



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

THURSDAY 13 OCTOBER 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.

DESCRIPTION

APOLOGIES

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 6.10.2005

DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

CORRESPONDENCE

PROPOSED CHANGES TO DRAFT WATER AND SANITARY SERVICES ASSESSMENT

COMMUNITY WASTE MINIMISATION FUND

CANTERBURY JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE - CONSTITUTING AGREEMENT REVIEW

MAKING THE CITY PLAN OPERATIVE IN PART

UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY INNOVATION INSTITUTE - UNDERWRITING

HEATHCOTE VALLEY PARK: FUNDING OF SPORT PARK FACILITIES

**REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD -
MEETING OF 21 SEPTEMBER 2005**

**REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD -
MEETING OF 19 SEPTEMBER 2005**

NOTICES OF MOTION

QUESTIONS

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 6.10.2005

Attached.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

CULTURAL PRECINCT

Submissions regarding the Cultural Precinct will be made by Messes Ian Bougen (Christchurch and Canterbury Marketing) and Tony Paine (Director, Christchurch Arts Centre).

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

5. CORRESPONDENCE

6. PROPOSED CHANGES TO DRAFT WATER AND SANITARY SERVICES ASSESSMENT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	City Water and Waste Manager
Authors:	Mark Rykers, Business Relations Team Leader, DDI 941-8640 Paula Southen, Reticulation Asset Management Planner, DDI 941-8274 Rob Hawthorne, Strategic Property Analyst, DDI 941-6458 Paul Dickson, Drainage Engineer, DDI 941-8392

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to table the amendments recommended by the Hearings Panel established to hear submissions on the Draft Water and Sanitary Services Assessment dated May 2005. This report seeks to have the draft assessments adopted by the Council subject to the amendments detailed in Appendix A and B attached to this report. The assessment covers the following water and sanitary services: water supply, wastewater, stormwater drainage, cemeteries and crematoria and sanitary conveniences. The Water & Sanitary Services Assessment has not been compiled as a comprehensive assessment of environmental values and issues facing the Council, but has been developed primarily to assess public health impacts in areas covered by this assessment in the Christchurch City area.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Local Government Act 2002 requires territorial local authorities to carry out an assessment for water and sanitary services in accordance with sections 123-129 of the Act by 30 June 2005. Although we will not meet this date, advice from Legal Services is that as long as we continue as quickly as is reasonably possible, this is extremely unlikely to be considered as a significant breach of the Act. The major objective of the requirement to undertake the assessments is to ensure future demand for services can be met and that public health is protected. The assessment covers services defined by section 25(1)(a), (b), (c), (d), (h), and (i) of the Health Act 1956 namely:
 - Waterworks
 - Drainage works, sewerage works and works for disposal of sewage
 - Works for the collection and disposal of refuse, nightsoil and other offensive matter
 - Cemeteries and crematoria
 - Sanitary services for the use of the public
3. As this Council had adopted a waste management plan under part 31 of the Local Government Act 1974 it is not required to undertake an assessment of works for the collection and disposal of refuse, nightsoil and other offensive matter.
4. A Special Consultative Procedure was followed between 29 April 2005 and 30 May 2005 to invite submissions on the draft assessments published in late April 2005. The Council received 36 submissions. Ten submitters asked to be heard by the Hearings Panel comprising Councillors Cox (Chairperson), Sheriff and Wells. Submitters were heard on 27 July 2005.
5. Information on key findings and options to meet demand have been presented to the Council through a seminar and detailed information is provided in the draft assessment for each area. The Special Consultative Procedure process has identified a number of changes in wording in the draft assessments. These changes are detailed in Appendix A. Appendix B details the preferred and recommended options from the draft reports modified as necessary from the consultative procedure. Budgetary and level of service impacts have also been detailed for each assessment area in the tables in Appendix B.
6. In terms of this report the preferred option is for the Council to accept this report and thereby adopt the Draft Water and Sanitary Services Assessment dated May 2005 modified by wording changes in Appendix A and recommended and preferred options detailed in Appendix B.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. The various assessments consider several options and, where practicable and sufficient information is available, these have been evaluated in terms of their estimated financial impact. Detailed financial information is not available on all options but work will be completed on these options by the Units responsible in time for the 2006-16 LTCCP process following adoption of these assessments.
8. The Council is required under part 7 (Sections 124-125, 127-129) of the Local Government Act 2002 to carry out an assessment of water and sanitary services within its district. Sections 83 to 89 of the Local Government Act set out the requirements in respect of the Special Consultative Procedure to be followed. These requirements have been met in finalising this report. The individual assessments also consider the requirements of the other pertinent legislation relating to each service and this information is contained in the assessment documents. Some of the recommended and preferred options may require future changes to existing regulations and bylaws to enable implementation. Any changes to existing regulations and bylaws will be signalled by the Units responsible for delivery of the service in a timely manner to allow implementation of the works recommended by this assessment and approved through the LTCCP process.
9. Appendix B details recommended and preferred options for works to improve the quality of the city's waterways. There are significant costs identified in implementing these works and this work will need to be considered in the context of the entire capital works programme proposed under the 2006-16 LTCCP.
10. The Local Government Act 2002 required the adoption of this assessment by 30 June 2005. This is a technical breach of an obligation imposed on the Council by the Local Government Act. Delays in presenting the final report have been associated with the unavailability of members of the Hearings Panel owing to ill health. Given the aforementioned technical breach of the Act with regard to timing of the adoption of the Water and Sanitary Services Assessment it is recommended that this paper and the draft assessment be adopted by the Council as soon as possible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

- (a) The Council receive the findings of the Hearings Panel as summarised in Appendix A and B of this report.
- (b) The Council adopt the Draft Water and Sanitary Services Assessment dated May 2005 modified by the wording changes detailed in Appendix A and the recommended and preferred options as detailed in Appendix B of this report.
- (c) The Council note that significant costs will be incurred in implementing all the preferred options and that recommendations on these will need to be considered in the 2006/16 LTCCP.
- (d) Following adoption by the Council, the Environmental Diversity and Liveable City Portfolio Groups be requested to reflect on the options set out in Appendix B and report back to the Council during its planning process for the 2006/016 LTCCP.
- (e) That through its policy review process, the Council consider whether it has adequate policy statements with respect to the environmental values of the city's water assets.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option**

Is for the Council to receive the changes to the draft assessment as detailed in Appendix A and Appendix B of this paper and to adopt the Draft Water and Sanitary Services Assessment dated May 2005 as amended by the changes detailed in Appendices A and B to this report.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Preparation of assessments enables community input to future service provision. Some of the assessments will have a direct impact on ensuring future social needs are met.	None identified.
Cultural	Some of the assessments will have a direct impact on ensuring cultural needs are met particularly in terms of providing for specific cultural requirements.	May be additional costs in meeting cultural requirements (e.g. cemeteries).
Environmental	The assessments have a requirement to focus on the environment. The key focus is deemed to be protection of public health.	Significant additional costs have been identified in the environmental protection of waterways.
Economic	Will provide improved long term financial information on future service and infrastructural requirements	Some assessment options have identified some additional infrastructural costs.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome: <i>"Our city's infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long term sustainability."</i></p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: Assessment has identified the need for future capacity requirements with associated capital works and operational expenditure. These requirements will be fed into the 06-16 LTCCP process.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: Maori will have a strong interest particularly in terms of protection of water and land from contamination. Maori have been consulted with throughout the formulation of the assessments and during the Special Consultative Procedure.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Consistent with LGA requirements and the Council's consultation guidelines.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: The results of initial consultation carried out with some assessments is detailed in the individual assessments. The Medical Officer of Health's comments have been received and incorporated into the assessments where applicable.</p> <p>Other relevant matters: A Special Consultative Procedure process has been utilised by the Council to obtain submissions from the public and affected parties in compliance with the requirements of the LGA 2002</p>		

7. COMMUNITY WASTE MINIMISATION FUND

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group
Officer responsible:	City Water and Waste Manager
Author:	Zefanja Potgieter, DDI 941- 8271

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The report proposes the establishment of the Community Waste Minimisation Fund and sets out the detail of the proposal.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. As from the 2005/06 financial year an annual amount of \$50,000 is available from the Council's *Waste Minimisation Fund* in the existing City Water and Waste budget to fund by way of grants suitable community based waste minimisation initiatives. This funding is derived from the existing general waste minimisation levy which is imposed on every tonne of refuse disposed of at landfill. (Potential funding for commercially based waste minimisation initiatives already exist through the *Sustainable Industries Fund* of the Recovered Materials Foundation.) The Community Waste Minimisation Fund therefore falls under the umbrella of the Council's *Waste Minimisation Fund*.
3. It is recognised that good ideas on how to increase waste minimisation exist in the community and that tapping into such knowledge and ideas could potentially add value to reaching the waste reduction goals set out in the Council's Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan 2003. It is also recognised that there may be instances where insufficient financial resources exist to develop such ideas, into viable and practical options of benefit to the whole community. Furthermore informing the public of the existence of the new Community Waste Minimisation Fund may in itself stimulate creative thinking towards such new ideas.

PURPOSE OF THE FUND

4. The purpose of the fund is to support the goals of the Council's Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan by encouraging and assisting the Christchurch community to contribute to these goals by developing effective and practical approaches to waste minimisation in the community. North Shore City Council has a comparable fund in existence, called the *WasteWise* Fund, and the proposal for Christchurch incorporates some elements of that.

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

5. Community waste minimisation projects, including but not limited to increasing community participation in *Reducing, Reusing, Recycling and Recovery* of materials from the waste stream; research; sponsorships and awards; and feasibility studies or set-up costs for new non-commercial initiatives.

APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY

6. Any individual or organisation. This would include individuals and community groups (whether incorporated or not).

INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

7. Details required from applicants:

Name and contact details.

Full description of project.

Project objectives/outcomes including how the outcomes will be assessed/measured.

Description of how the project meets the assessment criteria and how it contributes towards the Council's community outcomes

Breakdown of project tasks and time frames.

Breakdown of staff/volunteers/other funding that will be involved.

Breakdown of project costs.

How much funding is being sought from the Council.

7 Cont'd

8. Assessment criteria will be determined by the Planning Manager from time to time. It is proposed that the initial criteria cover the following categories as set out below and applicants would need to demonstrate to what extent the application addresses some or all criteria categories. Criteria weighting will depend on the individual project and its stated outcomes.

Category	Criteria	Assessment Basis (Note: The examples below are likely to differ from project to project)
A. Environmental	Effective use of natural resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The avoidance and/or diversion of waste from landfill anticipated▪ The extent to which the project will 'close the loop' of resource use▪ The avoidance of greenhouse gas emissions
	Amenity values are protected	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The extent to which visual impact, noise, odour, dust and litter are avoided
B. Social and Cultural	Community participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The level of community uptake and the extent to which the community is encouraged to take responsibility for its own waste and/or products
	Employment & education	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Potential for local job creation▪ Educational opportunities provided
C. Achievability	Flexibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The general practicability of the project and the likelihood that the outcomes will be achieved
D. Economic	Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Operational cost, capital cost, cost per household, cost per tonne (as appropriate)
	Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Avoided costs, revenue and other economic benefits (as appropriate)

PROJECT SELECTION AND FUNDING LIMITS

9. Project selection will be by the City Water and Waste Planning Manager and City Water and Waste Unit Manager. It is recommended that the maximum amount per application be \$10,000 from the total available annual funding of \$50,000. The Planning Manager should however have the discretion to review this provision if the particular circumstances require a different approach, and an annual management review of the operation of the Fund will be undertaken. Payment of grants may, depending on the conditions of approval of a grant not be a lump sum payment, but subject to approved progress reports.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. As from 2005/06, an annual amount of \$50,000 has been budgeted. As the funding is from the dedicated Waste Minimisation Fund, funds unallocated in any year can be carried over to subsequent years.

SUMMARY

11. The Community Waste Minimisation Fund is aimed at encouraging and assisting the Christchurch community to develop effective and practical approaches to waste minimisation in the community. An annual amount of \$50,000 has been budgeted. Once approved, the publication 'City Scene' will be used to promote participation in this initiative.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- Establish the Community Waste Minimisation Fund for 2005/06 financial year as set out in the report.
- Delegate to the Planning Manager the management and implementation of the Community Waste Minimisation Fund.
- Review the operation of the Community Waste Minimisation Fund for the 2006/16 LTCCP.

8. CANTERBURY JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE - CONSTITUTING AGREEMENT REVIEW

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	City Water and Waste Manager
Author:	Zefanja Potgieter, DDI 941-8271

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Council to approve changing the constitution of the Canterbury Joint Standing Committee, and to support inviting new members to join the committee.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. On 12 September the Canterbury Waste Subcommittee, the operative arm of the Canterbury Joint Standing Committee (CJSC), resolved:

“That member councils be requested to endorse:

- (a) *The adoption of the submitted draft new constituting agreements for two separate joint committees, the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee and the Canterbury Regional Landfill Joint Committee.*
- (b) *Extending a formal invitation to the Canterbury Regional Council to consider the approved version of the new draft constituting agreement as a basis for possible future membership.*
- (c) *Extending a formal invitation to the Waitaki District Council to join the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee upon its formation.”*

3. The current 2002 Constituting Agreement of the CJSC requires all ten member councils to unanimously agree to changes to the constitution and to inviting additional members to join. The current ten CJSC members are the Christchurch City Council and the Ashburton, Banks Peninsula, Hurunui, Kaikoura, Mackenzie, Selwyn, Timaru, Waimakariri and Waimate District Councils. CJSC and CWSC deal with both regional waste minimisation and regional landfill issues.
4. Under the Local Government Act 2002 a different and simpler operational structure is possible. While CJSC/CWSC deals with both regional waste minimisation and the regional landfill, the proposed new structure splits the work into two separate joint committees, one dealing with regional waste minimisation (the proposed new Canterbury Waste Joint Committee) and the other dealing with the new regional landfill at Kate Valley in the Hurunui district (the proposed new Canterbury Regional Landfill Joint Committee) where only the six shareholder councils will be represented - Christchurch, Ashburton, Banks Peninsula, Hurunui, Selwyn and Waimakariri.
5. The advantage of the new structure is a clear distinction between the regional waste minimisation activities to be undertaken by a larger group of councils, and the altogether separate landfill issues to be addressed by the smaller group of shareholders in Kate Valley landfill. This split also facilitates Environment Canterbury to consider joining the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee in advancing regional waste minimisation.
6. The proposals for the new Canterbury Waste Joint Committee also include:
 - Increasing the annual funding contribution of all members to the committee. For Christchurch it means that the annual funding contribution would increase from \$50,000 to \$75,000 per year, enabling more work to be done to advance regional waste minimisation.
 - Provisions for the existing *Regional Hazardous Waste Working Party* to become a subcommittee of the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee.
 - A proposed invitation to Environment Canterbury to join the committee, and
 - A proposed invitation to Waitaki District Council to consider joining the Committee. Part of Waitaki district falls into Canterbury, the remainder being in Otago.

8 Cont'd

7. Each of the ten member councils therefore need to pass the resolutions set out in this report to give effect to the new structure, planned to come into effect on 1 July 2006.
8. The Canterbury Waste Subcommittee report with full details is attached as Attachment A, and the two proposed Constituting Agreements as Attachments B and C.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Buddle Findlay has produced the attached two new draft Constituting Agreements. Funding exists for the increase of \$25,000 in the annual contribution from this Council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Endorse the adoption of the submitted draft new constituting agreements for two separate joint committees, the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee and the Canterbury Regional Landfill Joint Committee.
- (b) Endorse extending a formal invitation to the Canterbury Regional Council to consider the approved version of the new draft constituting agreement as a basis for possible future membership.
- (c) Endorse extending a formal invitation to the Waitaki District Council to join the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee upon its formation.

9. MAKING THE CITY PLAN OPERATIVE IN PART

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services
Officer responsible:	Environmental Services Manager
Author:	David Mountfort, DDI 941-8669

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend that the Council approve those parts of the City Plan which have been completed and resolve to make the City Plan operative in part.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The City Plan was first notified in 1995. Decisions on submissions were made in 1999. Approximately 400 references to the Environment Court were lodged. The great majority of these have been resolved, either by negotiated settlements or by decisions of the Court. Approximately 90 variations have been introduced. The great majority of these have also been resolved. Most of the City Plan is now beyond challenge and is legally deemed to be operative already. The final step in the Resource Management Act process for preparing the district plan is for the Council to approve the completed plan and make it operative.
3. There are a number of submissions, references and variations still not completed. It is possible for the plan to be approved and made operative in part. Those parts of the plan not being made operative will be clearly identified in the plan
4. In accordance with previous resolutions of the Council, it is intended to provide a version of the City Plan on the Internet.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

3. Finally approving the City Plan and making it operative are required steps under the Resource Management Act. There are four main legal consequences that follow from this:
 - The former Transitional District Plans cease to apply to any issue dealt with by the operative City Plan.
 - People are entitled to apply for changes to the City Plan and have their applications considered under a formal process. A report on this was considered by the Council on 15 September 2005.
 - Modifications to the City Plan are possible, but are carried out by the plan change process as opposed to the plan variation process. The processes are similar but not identical. A plan change does not have immediate effect but must be considered alongside the original provisions being changed, until the process is complete. Variations have immediate effect and replace the provision being varied from the date of public notification, although they may be further modified during the submissions and hearings process.
 - The 10 year review period starts to run.

The main financial considerations will be:

- The simplification in processing of resource consents and enforcement matters due to the lapsing of the Transitional Plans. This will result in minor cost savings for both the Council and applicants.
- The Council will also be able to dispense with giving advice about what provisions of the City Plan are complete and deemed to be operative.
- The new electronic production and publication systems will simplify the process of updating copies of the City Plan within the Council and in the community.

9 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Approve, pursuant to Clause 17(2) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991, the City Of Christchurch City Plan, with the exception of those provisions set out in the attached Schedule.
- (b) Authorise the Team Leader, City Plan to set and publicly notify the date on which the City Plan is to become operative, following the completion and distribution of the electronic and hard copy versions and the setting up of necessary administrative systems.

BACKGROUND ON MAKING THE CITY PLAN OPERATIVE IN PART

4. The City Plan was prepared between 1991 and 1995 and involved a great deal of research, tapping into past experiences, interviews with key members of the community, submissions made by a wide range of people, businesses and organisations, legal advice, and lengthy consideration by various committees of Councillors.
5. Much of the work in preparing the new Plan was done by the planning staff of the then Environmental Policy and Planning and the Environmental Services Units, assisted by many other Units of the Council, including City Streets, Parks, Waste Management, Water Services and Leisure.
6. The City Plan has been prepared by the Christchurch City Council to fulfil its obligations under the Resource Management Act 1991, and is prepared in three volumes:
 - Volume 1: The Statement of Issues
 - Volume 2: The Statement of Objectives, Policies and Methods
 - Volume 3: The Statement of Rules and Planning Maps
7. The City Plan was before the Council on 22 March 1995 and approved as the proposed District Plan for the City of Christchurch for the purpose of public notification in terms of Clause 5, First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991. It was publicly notified on 24 June 1995.
8. All citizens, community groups and businesses were invited to consider the City Plan as proposed, and to make submissions where this may be appropriate.
9. Over 2,500 people and organisations made 3,900 submissions covering over 12,000 topics. A further 1,500 people lodged submissions in support or opposition to the earlier submissions.
10. Hearings on the submissions took place over two years from October 1996 and involved over 630 days of hearings. Decisions on the submissions were made by the Council on 22 March 1999 and publicly notified on 8 May 1999. These decisions were subject to referral to the Environment Court within 15 working days.
11. Two hundred and seventy-three references to the Environment Court were lodged involving 409 topics. The City Plan as republished in September 1999, incorporates all amendments resulting from decisions on submissions made to the proposed City Plan notified on 24 June 1995.
12. Between 1999 and 2005 most of these references were either heard, withdrawn or settled by consent. Variation numbers 1 to 93 inclusive were publicly notified by the Council. Most of these have been completed, some remain to be heard by the Council or Environment Court. Ninety-three variations to the City Plan had been publicly notified by August 2005. Most of these have now been completed.
13. The City Plan was republished in May 1999, incorporating all amendments resulting from decisions on submissions made to the proposed City Plan. Numerous updates have been issued since, incorporating decisions of the Environment Court and subsequent Variation numbers 1 to 93 inclusive.
14. The City Plan has been available in electronic form, on the Council's intranet and for sale to the public on compact disc. The electronic version was a high quality product but achieved only limited sales. Electronic publishing has been complex and labour intensive and has required the maintenance of two separate versions of the Plan in different software. It was not practicable to publish on the internet in the form adopted. In recent years it has become usual for Councils to publish their plans on the internet. The opportunity has now been taken to update production techniques, move to a single version and publish the plan on the Council's website. This will be a high quality product, able to be readily browsed or searched. This electronic version is intended to be the authoritative version. It will be kept constantly up to date and in the opinion of the Ministry for the Environment will be the most advanced electronic version of an RMA plan currently available in New Zealand.

9 Cont'd

15. Hard copies will also be available, and updates made available for downloading from the Internet, and also through a hard copy subscription service for those who still require this.

PROVISIONS NOT YET ABLE TO BE MADE OPERATIVE

Outstanding references to the Environment Court

16. The following matters have not yet been completed by the Environment Court at time of writing:
- Retail issues in Industrial Business Zones
 - Floodplains issues
 - Airport Issues – limits to urban growth in vicinity, aircraft noise management, engine testing, retailing on the airport site, rezoning of rural site within airport noise contours
 - Urban growth at Belfast, Masham, Aidanfield and Cashmere
 - Living 1A zone issues
 - Zoning of Meadow Mushrooms site and surrounding lands at Awatea
 - Coastal hazard lines at South Brighton
17. It is possible that some of these matters may be resolved prior to the Council meeting, particularly in the airport group, South Brighton and Meadow Mushrooms and if so the Council will be advised at the meeting.

Outstanding Variations

Variation 52	Restrictions on urban growth near airport	Awaiting final decision of Environment Court.
Variation 82	Latimer Square road closure	Waiting for Environment Court hearing.
Variation 84	Stonehurst Accommodation	Awaiting Environment Court. Settlement by consent probable.
Variation 86	Retail distribution	Awaiting Council hearings November 2005.
Variation 89	Recession Planes	Council decision released, in appeal period.
Variation 90	Rural allotment clustering	Submissions heard, awaiting Commissioners decision.
Variation 91	Financial contributions	Council decision released, in appeal period.
Variation 92	Johns Road rezoning	Council decision released, in appeal period.
Variation 93	Clearwater	Publicly notified, in submission period.

Miscellaneous Matters

- Living 1A prohibited activity, minimum lot size of 1,500m² facing rural zones. The Council has agreed to initiate a further variation changing prohibited activity status to non-complying to resolve an existing reference. Draft variation is in consultation phase.
- Opawa Road/Port Hills Road. Submissions on the original plan were not resolved. Issues with property owners were resolved by negotiation and road widening is being carried out in reliance on the existing designation in the Transitional District Plan. This requires a new notice of requirement from Transit NZ to conclude the matter.
- State Highway designations. The recent notice of requirement from Transit NZ to designate the routes of all the existing State Highways in Christchurch has been publicly notified. No submissions were received. The Council has to make a recommendation to Transit NZ on this requirement but the matter has been complicated by recent issues relating to noise mitigation that arose in a case in Napier.

REMAINING WORK REQUIRED AFTER COUNCIL APPROVAL

- Complete the preparation of the electronic master City Plan document.
- Establish a system for printing hard copy versions from the master document and print copies for initial distribution.
- Establish systems for updating the master document and making updates available to plan holders.

9 Cont'd

- Complete preparations to make the City Plan available on the Internet.
- Provide training on the new electronic version to internal users and regular external users.
- Publicly notify that the City Plan is operative.
- Publicise and promote the on-line version of the City plan.

18. These remaining actions are anticipated to require 3-4 weeks. If completed successfully it is anticipated that the City plan can be made operative by the end of November.

OPTIONS

19. The options are:

- (a) Approve and make the Plan operative in part at this time.
- (b) Do nothing now. Wait until all existing matters are complete before approving the Plan and making it operative.
- (c) Do not approve the plan at all or make it operative.

PREFERRED OPTION

20. The preferred option is (a).

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Preferred Option

This achieves cost savings for those preparing, reporting on and deciding consent applications and removes the need to give advice on which sections of the plan are deemed to be operative.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	No particular benefits or costs. This is a formal legal step which does not affect the contents of the Plan.	No particular benefits or costs. This is a formal legal step which does not affect the contents of the Plan.
Cultural	No particular benefits or costs. This is a formal legal step which does not affect the contents of the Plan.	No particular benefits or costs. This is a formal legal step which does not affect the contents of the Plan.
Environmental	No particular benefits or costs. This is a formal legal step which does not affect the contents of the Plan.	No particular benefits or costs. This is a formal legal step which does not affect the contents of the Plan.
Economic	Simplifies consent processing and the giving of planning advice.	
Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome "a well-governed City" Also contributes to "A City with a Sustainable Natural Environment"		
Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: Simplifies processes, record keeping and public advice to a minor extent		
Effects on Maori: No known effects		
Consistency with existing Council policies: No known inconsistency		
Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Persons affected are those with outstanding submissions or references. As all provisions of the plan affected by these processes will not be made operative there is no effect.		
Other relevant matters: Nil		

9 Cont'd

Option (b)

Do nothing now. Wait until all existing matters are complete before approving the Plan and making it operative

There is no advantage in doing this. Some of the variations have several years before they can be completed. As the City Plan is a "living document", it is probable that further variations would be required. It is unlikely that there will ever be a time when there are no current amendments being considered and consequently there would never be an opportunity to make the plan operative.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Nil	Nil
Cultural	Nil	Nil
Environmental	Nil	nil
Economic	Nil	Costs owing to existence of Transitional Plans and the need to give advise on what provisions are deemed to be operative. Delays the opportunity for people to make applications for plan changes
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: No alignment with community outcomes</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: Adds minor complexity to administrative procedures</p> <p>Effects on Maori: None known</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: No policies relevant</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Persons preparing plan change applications likely to be opposed</p> <p>Other relevant matters: Christchurch is already one of the later Councils to achieve an operative plan and receives some adverse publicity for this.</p>		

9 Cont'd

Option (c)

Do not approve the plan at all or make it operative.

This is not recommended. The Council is obliged by the RMA to complete the plan, and approve it and make it operative. Likely to lead to Ministerial intervention.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Nil	Nil
Cultural	Nil	Nil
Environmental	Nil	Nil
Economic	Nil	Costs owing to existence of Transitional Plans and the need to give advise on what provisions are deemed to be operative. Delays the opportunity for people to make applications for plan changes
Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: No alignment with community outcomes Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: Fails to achieve Council's legal obligations under RMA Effects on Maori: Nothing particular known Consistency with existing Council policies: No relevant policies Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Likely to be opposed by many parties Other relevant matters: Would prevent private plan changes being applied for. Could lead to Ministerial intervention		

10. UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY INNOVATION INSTITUTE - UNDERWRITING

General Manager responsible:	Director of Strategic Investment
Officer responsible:	Director of Strategic investment
Author:	Bob Lineham, DDI 941-8411

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to underwrite fundraising by the University of Canterbury for an Innovation Institute, which will ensure the ability to secure Government funding of \$9.7 million for the project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The University of Canterbury has developed a proposal to establish an Information and Communications Technology (ICT) research and training facility which will bring together industry-led and university-led research and development to help enhance the local ICT industry and make it very significant in international terms. This is expected to have a very positive impact on the regional economy.
3. The Government has offered \$9.7 million in suspensory loans provided an equal amount of funding can be guaranteed from private sector sources and can be assured by January 2006.
4. The University of Canterbury Foundation is committed to raising the necessary local funds but needs a longer period to raise the required amount.
5. The University has sought Council support in the form of underwriting the private sector funding to an amount of \$5 million.
6. It is not intended that Council funding be uplifted on a permanent basis, if at all.
7. If called upon to provide the underwriting the Council could treat the funding as an investment and on the basis of an agreement entered into for the provision of the underwriting, would obtain interest on the funds which would leave the Council in an income neutral position.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. The Council has significant financial resources in the form of reserve funds but because of its own commitments for its own capital programme is not in a position to divert those funds to outside entities on a permanent basis.
9. The Council does have other funds such as the Capital Endowment Fund which needs to keep its capital intact to produce an ongoing income but which could be invested in this project if the underwriting is called up.
10. The Investment Policy of the Council allows for an unsecured investment of this nature provided it has been approved by the Council.
11. An investment with an interest income flow would leave the Capital Endowment fund income in a neutral position.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended:

- (a) That the Council approve the underwriting of the University of Canterbury Innovation Centre project to the maximum amount of \$5 million.
- (b) That the Council confirm that should the underwriting commitment be called up, that it be made available in the form of an unsecured interest bearing loan as an investment of part of the Capital Endowment Fund.
- (c) That the Director of Strategic Investment be authorised to enter into an agreement with the University of Canterbury and to finalise the details of that agreement.

BACKGROUND ON UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY INNOVATION INSTITUTE - UNDERWRITING

12. The University of Canterbury (UOC) wishes to establish a national centre of excellence for research and training in information and communication technology (ICT). It is seen to be an important opportunity to grow the economic development potential of the region in ICT as it will provide a means of linking industry led R&D with academic expertise and enable post graduate research ideas to be developed through to reality.
13. Attached is a summary of the proposal and request to Council to help facilitate this project through the provision of underwriting. A seminar for Councillors has been arranged for 11.30am on 11 October where the Vice Chancellor will outline more about the project and the benefits it will bring to the city.
14. The total project has a cost of \$19.4 million and government funding through a suspensory loan of \$9.7 million has been announced provided an equivalent local amount can be raised.
15. The UOC has approached the Council to assist it to secure the government funding of \$9.7 million which has been promised for this project provided UOC can prove to the government by 6 January 2006 that it has an equal amount secured from local sources.
16. The UOC already has on hand funds of approximately \$3 million and believes that it can raise the balance from industry research partners over the following two years. The University Foundation headed by Mr Steven Collins has made a commitment to raise the needed funds. However, the government will only make its commitment available subject to the following conditions:
 - The ability to raise the total amount of local funds must be demonstrated by 6 January 2006.
 - A pattern of drawdown of the government funds must be committed to on 6 January 2006.
 - Funds do not have to be on hand on 6 January but a commitment to have the matching local money available on the forecast dates must be met or government funding will be foregone.
 - The Government will only make available funds to match what is actually on hand on the drawdown dates.
17. The UOC is seeking an underwriting commitment from the Council of \$5 million so that it can secure the funding offer from government by January 2006. They do not intend to draw this from the Council in the long term although they may need to call it up temporarily if their fundraising cannot achieve the pattern of drawdown forecast in January 2006.
18. The Council's Strategic Directions document has goals, objectives and challenges under the 'Prosperous Economy Outcome' which are consistent with the support of the proposal. In particular some of the relevant references are:

Goals and Objectives

- Enhance business activity in the city by investing in, managing and encouraging provision of infrastructure, byfacilitating the provision of 'next generation' communications infrastructure.
- Work in partnership with the business and education sectors to attract and train people with diverse skills that meet business needs, by supporting the development of trade and professional skills to meet current and future needspromoting and teaching the entrepreneurship and values of business to the community ...supporting the work of the tertiary education providers

Key Challenges

- Investing in Innovation We need to invest more in research and development and to become more effective at getting good ideas to market.
19. One of the important aspects of this facility will be its ability to produce significantly better graduates in the ICT area which will be a major complement to the plan to position Christchurch as an internationally significant digital city.

10 Cont'd

OPTIONS

20. The Council has three options for dealing with this request:

- Take no action
- Make a grant
- Provide underwriting

PREFERRED OPTION – PROVIDE UNDERWRITING

21. Assuming that the Council wishes to ensure that UOC is able to gain access to the government funding of \$9.7 million and provide this facility to help grow the local ICT industry and economy, then the preferred option is to provide the requested underwriting support of \$5 million for this project.
22. Although this request is for underwriting and there is a genuine expectation that UOC will not need to call up the underwriting, it will be a contingent liability for the Council until such time as the funds are all raised by UOC and will need to be recorded in the Council's accounts in this way.
23. Because there is a contingent potential for this underwriting to be called up it, is necessary to consider how the Council would handle it in those circumstances. It is my recommendation that this be by way of an investment in an interest bearing loan and therefore the matter needs to be evaluated against the criteria in the Council's Investment Policy.
24. The Council's Investment Policy provides that loans to community organisations may be made provided they are authorised by the Council. Such loans should have a designated funding source and if they are to be unsecured this must be specified. It is therefore within the Council's power to determine to make a loan to UOC on the basis outlined and on the assumption that UOC as a public entity is seen as a community organisation. From my initial investigations such a loan would need to be unsecured given the restrictions on UOC from pledging its assets and revenues as security. The fact that UOC is a Crown backed public entity should be adequate to assure the Council that any loan funds do not need to be specifically secured since they would be provided to a secure public body for a facility which could not be estranged from public ownership.
25. Should the Council agree to this underwriting then I believe that it should be supported by a properly drawn up agreement which not only spells out the circumstances on which the underwriting would be made available but also the basis on which any underwriting would be treated as a loan until such time as it is repaid.
26. If the underwriting was called up then it could be treated as an investment of funds from the Capital Endowment Fund and the interest payable by UOC would enable the budgeted income of the Capital Endowment Fund to be maintained. In this way the Council budget and forecasts would be unaffected.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Preferred Option – Provide Underwriting

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	NA	NA
Cultural	Enhances opportunities for highly skilled post graduates in ICT to be developed. Institute will be a new destination for domestic as well as international students	No direct cost to the Council
Environmental	Proposed building intended to be an icon building by which New Zealand's ICT industry is recognised	No direct cost to the Council
Economic	Government grant of \$9.7 million towards this facility is assured. Attraction of global companies because the region is rich in innovative research and educated manpower Expertise to drive ICT development in the region.	Nil cost. Risk that underwriting may be called up in which case the Council would charge interest and remain in a neutral position regarding its income stream.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome a prosperous city .. based on a range of successful and innovative businesses. Also contributes to strategic objectives as noted above in the background section of this report.</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: No direct impact on the Council's capacity as even if underwriting is called up it will be in the form of an investment and income flows will be maintained.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: Neutral</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Consistent with the Council's policy to encourage economic development. Project supported by CDC</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: This is the preferred option for the University and its supporting industry partners</p> <p>Other relevant matters: Refer to other parts of this report.</p>		

Maintain The Status Quo – Take no action

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	NIL	NIL
Cultural	NIL	NIL
Environmental	NIL	NIL
Economic	NIL	NIL
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: No contribution to community outcomes. May mean the loss of funding and failure to achieve the proposal by UOC. This would lose an opportunity to contribute to the Prosperous City community outcome</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: Nil</p> <p>Effects on Maori: Neutral</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Failure to achieve this economic development opportunity at no cost to ratepayers</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: University and local ICT industry would be disenchanted at the lack of Council support</p> <p>Other relevant matters: Refer to other parts of this report.</p>		

Option 3 – Make a Grant

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social		
Cultural	Enhances opportunities for highly skilled post graduates in ICT to be developed. Institute will be a new destination for domestic as well as international students.	
Environmental	Proposed building intended to be an icon building by which New Zealand's ICT industry is recognised.	
Economic	Government Grant of \$9.7 million towards this facility is assured. Attraction of global companies because the region is rich in innovative research and educated manpower. Expertise to drive ICT development in the region.	Cost of \$5 million grant would be a direct cost on rates and if spread over two years would add approximately 1.4% to the rates in each year.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome a prosperous city .. based on a range of successful and innovative businesses. Also contributes to strategic objectives as noted above in background section of this report.</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: A grant would add significantly to forecast rate increases and reduce the Council's ability achieve other objectives.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: Neutral</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Failure to achieve this economic development opportunity at no cost to ratepayers</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Undoubtedly would make interested parties commitment much easier but this is more than is being asked for.</p> <p>Other relevant matters: Refer to other parts of this report.</p>		

11. HEATHCOTE VALLEY PARK: FUNDING OF SPORT PARK FACILITIES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	Greenspace Manager
Author:	Brent Smith, Capital Projects Team Manager DDI 941-8645

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval to bring forward \$525,000 funding identified in 2008/09 and 2009/10 in the current LTCCP, to this financial year so that sport facilities can be developed at Heathcote Valley Park and available for use in winter 2006.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Heathcote Valley Park development plan proposes, amongst others, the development of playing fields and associated facilities. Two playing fields have been developed and one car park but no public toilet or changing facilities. Funding for this and the additional two playing fields and landscaping is identified in 2008/09 and 2009/10 in the 2004/14 LTCCP. \$49,000 is currently allocated in the 2005/06 Annual Plan for initial field preparation at Heathcote Valley Park.
3. The Ferrymead Bays Soccer Club submitted a late submission to the 2005/06 Annual Plan seeking funding to be brought forward so that planned sporting facilities could be developed at Heathcote Valley Park now and ready for senior use by winter 2006 and junior use in 2006/07 to address the shortage of playing fields in the area. It was determined that toilet and changing rooms and additional car parks would be needed to support senior use and new fields developed for junior use. A response was prepared for the Council deliberations, (reference Folder 5 submission number 3987), but was overlooked during the 2005/06 Annual Plan deliberations and has resulted in the need for this report.
4. In order to determine if it would be appropriate to develop the sporting facilities at Heathcote Valley Park sooner than anticipated an analysis of current playing fields in the eastern part of Christchurch was undertaken. The south-east area of Christchurch by nature of its terrain has always had a shortage of suitable flat land for use as sports parks. Issues around competition for use of available fields particularly for use by winter codes have been longstanding. The pressure on sports fields has recently increased with an explosion in the number of junior players in the primary sports codes of rugby and soccer in the area over the last five years. This increase in player numbers has caused an acute shortage of available pitches and facilities for both junior and senior players across these codes. This participation increase is partly due to increases in population in this area of the city as well as a general increase in numbers playing soccer across the city and the collective efforts of the two major clubs (Sumner Rugby Club and Ferrymead Bays Soccer Club) in promoting and organising their sport.
5. The Council was aware of the anticipated growth in population and the existing and subsequent need for new sports grounds in the area and had an existing plan in place to develop Heathcote Valley Park for sports fields but the proposed expenditure for completion of the playing fields and construction of appropriate facilities was soon outstripped by the local requirements for these facilities. The Ferrymead Bays Soccer club alone fields 71 teams with annual growth in the last five years of nearly 20% per annum. This has resulted in many teams not playing a "home" game for many years and also means that protection of the existing playing surfaces becomes more difficult as usage increases.
6. The demand for additional fields was so strong that the two clubs driving this need got together to lobby the Council for the acceleration of the development of these fields and with Council staff support and facilitation by the local Councillor, a plan was developed to resolve the conflict and cater for the short and long term needs of both codes. Part of the proposed solution involved the acceleration of the proposed development of the sports fields and this proposal is supported by the local community, local club and code associations within the local area.
7. The two winter clubs who put forward the proposal are very well organised and active clubs who are providing a valuable community service for the people of Heathcote, Ferrymead, Sumner and Redcliffs.

11 Cont'd

8. Community consultation was undertaken on the sports fields as part of the Heathcote Valley Park development during 2002, and at that time there was no reference to planned public toilet or changing room facilities. The intention to bring forward the development of sporting facilities at the playing fields was, however, described in the July 2005 Heathcote Valley project newsletter. A resource consent would be required for the public toilet and changing rooms. Because of the time required to complete the detailed designs, obtain a resource and building consent and the construction period, it is important to action this now so that the building would be complete by 30 June 2006.
9. After considering the submission from the Ferrymead Bays Soccer Club, the need for additional playing fields and the costs and time to develop associated sporting facilities, three funding options were identified and assessed. These are as follows:
 - (a) Status quo of developing sport facilities at Heathcote Valley Park in 2008/09 and 2009/10
 - (b) Bring forward the development of sport facilities at Heathcote Valley Park to 2005/06
 - (c) Bring forward the development of sport facilities at Heathcote Valley Park but staged over two financial years (i.e. development during 2005/06 and 2006/07)
10. Having assessed all the options it is recommended that option (b) be adopted. This would allow for all required works, including the public toilet and changing rooms, to be completed by winter 2006, subject to resource consent approval.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. Due to large subdivisional activity, including in the Heathcote Valley, the reserve contribution fund is of sufficient size to support the draw down of an additional \$525,000 in 2005/06, or 2005/06 and 2006/07 to support this proposal. By drawing down the funding from the reserve contribution fund there is no impact on the projected Council borrowing to fund capital works. The cost to maintain the facilities would have to commence in 2006/07 instead of 2008/09 but is not considered significant.
12. Resource consent would be required for the public toilet and changing room facilities.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council bring forward the development of sport facilities at Heathcote Valley Park to the 2005/06 financial year.

BACKGROUND ON HEATHCOTE VALLEY PARK: FUNDING OF SPORT PARK FACILITIES

13. There is a general shortage of sports fields in eastern Christchurch. The Hagley/Ferrymead Leisure, Parks and Waterways Study in 2003 identified the development of more fields at Cuthberts Green and Heathcote Valley Park as immediate options to address this need and progress is being made with the creation of two junior sport fields at Heathcote Valley Park. The sports field shortage was reinforced through the Hagley/Ferrymead Leisure, Parks and Waterways Study Draft Three Year Action Plan for 2004-2007 which also referred to the need to provide toilets open for use at these sport fields.
14. The sports field shortage is being exacerbated by increasing participation rates of soccer, with the Ferrymead Bays Soccer Club averaging growth of 18% over the last five years and fielding 71 teams in 2005. Other major clubs in the area, such as Sumner Rugby, are also experiencing growth and competing for field usage.
15. The Council has identified funding in year 2008/09 and 2009/10 in the 2004/14 LTCCP to develop two additional fields, build public toilets and changing rooms and additional car parks at Heathcote Valley Park (conceptual plans are attached). \$49,000 is currently allocated in the 2005/06 Annual Plan for preliminary field preparation and planting at Heathcote Valley Park.
16. The Council met with all the winter code users to discuss these issues and it was suggested that the two current junior fields at Heathcote Valley Park could be allocated to soccer and readily converted to senior fields now, if they were supported by public toilets and changing rooms, a code requirement for intermediate premier and senior teams, to help alleviate the current sports fields shortage. The Ferrymead Bays Soccer Club subsequently submitted a late submission to the 2005/06 Annual Plan seeking funding to be brought forward so that planned sporting facilities could be developed at Heathcote Valley Park now to allow for these fields to be ready for senior use by winter 2006 and junior use in 2006/07. A response was prepared for Council deliberations, (reference Folder 5 submission number 3987), but was overlooked during the 2005/06 Annual Plan deliberations and has resulted in the need for this report.

OPTIONS

17. After considering the submission from the Ferrymead Bays Soccer Club, the need for additional playing fields and the costs and time to develop associated sporting facilities, three funding options were identified and assessed. These are as follows:
 - (a) Status quo of developing sport facilities at Heathcote Valley Park in 2008/09 and 2009/10
 - (b) Bring forward the development of sport facilities at Heathcote Valley Park to 2005/06
 - (c) Bring forward the development of sport facilities at Heathcote Valley Park but remain staged over two financial years (i.e. development during 2005/06 and 2006/07)

PREFERRED OPTION

18. Having assessed these options it is recommended that option (b) be adopted. This would allow for all required works to be completed as soon as practicable, with works programmed for completion by winter 2006.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option (b)**

Bring forward the development of sport facilities at Heathcote Valley Park to 2005/06

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Current fields can be fully utilised earlier than planned as they will be supported by facilities needed for senior use. Will take pressure off other sporting facilities around the city	
Cultural		
Environmental	Favourable outcomes will be achieved through the consultation and resource consent process. Planting of the site can be carried out sooner.	Condensed time period for consultation process.
Economic	Minimal impact on rates as funding drawn down from Reserves contribution fund. No requirement to hire temporary toilet facilities.	Maintenance costs of facilities and fields will commence sooner than originally planned. May result in need to carry forward the balance of funds if the project is not completed by 30 June 2006
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome a City of Healthy and Active People Also contributes to a Cultural and Fun City</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: Developing additional car parks and public toilets and changing rooms earlier than planned will result in operational and maintenance costs commencing earlier than planned but they are not considered significant.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: Will benefit Maori participating in soccer in the eastern area by providing local playing opportunities</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Greenspace practice is to provide public toilets and changing rooms on all sports parks</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Community views will be considered in the consultation and resource consent process</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

11 Cont'd

Maintain The Status Quo (Option (a))

Status quo of developing sport facilities at Heathcote Valley Park in 2008/09 and 2009/10

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Current fields will be able to be used by juniors	No facilities for senior soccer until winter 2009 Continuing pressure on other sporting facilities and fields around the city
Cultural		
Environmental	Longer time available for fields to establish prior to intensive sports use.	Delays in planting because of staged funding.
Economic	Reserve contribution fund will remain accruing interest until required in the future. No maintenance costs until 2008/09 aside from mowing costs.	
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome a City of Healthy and Active People Also contributes to a Cultural and Fun City</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Effects on Maori: Will benefit Maori participating in soccer in the eastern area by providing local playing opportunities</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Greenspace practice is to provide public toilets and changing rooms on all sports parks</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: This will be established through the project process</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

11 Cont'd

Option (c)

Bring forward the development of sport facilities at Heathcote Valley Park but remain staged over two financial years (i.e. development during 2005/06 and 2006/07)

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Current fields can be fully utilised earlier than planned as they will be supported by facilities needed for senior use. Will take pressure off other sporting facilities around the city.	Current fields will be reallocated to senior use so new junior fields will not be available until 2006/07. Senior players will be required to change in full view of the public.
Cultural		
Environmental	A longer time period is available for the resource consent process.	Delays in planting because of staged funding.
Economic	If there are any hold ups in the consent process, splitting funding may result in no need to carry forward funds.	Maintenance costs of facilities and fields will commence sooner than planned Reserve contribution fund will be reduced Toilet facilities may need to be hired.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome a City of Healthy and Active People Also contributes to a Cultural and Fun City</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: Developing additional car parks and public toilets and changing rooms earlier than planned will result in operational and maintenance costs commencing earlier than planned but they are not considered significant.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: Will benefit Maori participating in soccer in the eastern area by providing local playing opportunities</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Greenspace practice is to provide public toilets and changing rooms on all sports parks</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: By spreading the development over two financial years there will be issues regarding toilets and parking on this site.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

**12. REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD -
MEETING OF 21 SEPTEMBER 2005**

Attached.

**13. REPORT OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD -
MEETING OF 19 SEPTEMBER 2005**

Attached.

14. NOTICES OF MOTION

15. QUESTIONS

16. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.