measures in an integrated litter reduction strategy.
7. This trial has led to the recommendation to develop the ‘Don’t be a tosser – do the right thing’ campaign. This campaign is based on successful anti litter communication used in Australia and combines an awareness message with a positive reinforcement statement.

### FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. Adopting the approach recommended in this report will be accommodated within existing budgets for the 2005/06 financial year. Measurement and evaluation of the implementation of this programme will enable requirements to be identified for the 2006/16 LTCCP.

## 7 Cont'd

### STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council approve the implementation of the actions proposed in this report, including the "Don't Be a Tosser" campaign, Clean City Partners programme and supporting actions including:

- Education and promotion to increase awareness of litter
- Providing infrastructure for cigarette butt disposal
- 'Hot spots' cleaning
- Partnership with Keep Christchurch Beautiful to engender community support
- Working with other community organisations
- Integrating the Clean up the World campaign into the overall litter strategy
- Gaining the support of business that generate packaging which is prevalent in Christchurch litter
- Enforcement
- Managing litter reduction from rubbish/recycling
- Measurement and evaluation

### BACKGROUND ON LITTER STRATEGY

#### Council Direction

9. At its July 2004 meeting, the Council adopted a litter strategy based on the goal of:

*"Christchurch is New Zealand's cleanest city, with citizens who are responsible for their own litter and do not tolerate others littering."*

10. Specific strategies directed towards managing litter issues adopted by the Council were:

- Better definition and management of the issue.
- Attacking the problem at source.
- Dealing with the results aggressively.

11. The Council requested information on:

- (a) *What regulatory methods might be able to be implemented to require fast food outlets to collect and remove litter, originating from their premises, deposited in the areas surrounding those premises, and;*
- (b) *Whether the Council can impose fines, similar to parking infringements, on individuals who deposit litter in the city."*

12. An initial report from the Council's solicitor was provided with more detailed investigation of the provisions of the Litter Act 1979 required prior to the preparation of any bylaw.

13. Recommendations from the Sustainable Transport and Utilities Committee were:

- (a) *That the report on progress towards implementation of the Litter Strategy be received.*
- (b) *That the project team instigate discussions with takeaway food premises in the central city pilot area, with a view to developing a voluntary programme for management and reduction of litter, consistent with Section 9 of the Litter Act 1979.*
- (c) *That staff investigate the preparation of a draft bylaw under Section 12 of the Litter Act 1979, including a schedule defining specific premises and locations in the central city pilot area, and requiring the occupiers of the premises to provide, maintain and empty litter receptacles that they may be required to provide under Section 9(3); the provisions of this bylaw to be used only in the event that a voluntary compliance regime is shown to be ineffective.*
- (d) *That staff investigate options for increasing public awareness of the role of litter control officers, and for publicising the infringement notice provisions set out in Section 15(1) of the Litter Act 1979.*

## 7 Cont'd

### Project Team Direction

14. A project team from across the Council was convened to progress the litter strategy. This included staff from City Environment, Regulation and Democracy, Public Affairs, Community Services, Corporate Services and Strategic Development groups. An action plan was developed with key actions including:
  - Measuring current state in target areas.
  - Stocktake of current information.
  - Identify other interested parties.
  - Research into residents' views and perceptions of litter issues.
  - Review current education and promotion activities.
  - Review options for regulatory control.
15. Direction from the Council focussed on litter in the central city area. In the initial stages of the project this was the focus. Measurement was conducted over a seven-day period with a series of photos taken at set times at the sites along Colombo Street and in the City Mall. These showed a clean streetscape. It must be noted that this area is cleaned regularly, therefore the issue of litter in the central city was not de-prioritised by the project team. However, the scope of the project was widened to include suburban locations for measurement and implementation of a trial social marketing campaign.
16. Following initial Project Team work on stocktaking and clarifying the issues to be addressed, the emphasis shifted to finding source reduction solutions that will make a difference.

### Trial of Source Reduction Campaigns

17. As litter is not a problem unique to Christchurch our approach was to look internationally and nationally for source reduction strategies that have had measured success in reducing litter. Following evaluation of international campaigns a 'social marketing' trial of two campaigns was undertaken. Sites in the Central City (Colombo Street) and suburbs (Buckleys Road) were identified for a simple, but measurable, trial utilising signs on the sides of rubbish bins communicating the campaign message.
18. The two campaigns chosen for trial were:
  - 'Don't Waste Christchurch'
  - 'Don't be a Tosser'
19. Our secondary research suggested the importance of positive reinforcement for changing behaviour, therefore both campaigns were combined with 'Do the right thing', another proven reinforcement message from Australia.
20. Trials of both campaigns in both locations followed a control period measure. Litter counts were taken of litter on the ground and measures were taken of the volume of rubbish placed in bins carrying the campaign messages.
21. At both locations the 'Don't be a Tosser – do the right thing' message made a significant impact.

### Results of Campaign Trials

#### *'Don't be a Tosser'*

22. The first trial site was Buckleys Road, a notorious litter hotspot, adjacent to Eastgate Mall. There are numerous bus stops in the trial area, which are heavily used by school children of all ages. The bus stops are used as a bus exchange so there are many people passing through the area. Major retailers in this area are McDonalds, Subway, KB's Bakery and various others in the mall food court. The site was measured Monday to Friday at 9am and 5pm. At weekends the site was measured at 5pm. There were seven rubbish bins in this trial area.

## 7 Cont'd

### Observations:

- During the control period, littered items were predominantly non-traditional fast food items such as confectionery wrappers, chip packets and plastic bags.
- McDonalds packaging accounted for almost a quarter of all littered items

### After the 'Don't be a Tosser' trial was implemented:

- Non fast food litter decreased by 36.5%
- Fast food litter decreased by 30.8%
- The total decrease of litter was 33.7%
- On average bin usage increased by 13.7% (volume)
- On weekends 4 out of 7 bins were full and/or overflowing by 5pm
- During the weekdays at 5pm, 6 of the 7 bins were 80% full, compared with only 2 out of the 7 bins during the control period.

23. The second site was Colombo Street between Hereford Street and Cashel Mall. This area has very high foot traffic and major retailers in the trial area are McDonalds, Burger King and KFC. The site was measured every day at 4pm. Currently cleaners operate in the area all day, but for the purposes of the trial they left the area clean at 12pm (including emptying all bins) and did not re-enter the site until after 4pm when the litter count had concluded. There were six rubbish bins this trial area.

### Observations:

### After the Don't be a Tosser' trial was implemented:

- Non fast food litter decreased by 47%
- Fast food litter decreased by 55.7%
- The total decrease in litter was 53%
- On average bin usage increased by 12%

### *'Don't Waste Christchurch'*

24. Litter counts from this trial period are being analysed. It is clear that this campaign has also made a significant impact but not to the same degree as the 'Don't be a Tosser' campaign.

### **Promotion and Education to Reduce Litter**

25. It is recommended that "Don't be a tosser – do the right thing' is used in targeted promotional campaigns in areas identified as litter 'hot spots'. Particularly it should be used in areas where the 'littering' population is observed to be of a younger age. The campaign message was originally developed to appeal to males and females age 15-24, using vocabulary which they are familiar with.
26. The Litter Project Steering Team would determine hot spots after considering litter count information and community feedback. Locations for litter counts have not yet been determined in detail, but it would be envisaged that problem areas are identified so that the litter count can provide evidence for action, even to the extent of identifying offenders.
27. The trial campaigns focussed on areas with litter bins. However, if an area is identified where the concern is littering of streets or kerbsides (and not related directly to litter around litter bins) then such an area could be designated a hot spot for a targeted campaign.
28. It is recommended that promotional material for this campaign extend beyond that used in the trial campaign. Depending on the location of targeted campaigns, tools for promotion will include posters on bins, bus shelter advertising, bus back advertising material and posters for display in retail outlets.

## 7 Cont'd

29. Education campaigns will continue to target school age children, so that an awareness and understanding of littering as an environmental issue begins at an early age in Christchurch. The Christchurch City Council currently produces quality educational resources on litter for schools. An on-line environmental resource guide, litter abatement resource (secondary schools, fitting with English curriculum) and KCB Tidiness resource (Years 1-3) are used in schools.
30. Schools participation in Clean up the World is promoted and encouraged and the Learning Through Action environmental education team also includes waste and litter reduction education in its connection with schools.
31. It is recommend, that in addition to the work currently happening in this area, that materials link to the 'Don't be a Tosser' campaign to increase clarity of the overall anti-litter message.

### **Providing Infrastructure for Cigarette Butt Disposal**

32. Recent legislative change has forced smokers out onto pavements and exacerbated the issue of cigarette butts litter. Secondary research indicates there is a perception that dropping cigarette butts into rubbish bins can set the bin on fire, so many smokers do not take this option. Rubbish bins with separate receptacles for cigarette butts are available and it is recommended that these are installed in the central city and other areas in conjunction with a 'Clean City' campaign to encourage retail outlets to take a role in reducing litter (200 bins to be installed in Stage 1).
33. The Transport and City Streets Unit is currently in discussions to obtain sponsored bins with a cigarette butt receptacle.
34. It is recommended that at the time of distribution of sponsored bins to businesses within a Clean City promotion, a PR campaign is undertaken to highlight this issue. The campaign would assign two Council staff to collect only cigarette butts from pavements, gutters and gardens for two days. This collection then provides a visual 'front page' opportunity for graphically displaying the extent of this problem. The collection would be displayed in Cathedral Square to further promote the cigarette butt litter problem.

### **Hot Spots Cleaning**

35. Hot spots cleaning will support targeted 'Don't be a Tosser' campaigns. Research proves that a clean 'street scape' reduces the inclination to drop litter. Therefore in areas where we are communicating the campaign message we will support it by increased service levels to ensure the area is cleaned at the start of the campaign and to ensure full bins are cleared during the campaign.
36. Hot spots cleaning will be additional to service levels for cleaning. Transport and City Streets Unit have existing contracts which stipulate minimum performance standards for frequency of cleaning and for cleaning up of glass, litter on the pavement, litter in planted areas, slot drains and minor stains including animal, human and bird fowling, (including vomit, urine and faecal matter), drink and food.

### **Partnership with Keep Christchurch Beautiful (KCB)**

37. KCB has a long history of community-based activity in litter reduction and city beautification. Among the programmes independently delivered by KCB are:
  - Litter Awards
  - Schools Environmental Enhancement Programme (SEEP)
  - Enviro Action (schools project)
  - Litter counts

**7 Cont'd**

38. Over the past two years the Council has reviewed the relationship between KCB and the Christchurch City Council.
- Previously the Council employed a coordinator for KCB; from the start of the 2004/05 year the Council has no longer provided a coordinator.
  - Funding has been moved to the Major Grants funding stream, in line with arrangements for other community organisations.
  - The Council resolved that a Memorandum of Understanding should be developed to outline future work and to provide a basis for future funding decisions.
  - Currently KCB retains access to project funding through the Major Grants and other community funding streams.
39. In 2004 further discussions were held between KCB and staff to clarify the future relationship, and to explore opportunities for KCB involvement in the litter strategy.
40. The Council has confirmed that it recognises the significant community-based role of KCB in litter reduction, and wishes to work in partnership with KCB in achieving the goals of the litter strategy. It has been agreed that:
- The Council and KCB will work to conclude a Memorandum of Understanding or similar relationship agreement.
  - KCB will develop a work programme to detail the initiatives it proposes to deliver, to support KCB funding applications through appropriate community funding streams. (Council staff are already assisting KCB with this.)
  - The Council will discuss with KCB the possibility of KCB carrying out a revised litter count programme, which is linked to the litter strategy, and subject to specific work programme and performance targets.
  - Other opportunities for KCB to deliver specific campaigns or projects in support of the goals of the litter strategy will be discussed on a case by case basis.

**Working with Other Community Organisations**

41. Council staff will continue to work with other organisations as is appropriate, to meet the priorities and achieve the objectives of the Litter Strategy.
42. Current or past work with groups includes support of such initiatives as a community pride week addressing litter and associated issues in Phillipstown; support of a Korean Society Beach Clean Up; and support for groups and organisations that have taken part in the Clean up the World Project. Sixty-five of the 128 groups and individuals that were involved in Clean up the World in 2004 were community, service or recreational groups. As a commitment to future outcomes of the Litter Strategy the Hagley/Ferrymead Community board adopted a recommendation, by cross unit staff based in Hagley/Ferrymead, to allocate funds from 2005/06 Project Funding toward litter related projects tagged for Environmental Events under the Community Events and Special Days Fund.
43. Community services staff, both on a local and metropolitan level, will continue to work with non-government organisations (NGO's) and groups within the voluntary sector as is appropriate when working to build the capacity of groups and organisations under the priorities of the Community Services Team work plans.
44. Community Groups actioning litter pick-ups in public areas can access free rubbish bags or coupons for trailer dumping at Transfer Stations.

**Integrating 'Clean Up the World' Promotion into the Litter Strategy**

45. The Clean up the World campaign provides an annual opportunity to highlight community involvement in reducing litter. In 2004 approximately 130 groups and individuals were involved. It is proposed that we work with KCB on this to utilise its community ties which have a significant role in involving the community to a wider extent.



**7 Cont'd**

46. Any promotional material produced for Clean up the World should link back to the litter strategy and particularly the Clean City Partners programme can be a vehicle for engaging more businesses in Clean up the World.

**Gaining the Support of Businesses that Generate Packaging which is Prevalent in Christchurch Litter**

47. It is recommended that a positive approach be taken to encouraging businesses to take responsibility for their litter. A Clean City Partners programme (based on Sydney's Clean Harbour Partners programme) is proposed which supports city businesses and their staff to prevent litter.
48. The programme will encourage increased awareness and improved management practices to preserve our city in partnership with city businesses. All Clean City Partners will be asked to undertake voluntary actions and pre cautions to prevent litter from their business, staff or premises entering the 'city scape'.
49. Business activities will include:
- Maintaining cigarette butt receptacles outside their premises
  - Distributing educational material to staff to increase understanding of the environmental impacts of inappropriately disposing of cigarette butts and litter
  - Encouraging customers and staff to be aware of their litter responsibilities
  - Keeping the workplace and customer area tidy
  - Displaying 'Don't be a Tosser' promotional material within premises.
50. The Council will:
- Provide a sponsored cigarette butt receptacle for use outside business premises (where appropriate)
  - Provide Clean City brooms and shovel sets for pavement clean-ups outside premises (where appropriate)
  - Provide a range of educational resources and checklists to assist partners to 'litter' educate and increase awareness of litter responsibilities to staff
  - Provide 'Don't be a Tosser' promotional material for display in customer areas
  - Provide a certificate that acknowledges their commitment to the programme
  - Publicly recognise partners for their participation and publicise their success in City Scene and on the Council's website
  - Instigate a 'Clean City partner' award, from the Mayor, on a monthly basis.

**Enforcement**

51. Secondary research of international litter campaigns suggests that enforcement is not effective as the lead tactic in reducing litter. On this basis it is proposed that enforcement is used as a support tool within the 'Don't be a Tosser' campaign.
52. Currently, Parking Officers, Park Rangers and Council Enforcement Officers are warranted as Litter Control Officers. All members of the Police are deemed to be Litter Control Officers by virtue of their office.
53. The enforcement options available under the Litter Act 1979 when a Litter Control Officer sees a person depositing litter in any public place are:
- Require the person to remove the litter and put it in a litter bin.
  - Require the person to provide their name and address and initiate legal proceedings to prosecute as an offence against the Act (fine not exceeding \$500).
  - Require the person to provide their name and address and issue an infringement notice (instant fine) for \$100.

**7 Cont'd**

54. In practice, it is often very difficult to obtain a person's name and address with people either refusing to provide it or giving false details. This is an offence against the Act, but is very difficult for a Council Officer to take further action without Police assistance. Uniformed Council officers have a greater chance of success than non-uniformed officers, but the presence and co-operation of the Police is essential for any enforcement action.
55. It is proposed that enforcement is used as part of tactical hot spot campaigns. To do this it is suggested that consideration could be given to appointing officers from a security firm as Litter Control Officers. These officers would wear clothing that clearly identifies them as a Litter Control Officer. The presence of identifiable officers would be used tactically in 'hot spot' areas at targeted times – for example, Cashel Mall, Friday nights.
56. Additionally, to increase awareness of fines and enforcement, PR activity could support this through publicly exposing litter of offenders.
57. Enforcement is recommended as a course of action in support of the Clean City campaign if positive engagement with individual retailers/ businesses is not effective.
58. Under Section 9(2) of the Litter Act (1979) the Council may require the occupier of such premises to take all reasonable steps to prevent litter generated on or attributable to those premises from being carried or escaping on to streets or other public places. Such reasonable steps could include requiring those occupiers to provide, maintain and empty an adequate number of litter receptacles upon those premises for the deposit of such litter. They could also include requiring the occupiers to erect signs upon those premises requesting patrons not to discard litter upon public places outside the premises.
59. Under Section 9(3) the Council may require the occupier of such premises to provide and maintain, at the occupier's own cost, litter receptacles in any street or public place in the vicinity of those premises for the deposit of litter as may be reasonably necessary to ensure that the street or public place is kept free of litter emanating from those premises.
60. Whether or not the Council could require the operator of any such premises to empty any litter receptacles it has required the operator to erect and maintain in a public place under Section 9(3) is a difficult question. Section 9(5) provides that every public authority shall make appropriate provision for the emptying of the contents of litter receptacles situated within public places under its control or in its district. This necessarily includes any litter receptacle that the public authority has required any person to provide and maintain under Section 9(3). In my view Section 9(5) places the responsibility for emptying such litter receptacles upon the public authority, not the person that the public authority required to provide that litter receptacle. However, a case could be made out that the Council, as a public authority, could make a bylaw under Section 12 of the Act requiring such persons to empty and dispose of litter which is deposited in any litter receptacle they have been required to provide under Section 9(3). Section 12 provides

*"12 Public authorities may make bylaws*

*Every public authority, whether alone or acting jointly for the purposes of this Act with another public authority or public authorities, may from time to time make such bylaws as it thinks fit to give effect to the provisions of this Act.*

*Status Compendium."*

61. It could be argued that such a bylaw requirement is giving effect to the provisions of the Act.
62. It is recommended that Council staff prepare such a bylaw, to be presented to the Council if sufficient progress is not made through implementation of the Clean City Partners programme.

**Litter from Rubbish/Recycling Collection**

63. A three-pronged approach - education; action against unofficial bags; and measurement – is currently in place to manage the reduction of litter from rubbish/ recycling collections.

## 7 Cont'd

64. Education on efficient presentation (packing) of recycling/rubbish bags is the key to keeping material within crates/bags thereby reducing the amount of litter that escapes. Recycling information is currently communicated through television advertising, schools recycling programmes and information flyers. Information flyers on rubbish bags, bag attack, recycling presentation and recycling items have been produced in 11 languages and are used to communicate to those who do not present their rubbish/recycling properly.
65. Unofficial bags (non CCC) are stickered and left for residents to take ownership. A process is in place so that if bags are not moved after two days they will be collected. Collectors make a note of houses which have unofficial bags outside them and letters are sent to repeat offenders stating rules and procedures and inclusion of a rubbish bag flyer. Continual offending, once bags are checked for identification evidence, results in a \$100 fine being issued.
66. Monitoring - problem areas are regularly monitored and we knock on doors, talk to residents, leave information and utilise community groups in order to make the public aware and change behaviour. Collectors are audited for performance by a Council 'auditor' who monitors a collector's performance at a rate of 2,500 houses per month. Litter is assessed using a formula of the amount of litter per 100 houses to provide a traceable measurement over time. Current spillage is at an average 3.9% (3.9 pieces of litter per 100 houses) - it must be noted that this cannot all be attributed to the collector – it could be wind blown, overflowing recycling crates, bad presentation of recycling and general public littering.
67. Phone complaints are also monitored. On average 15 complaints a month in regard to spillage, which equates to 0.002 % (there are over 1 million individual collections per month).

### Measurement

68. The review of litter management projects in New Zealand and internationally, revealed that very few included any detailed measure or evaluation of the success of campaigns. The Council's strategy needs to be supported by research and analysis of measurable impacts of the campaign, so that resources are effectively targeted not only at increasing awareness but also changing long-term behaviour.
69. Ongoing measurement of attitudes to a 'clean' city and litter in the city will be included in the Annual Residents' Survey and central city research. This allows litter specific research to focus on measurement.
70. As part of our secondary research we have evaluated the templates used in other cities. From this information a new template for 'litter counts' has been developed. This has been used in the assessment of the trial campaigns and it is our expectation that KCB will adopt this template in the future so that we have a common base for litter count information.
71. Measuring of litter from rubbish/recycling collections is under way.

### Acknowledgement

72. The secondary research, assessment of options for a social marketing trial and the development, implementation and reporting on that trial have been done by Willie Laphorn. Willie worked in the Council's Marketing Unit as an intern from the University of Canterbury and his work has made a significant contribution to progressing our litter strategy.

### OPTIONS

73. (a) Adopt the 'Don't be a Tosser' tactical campaign and associated actions outlined in this document to be implemented in 2005/06.  
(b) Reject the action plan outlined in this document and continue with current education service and community group activities.

### PREFERRED OPTION

74. Adopt the 'Don't be a Tosser' tactical campaign and associated actions outlined in this document to be implemented in 2005/06.

## 7 Cont'd

## ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

## The Preferred Option

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	An improved environment for social interaction for residents and visitors	No impact on current budget. Assessment for future budget after 2005/06 year.
<b>Cultural</b>	n/a	As above
<b>Environmental</b>	Improved city environment	As above
<b>Economic</b>	Potential contribution to increased economic impact from visitor spend if Christchurch has a reputation of a clean city	As above
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b> Primary alignment with community outcome a city with a sustainable natural environment where our people enjoy and value our natural environment and take responsibility for protecting and restoring it.</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p><b>Effects on Maori: N/a</b></p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b> Environmental Policy</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b> Annual residents' surveys and central city surveys suggest that residents of Christchurch take pride in their city environment and would support efforts to reduce litter.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		

## Maintain The Status Quo (If Not Preferred Option)

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	No change to environment for interaction. Potential deterioration in the future if litter problem increases.	No impact
<b>Cultural</b>	n/a	As above
<b>Environmental</b>	No improvement to city environment	As above
<b>Economic</b>	Potential cost through the missed opportunity to improve the reputation of Christchurch as a clean city.	As above
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b> No improvement in primary community outcome of a sustainable and natural environment</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b> Annual residents' surveys and central city surveys suggest that residents of Christchurch take pride in their city environment and expect the Council to lead the city in improving the natural environment. This option would not demonstrate that leadership.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		

**8. CITY PLAN DEVELOPMENT RULES IN LIVING 1A ZONE**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Environmental Services Manager
<b>Author:</b>	David Mountfort, DDI 941-8669

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Council of the outcome of Environment Court proceedings and to recommend that a City Plan variation be prepared to overcome difficulties identified by the Court.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Living 1A zone in the City Plan zone prohibits the building of houses on lots of less than 1500m<sup>2</sup> where those lots are adjacent to rural zones. Similar rules in the subdivision chapter prevent the creation of such allotments. Suburban Estates Ltd (SEL) opposed the subdivision rules but omitted to oppose the Living zone rules, which are now deemed to be operative. There have been complications in the original hearing of the submission and with the subsequent Environment Court reference. The City Plan References Subcommittee has supported the position of SEL that both Living 1A and subdivision rules should be amended. An attempt to get the Environment Court to extend the scope of the reference to include the L1A zone using s293 of the Resource Management Act was unsuccessful. SEL has requested the City Council to prepare a variation to the City Plan to change the status of the Living 1A lot size rule to non-complying, to enable resource consents to be applied for. The City Plan References Subcommittee has considered the matter on 20 June 2005 and resolved to support this request.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

3. SEL has offered to fund the preparation of a variation (refer attached letter). Consequently the financial costs to the Council will be minor, consisting only of limited staff time to review SEL's work and process the notification and hearing of the variation. Introducing a variation could be the best way to resolve legal proceedings that are becoming very complex and protracted. The variation would affect only one specific rule so the Council could continue to make the balance of the City Plan operative in part.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Council agree to consider and if appropriate publicly notify a variation to the City Plan prepared at the expense of SEL to change the prohibited activity status of certain subdivisions in the Living 1A zone from prohibited to non-complying.

## 8 Cont'd

**BACKGROUND ON CITY PLAN DEVELOPMENT RULES IN LIVING 1A ZONE**

4. When the City Plan was prepared in 1995 it contained several zones designed to provide a transition between Living, Rural zones, the Airport and the Port Hills. Subdivision and building of new homes were prohibited in these zones where the allotments exceeded certain rules, notably minimum lot sizes. These rules were contained in both the Living zones, which regulated building of houses and the subdivision rules, which regulate subdivision of allotments. Suburban Estates Ltd intended to oppose these provisions but lodged a submission only in respect of the subdivision rules. This submission is yet to be finally resolved. The Living zone rules have passed beyond the point of challenge and are deemed to be operative by the Resource Management Act.
5. The policy underpinning this approach is Policy 6.3.12, as follows:
 

*6.3.12 To reinforce the consolidation of the urban area by:*

  - (a) *improving the landscape quality of the rural-urban interface;*
  - (b) *establishing a transition of low density housing, open space or esplanade reserves, adjacent to the urban boundary, particularly where no clear physical boundary to urban growth exists; and*
  - (c) *encouraging the planting of suitably located trees on the urban-rural interface, to create a high standard of amenity, and to better define and improve the quality of the urban edge of the city.*
6. The only zone remaining in contention is the Living 1A zone. In the L1A zone subdivision and building of new homes are both prohibited activities where the lots concerned would be less than 1500m<sup>2</sup>. The rule currently provides:
  - (b) *Notwithstanding (a) above, a residential activity shall be a prohibited activity for which no resource consent shall be granted in the following circumstances:*
    - (i) *in the Living 1A Zone:*
      - (a).....
      - (b) *on all other sites in the Living 1A Zone where the site adjoins the Rural 2, Rural 3, Rural 5 or Cultural 3 (McKenzie School) Zones, or the site is opposite and separated from these zones by having frontage to a road or waterway, and where the net area of any site for a residential unit is less than 1500m<sup>2</sup>.*
7. The effect is that even if the company succeeds in its submissions against the subdivision rules, it could gain no benefit as it would be able to subdivide lots of less than 1500m<sup>2</sup> on the rural edge but the resulting allotments could not be built on. It would not be possible to apply for resource consents.
8. To complicate the issue the company's submissions were not fully dealt with by the Council. Although there was a hearing and decision and a reference to the Environment Court, it has been discovered since the Court hearing that the only part of the original submission dealt with by the Council was the Living 1C zone. The Environment Court reference in respect of the other zones is therefore invalid. The Council can and should hear and decide the remainder of the submission but this would address only the subdivision rules not the living zone rules. Prior to the discovery about the lack of a Council decision, the City Plan References Subcommittee had resolved to settle the reference in respect of the subdivision rules by consent, by changing the prohibited activity to non-complying. It also resolved to join with the applicant in applying to the Environment Court to use its powers under s293 to extend the scope of the matter to include the Living zone rules. However, due to developing case law on s293 the Court was unable to exercise that power and has declined to do so.
9. The case is now hopelessly mired in the Environment Court and there is no clear way forward. SEL has indicated that it may seek leave to lodge a late appeal in the High Court or reopen the case in the Environment Court. The Council could apply to have the case struck out on several technical grounds. If that succeeded it would get the case disposed of but certainly not solve the problem with the City Plan.

**8 Cont'd**

10. SEL has recently requested the Council to urgently prepare a variation to the City Plan to address the issue, so that it can incorporate this into a subdivision it wishes to apply for land at Templeton. However such a variation would fail to qualify for high priority under the Council's recently adopted priorities for City Plan workload. This was explained to SEL, who have therefore offered to fund the preparation of the variation.
11. The City Plan References Subcommittee has considered the matter on 20 June 2005 and resolved to support this request.
12. The Environment Court has commented in previous cases that it does not see the current L1A zoning as an effective technique for achieving a good urban-rural transition. Although it would create a row of larger lots at the boundary, these are often fenced with 2 metre paling fences, so the more open landscape being sought is completely lost. Retaining Policy 6.3.12 but allowing for resource consent applications would allow developers to come up with alternative ways of achieving a better transition, such as tree planting or more open fencing styles, so may better meet the policy than the present rules.
13. The matter affects only a small part of the Living zone rules and there are only a few undeveloped L1A sites affected by the rule, including the SEL site at Templeton. Therefore there would be minimal impact on making the City Plan operative in part. The relevant rules will simply not be made operative.

**OPTIONS**

14. The options are as follows:
  - (a) Deal only with the outstanding submission on the subdivision rules. This is a statutory obligation and must be carried out. This would not resolve SEL's difficulties.
  - (b) As for (a) and also vary the City Plan to change the prohibited activity status of certain subdivisions in the L1A zone to non-complying.
  - (c) As for (a) but change the City Plan after the Plan is made operative.
  - (d) As for (a) but allow SEL to make a privately requested plan change after the City Plan becomes operative.

**PREFERRED OPTION**

15. There is no "do nothing" option. Option (a) is the minimum that can be done but does not improve the plan in a way that seems desirable or resolve SEL's issues. The preferred option is (b). This is because it is desirable to resolve this issue promptly and at the same time as the existing submissions and Environment Court references are dealt with. If this is not done then dealing with the existing submissions and references would be difficult. SEL has indicated it may seek leave to take the matter to the High Court. Option (a) by itself would not resolve SEL's issues or implement the City Plan References Subcommittee's previous resolutions. Options (c) and (d) would resolve the issues and improve the plan, eventually. They are uncertain as to timing. The matter would not qualify for priority as a Council-prepared plan change in the foreseeable future. It is not known when the plan actually will become operative and SEL does not know whether the Council would allow a privately-requested plan change to be brought within the first two years anyway. The Council has yet to adopt an approach to private plan changes and the two-year rule.
16. In conclusion, this variation is being proposed to remedy a situation which has developed a long and complicated history through the City Plan process to date. Were it a new matter arising it would not be recommended at this time. It will have only a minor impact on the Council's finances and will not delay making the bulk of the City Plan operative.

## 8 Cont'd

## ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

## The Preferred Option

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
<b>Social</b>		
<b>Cultural</b>		
<b>Environmental</b>	Improve the opportunity for transitional landscapes to be developed between residential and rural areas.	
<b>Economic</b>	Enables greater use of residential land	Minor costs to the Council for reviewing and processing a variation.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b>            Primary alignment with community outcome "A Liveable City"            Also contributes to "A Prosperity City"</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b>            None known</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b>            No known inconsistency</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b>            Likely to be favoured by property developers. Variation process will discover views of neighbours and community groups.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		

## Maintain The Status Quo (If Not Preferred Option)

This would mean completing only the existing unheard submission on the subdivisional rules

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
<b>Social</b>		
<b>Cultural</b>		
<b>Environmental</b>		Maintains an existing anomaly in the plan
<b>Economic</b>		Likely to increase legal costs and complexities with completing City Plan.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b>            Poor alignment with liveable city and prosperous city outcomes</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b>            None known</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b>            No inconsistency known</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b>            Would not be favoured by developers. This process would not discover attitude of residents, neighbours, and community groups.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		



## 8 Cont'd

## Option 3 Change to City Plan after it is made operative (Private or Council-initiated)

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
<b>Social</b>		
<b>Cultural</b>		
<b>Environmental</b>		
<b>Economic</b>		
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b>            Primary alignment with community outcome Liveable City            Also contributes to a Prosperous City</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b>            None known</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b>            No inconsistency known</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b>            Not likely to be favoured by property developers because of delays. Variation process will discover views of neighbours and community groups.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		

## 9. EXTENSIONS TO GENERAL CARRIAGEWAY MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport & City Streets Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Peter McDonald, Pavement Maintenance Team Leader, DDI 941-8668

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to extend three carriageway maintenance contracts by varying lengths to tie in with the start time for new area wide network management contracts.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The city is currently split into three contract areas for general carriageway maintenance. There are also other contracts for specific types of work such as footpath maintenance and signs and markings maintenance. New contracts are being developed that will include all maintenance work within the road boundary. Only specialist work such as street lighting and traffic signals will be excluded. These new contracts will have a network management focus and will provide a more responsive service delivery and clearer responsibilities. The central city will be split out as a separate area. Street cleaning will be included in these new contracts.
3. Two of the new area contracts plus the new central city contract will be tendered this month with start dates of 1 October and 1 December. The third area will be tendered in 18 months time with a start on 1 July 2007. The three existing contracts require extensions to tie in with these new contract start dates.
4. The current carriageway maintenance contracts were all awarded on a three year term with provision for two 1 year extensions based on contractors' performance, up to five years. The three contracts were let 3, 4 and 5 years ago. One contract will have to be extended beyond five years by three months because it is not possible to have the new contract let and ready to start in time. The five year term is a Land Transport NZ requirement and they have advised that an extension up to three months is allowed in this case.
5. In all cases the contractor has performed well and has met the key performance indicators set out in the contract. In each case the contractor has agreed to the extension of the contract using the existing rates.
6. The existing cleaning contract finishes on 31 July and options are being considered for how the cleaning work will be done to tie in with the new contract start dates.
7. Contract and extension details:

Contract Name	Contractor	Start Date	Extension	Contract Value	Value of Extension
CN 1999/2000-284 General Carriageway Maintenance Area 1	Works Infrastructure	1/7/00	3 months – to 30 Sept 2005	\$1,034,908.00	\$220,000
CN 2001//02 – 192 General Carriageway Maintenance Area 2	Works Infrastructure	1/7/02	1 year – to 30 June 2006	\$4,148,629.87	\$2,150,000
CN 2000/01 – 240 General Carriageway Maintenance Area 3	Fulton Hogan	1/7/01	5 months – to 30 Nov 2005	\$2,652,894.00	\$1,330,000

### FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. The work covered by these contracts is funded from the Transport and City Streets Maintenance and Carriageway Sealing and Surfacing Budget with financial assistance from Land Transport NZ. These extensions meet Land Transport New Zealand requirements.

**9 Cont'd****STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Agree to extend CN 1999/2000-284 General Carriageway Maintenance Area 1 by three months to 30 September 2005.
- (b) Agree to extend CN 2001/02-192 General Carriageway Maintenance Area 2 by one year to 30 June 2006.
- (c) Agree to extend CN 2000/01-240 General Carriageway Maintenance Area 3 by five months to 30 November 2005.

**10. APPOINTMENT OF PRINCIPAL RURAL FIRE OFFICER**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Acting Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Keith Marshall, Principal Rural Fire Officer – DDI 941 8781

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the appointment of a Principal Rural Fire Officer for a three year term.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Forest and Rural Fires Act 1977 provides that where a Council has appointed one or more persons as a Rural Fire Officer, the Council must appoint a Principal Rural Fire Officer. The Council has 12 persons holding Rural Fire Officers warrants.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

3. As well as the Forest and Rural Fires Act 1977 (being the principal Act relating to this appointment) there are additional provisions in the following legislation and bylaws relating to this appointment, and to forest and rural fires:
  - (a) Local Government Act 2002
  - (b) Fire Service Act 1975
  - (c) Forest and Rural Fires Regulations 1979
  - (d) Christchurch City Fires Bylaw 1991

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Agree to the appointment of an "in-house" Principal Rural Fire Officer reporting directly to the Greenspace Manager.
- (b) Appoint Mr Keith Marshall as Principal Rural Fire Officer for a further term of three (3) years under Section 13(1) of the Forest and Rural Fires Act 1977, commencing on 1 July 2005.

**BACKGROUND**

4. The Council appointed Mr Keith Marshall as Principal Rural Fire Officer on 1 July 2002 for a term of three (3) years. The Council is legally required to appoint a Principal Rural Fire Officer.

**OPTIONS**

5. The Greenspace Unit recommends that Mr Keith Marshall be re-appointed for a further term of three (3) years commencing on 1 July 2005. Mr Marshall has more than 30 years experience as a Rural Fire Officer including 13 years with the Council. He was Deputy Principal Rural Fire Officer prior to July 2002.

**10 Cont'd****PREFERRED OPTION**

6. The preferred option is that the Council, under Section 13(1) of the Forest and Rural Fires Act 1977, appoint Keith Marshall as Principal Rural Fire Officer for a further term of three (3) years commencing on 1 July 2005.
7. The chosen option is to continue to have an in-house Principal Rural Fire Officer, reporting directly to the Greenspace Manager.

**11. 2005 LOCAL GOVERNMENT NEW ZEALAND CONFERENCE**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Secretariat Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Max Robertson, DDI 941-8533

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the appointment of a replacement alternate voting delegate at the 2005 Local Government New Zealand Conference.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Christchurch City Council is entitled to appoint three conference voting delegates, with any additional members attending as observers.
3. At its meeting on 19 May 2005 the Council appointed the Mayor and Councillors Carole Evans and Bob Shearing as the Council's three voting delegates at the conference. The Council also appointed Councillor Barry Corbett as an alternate voting delegate.
4. As Councillor Corbett has since advised that he is unable to attend the conference, it is necessary to appoint a replacement alternate voting delegate.
5. The following elected members have registered for the conference:

The Mayor  
 Councillor Carole Evans (Deputy Mayor)  
 Councillor Sally Buck  
 Councillor Helen Broughton  
 Councillor Anna Crighton  
 Councillor Bob Shearing  
 Councillor Sue Wells  
 Mrs Yvonne Palmer (Chairman, Shirley/Papanui Community Board)

6. It will therefore be necessary for one of the following Councillors to be appointed as the replacement alternate voting delegate:

Councillor Sally Buck  
 Councillor Helen Broughton  
 Councillor Anna Crighton  
 Councillor Sue Wells

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that one of the four Councillors listed above be appointed as this Council's alternate voting delegate, to replace Councillor Barry Corbett.

**12. REPORT OF MISUSE OF MOTOR VEHICLES SUBCOMMITTEE**

Attached.

**13. REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING OF 15 JUNE 2005**

Attached.

**14. STAFF ORGANISATION VALUES LAUNCH**

Staff will give a presentation on this topic.

**15. NOTICES OF MOTION**

**16. QUESTIONS**

**17. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

Attached.