

6. 6. 2013

BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD

**SUBMISSIONS COMMITTEE
25 MARCH AND 3 APRIL 2013**

**Minutes of a meeting of the Submissions Committee
held on Monday 25 March 2013 at 12.30pm in the Meeting Room, Shirley Service Centre,
36 Marshland Road and reconvened on Wednesday 3 April 2013 at 12 noon in the Meeting Room,
Shirley Service Centre, 36 Marshland Road**

PRESENT: Linda Stewart (Chairperson), Tim Baker, David East and Tim Sintes.

APOLOGIES: An apology for absence was received and accepted from Julie Gorman for both meetings.

The Committee reports that:

PART C – DELEGATED DECISIONS

1. DRAFT CHRISTCHURCH CITY THREE YEAR PLAN 2013-16 – BOARD SUBMISSIONS

At its meeting on 18 February 2013, the Board resolved that its Submissions Committee consider and prepare a submission on the Christchurch City Three Year Plan 2013-16 presented back to the Board for adoption.

The Committee reviewed the draft documents and prepared the **attached** submission for adoption by the Board.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the Board's submission on the Christchurch City Three Year Plan 2013-16, be adopted.

2. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The Committee **resolved** that the meeting on 25 March 2013 be adjourned at 3pm and reconvened at 12noon on Wednesday 3 April 2013.

The meeting on 3 April 2013 concluded at 2.35pm.

SUBMISSION TO: Christchurch City Council

ON: Christchurch City Draft Three Year Plan 2013/16

BY: Burwood/Pegasus Community Board

CONTACT: Linda Stewart
Chairperson
c/- PO Box 27023
CHRISTCHURCH 8640

027 4053257
landnotes@xtra.co.nz

1. INTRODUCTION

The Burwood/Pegasus Community Board appreciates the opportunity to make this submission to the Council on its Draft Christchurch City Three Year Plan ('the Plan'), for the period 2013/16.

The Board **does** desire to be heard in support of its submission.

2. SUBMISSION

The primary focus of the Board's feedback on this draft Plan is the major facilities rebuild projects and on the proposed capital programme. Mention is also made regarding the Rates Remission Policy and on scheduled Fees and Charges.

A general point which the Board feels obliged to make is its frustration at not being able to readily identify the scope of some of the key capital projects e.g. land drainage works, because the draft document is framed in a manner that in general, uses only global figures. This approach did not enable the Board to understand and scrutinise the extent of such projects proposed to be undertaken in the Burwood/Pegasus ward.

VOLUME 1

Major Community Facilities Rebuild (Page 52)

Eastern Aquatics Facility

The Eastern Aquatic Facility is mentioned on this page and no doubt elsewhere in the documentation, as providing a Council contribution of \$31 million.

While offering its absolute endorsement for the retention of this sum in the budget, the Board requests that for the avoidance of all doubt, this funding must be earmarked for an aquatic based facility that replaces Queen Elizabeth 11 Park to be located in the **Burwood/Pegasus ward**. (Board emphasis)

The Board highlights the Council's decision made on this matter through its Annual Plan 2012/13, which was to:

"Approve a recreation and sport facility to be built at QEII or agreed alternative location following wide community consultation and with a preliminary budget of \$30.5 million (29 million plus inflation allowance)...."

Athletics Track

The Board acknowledges the intended amount of \$6.7 million for an athletics track presumably as part of the Nga Puna Wai sports hub proposal in Middleton.

The Board would point to the success of the grass-based athletics facility currently operating at Rawhiti Domain in New Brighton.

In this regard, the Board seeks the Council's support for this key local facility to be not only retained but enhanced through this budget as even in its present configuration, it is making a major contribution to the significant progress being achieved by Rawhiti Community Sport Inc in establishing a viable and sustainable local sports hub on the Domain.

Former AMI Stadium Replacement

The Board restates a view expressed last year in its submission on the Draft Annual Plan, which is that there is a repeated heavy emphasis in this draft budget in providing major public facilities in the central city.

While appreciating why this is so in relation to the requirements of the Central City Recovery Plan, the Board does feel that the Council needs to redirect its focus from the central city and address the capital project needs of suburban communities.

In this respect, the Board congratulates the Council for its intention to begin the rollout of its programmes for the suburban master plans.

While not a majority perspective, the Board does suggest that an agreed means needs to be found to defer the covered stadium given its considerable capital cost, and that the temporary AMI facility at Addington can continue to meet the city's stadium needs for the foreseeable future. The Board submits that the covered stadium proposal could be deemed 'aspirational' rather than a 'business as usual' requirement.

Lichfield and Manchester Street Carpark Repairs

The Board would prefer that the repair works on these car parking buildings be staged in a way that reflects the pace of the rebuild and the associated off-street parking demand arising.

Capital Projects

The Board is wholeheartedly supportive of those various listed capital projects in the Burwood/Pegasus ward and in particular notes the following as BAU Growth related:

- ID 234 Marshland/Prestons – intersection improvement
- ID 1347 Lower Styx/Marshland – intersection improvement
- ID 1985 Mairehau/Marshland – intersection improvement
- ID 2034 Burwood/Mairehau – intersection improvement

Cycleways

The Board appreciates the intended Major Cycleway: Avon River Route – New Brighton to City project (ID 1982 Aspirational – Increased Levels of Service).

Progress on this important project has been sought by the Board for several years so to have it signalled in this Plan, is most welcomed.

New Brighton Centre Master Plan

The Board compliments the Council for the intended funding commitment of \$2.2 million (ID 2383) to begin the implementation of this much anticipated project that will contribute significantly to the rejuvenation of the New Brighton Centre and surrounding areas.

Landfill

The Board acknowledges the ongoing programme of aftercare associated with the closed areas of the Burwood Landfill (ID 162).

Northern Trunk Sewer

The Board notes that the path of this important work (ID 873) will traverse through the Burwood/Pegasus area to the Bromley Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The Board is unsure of the impact of this project (if any) on the Burwood/Pegasus Ward and requests further information on the scope of the proposed works.

Travis Wetland

The intended ongoing funding for work in this significant natural area (ID 484), is much appreciated by the Board.

New Brighton – Open Space

The Board seeks clarification on what this project relates to (ID 2386). The activity refers to Neighbourhood Parks in the Aspirational category but provides no other supporting details.

Core Passenger Transport Route/Facilities - East (New Brighton)

Again, the Board is unsure what this relates to (ID 931) and requests further information on the scope of this project.

Pages Road Upgrade

The Board is very supportive of this project (ID 927) and accordingly requests that it be moved from the Aspirational category to BAU Core.

Avon SMP- Waterways Detention and Treatment Facilities

In noting that this project (ID 2416) relates to flood protection and control works associated with the Avon River, the Board submits that successive budget plans will need to address flood protection measures post earthquake for those lower Avon River and Estuary areas.

The Board also seeks a briefing from staff at an appropriate point on the details of future plans for the stop bank network and land drainage issues along the Avon River corridor and connected wetland areas.

General Comment

The Board notes the commentary in the Plan (Volume 1, pages 17 to 21) given to the issues and challenges for the future rebuild and recovery of Christchurch.

Given the magnitude of what lies ahead, the Board understands that all of the capital projects described as 'aspirational' won't all make it through for adoption in the Plan. The Board would hope however that these projects will contribute to framing the capital programme in the next Long Term Plan.

On the topics of 'like for like' and 'betterment', the Board recalls that in the Council's adopted Stronger Christchurch Infrastructure Rebuild Plan in December 2011, it was stated that:

‘ Resilience and betterment

The vision for rebuilding earthquake-damaged infrastructure is about ‘creating resilient infrastructure that gives people security and confidence in the future of Christchurch’. It is important that it is understood what is meant by the term resilience. Linked with resilience is the term betterment.

In the case of the infrastructure rebuild, resilience is the ability of our services to resist future earthquake damage and continue to function. Improved infrastructure resilience can be achieved by: using better materials, adopting higher construction standards, creating new systems, building redundancy into systems, and eliminating, isolating or minimising the hazard.

Betterment is used to describe an improvement in the system and it raises both opportunity and cost. Examples we will face in the infrastructure rebuild include providing improved resilience to future earthquakes, increasing the capacity of piped networks, enhancing streetscapes and providing new infrastructure to meet the needs of the future.

These opportunities will be considered as part of our strategic planning. Clearly, this can create additional costs to the rebuild and will need to be considered carefully by both local and central government. In some cases a betterment opportunity may lead to a reduction in cost, for example, where a street is narrowed and brought up to current standards or where underground infrastructure is installed at a shallower depth. These opportunities will be vigorously pursued.

We will need to review the implications of improving resilience and or including betterment on a project-by-project basis, especially where there is increased budget required. A mechanism is being established to formalise decisions made where there is an impact on the overall cost. A range of situations along the spectrum of resilience and betterment will need to be considered during the infrastructure rebuild. However, It is expected that the starting point for the infrastructure rebuild will be the rebuild of ‘like for like’ assets with the same Level of Service (LOS) i.e. similar layout and technology,

but using modern equivalent materials or construction methods and any increased resilience measures gathered through earthquake learnings. A number of technical standards and guidelines are being put in place to determine how this is defined for each asset.

The Board highlights this important aspect as it is aware of the interest and growing expectations evident from communities in Burwood/Pegasus wanting to know more about the infrastructure rebuild programme and clarity around the process for contributing to projects including improvement opportunities.

The Board looks forward to being an active participant in all such local instances.

Business Unit Budgets/Levels of Service

Wainoni/Aranui Family Centre

The Board is aware that this facility is destined to be demolished.

The Board asks what contribution is the Council making towards its replacement and will the insurance proceeds from the (now) demolished Aranui Hall and the Centre itself, be utilised towards the rebuild?

Community Grants (page 237)

The Board notes that the level of increase from 2014/15 and 2015/16 is minimal to the extent that it may not keep up with the Consumer Price Index. Nor does it reflect the significant and growing earthquake related recovery needs of our affected local communities.

On this basis therefore, the Board would request that the Council revisit and address the issue of inflation proofing this much needed and tangible funding support to the community.

Civil Defence and Emergency Management (page 237)

The Board would appreciate receiving more information about this activity including clarification about the extent of community preparedness proposed over the three year period of the Plan.

The work undertaken in the South New Brighton/Southshore communities was to be a 'pilot' however its rollout was curtailed by the earthquakes. Other local coastal areas were to follow so the Board is keen to know whether this has been factored in to the Plan.

Queen Elizabeth 11 Park – Greenspace Areas

The Board is interested in receiving any funding information contained in the draft Plan for the various open space areas spread across the former QEII Park site.

Capital Endowment Fund re salt water pools

The Board asks the question '*Can the Capital Endowment Fund be utilised to contribute towards the provision of salt water pools as part of the water park proposal at New Brighton?*'

Bexley Reserve and South New Brighton Reserves

The Board has been kept informed by staff of the work being done regarding the Concept Plan for Bexley Reserve and the revision of the Management Plan for the South New Brighton Reserves. The Board fully supports the completion of these projects.

Responding to the earthquake impacts has been the basis of this important work. The Board sees this as a tangible contribution being made by the Council towards the recovery of these reserve areas and most importantly, the immediate local communities in Bexley and South New Brighton/Southshore.

On the basis that the updated plans will be adopted within the next Council term, it is not clear to the Board whether funding is provided in the Draft Three Year Plan to give effect to work programmes identified in each of the (to be) approved plans.

If no such funding is earmarked, the Board would strongly submit that this must happen otherwise the contribution to the recovery of these communities will be considerably delayed.

VOLUME 2

Public Conveniences (pages 12 to 15)

The Board notes the legislative requirements on the Council to periodically assess the provision of sanitary services, including public toilets.

It is the Board's view there are public toilets provided by the Council that are not up to the standard expected by the public. Such examples are the toilets in New Brighton at the Pier and those located in the Mall precinct.

While noting that the draft New Brighton Centre Master Plan identifies planned new facilities, the Board seeks an immediate improvement in the levels of service for these particular toilets ahead of their eventual replacement.

Stormwater (pages 16 to 18)

The Board offers its support and endorsement for the intended stormwater assessment work.

The Board's expectation is that this work will be carried out in conjunction with the Earthquake Commission and CERA in relation to addressing the flooding and new ground level related issues relevant to the lower Avon River catchment.

Wastewater Collection and Treatment (pages 19 and 20)

The Board acknowledges the mention made that Marshland has been identified as a high risk area owing to its shallow groundwater and peaty soils.

Development Contributions Policy 2013 (pages 57 to 123)

While noting the complexity of this policy, the Board records its general support for its content.

Remission and Postponement Policy of Rates on Maori Freehold Land (pages 125 to 126)

In acknowledging the rationale for the formulation of this policy, the Board's preference would be that this aspect be covered in an integrated and 'all embracing' rate remission policy rather than separately, as set out in the Plan.

Rates Remission Policy (pages 127 to 130)

- **Earthquake- affected properties**

A question that the Board has is in regard to point (i):

*'rates remission on the value of improvements, or 40 percent rates remission, whichever is the greater for residential and non residential properties that are **unable to be occupied.**'*

Do the words in bold above apply to the now numerous rateable residential properties which have, are currently or are listed on forward work programmes to receive earthquake related repairs that will necessitate them to be 'unable to be occupied' for varying periods of time?

- **Electricity Supply Charges**

The number of properties in Burwood/Pegasus that will receive a replacement low pressure pump sewer system is significant.

While the Council's intended remission for those affected properties will seemingly apply for the 2013/14 year, the Board would prefer that in future years, the property valuations and the corresponding rates that are struck, will take account of the electricity requirements for those properties which are to receive the low pressure wastewater service.

Fees and Charges (pages 139 to 208)

In general, the Board accepts the intended changes to many of the fees and charges set out in the schedules. It does however wish to highlight several examples where it is felt that the proposed fee increases are too high.

The first of these relates to the 10 percent increase for weekend event hire for the use of the North New Brighton War Memorial Hall and Community Centre (page 143). The location of this facility is in a community still very much in earthquake recovery mode and in recognition of this, the Board feels the proposed fee increase for users of this popular venue, is not appropriate.

A second example is in relation to minor plumbing alterations (page 191) which is set to rise in year 2013/14 from \$305 to \$675, a 121 percent increase.

The Board considers this to be excessive. It is also the Board's view that such fees have escalated in recent times and from feedback received, the layman finds this hard to justify. If these fee rises are to be substantiated, it is the Board's expectation that there is a commensurate improvement in service levels delivered to customers.

15. 4. 2013

Burwood/Pegasus Community Board Submissions Committee 25. 3 .2013 and 3. 4. 2013

- 8 -

Council Controlled Organisations (pages 215 to 234)

The Board noted the text content with interest. Its observation however is that the summarised schedules of the Statement of Financial Performance Targets are not consistent in their described wording and do not enable the reader to glean much value in the abbreviated format presented.



Linda Stewart
Chairperson

BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD

17 April 2013