



# **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**

**THURSDAY 9 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.

<b>PAGE NO</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
1	<b>APOLOGIES</b>
3	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 2.6.2005</b>
-	<b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>
-	<b>PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS</b>
-	<b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>
5	<b>AWAROA/GODLEY HEAD COASTAL PARK DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT</b>
83	<b>SUBURBAN SWIMMING POOLS REVIEW</b>
111	<b>STRATEGIC TRANSPORT ISSUES</b>
115	<b>WASTEWATER OUTFALL EASEMENTS – APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONERS</b>
119	<b>REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD</b>
-	<b>NOTICES OF MOTION</b>
-	<b>QUESTIONS</b>
121	<b>RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC</b>

- 1. APOLOGIES**
  
- 2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 2.6.2005**  
Attached.
  
- 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
  
- 4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**
  
- 5. CORRESPONDENCE**

## 6. AWAROA/GODLEY HEAD COASTAL PARK DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Derek Roozen, DDI 941-8798

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
  - (a) Provide the Council with:
    - (i) An analysis of public submissions received on the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept;
    - (ii) The minutes of the combined Christchurch City Council/Department of Conservation hearing of submitters;
    - (iii) Conclusions and recommendations of the Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park Development Concept Subcommittee that heard and considered the submissions;

and to

- (b) Seek the Council's support for further investigations to be undertaken on identified key concepts.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept document (text side (Attachment A) and map side (Attachment B)), which is the product of a partnership between the Christchurch City Council and the Department of Conservation to integrate the planning and management of the area, was publicised for public comment at the end of 2003. One hundred and twenty-two submissions were received.
3. Following a report to the Parks, Gardens and Waterways Committee on 29 July 2004, the Council resolved to set up a subcommittee to hear submitters. The membership of this subcommittee comprised two City Councillors and two representatives of the Department of Conservation. The hearing convened on 19 and 20 August 2004 and 20 submitters were heard.
4. The minutes from this hearing are included in the submission analysis report but are also separately attached (Attachment C). Part A (53 pages) of the report, which includes the hearing minutes, is provided to Councillors as a separate document. The full report (183 pages) is tabled. An executive summary of the report is attached (Attachment D).
5. The Department of Conservation indicates the level of its support for, and involvement in, the proposed Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept, and how it sees it may contribute to the investigation and/or implementation of any of the key concepts, in a separate document (Attachment E).

### FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. Costs, budgets and funding sources were not specified in the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept document because the proposals in the draft document are conceptual at this stage. It is intended to obtain the Council's, and the Department of Conservation's, support for detailed investigation of the key concepts, including the options, with a full cost/benefit assessment done for each option. Through this, accurate financial information can then be provided.
7. Table 1 gives a speculative view of the possible order of expenditure likely to be required to achieve implementation of each of the proposed key concepts.
8. Table 2 gives an indication of the possible investigation requirements for each of the proposed key concepts, including the personnel needed to do the work, costs and timeframes.

## 6 Cont'd

9. Table 3 specifies the separate research components of the investigation work proposed to be provided by external consultants.
10. Table 4 gives a breakdown of the indicated/estimated staff time to be utilised for each key concept.
11. Table 5 provides a summary of the identified resourcing for the proposed investigation work.
12. There is no statutory obligation on either the Council or the Department of Conservation to prepare a development concept document for the Awaroa/Godley Head peninsula area, nor is there any statutory or legal obligation on either party to consider or implement any of the concepts that have been proposed. The Council's development and management of the land in the area that is under its administration is guided by the Community Outcomes of the Long Term Council Community Plan and implemented through the operational and capital expenditure programmes of the Greenspace Unit.
13. No decision is being sought from the Council, at this stage, on the implementation of any of the identified key concepts, including the proposed penguin project. Instead, a request for support for further investigation is being made. Following any investigation that is supported by the Council, it is anticipated that recommendations will be made in a subsequent report towards the end of 2005 or early in 2006. Neither this report makes, nor the later report, will make any conclusions or recommendations on any matter concerning the baches at Taylors Mistake and Boulder Bay. The bach issue is being dealt with through an independent and separate process within the Council. It is expected that any recommendations for implementation of any aspect of the proposed penguin project at Boulder Bay that arise from the key concept investigations will be presented to the Council following the Council's receipt of a separate report on the baches' future.
14. **Table 1: Possible Costs of Implementing Key Concepts:**

Key Concept	Possible Maximum Order of Cost of Implementation <sup>1</sup>	Staging	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Revenue to Offset Cost
Historical assets' preservation/ interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely met by existing programmes, particularly the Department of Conservation's, for the Godley Head area.</li> <li>• Following, and dependent upon, the evaluation of options for use of historic buildings at Godley Head, as part of the Historical Assets Preservation/Interpretation and Visitor Centre key concepts investigations (see Table 2), resources will be required to facilitate building tender contract(s).</li> <li>• A review of the currently operative interpretation strategy will also be facilitated in 2006/07 following the completion of the above investigations.</li> </ul>	Short to medium term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department of Conservation/Godley Head Heritage Trust to lead ongoing historic building management.</li> <li>• The Department has an existing (but intermittently Head Office allocated) funding stream for this work.</li> <li>• The Department will lead and fund the building tender contract(s) if it is to retain administration of the asset.</li> <li>• Proposed to be joint Department/ Christchurch City Council funding and resourcing of the interpretation strategy review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From public information/ visitor centre sales.</li> </ul>
Open sanctuary/ predator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost of this is largely the cost of the component parts, such as predator control</li> </ul>	Medium term for the open	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some from administering organisations, but</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant marketing potential for</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> These are rough guesstimates of the set-up cost only, based on consideration of broadly similar developments in other locations throughout New Zealand. Further detailed investigation will be required to give more accurate cost estimates.

Key Concept	Possible Maximum Order of Cost of Implementation <sup>1</sup>	Staging	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Revenue to Offset Cost
proof fence/ new plantings	<p>(including a possible fence (\$500,000 plus for a 2 to 3 km fence<sup>2</sup>), plantings, associated visitor and management facilities, and public access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing programmes of work would meet some cost. This would be the case with new plantings, which would largely come under existing land protection and restoration planting programmes.</li> <li>Actual cost would depend upon the level, and sites, of planting undertaken.</li> </ul>	sanctuary, over the long term for new planting, and 5 to 10 years hence for a fence, if the need for one is later proven.	<p>majority from external sources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the fence, at least half would come from external sources.</li> <li>New plantings would be led by the Council, with volunteer assistance.</li> </ul>	viable revenue streams to be achieved from tourism.
Visitor centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will be dependent on the nature of the facility and its location.</li> <li>Cost could range from relatively low (tens of \$1000s), if located in an existing historic building at Godley Head and run by the Godley Head Heritage Trust, to significant (\$ millions) with a new purpose-built building.<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>	Depending upon what is required – any time in the short to long term.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depending upon the nature of the facility, could range from being met through Department of Conservation/ volunteer contribution (for use of an existing building) to significant Council funding as well as from grants and sponsorship.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be main vehicle for revenue accrual for the proposed coastal park, through sales of info and services to visitors.</li> <li>Could have a commercial component, such as a café.</li> </ul>
Penguin breeding/ viewing project <sup>4</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a pre-existing and separate project proposal – may not need much new infrastructure development, so probable that the cost would not be significant.</li> <li>There will be some organisational input, met through existing work programmes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Department of Conservation – provision of suitable land for nesting habitat and auditing of ecological feasibility.</li> <li>The Christchurch City Council – on access issues.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Medium to long term.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intention is for a Charitable Trust to develop the project and manage it in the long term.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential to be a major tourist attraction and therefore to become a significant and self-funding economic entity.</li> </ul>
Park entrance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement of existing entrances, such as the Godley Head Road entrance at Evans Pass, already required.</li> </ul>	Short term.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council budgeted.</li> </ul>	-

<sup>2</sup> Budget in the draft Biodiversity Strategy indicates a proposed new 50% contribution of \$250,000 towards predator proof fencing at Godley Head. The Council has approved expenditure of \$300,000 towards the total cost of \$400,000 for a 3.35 km long predator proof fence at Styx Conservation Reserve. The Council also made a \$50,000 capital grant to the Riccarton Bush Trust in 2003/04 towards the establishment of a predator proof fence around Riccarton Bush (costing in excess of \$280,000 excluding GST for over 1 km of fence). Other relatively recent fences include those for the Tawharanui Regional Park/Open Sanctuary (a similar scenario to the proposed Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park) north of Auckland (2.5 km, \$639,000, with a third funded by Auckland Regional Council), and the Karori Wildlife Sanctuary in Wellington (8.6 km, \$2,040,000).

<sup>3</sup> As a comparison, Tawharanui Regional Park, previously a farm park (as is Godley Head), will be utilising existing farm buildings for visitor information and facilities. At the other end of the scale is the Karori Wildlife Sanctuary, which has budgeted \$15.4 million for a 'Gateway Project', including an iconic visitor centre, with café/restaurant, retail shop and function facilities, new visitor attractions and improved car parking and road access.

<sup>4</sup> Existing penguin projects elsewhere that are often referred to for comparative purposes are the Philip Island Penguin Parade in Victoria, Australia (quoted as the number one multi-million dollar tourist destination in Australia and self-funding), and the Penguin Parade near Oamaru (\$1.3 million new development, including a new visitor centre, being funded through entrance fees and grants).

Key Concept	Possible Maximum Order of Cost of Implementation <sup>1</sup>	Staging	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Revenue to Offset Cost
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May mostly involve provision of good signage and may be covered in existing budgets.</li> </ul>			
Park access and facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be a demand for enhanced facilities with increased numbers of visitors.</li> <li>• Likely, also, to be a requirement for upgrade of the Godley Head Road to accommodate increased amount of, and heavy vehicle, traffic.</li> <li>• Level of cost of a road upgrade would be dependent on the nature of redevelopment, which could range from judder bars, passing areas and crash barriers being installed (lower cost) to full road widening (high cost).</li> <li>• Another option is to close or limit the road to public access (no further cost).</li> <li>• Are existing initiatives for new tracks in the area but the proposed coastal park may give rise for the need for further and improved tracks.</li> </ul>	Would be required in early to medium term.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council budget for road upgrade. Improvements to facilities, including provision of new tracks, in the area are already being funded and programmed by both the Council and Department of Conservation.</li> <li>• Also, some volunteer assistance with new tracks is currently being given.</li> </ul>	-

15. **Table 2: Proposed Investigation Requirements:**

Key Concept	Investigation	Possible Timeframe	Estimated Resources Required	Contributions
Historical assets' preservation/ interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is existing work<sup>5</sup> on this key concept by DoC<sup>6</sup> and the GHHT<sup>7</sup>.</li> <li>• Cost of restoration and maintenance of all historic assets has been calculated by DoC and entered into the DoC Historic Asset Management database (HAMS).</li> <li>• Purpose of the investigation would be focussed on the future usage of three buildings (two ex-Army messes, one shearing shed). The Quartermaster's Store is occupied by the GHHT, who are interested in using it for a museum/visitor centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 month evaluation of options for building utilisation - to be part of the Visitor Centre investigation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a 6 month evaluation for both the Historical Assets and Visitor Centre key concepts (see the resource requirements specifically indicated for the Visitor Centre one), estimate \$10,000 for consultancy fees and 240 hours of staff time to assist.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOC and CCC<sup>8</sup> to jointly lead historic building and Visitor Centre investigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ DoC to provide 100 hours staff time.</li> <li>○ DoC to allocate \$5,000.</li> <li>○ See the Visitor Centre key concept section for CCC provided staff hours and funds.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> Specifically on the ex-WWII military sites at Godley Head.

<sup>6</sup> Department of Conservation.

<sup>7</sup> Godley Head Heritage Trust.

<sup>8</sup> Christchurch City Council

Key Concept	Investigation	Possible Timeframe	Estimated Resources Required	Contributions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This investigation needs to be part of the Visitor Centre investigation.</li> </ul>			
<p>Open sanctuary/ predator proof fence/ new plantings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to evaluate the need for this key concept, what it may constitute and what options there are.</li> <li>Investigation to be ecological/ biodiversity based.</li> <li>To be a staged investigation: <u>Stage I</u> to identify what is there and what the potential for ecological enhancement is.</li> <li>Outcome of the <u>Stage I</u> investigation – being able to identify needs/ answer questions, such as the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Need for a predator proof fence to achieve a predator free environment for an open sanctuary area?</li> <li>ii. Requirements for habitat/ biodiversity enhancement/ restoration.</li> <li>iii. Implications of not doing anything.</li> </ul> </li> <li><u>Stage II</u> – a subsequent investigation of detailed methods of implementation of identified ecological enhancement opportunities, such as a predator proof fence and other advanced predator control measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possible timing of the staged investigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Stage I</u> – 6 month evaluation, and report on outcomes at the end of 2005 or early in 2006.</li> <li>ii. <u>Stage II</u> – dependent upon the outcome from the previous stage of investigation (may be undertaken in 2006 or later).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For <u>Stage I</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Staff (CCC and DoC) time to facilitate, manage, contribute to and report on evaluation (estimate total of 240 (DoC 40) hours required).</li> <li>ii. <b>External contractors to undertake species category specific ecological investigations - that is, separate fauna/flora investigations (survey and evaluation of restoration potential) (estimate up to a 6 month period of research, with total budget up to \$33,000). See Table 3 for details.</b></li> </ul> </li> <li><u>Stage II</u>: Not covered in this investigation as dependent upon the outcome of <u>Stage I</u>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CCC (and, in particular, Greenspace Unit staff) to lead the open sanctuary concept and to undertake the investigation of this, including facilitating the proposed ecological evaluation of the area (<u>Stage I</u>).</li> <li><b>DoC – considers this key concept a low priority proposal and has no available funding for the investigation of this. Is, though, able to contribute 40 hours of staff time towards the ecological evaluation (<u>Stage I</u>) and to comment on results.</b></li> <li>CCC to also lead the subsequent consideration of needs coming out of the ecological evaluation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Guiding the direction of plantings in the area.</li> <li>ii. Further investigation of species reintroduction and pest/weed control potential.</li> <li>iii. The later (may be years down the track) investigation of options for a predator proof fence or other methods of predator control for protection of an open sanctuary (<u>Stage II</u>).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Planning for and implementation of new plantings in the</li> </ul>

Key Concept	Investigation	Possible Timeframe	Estimated Resources Required	Contributions
				<p>area to largely come under existing CCC and DoC development and management programmes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, CCC should allocate up to 140 hours of staff time to contract facilitation, management, monitoring and integration and review of outcomes.</li> </ul>
Visitor centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A joint investigation is proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) To assess the demand/need for a visitor/information centre and consider options for type and location of such a facility.</li> </ul> <p>Options to consider range from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fitting in with the GHHT's utilisation of the Quartermaster's Store at Godley Head as a museum.</li> <li>Developing another ex-military building or the shearing shed at Godley Head as a visitor centre.</li> <li>Constructing a new purpose-built facility at one of a range of site options.</li> </ol> <li>(2) An evaluation of existing Godley Head building usage options.</li> </li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over a 6 month period.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Although requiring facilitation, monitoring and review by staff (estimate 140 hours), ideally a consultant specialising in visitor/tourism marketing should be commissioned to undertake a study of visitor needs and uses, and visitor centre options (estimate up to \$10,000 for a contract of up to 6 months duration).</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CCC to lead consideration of needs and options.</li> <li>CCC should allocate approximately 100 hours of staff time to contract facilitation, management, monitoring and outcome review.</li> <li>If located in the Quartermaster's Store and run by the GHHT, then project led by DoC.</li> <li><b>DoC can contribute 40 hours staff time to assist the investigation, particularly where it relates to the use of the historic buildings at Godley Head, and \$5,000 towards the consultant costs.</b></li> </ul>
Penguin breeding/viewing project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is a pre-existing proposed project (was a Turning Point 2000 project) being driven and investigated by the WFPT.<sup>9</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the short term, as most of the investigation work has already been completed by the WFPT.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DoC staff time to assess/respond to outcomes arising from the WFPT's investigatory work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DoC to lead and provide 40 hours of staff time to respond to the ongoing investigation by the WFPT.</li> </ul>
Park entrance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigation applies to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Godley Head Road access-point at Evans Pass.</li> <li>Track access from</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staged: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Stage 1</u> – About a week's work can be undertaken at any time, except for the</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rough estimate for up to 40 hours of existing staff time to do the <u>Stage 1</u> assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CCC to lead.</li> <li>May be undertaken partly by staff as part of existing work programme assessment.</li> </ul>

<sup>9</sup> White-flipped Penguin Trust.



Key Concept	Investigation	Possible Timeframe	Estimated Resources Required	Contributions
	<p>Taylor's Mistake Beach.</p> <p>iii. Potential track access to Scarborough Hill Park from the lower Scarborough spur.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The investigation is to assess the status of the formally identified park entrances and their development, such as provision of signage, and to scope feasibility and potential requirements, including for further future detailed design planning, in the event the coastal park key concepts proceed.</li> </ul>	<p>consideration of the proposed Scarborough spur access, which is subject to the subdivision consent process timeframe.</p> <p>ii. <u>Stage II</u> – Dependent upon the outcome of the investigation of the key concepts (such as the visitor centre, open sanctuary/ predator proof fence and the penguin project), may need to do detailed design investigations for the park entrances (if required, would be timed for 2006 or later).</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Also, involves collection of information from other Council assessment processes, in particular that relating to the subdivision application for lower Scarborough spur.</li> <li>Estimate up to 40 hours of CCC staff time to allocate to the initial scoping investigation (<u>Stage I</u>).</li> </ul>
Park access and facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Involves an overall access and facilities assessment, integrating all existing organisational information, and indication of likely needs if the other key concepts for the coastal park are to be implemented.</li> <li>Will include assessment, by the CCC, of access issues at Boulder Bay (may, in part, be addressed through other Council assessment processes).</li> <li>Investigation needs to take into account all existing work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developments and maintenance of access and facilities to a large extent already comes under existing planning/ work programmes.</li> <li>DoC is already developing further</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staged: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Stage I</u> – scoping assessment of current status of park access and facilities and future requirements if the coastal park key concepts proceed.</li> <li><u>Stage II</u> – this is dependent upon the key coastal park concepts proceeding. For example, if the Penguin project proceeds in the next year, Godley Head Road may need improvements after 5 to 6 years – at that time, an investigation to assess requirements can be instigated. The road is considered to be currently suitable for</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possibly require up to 40 hours of staff time to do the <u>Stage I</u> assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CCC to lead and contribute up to 20 hours staff time to <u>Stage I</u>.</li> <li>DoC can contribute 20 hours staff time towards investigation work for <u>Stage I</u>.</li> </ul>

Key Concept	Investigation	Possible Timeframe	Estimated Resources Required	Contributions
	<p>tracks at Godley Head.</p> <p>iii. CCC and/or volunteers also currently or recently involved in mountain bike track developments/improvements nearer the western end of the proposed coastal park area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible new developments associated with the proposed coastal park concept, such as access road upgrade, would require subsequent investigation.</li> </ul>	access.		

16. **Table 3: Proposed Ecological Investigation – External Consultants:**

Ecological Investigation Project	Approximate Timeframe	Purpose/Project Details	Estimated Cost
Birds	6 months	To research and advise on the potential viability of reintroducing bird species to the area. Can be assisted by staff (Council Rangers).	\$10,000
Lizards	6 months (over spring and summer)	Simple report on the status of lizards in the area and the measures required to conserve these. Can be assisted by staff (Council Rangers).	\$3,000
Animal pests	3 months	Scoping report on animal pests in the area and what further measures can be taken to remove these. Coverage to include mice, rats, possums, cats, mustelids and hedgehogs. Can research existing information.	\$5,000
Invertebrates	6 months (over spring and summer)	Survey work and identification of species significance.	\$10,000
Plants	3 months (spring)	<p>A plant ecologist, with some staff assistance, to research existing information and to evaluate the potential for ecological enhancement. In particular, to ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What can be left to natural regeneration?</li> <li>• Where should there be regeneration?</li> <li>• What areas could have enhanced planting?</li> </ul>	\$5,000
<b>ESTIMATED TOTAL:</b>			<b>\$33,000</b>

17. **Table 4: Proposed Investigations – CCC/DoC Staff Input:**

Key Concept	Department of Conservation Contribution	Christchurch City Council Contribution	Total Staff Time Contributions

	Hours	Hours	Equivalent Cost (Hours x \$75)	Hours
Historical assets' preservation/ interpretation	100 hours	See the Visitor Centre key concept section for CCC provided staff hours.	-	100 hours
Open sanctuary/ predator proof fence/ new plantings	40 hours	140 hours	\$10,500	180 hours
Visitor centre	40 hours	100 hours	\$7,500	140 hours
Penguin breeding/ viewing project	40 hours	-	-	40 hours
Park entrance	-	40 hours	\$3,000	40 hours
Park access and facilities	20 hours	20 hours	\$1,500	40 hours
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>240 hours</b>	<b>300 hours</b>	<b>\$22,500</b>	<b>540 hours</b>

18. **Table 5: Proposed Investigations – Summary of Resources to be Provided:**

	Staff Hours	External Consultant Fees	Explanation
<b>Department of Conservation Contribution</b>	240 hours	\$5,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Department's focus is on the management and future use of the historic ex-military buildings at Godley Head. It acknowledges that a potential use of one of the buildings could be as a visitor centre for the proposed coastal park. It has allocated 100 hours of its staff time (in addition to a further 40 hours of staff time, and \$5,000 towards the consultant fees, to investigate options for a visitor centre).</li> <li>The Department considers the key concept for an open sanctuary, and associated predator proof fence and new plantings, to be a low priority for implementation and advises it has no available funding for the investigation of this. It is, though, able to contribute 40 hours of staff time towards the proposed Stage I ecological evaluation and to comment on results.</li> <li>The Department will lead the review of the Penguin project as promoted by the White-flipped Penguin Trust and will allocate 40 hours of its staff time towards this.</li> <li>It also contributes 20 hours towards the Stage I assessment of current park access and facilities and what future requirements there are.</li> </ul>
<b>Balance (Christchurch City Council Contribution)</b>	300 hours	\$38,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff of the Greenspace Unit champion the two major key concepts – (1) Open sanctuary/predator proof fence/new plantings and (2) Visitor centre. It is acknowledged that it is crucial that there be thorough prior investigation of needs, feasibility and options before any decision can be made on possible implementation. To facilitate this, it has been identified that external consultants are engaged to undertake separate ecological and visitor centre building option investigations, with Council and Department of Conservation staff assistance to facilitate and monitor.</li> <li>The estimated cost of the above consultancies have been identified in Table 2 and totals \$43,000. As the identified Department of Conservation contribution is \$5,000 towards the visitor centre investigation, the balance of \$38,000 will need to be met by the Council.</li> <li>The Council's contribution of staff hours to assist the investigations is mostly towards that for the two major key concepts, and largely to do with external consultant contract facilitation, management, monitoring, and with</li> </ul>

	<b>Staff Hours</b>	<b>External Consultant Fees</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
			integration and review of outcomes (240 hours). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The remaining Greenspace Unit staff time (60 hours) is towards actioning investigations of the (1) Park entrance and (2) Park access/facilities key concepts, which are proposed to be led by the Council.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>540 hours</b>	<b>\$43,000</b>	

19. There is no allocation in the Greenspace Unit's 2005/06 budget to cover the Council's contribution to the proposed investigations. In order to commence the investigations at the earliest possible time to achieve outcomes to report back to the Council at the end of the year, or early in 2006, and to undertake the ecological investigations during the optimum spring and summer seasons, additional funds in the 2005/06 budget will be required.
20. The Department of Conservation advises that it needs to investigate future uses of the ex-military buildings at Godley Head, which is part of the proposed visitor centre investigation, in the 2005/06 financial year.
21. The alternative is to identify the required expenditure in the 2006 Long Term Council Community Plan but this will have the implication of deferring the commencement of any investigations to after the end of June 2006.

## 6 Cont'd

### STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Council should consider the following recommendations, which include the recommendations of the Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park Development Concept Subcommittee:

- (a) Receive the information on the analysis of public submissions on the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept document.
- (b) Approve the finalisation of the Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept document and adopt this.
- (c) Agree to support further detailed investigation, as specified in Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 of this report and including the Council's estimated contribution of \$38,000 towards external consultants' fees and 300 hours of Greenspace Unit staff time, on the key concepts proposed in the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept, including values, feasibility, costs, funding sources, possible partnerships and development options (Option A).

Key concepts being (not in priority order):

- 1. Preservation and interpretation of historical assets.
  - 2. Open sanctuary (including new plantings and a possible predator proof fence).
  - 3. White-flipped penguin breeding and public viewing project.
  - 4. Visitor centre.
  - 5. Coastal park entrance.
  - 6. Public access and facilities, including new tracks.
- (d) Approve additional funding to be made available to the Greenspace Unit for the 2005/06 financial year to enable the proposed investigations, if supported by the Council, to proceed after the end of June 2005.
  - (e) Invite the Canterbury Regional Council to indicate its support and how it may contribute to investigation and/or implementation of any of the above key concepts.
  - (f) Receive and note the Department of Conservation's written statement of its position on the level of its support for, and involvement in, the proposed Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept and how it may contribute to the investigation and/or implementation of any of the above key concepts.
  - (g) Invite Ngai Tahu to indicate its support and how it may contribute to investigation and/or implementation of any of the above key concepts.
  - (h) Research and investigate an appropriate Memorandum of Understanding for partnerships in the above concepts.
  - (i) Thank members of the Subcommittee, Council staff and staff of the Department of Conservation for their enthusiastic contributions to this project.
  - (j) Inspect the area(s) under consideration.

**BACKGROUND ON THE AWAROA/GODLEY HEAD COASTAL PARK DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT – REPORTING ON THE ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS**

22. The draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept document is the product of collaborative work by staff of the Christchurch City Council's Greenspace Unit and the Christchurch Area and Conservancy Offices of the Department of Conservation. It is the culmination of a long period of research and liaison and is the presentation of a group of concepts for the best future development, management and use of a key area next to Christchurch - the Awaroa/Godley Head peninsula.
23. Many of the concepts reflect existing use, approved management programmes and recreational facility development of the area. The concept document supports the intent of a Memorandum of Understanding signed by both organisations on 12 February 2004 for the integrated facilities management and planning for biodiversity management of the resources under the administration of each in the Port Hills area (Attachment F).
24. For each of the significant concepts for developments in the proposed coastal park area, the Council's and the Department of Conservation's support is sought for further detailed investigation, including identification of costs and funding sources. There is no requirement, at this stage, for a commitment by either organisation on programming and budgeting for the implementation of any concept.
25. The overall coastal park concept for this key and popular open space area on the doorstep of Christchurch reflects and supports a wide range of planning documents prepared by the Christchurch City Council and other organisations. The thinking for an integrated approach to the management and use of the area for such public purposes as conservation and recreation has been in train for some time and the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept document is an innovative attempt to promote and implement this approach.
26. Existing and current Council strategies and plans that directly identify an Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park are listed in Attachment G.
27. Other Council approved plans and documents, and relevant plans of other organisations, for which the respective visions, goals and objectives are met, supported and/or not contradicted by the Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park concept, are also listed in Attachment G.
28. Much of the Awaroa/Godley Head area is in public ownership and accessible by the public for recreational purposes. Attached are (1) a plan of land tenure and (2) a description of land status (Attachment H).
29. Public consultation on the draft development concept document was completed on 12 March 2004, following a period of two and a half months for submissions to be received. A total of 122 submissions were received, with some of these being detailed.
30. At the commencement of the consultation, copies of the draft document had been provided to all members of the Council, and also to Department of Conservation staff and identified stakeholders and interested parties.
31. A non-statutory hearing was facilitated on 19 and 20 August 2004 and 20 submitters heard.
32. A submission analysis report (see Attachment D for an executive summary of this report), including the minutes of the hearing, was distributed to submitters in January 2005.

## 6 Cont'd

### OPTIONS

33. There are three options before the Council:
  - A. To support further detailed investigation on **all** of the key concepts proposed in the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept, including values, feasibility, costs, funding sources, possible partnerships and development options.
  - B. To support further detailed investigation on **selected** key concepts proposed in the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept, including values, feasibility, costs, funding sources, possible partnerships and development options.
  - C. To decline to support further detailed investigation on concepts proposed in the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept.
34. These options refer only to key concepts proposed in the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept document and not to existing budgeted development and maintenance programmes for the area, including those of both the City Council and the Department of Conservation. This is unless it is proposed to significantly expand on any of the existing programmes, including those being instigated by external groups.

### PREFERRED OPTION

35. The preferred option is Option A as this will keep open the greatest possible range of future options for development of the Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park area that can be considered by the Council at a later date. It is possible at that time for decisions to be made to implement the most cost effective and practical of the development options that have by then been fully investigated.

## ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

## The Preferred Option (Option A)

To support further detailed investigation on **all** of the key concepts proposed in the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept, including on: values, feasibility, costs, funding sources, possible partnerships and development options.

OPTION A	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
<b>Social</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeps the maximum range of key concept options open for full investigation and consideration as to the merit of each.</li> <li>• This permits the potential optimum future realisation of a high profile (regional, national and even international) coastal park resource, one which has improved visitor facilities and caters well for visitors' health, wellbeing and experience through the provision of a wide range of opportunities for activities, including relaxation, recreation and learning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No real social costs, other than the ratepayers' possible future indirect financial investment in the area's resources.</li> <li>• A promoted coastal park may raise unrealistic expectations for the visitor level of service provided, in terms of access and facilities.</li> <li>• There may be an opportunity cost of limited resources not going to other possibly higher priority sites that provide an important social benefit.</li> <li>• There may be a 'clash of interests', with respect to potential conflicting uses if as many as possible of the key concepts are implemented, such as public recreational access versus ecological protection (but this can be managed appropriately for with good planning).</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are significant historical and tangata whenua values in the proposed coastal park area that can be best managed, promoted, interpreted and protected under a planning framework that captures and integrates all opportunities to protect, manage and interpret these values.</li> <li>• This option, for full investigation of all key concepts, provides the best scenario to achieve this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased visitor numbers to the area could increase impacts on the values that are important to conservationists, historians and the tangata whenua, as well as for those visitors who appreciate remote, undeveloped and empty places.</li> <li>• This can, though, be addressed with good planning, design, management and provision of information.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This maximises the opportunity to achieve the potential optimum future enhancement and protection of the many environmental values found in the area, including ecological and historical ones, through consideration of all options for potential initiatives to build on the environmental benefits of existing, approved programmes.</li> <li>• Implementation of all feasible concepts in the future will permit improvements to made to the area's environmental management, such as more effective and widespread predator and weed control, that is currently not able to be achieved under existing work programmes.</li> <li>• Also, the high profile of the proposed coastal park, and the provision of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of some of the more major and potentially controversial concepts, such as the proposed predator proof fence and plantings on the north-facing slopes, may be impractical and potentially expensive and therefore not viable (future implementation costs, though, could be met from a variety of funding sources).</li> <li>• New developments, with the accompanying increase in visitors, may impact on environmental values (although good planning and design can help to avoid this).</li> </ul>



OPTION A	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
	<p>visitor information facilities, will serve to educate people about environmental matters.</p>	
<p><b>Economic</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential financial benefits to the city's economy of the area being developed as a prime tourism attraction are maximised if as many as possible of the proposed development concepts are further investigated and eventually implemented.</li> <li>• This can be furthered through linkage of the area with other key visitor attractions in the city to provide enhanced tourism experiences and encourage increased tourist numbers and duration of stay.</li> <li>• Having a good range of tourist attractions and activities in the Awaroa/Godley Head area will increase the chance of the area becoming a noted tourist destination.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost of investigating the proposed key concepts further can be met within existing organisational planning programmes. To assist, existing resources and information can be tapped into, and the investigations can be staged.</li> <li>• There are potential future significant set-up costs for one or more of the key concepts, such as the predator fence and visitor centre (although these could be met from a range of funding sources).</li> <li>• Cost of implementing other concepts, such as track improvements/ maintenance and weed control, is already covered to a large extent by existing work programmes.</li> <li>• Would be an obligation on the Council and Department of Conservation to retain the standard of a high profile visitor resource, once developed and promoted, but the benefits to the city should outweigh this.</li> <li>• Costs of necessary ancillary development and ongoing maintenance may also be high, including the need to improve infrastructure, such as the upgrade of the access road (Godley Head Road) to the required standard. This may be considered an investment for the future but also some of the cost could be met by the tourism industry, which stands to benefit.</li> <li>• Also, good planning, provision only of facilities that are shown to be needed and sustainable use of resources, such as utilising an existing building for a visitor centre, can keep the costs down over the long term.</li> </ul>

**OPTION A****Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:**

Primary alignment with community outcomes for a city with a sustainable natural environment: *“Our City’s natural resources, biodiversity, landscapes, and ecosystem integrity are protected and enhanced.”* and *“Our people enjoy and value our natural environment and take responsibility for protecting and restoring it.”*

Also contributes to *“Our City provides the natural and built environments that enable people to enjoy long and healthy lives”* and *“Our City’s infrastructure, facilities, open space and natural environments support a diverse range of arts and leisure activities.”*

**Impact on Council’s capacity and responsibilities:**

In the medium to longer term, the Council will need to cover or contribute to the development and upkeep of any new assets on site that it owns or has a share in, such as a visitor centre or predator proof fence. This, though, can be planned and budgeted for well in advance. The benefits should outweigh the costs of commitment.

As a shared project with the Department of Conservation, the costs and commitments may also be shared, subject to agreement. It is expected, though, that there will be extensive contribution by interest groups, sponsors and volunteers to offset this.

Many of the proposed concepts relate to planning, development and activity already programmed into existing work programmes by the Council’s Greenspace Unit and the Department of Conservation and therefore will not constitute an additional impact on the Council’s resources. In the short term, before final decisions on any of the proposed concepts are made the cost to the Council is simply that of staff time in investigation.

**Effects on Maori:**

The area in question has some values of importance to Maori that, potentially, in a situation of inadequate management of increasing visitor numbers, could be adversely impacted on. In light of expected good and careful planning for the proposed coastal park, and in consultation with the tangata whenua, any adverse impacts can be avoided. On the contrary, the protection of these values, such as physical sites, may be enhanced and their significance promoted and interpreted to the wider populace.

**Consistency with existing Council policies:**

Meets the stated Council activities in the Long Term Council Community Plan for parks and open spaces (*involvement of the community and stakeholders, providing opportunities for environmental education and informal recreation in the natural environment, and conserving natural, heritage and scenic values* (pages 79-84)).

It supports and/or contributes to the visions and strategic objectives of a range of Council strategies: in particular, it implements the strategic objective in the Port Hills Regional Park Acquisitions Strategy 1999 for a Coastal Park based around the Godley Head area; it supports the vision in the Coastal Parks Strategy 2000–2010 for the enhancement of the coastal environment and meets the stated draft development programme in this strategy for the Godley Head Coastal Park.

**Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:**

The draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept document has been publicly consulted on, with all identified persons and groups affected, or likely to have an interest in the area, being directly advised and invited to comment. One hundred and twenty-two submissions were received. There was overwhelmingly strong support for the proposed concepts, with some submitters making constructive, practical suggestion on the feasibility of implementation of the concepts.

**Other relevant matters:**

One of the proposed key new concepts was previously identified as a Port Hills 2000 project, as part of Turning Point 2000 initiated by the Christchurch City Council. This is for the establishment and development of a white-flipped penguin colony at Godley Head.

6 Cont'd

**Maintain The Status Quo (Option C)**

To decline to support further detailed investigation on concepts proposed in the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept.

<b>OPTION C (Status Quo)</b>	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No additional benefits for the community will necessarily accrue, other than those resulting from the usual day to day planning and work programming for the area, such as improvement of tracks.</li> <li>• This option will keep the area as it is – largely semi-wild and undeveloped. Those who appreciate a more adventurous and remote experience will continue to benefit from access to the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No opportunity realised to achieve a premier coastal park for the city, which could be a future major attraction for visitors.</li> <li>• Taking no further action to investigate potential beneficial developments may lessen the opportunity to address a potentially increasing inadequacy of the area to appropriately meet visitor needs in light of inevitable increasing visitor numbers.</li> <li>• Will be less opportunity for community and interest group participation in the conservation and development of the area.</li> <li>• Cost to the community of the Council not taking the opportunity to explore options to optimise the public recreational resource.</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural and heritage values remain relatively unmodified and 'hidden' and available to be experienced by those who make the effort to access and learn about them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less possibility to promote and educate visitors about the cultural and historical values of the area in an enhanced and coordinated way through quality interpretation, including at a dedicated visitor/information centre.</li> <li>• Physical sites and features that have cultural value, although maintained to some extent under existing planning and work programmes, may deteriorate in the absence of an integrated and enhanced programme of conservation.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both the Christchurch City Council and the Department of Conservation are able to continue with existing planned and budgeted programmes, integrated to the extent already agreed to under the Memorandum of Understanding signed by both parties in February 2004 regarding the facilities management and planning for biodiversity management of the Port Hills reserves – environmental benefits will continue to accrue from these.</li> <li>• Are existing efforts for ecological enhancement, such as the white-flipped penguin colony, and the measures taken for its protection, at Harris Bay.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibly less chance, under existing budgets and work programmes, to satisfactorily resolve environmental management issues, such as weed control, in the area.</li> <li>• Likely will not realise the enhanced and new environmental projects that such a high profile coastal park development concept may help initiate, give impetus to and incite increased buy-in and involvement of community and interest groups.</li> </ul>

OPTION C (Status Quo)	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant change to existing financial programmes for the management of the area, other than those to be normally expected in order to meet changing maintenance and community needs.</li> <li>• No requirement for alternative funding to be sought from other sources to finance any significant future developments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No long-term investment in the integrated planning for, management, enhancement and development of, and encouragement of community involvement with, a project that could develop the area into a key visitor attraction for the city – therefore, there will not be the spin-offs for the city and regional economy from such a visitor/ tourism attraction.</li> <li>• No opportunity to contribute to further raising the profile of Christchurch, both nationally and internationally.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b>  No enhanced contribution to meeting the community outcomes for a city with a sustainable natural environment (<i>“Our City’s natural resources, biodiversity, landscapes, and ecosystem integrity are protected and enhanced.”</i> and <i>“Our people enjoy and value our natural environment and take responsibility for protecting and restoring it.”</i>).</p> <p>Also, doesn’t contribute further to <i>“Our City provides the natural and built environments that enable people to enjoy long and healthy lives”</i> and <i>“Our City’s infrastructure, facilities, open space and natural environments support a diverse range of arts and leisure activities.”</i></p> <p><b>Impact on Council’s capacity and responsibilities:</b>  No additional impact.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b>  No potential opportunity realised to especially promote and educate visitors to the area of the sites and other values that of importance to Maori as part of the package of key values promoted by a coastal park.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b>  Does not contribute further to the implementation of the visions and strategic objectives of a range of Council strategies that refer specifically to the creation of an Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park, including the strategic objective in the Port Hills Regional Park Acquisitions Strategy 1999 for a Coastal Park based around the Godley Head area, the vision in the Coastal Parks Strategy 2000–2010 for the enhancement of the coastal environment and the stated draft development programme in this strategy for the Godley Head Coastal Park. It does not add to the stated Council activities in the Long Term Council Community Plan for parks and open spaces (<i>involvement of the community and stakeholders, providing opportunities for environmental education and informal recreation in the natural environment, and conserving natural, heritage and scenic values</i> (pages 79-84)).</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b>  Does not reflect the submitters’ overwhelmingly strong support for the proposed concepts, although there is some submitter reservation on the implementation of some of the potentially expensive concepts, such as the proposed predator proof fence running right across the peninsula.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b>  Some of the activities and developments in the area that are covered by the proposed concepts are existing or proposed projects that exist in their own right and will continue to apply irrespective of any decision not to further investigate and consider implementing any of the proposed key concepts. These include the proposed penguin viewing project at Boulder Bay that is advocated by the White-flipped Penguin Trust, and the proposed accessway up lower Scarborough spur that is subject to the outcome of a subdivision application.</p>		

6 Cont'd

**Option B**

To support further detailed investigation on **selected** key concepts proposed in the draft Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park development concept, including on: values, feasibility, costs, funding sources, possible partnerships and development options.

OPTION B	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
<b>Social</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opportunity is realised to promote a coastal park for the Awaroa/Godley Head peninsula area, one which can encourage more visitors for recreation, relaxation and education purposes, and based largely on existing visitor facilities and management.</li> <li>• Possible to achieve an improved level of service through integrated Council/Department of Conservation planning and management, already happening (through the Memorandum of Understanding).</li> <li>• The focus can be on investigating those proposed key development concepts that are potentially more realistic and therefore more readily achievable – the future public benefits are consequently more foreseeable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for visitors to improve their wellbeing through recreation, relaxation and learning in the area will continue to improve into the future to some extent.</li> <li>• They may be more limited, though, compared to under the Preferred Option A, with the probable absence of the more visionary and significant (although potentially more expensive and therefore unviable) concepts, such as the open sanctuary contained by a cross-peninsula predator proof fence, and a purpose-built visitor centre.</li> <li>• If there is no further investigation of one or more of these key proposed concepts, there may be the loss of opportunity for the Council and the Department of Conservation to realise a potential icon open space coastal park area, which has the potential to have significant social benefits for the community well into the future.</li> <li>• Also, a reduced 'concept investigation package' may mean that the social benefits currently arising from the public's use and appreciation of the area are not maintained with the inevitable increasing numbers of visitors to the area.</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although this option may not provide the 'gilt-edged' outcome for conserving, promoting and educating about the historical and cultural values of the area that the Preferred Option A may give, it may be more beneficial in retaining the existing character of the historic sites by not developing or promoting them too much (for example, by having a lower key visitor/information centre).</li> </ul>	
<b>Environmental</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement of better environmental outcomes for the area with the integrated planning and management that the coastal park concept can foster, even if some of the proposed key concepts are not investigated and implemented in the future.</li> <li>• This option can serve to ensure that only realistic and cost-effective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the whole proposed concept package, as promoted in the Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park draft development concept document, is not further investigated, there is a risk that the best (which is not necessarily the cheapest or widely accepted) option for environmental outcomes is not selected.</li> </ul>

OPTION B	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
	<p>actions to improve environmental outcomes are investigated and potentially proceeded with.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For example, although there is concern about the cost and viability of the predator proof fence length and alignment, as proposed in the draft concept document, it may be better to weigh this up with other more low-key options before a final decision is made on which to implement, if any at all.</li> </ul>
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of some of the proposed concepts that are part of an overall coastal park concept will still serve to contribute to making the area an increasingly popular visitor attraction, with its accompanying benefits to the local economy but without the potentially major costs of some of the more 'grandiose' concepts, such as a long predator proof fence and a new purpose-built visitor centre.</li> <li>Also, funds and resources are not expended investigating concept options that are unlikely ultimately to be chosen.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the costs of implementing all of the proposed concepts in the development concept document are potentially high, it could be argued that this would be an investment for the future for such a notable open space area lying close to a major, growing city.</li> <li>Also, much of the costs could possibly be covered in part from funding sources other than from organisational budgets.</li> <li>Limiting the scale of the concepts that can be considered for implementation will ensure unrealistic future costs are not incurred but it may also limit the potential for the optimum economic benefits to be achieved in the future.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b> See Option A.</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b> See Option A.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b> See Option A.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b> See Option A.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b> See Option A.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b> See Option A.</p>		

## 7. SUBURBAN SWIMMING POOLS REVIEW

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Recreation Facilities Manager
<b>Author:</b>	John Filsell, DDI 941-8303

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek adoption by the Council of the recommendations of the Suburban Swimming Pools Review, May 2005.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Officers have reviewed the provision and operation of the Council's five small outdoor suburban swimming pools, Woolston, Edgeware, Papanui, Belfast and Templeton. This has resulted in a strong justification for change that is detailed in the review document (attached) and summarised in this report. If the changes detailed in the review are adopted by the Council there would be significant increases in levels of service at Edgeware, Belfast and Templeton Pools. Woolston Pool would alter its focus to become a dedicated school pool. Papanui Pool would be decommissioned.

### FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

3. None. All proposed changes are within existing budgets. Any savings from reducing services at Papanui or Woolston will be used to increase services at Templeton, Belfast and Edgeware.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Decommissions the Papanui Pool.
- (b) Opens the Woolston Pool to structured school or club swimming groups only.
- (c) Grants the Council's Recreation Facilities Manager delegated power to decide when to collect pool entry fees at the Edgeware, Belfast and Templeton outdoor swimming pools.
- (d) Supports the swimming pool management initiatives summarised in Table 1 of this report.

7 Cont'd

**BACKGROUND ON THE SUBURBAN SWIMMING POOLS REVIEW**

4. The review covers the Woolston, Edgware, Papanui, Belfast and Templeton outdoor pools only. The purpose of the review is to:
- identify whether there is sufficient reason to change the level of service at the suburban pools;
  - to identify options and recommend changes necessary to best fulfil the Council's goal/s in respect of suburban pools.

The review concentrates on what the Council is trying to achieve from its suburban pools rather than what particular set of "bricks and mortar" it chooses to maintain. The Council's goals in respect of pools are participation, accessibility, healthy lifestyles, education, active recreation and fun; not building maintenance. The pool is only the means to achieving the goal.

The rationale for change is summarised below and detailed in section five of the attached review document:

- Suburban pool public operating seasons are now 50 days (seven weeks) and shrinking, owing to resource constraints.
- Pools are not accessible to schools or open to the public in February, the warmest month.
- Attendance is dropping owing to user preference and climatic change.
- Non controllable costs are rising, such as energy and maintenance.
- Some pools are in a very poor physical condition and will fail e.g. Papanui.
- Cost of providing a swim is growing, (30 times higher than some other Council pools).
- Almost all user groups and two community boards have called for change.

If change is not planned it will be imposed at short notice, again, by pool failure or lack of resources.

**OPTIONS**

5. Four options are summarised below and detailed in section six of the attached review. They are:
- 5.1 Retain current length of season
  - 5.2 Increase the financial resource
  - 5.3 Change levels of service between pools according to need
  - 5.4 Retain the status quo

Options 5.1 to 5.3 require changes to the way the Council manages its suburban pools and these are summarised in Table 1 below.

<b>Table 1: Changes to Suburban Pools Management Practices</b>		
<b>Change</b>	<b>Justification</b>	<b>Drawback</b>
Suburban pools will not be open some or all public holidays.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Save on expensive holiday pay costs</li> <li>• Best time for family visits to other pools, easy to advertise</li> <li>• Families do not tend to use suburban pools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand on facilities on fine days</li> <li>• Pools not open on holidays</li> </ul>
Schools will be given the option of not hiring a lifeguard for schools-only sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools are well equipped to supervise children</li> <li>• Schools have option to hire lifeguard</li> <li>• Schools can manage risk</li> <li>• Saves schools \$\$\$</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional risk for schools (not for the Council to manage)</li> </ul>
One lifeguard on duty on some low use public sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better use of resources</li> <li>• Improved supervision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personal safety risk to staff</li> <li>• Risks of unpredicted increase in use</li> </ul>



## 7 Cont'd

Change	Justification	Drawback
RFU will have the delegated authority to decide not to collect the entry fee where doing so will compromise supervision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revenue is minimal</li> <li>• Costs more to collect than its worth</li> <li>• May increase patronage</li> <li>• Target lower socio economic groups</li> <li>• Less risk of robbery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devalue service</li> <li>• Precedent for others</li> </ul>
The pools will be closed on bad weather days when under 15 people would visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A system would be managed through the Customer Call Centre to advise closures</li> <li>• Cost savings</li> <li>• Why open when no users</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs careful management</li> <li>• Inconvenient for bad weather swimmers.</li> </ul>
Reaffirm that maintenance levels are managed to focus on keeping pools operational rather than preserved into the long term.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is current practice</li> <li>• Limits the resource needed</li> <li>• Keeps pools open</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suburban pools will not exist in their current format in the long term.</li> </ul>

### 5.1 Retain current length of season

This involves providing 2004/05 length of season (50 days) at each suburban pool with existing resources and using changed management practices to offset increased energy, HR and some maintenance costs.

#### **Advantages:**

This option keeps present systems going in the face of increased costs:

- No reduction to 2004/05 length of season.
- No increase in the cost of service.
- Increased costs managed within current budget.
- All five suburban pools operating for the public.

#### **Disadvantages:**

This option does not address many of the major concerns detailed in section four of this report. It is more of the same, perpetuating inefficiencies and a departure from industry best practice.

- Sustainability of all suburban pools is put at risk as they will not increase their operating season or address pressing maintenance issues.
- The pools will not be open to schools in February unless they hire the pool at considerable cost.<sup>10</sup>
- Pools will still be competing with each other for business.

### 5.2 Increase financial resource

Extend the season at all suburban pools from 50 to 75 days (open February) using \$44,000 of additional funding and changed management practices.

#### **Advantages:**

- Increased level of service.
- All five suburban pools open to the public.
- Pools accessible to schools and the public in February.

<sup>10</sup> For example a one month programme by Templeton School cost \$5,700 in 2005.

## 7 Cont'd

### ***Disadvantages:***

This scenario was rejected by the Council and the Community and Leisure Committee in February/March 2004.<sup>11</sup> It is seen as throwing more money at a problem without fixing it.

- Sustainability of some suburban pools is put at risk as pressing maintenance issues will not be addressed.
- Pools will still be competing with each other for business.
- Will require increased resources with no budgetary provision.
- Council may be seen as choosing to spend more money rather than confronting and managing fundamental issues.

### 5.3 **Change levels of service between pools according to need**

Provide different levels of service at each facility, according to need, to maximise the fulfilment of community outcomes. This will be done from a city-wide perspective without increasing the financial cost to the community. Changes involve significant increases to levels of service at Edgware, Belfast and Templeton Pools. Woolston Pool would alter its focus to become a dedicated school pool. Papanui Pool would be decommissioned. Changes are summarised in Table 2, below.

This option also involves changes to management practices outlined in Table 1 of this report.

---

<sup>11</sup> The decision included the suburban pools into the scope of the Aquatic Facilities Strategy and an accompanying proposal to increase funding by \$35,000 to maintain season duration did not proceed.

Table 2: Changes to levels of Service at Suburban Pools									
Pool	Public users 04/05	\$/ user 04/05	Asset condition	<sup>12</sup> User experience	Distance to O/D pool <sup>13</sup>	Current level of service	Proposed level of service	Justification	
<b>Edgeware</b>	3,070	\$16.49	3	8	4 km	50 Days Mid Dec & Jan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>91 Days Dec, Jan &amp; Feb</li> <li>Hot showers</li> <li>Later closing (6.30 pm)</li> <li>Enhanced programming</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most popular suburban pool, close to town, committed user groups</li> <li>Better facilities, deep water</li> <li>Potential to grow</li> <li>Edgeware asset condition can be managed if Papanui is decommissioned</li> </ul>	
<b>Belfast</b>	1,234	\$25.04	6	5	4 km	50 Days Mid Dec & Jan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>77 Days Mid Dec, Jan &amp; Feb</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant distance to other facilities</li> <li>Asset in reasonable condition</li> </ul>	
<b>Templeton</b>	1,490	\$20.17	6	6	7 km	50 Days Mid Dec & Jan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>63 Days Jan &amp; Feb</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong support from school</li> <li>Asset in reasonable condition</li> <li>Large distance to other pools</li> <li>Pleasant semi rural environment</li> </ul>	
<b>Woolston</b>	985	\$37.57	8	1	1.7 km	50 Days Mid Dec & Jan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open Feb to mid Mar</li> <li>Schools use only</li> <li>CCC maintain asset and water</li> <li>School open &amp; clean</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 1.7 km to Waltham outdoor pool</li> <li>Pool has no heating, not used by public</li> <li>Asset condition is good and close proximity to school lends itself to school pool use</li> <li>Very low cost to operate as school pool</li> <li>User charge reflects schools contribution</li> </ul>	
<b>Papanui</b>	1,221	\$25.46	1	2	4 km	50 Days Mid Dec & Jan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pool decommissioned</li> <li>School assisted to find other pool time.</li> <li>Swim club moves to Edgeware or Belfast</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very low public use</li> <li>Asset in a poor condition in all areas</li> <li>Close proximity to Edgeware and Belfast pools</li> <li>High heating and maintenance costs and an unpredictable plant so not suitable as a school pool</li> <li>Only one major user, Papanui School</li> <li>Poor facilities, main pool too shallow</li> </ul>	

<sup>12</sup> Customer service potential based on facilities offered and condition of asset.

<sup>13</sup> Distance as at 1 May 2005 ie before any of the review recommendations are actioned.

## 7 Cont'd

**Advantages:**

This is a genuine attempt to think outside the square, to address the issues in a sustainable manner. There is a hard decision in respect of Papanui Pool but the logic behind it is sound. This option is the best in getting maximum value from the suburban pools in the medium term.

- Overall increase of 30 operational days on 2004/2005 levels of service.
- Three pools have substantial increases in service at no additional cost to the Council.
- No increase in the cost of service.
- Increased costs managed within current budget.
- Substantial flexibility in season length.
- Four pools open to schools in February; three pools open over the school holidays.
- Keeps a suite of outdoor pools open as equally spaced as possible throughout the city.
- Allows for additional investment and programming at the pools that can best justify it.
- Identifies and manages additional risk.
- Uses finite maintenance resources in a sustainable fashion, i.e. funds previously allocated to Papanui will be used to preserve Edgeware.
- This option proactively manages a pool decommission rather than waits for an unscheduled asset failure.

**Disadvantages:**

The principal disadvantage is that the general public will not be able to access an outdoor pool at Papanui, as they have in the past.

- Reduced levels of service at Papanui and Woolston Pools.
- Papanui School and Swim Club will need to be relocated.

5.4 **Retain the status quo**

This involves maintaining the current philosophy of providing similar levels of service at each facility. Owing to increased costs beyond Council's control the season will probably shrink.

**Advantages:**

- No changes.

**Disadvantages:**

- The rationale for change outlined in section 4 of this report is ignored.
- Instead of managing change there is a probability that change will be imposed without warning by asset failure or increase costs.
- Owing to increased costs the pool season will shrink further.
- Ineffective use of Council resources.

**PREFERRED OPTION**

6. The preferred option is option 5.3, **change levels of service between pools according to need** and the changed management practices outlined in Table 1. This was supported by the Creating Stronger Communities Portfolio Group and the Council seminar subject to consultation with affected parties. The subsequent consultation process run through April 2005 has supported option 5.3. This is detailed in section eight of the attached review.

## 7 Cont'd

**ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**

7. Table 3 evaluates each option presented in this report in terms of:

- the extent of fulfilment of Council's goal for suburban pools,
- the extent to which the principles driving the review are satisfied,
- the degree to which the rationale for change is met, and
- any publicity considerations.

<b>Table 3: Evaluation of Options</b>				
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Options</b>			
	<b>Retain Current Length of Season</b>	<b>Increase the Financial Resource</b>	<b>Change Levels of Service Between Pools</b>	<b>Retain the Status Quo</b>
<b>Councils Goal for Suburban Pools</b>				
Maximising fulfilment of community outcomes through the sustainability of the facility and level of participation.	3	2	7	2
<b>Principles Driving the Review and Rationale for Change</b>				
No additional cost of service.	7	0	7	7
Sustainability, condition of the asset.	3	2	6	2
Another pool in appropriately close proximity.	7	7	4	7
Pool services are available to schools in February.	2	7	7	2
Any risks are identified, accepted and appropriately managed.	5	2	8	2
Suburban pools compliment not compete with other pool provision.	4	4	8	4
<b>Other Rationale for Change</b>				
Adverse publicity reaction for the changes.	6	2	6	7
Adverse publicity reaction for not changing.	2	5	7	2
<b>Totals<sup>14</sup></b>	<b>39/90</b>	<b>31/90</b>	<b>60/90</b>	<b>33/90</b>

Note: Additional assessment processes are detailed in the attached review in section seven.

<sup>14</sup> Each marked out of 10, 1 being least favourable

## 7 Cont'd

<b>Significance:</b>		<b>High/ Medium/ Low</b>
<b>Impact on social, economic, environmental or cultural wellbeing.</b>	Positive impact as service levels grow overall	Low
<b>Impact on Council's capacity</b>	Positive as existing resources are better used to cater for more activity	Low
<b>Alignment with the LTCCP or Annual Plan</b>	Aligned	Low
<b>Expenditure Required and magnitude of the decision in terms of its net cost to the Council.</b>	No additional cost to Council, potential long term saving in maintenance costs	Low
<b>Potential Effects radically different</b>	Totally quantifiable effects in a tight framework	Low
<b>Degree of controversy</b>	Low outside the limited user groups and possibly the local community, higher for those affected  User groups and the respective pool communities have supported the review findings  Strong community support  In the Shirley Papanui area two out of three pools have a substantial increase in service.	Low
<b>Reversibility of the decision.</b>	Decommissioned pool can be recommissioned, i.e. no demolition, schools only pool can be opened to public	Low
<b>Certainty of information.</b>	Purely factual information where necessary verified by an independent engineer	Low
<b>Impact on Strategic Assets</b>	None	Low
<b>Change to mode of delivery of a Group of Activities.</b>	Very small, affects 0.062% of users to Council funded pools	Low
<b>Change to level of service of a Group of Activities.</b>	Positive change to levels of service overall at suburban pools	Low
<b>If this is a <u>significant decision in relation to land or a body of water</u>, how does it take account of the relationship of Māori to ancestral land, water, sites, waahi tapu, valued flora and fauna, and other taonga?</b>	No	N/A
<b>Any other relevant matters</b>	Needs of specific pool user groups will be addressed	Low
<b>Should the proposal be decided through LTCCP (or amendment)?</b>	No	N/A

## 7 Cont'd

## VIEWS OF AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES

<b>What research, communication or consultation has been undertaken? (including considering information already held by the Council)</b>	Extensive research and consultation as prescribed by Council seminar 23 March Consultation with all pool user groups of the past two years
<b>What was done to encourage interested or affected persons to present their views?</b>	All affected parties identified and individually consulted and invited to meetings
<b>What consideration has been given to community views on this matter?</b>	As directed priority was given to the affected communities
<b>What opportunities were Maori given to contribute to the proposed decision?</b>	N/A
<b>Is there a legal requirement to consult? What?</b>	No
<b>Is a Special Consultative Procedure Required Prior to Decision? Why</b>	No
<b>Must the decision be made through an LTCCP? Why?</b>	No

## UNIT CONSULTATION

<b>Units Consulted</b>	<b>Comments on Proposal</b>
Research and Policy	Support, consistent with Council's Aquatic Facility Strategy process
Facility Assets	None
Community and Recreation	Supportive, advised to consult with affected communities, this was done

**8. STRATEGIC TRANSPORT ISSUES**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Author:</b>	Jane Parfitt, DDI 941-8656

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to provide strategic overview of the legislation, policies and strategies which impact on CCC and to identify the other parties with whom we partner to deliver our responsibilities.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Christchurch City Council's transport strategies and programmes fit within national and regional frameworks and involve many other agencies all working together. While the end result is the capital programme, much planning goes into this over many years. It is not possible to easily change one part without reviewing the whole. In addition we must be mindful of funding requirements and integration with other Christchurch City Council strategies and community outcomes.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

3. Not applicable because this report is for information.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Council agrees to conduct a seminar of the current status and content for the MCTS and GCTS.



**BACKGROUND ON STRATEGIC TRANSPORT ISSUES**

4. The Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS) is a statutory document prepared under the requirements of the Land Transport Act 1998. It contributes to the Government's overall vision of achieving an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system and it takes into account other government transport energy, health and economic development objectives and strategies.
5. The Regional Land Transport Committee (RLTC), a standing committee of Environment Canterbury, is responsible for preparing the Canterbury RLTS. This committee includes representatives from Environment Canterbury, City and District Councils, Government transport agencies and health business, cultural, environmental and transport interest groups. These agencies and groups are responsible for the ongoing development and implementation of the strategy.
6. Within the greater Christchurch area, the greater Christchurch urban development strategy (UDS) involves a co-ordinated approach between the Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Banks Peninsula District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Environment Canterbury, Land Transport New Zealand and Transit New Zealand. A greater Christchurch Transport statement is being developed as the transport section of the UDS, covering the same geographical area. These two projects are vital to the integration of land use development and the provision of land transport in and around Christchurch.
7. Key components of the MCTS include five strategies – parking, public transport, cycling, pedestrian and road safety. Integration is delivered through projects and the capital programme. Projects incorporate all strategies and take account of other Christchurch City Council strategies and statutory requirements.
8. The Canterbury RLTS 2005 to 2015 and its two new components – the Canterbury Regional Land Transport Freight Action Plan and Cycling in Canterbury (a strategy for the development of a regional network of cycling routes) were adopted and made operative by the Canterbury Regional Council in 31 March 2005. As stated above, the RLTC developed this strategy which sets out a framework for future planning and provision for regional land transport in Canterbury in consultation with its member agencies and the Canterbury public at large. The Christchurch City Council is a member of this committee.
9. If we wished to review/change the cycle strategy this could not be done in isolation from other strategies and the statutory requirements described above.
10. A major change to the cycling strategy would drive a basic review of parking, pedestrian, road safety and public transport strategies and would potentially involve changes to the transport sections in the city plan. A review of the impacts on/change to the MCTS/GCTS/UDS directions and philosophy would be necessary and the impacts on the RLTS (in particular Christchurch City Council commitments) would also need to be reviewed for impacts on consistency with NZTS; in particular to investigate whether this would impact on funding assistance from central government.
11. A review of the cycling component of current and future projects would impact on the forward capital programme possibly requiring a change to the LTCCP and a special consultative process.
11. The draft community outcomes currently out for consultation include outcomes related to the support of cycling. In addition, other Christchurch City Council policies need the support of the cycling infrastructure (Active Living Christchurch and Safer Christchurch). Any review of the cycling strategy therefore would need to take into account the need to be consistent with achieving community outcomes.
12. Appendix 1 (attached) contains a chart showing how various strategies and initiatives fit together and how they impact on each other.

**9. WASTEWATER OUTFALL EASEMENTS – APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONERS**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	John Allen – Policy & Leasing Administrator – Greenspace Unit – DDI 941-8699

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to enable the Council to appoint Commissioners to hear submitters in support of their submissions regarding proposals for temporary and permanent easements over South New Brighton Park and the South New Brighton foreshore reserves, to enable temporary construction sites to be located on park and reserve land, and for the wastewater pipeline to be laid through this land.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. There is a need for the Council to appoint impartial Commissioners to a Reserve Hearings Panel to hear submitters' views concerning the proposal to approve both temporary and permanent easements over South New Brighton Park, and part of the South New Brighton foreshore reserves, both areas of land being vested in the Council under the Reserves Act 1977. The easements are required to enable the pipeline to be laid through these reserves.
3. The Hearings Panel, after hearing submitters and considering their views and submissions, will make recommendations to the Council, which will be included in a detailed report for its consideration, and decision.
4. There is an opportunity to use the same Commissioners that have been appointed to hear the submissions in relation to the resource consent applications to Environment Canterbury, the Christchurch City Council, and the Banks Peninsula District Council with respect to the construction and operation of the proposed ocean outfall for treated wastewater, these same Commissioners being the Commissioners that heard, and decided on the resource consent application conditions for the Waimakariri District Council Ocean Outfall.
5. It is recommended that the Council also appoints these Commissioners to a Reserves Hearings Panel to hear submitters' views in relation to the proposal for temporary and permanent easements over the reserve land vested in the Council, to enable the wastewater outfall and pipeline to proceed. After considering submitters' views the hearings panel will make a recommendation to the Council for consideration.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6. The Council is required under section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977; sub-section (6), to grant itself easements prior to establishing temporary construction sites on a reserve, and placing pipelines through a reserve. This section of the Reserves Act provides:
  - (6) *Rights of way and other easements may be granted under this section to any person, including, notwithstanding any rule of law to the contrary, the administering body in which the reserve is vested, and, where the right of way or other easement is granted to the administering body, covenants and agreements in respect of any such transaction may be entered into by the administering body in the one capacity so as to bind or benefit the administering body in the other capacity as fully and effectually as if the administering body were a separate person in each capacity.*
7. The temporary easements will be granted under sub-section 48(1)(a) of the Reserves Act 1977, 'Any *Public Purpose*;' while the easements in which the pipe will be laid will be permanent, being granted under section 48(1)(f), *Provide or facilitate access or the supply of water to or the drainage of any other land not forming part of the reserve or for any other purpose connected with any such land.*

9 Cont'd

8. The Council has publicly advertised its intention to grant the easements in accordance with the requirements of sub-section 48(2) of the Reserves Act 1977. Sub-section 48(3) states that sub-section 2 *'shall not apply in any case where-*
  - (a) *The reserve is vested in the administering body and is not likely to be materially altered or permanently damaged; and*
  - (b) *The rights of the public in respect of the reserve are not likely to be permanently affected - by the establishment and lawful exercise of the right of way or other easement.'*
9. The Council needs to put in place easements that allow tenderers for the ocean outfall construction contract to consider the widest range of methods that they may wish to use to construct the outfall. If the successful contractor decides to lay the pipeline using an open trench method, then a small number of trees in South Brighton Park may need to be removed. However if a micro tunnelling method is used, no disturbance to the trees will occur. Officers have decided after consulting with officers from the Department of Conservation to advertise all the proposed easements, to ensure that there is no possibility of a legal challenge being made in the future, against a decision to grant the easements.

**PROPOSED COMMISSIONERS**

10. It is important that because the easements being applied for are for the benefit of the Council, that elected members who usually constitute the Council's Reserve Hearings Panels to hear submitters' views, and make a recommendation to the Council are not involved in this process.
11. A hearing has been arranged to hear submitters' views as part of the resource consent process for acquiring the resource consents necessary for the project to proceed. This hearing has been set down for the period from Tuesday 7 until Friday 24 June. The Commissioners for this hearing have already been appointed. It is sensible therefore to appoint these Commissioners as the Reserve Hearings Panel to hear submitters' views, in support of their submissions concerning the proposal for both temporary and permanent easements over South New Brighton Park, and the South New Brighton foreshore, because of their inherent knowledge of the project. With respect to the other consent applications, these Commissioners will after considering submitters' views and their submissions make recommendations to the Council, on the proposal to grant the easements. These recommendations will be included in a full report that will be prepared for Council deliberation. It is anticipated that this hearing will occur at the end of the resource consent hearing.
12. The Commissioners proposed are:

Anthony Hughes-Johnson, a Queen's Counsel based in Christchurch, who is an experienced commissioner.

John Lumsden, a Coastal and Resource Management Engineering Consultant, based in Christchurch, who is very experienced in this field, having in the past been retained to undertake work for local authorities, and private companies in his specialist field throughout New Zealand.

Dr Greg Ryder, a Water Quality Scientist/Consultant, based in Dunedin. He has a PhD in Zoology, and extensive experience in the production of publications, technical reports, and extensive experience as an expert witness appearing for local authorities, and private enterprise.
13. These three Commissioners were the three Commissioners who heard and decided on the resource consent application conditions required for the Waimakariri District Council Ocean Outfall.

9 Cont'd

**PROCESS**

14. The process by which the Council is able to grant easements is set out in section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977. The process is set out below:
  - 14.1. The Council publicly advertises its intention to grant an easement(s) in a newspaper which circulates in the area, giving the public one calendar month to make a submission on or object to the Council's proposal.
  - 14.2. If a submission is received, and the submitter wishes to be heard in support of their submission, **(two submitters have indicated that they wish to be heard in support of their submission)**, they are given the opportunity to be heard, hence the appointment of a Reserve Hearings Panel.
  - 14.3 The Reserve Hearings Panel hears submitters, and considers any other submissions received, making a recommendation to the Council.
  - 14.4. Officers prepare a report for the Council to consider, which includes a synopsis of the submitters' concerns, and the Reserves Hearings Panel's recommendations
  - 14.5. If the Council resolves to grant the easements, the file is sent to the Minister of Conservation for review, and consent or otherwise for the granting of the easements proposed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council appoints Anthony Hughes-Johnson, John Lumsden, and Dr Greg Ryder to a Reserve Hearings Panel, to hear submitters' views in support of their submissions concerning the proposal to obtain Council approval for the granting of temporary and permanent easements over land vested in the Council under the Reserves Act 1977, to enable the construction of the wastewater outfall and pipeline, and to make a recommendation to the Council on the submissions.

**10. REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD**

Attached.

**11. NOTICES OF MOTION**

**12. QUESTIONS**

**13. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

Attached.